

## Annual Meeting in St. Louis to Center on Revitalization of AAUP in Missouri

The Missouri Conference Annual Meeting will be held on Saturday, February 24, 2007 at Webster University in St. Louis. In addition to several knowledgeable speakers, we will have a brief business meeting and elections for officers and executive council members.

### Joint Meeting with St. Louis Association for Contingent Faculty

For the first time in recent memory, the Missouri AAUP Annual Meeting will be held jointly with another organization. The St. Louis Association for Contingent Faculty (SLACF) arose from a conference last April that brought together full- and part-time faculty, administrators, and a range of speakers, participants, and sponsors. The AAUP and SLACF will meet jointly in the morning session to hear invited speakers; the separate afternoon sessions will include business meetings for each group. Organizers from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the Missouri National Education Association (MNEA) will also be present. Members of the Missouri Association of Faculty Senates (MAFS) will also be invited to attend and participate.

Webster University is located in Webster Groves, MO (63119), a southwestern suburb of St. Louis. The meeting will be held in the Conference Room of the Emerson Library at 101 Edgar Road. See [webster.edu](http://webster.edu) for parking and driving instructions. Visit the Missouri Conference Website at [moaaup.org](http://moaaup.org) for more meeting information.

### State Senator Rita Days to Discuss Higher Education in Missouri

Missouri lawmaker and longtime friend of education, Rita Heard Days (14<sup>th</sup> District), has accepted our invitation to deliver a keynote address and will speak about several different issues facing academe in the state.



Missouri State Senator  
Rita Heard Days

Senator Days was born in Louisiana, graduated from Webster High School in St. Louis, and received a music degree from Lincoln University in 1972. She was first elected State Representative in November 1993 and later served as Majority Whip. Senator Days sponsored or co-sponsored legislation on early childhood education and education reform and has served on the Commission on the Future of Higher Education as well as the Southern Legislative Conference Education Committee. She was elected to the state senate in 2002 and serves on the education committee, among others.

See Meeting, page 2

### Lincoln University: A Model of Administration/AAUP Cooperation

After years of grassroots work toward salary equity and parity, Lincoln University's faculty started the 2006 academic year with pay that finally reflects current state average salaries as well as taking into account years of service and years at rank. Because most faculty salaries were so far below the state averages, increases of thousands of dollars were awarded, with the most being an adjustment of over \$18,000. Staff pay was also raised, and we are in stage one of a two-phase plan for reviewing and increasing staff salaries. A short history of this issue reveals the importance of the AAUP on Lincoln's campus.



by  
Nancy Browning  
Executive Council,  
MO AAUP

As early as the year 2000, the university senate created an *ad hoc* committee to review issues of equity and parity in salaries. However, the administration at that time only gave lip service to increasing salaries; indeed, the president at that time wrote to the campus community that he would not deal with the unequal salaries among peers that had preceded his administration.

After the Board of Curators ignored a vote of no confidence in the President, the local AAUP group was reformed in 2002 (having lapsed on campus for several years).

When searching for a new president in the fall of 2004, AAUP guidelines were put forth, suggesting that faculty and staff representation be significant and that those representatives be elected to serve on the search committee. Although the number of faculty and staff committee members was much lower than AAUP guidelines suggest, the faculty and staff were allowed to elect representatives. The search produced an excellent candidate, Dr. Carolyn R. Mahoney, who began her tenure at Lincoln in February of 2005.

See Lincoln, page 2

#### In This Issue

Annual Meeting	1-2
Positive Changes at Lincoln University	1-2
Nancy Browning	
Tenure Myths	3-4
Keith Hardeman	
Disturbing Trends in Higher Education	
John Harms	6, 4

Meeting, from page 1

### Richard Schneirov and David Robinson Round Out Conference Speakers

Two other speakers will address topics of general interest to the combined groups. **Professor Richard Schneirov** (Indiana State University), a labor historian and member of the AAUP Committee on Contingent Faculty and the Profession, will join us to talk about recent developments in the effort to achieve parity between full- and part-time faculty.

Professor Schneirov holds a Ph. D. from Northern Illinois University (1984) and has taught at Indiana State since 1989. He is the author of several books including *Labor and Urban Politics: Class Conflict and the Origins of Modern Liberalism in Chicago, 1864-97* (University of Illinois Press, 1998) which won an award for books in the category of North American urban history. Professor Schneirov is on the editorial board of *WorkingUSA: The Journal of Labor and Society*.

Missouri Conference member **David Robinson** (Truman State University) will talk on "Collegiality, Contingency, and the Continuation of Tenure," noting the broad history of these issues and highlighting relevant AAUP policies and practices.



David Robinson,  
Truman State University

Professor Robinson has served in various capacities with the Truman State AAUP (as president from 2003-2006) and is a member of the state AAUP executive council.

Dr. Robinson holds a Ph. D. in History from the University of California at Berkeley (1987) and has taught at Truman for the past sixteen years. His travels, research, and publication often focus on the history of higher education and he notes,

There are connections (and frequent disconnects) between the history that I research and the experience that I have, today in the American academy. Collegiality under the German, Humboltian model of higher education meant faculty sharing the main responsibility for running their institutions. "Professional" administrators in universities today often use the word "collegiality" when they mean "compliance" (to what they personally want). I like to take the long view, naturally, and see if we can better understand ourselves, our accomplishments, and our challenges, in terms of past experience and the history of our institutions.

### UMKC CHAPTER NEWS

by Stuart McAninch and Susan Adler

On October 20, the AAUP chapter at UMKC sponsored a tenure workshop that brought together current and former deans and associate deans, department chairs, and members of promotion and tenure committees at the unit and university levels to discuss tenure review procedures and issues pertaining to tenure review and tenure. Faculty



members who have recently been awarded tenure and whose applications are currently being reviewed also participated in the discussion. Approximately twenty tenure-track faculty members attended. Pat Brodsky, chapter president, reviewed AAUP principles related to tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance in her introductory remarks. Drawing on their own experiences, chapter members also emphasized the importance of not waiting for tenure to be awarded before speaking up on pressing issues facing faculty and the university.

Gary Ebersole, professor of history and religious studies and chapter member, was elected Chair of the Faculty Senate in the spring elections. The Senate is continuing work on securing a stronger voice for faculty in budget making and on analysis of issues pertaining to cost and efficiency of the university's administrative structure. ■

Lincoln University, from page 1

During the summer and fall before Dr. Mahoney arrived, the chair of the university senate formed two *ad hoc* committees on salary, resulting in the recommendation that the university form a Compensation Committee charged with reviewing the salary schedule for faculty and staff, among other responsibilities. When the senate recommended this committee to Dr. Mahoney, she created it and stood behind its recommendations when money needed to be allocated by the Budgetary Review Committee. That the Budgetary Review Committee had faculty members was also new to Lincoln and supported by Dr. Mahoney.

Because the AAUP was consulted and because Lincoln University followed its principles and practices, at least to some extent, we now have a president who

Because the AAUP was consulted and because Lincoln University followed its principles and practices, at least to some extent, we now have a president who consults regularly with the AAUP Executive Committee and takes our ideas into consideration.

—Nancy Browning

consults regularly with the AAUP Executive Committee and takes our ideas into consideration. The AAUP Executive Committee had also recommended anonymous evaluation of administrators be completed by all faculty. Dr. Mahoney agreed and quickly effected this, so that some administrators were evaluated in the fall of 2005, her first fall on campus, and the rest, including herself, were evaluated during the spring of 2006. Some administrators resigned or retired after this evaluation.

Those of us who have taught at Lincoln for years and who have worked for faculty governance and for fair compensation offer our success story and hope that it will inspire faculty and staff at other campuses to activate or reactivate local AAUP chapters. ■



# TENURE MYTHS

When comparisons are made between college professors and professionals working in the private sector, those who

are unfamiliar with the concept of tenure may be biased in thinking that educators shouldn't have greater job security than anyone else. The reality is that the levels of job security in both areas are probably far more closely related than most people realize. Therefore, it is important to examine some of the myths and realities concerning tenure as it protects academic freedom.



by Keith T. Hardeman  
Vice President  
MO AAUP

## Myth #1: Tenure Insures Lifetime Employment

Probably the biggest fallacy about tenure is that, once attained, professors, unlike other professionals, have permanent employment and cannot be fired. That is, in the simplest of terms, untrue. In fact the only difference between the approach of terminating a faculty member and an at-will employee is that the faculty member must be given due process. In other words, a case must be made that the termination is justified. Supreme Court justices have lifetime employment. Tenured college professors are renewed year to year so long as there is appropriate funding and no cause or justification for dismissal.

## Myth #2: Tenure Causes Professors to Become Complacent and Less Productive

This fallacy is rooted in the previous one. After all, when one has permanent employment, why put forth the effort to stay atop of one's field? Why spend countless hours creating new classes and revamping old ones? Why invest time in technology to better present course material? Why research? Why write about anything of significance? Why write at all? The answer to each of these questions is simple: because, as evidence will show, the vast majority of college and university faculty are professionals dedicated to the improvement and advancement of higher education.

While opponents of tenure believe it does little but cover for laggards, there is clear evidence that tenured and tenure-track faculty are more productive than contingent faculty (those who are on full- or part-time non-tenured lines). Tenure-line faculty work more hours per week, spend more time on teaching activities, and publish more than their contingent counterparts.

The results of a 1992-93 study conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics show that during the two-year study, tenure-line faculty spent roughly fifty hours per week—about four hours per week more than full-time contingent faculty—working at their institutions. In addition, they devoted about three percent more of their time toward teaching than did adjuncts. Tenure-line faculty out-published and out-presented full-time adjuncts almost two to one.

When compared to part-time faculty exclusively, full-time professors worked an average of 30-40 hours more per week at their respective institutions, spent considerably more time teaching in the classroom, and dedicated two to three times as much outside-of-class instruction to students. Comparisons of professional development yielded even greater discrepancies between the two. Depending on the type of institution, virtually all full-time faculty published significantly more and, in some cases, as much as five to ten times more than part-time. The very idea that most tenured professors are lazy boors who need to be whipped into shape is woefully out of touch with reality.

Tenured faculty spend more hours per week than full-time adjuncts, devote more of their time teaching than adjuncts, and out-publish and out-present contingent faculty by about two to one.

—National Center for Education Statistics

## Myth #3: Most College Faculty Have or Are in Line to Receive Tenure

The numbers of full-time tenured faculty are shrinking—dramatically. Retirements often result in replacement of the tenure-line by a contingent position, whether full- or part-time. Part-time faculty positions have increased by 43 percent in the U.S. since 1995. Though these numbers include for-profit institutions where the corporate model is most prevalent (and where tenure is all but nonexistent), those in contingent positions in the not-for-profit area still account for nearly 50% of all faculty in public institutions and 40% in private colleges and universities.

## Myth #4: Reducing or Eliminating Tenure Saves Money (And Lowers Tuition) Without Reducing Instructional Quality

In terms of budgets, having a majority of faculty holding part-time positions might initially sound attractive to administrators, boards of trustees, and professionals in the private sector. Paying instructors on a per-class basis yields far lower salaries, and there are no benefits for the

institution to cover financially. As former AAUP Associate General Secretary Ernst Benjamin says, however, "Unfortunately, as with other swindles, the proposition that sounds too good to be true is."

There are many problems associated with this model. This is not to suggest, however, that part-time or other contingent faculty serve no role in higher education, nor does the blame for corresponding problems lie with them. The author realizes most part-time faculty are doing their best to get grounded into full-time tenure-track positions. The following represent some problems that are likely to occur in the event of tenured or tenure-track faculty not being a clear majority in an institution.

Part-time faculty may not be as available for office hours and outside help. Those who teach classes at more than one venue ("freeway flyers") will likely be spending more time behind the wheel than behind a desk.

First, students frequently suffer the consequences of reduced educational continuity. For many reasons, part-time faculty and full-timers with semester or year contracts are often associated with a high turnover rate. With turnover, institutions get different levels of qualifications and competence along with varying areas of expertise. Attracting the best teachers essentially becomes a roll of the dice, and few may be able to stick around for long. Course offerings would be in constant flux.

Second, part-time faculty may not be as available for office hours and outside help (see previously mentioned studies). Those who teach classes at more than one venue (faculty sometimes known as "freeway flyers") will likely (and out of necessity) be spending more time behind the wheel than behind a desk.

Third, contingent faculty are less likely to attend faculty meetings or serve on faculty committees, both important components of faculty governance. They could have little or no say on curricular decisions, assessment activities, college policies, personnel discussions, and evaluation (and tenure) procedures. Therefore, they likely have little investment in an institution that puts little investment in them.

Fourth, since most part-time faculty are not evaluated on professional development, there is less incentive for research and writing, two exercises that obviously enhance one's knowledge in a respective discipline. Without doubt, taking on such projects, as most tenure-line faculty are required to do, can translate into improvement in the classroom as well.

One cannot dispute that as enrollments increase and the cost of education rises, the number of tenure-line faculty has declined. Therefore, it's perplexing, to say the least, when critics insist that tenure is responsible for recent dramatic increases in tuition. In terms of quantity, quality and proportion, tenure-line professors teach more, research more, write more, publish more and spend more time with students than contingent faculty. Given these comparisons, it could be reasonably argued that tenure conclusively provides students with better instruction and is more cost-efficient than its lack of availability. AAUP salary reports indicate that tenure-line faculty earnings are not excessive. Sadly, when today's salaries are adjusted for inflation, they are slightly below 1971 levels. It is extremely unfortunate that tenure-line faculty have erroneously and unfairly become scapegoats of budgetary problems and tuition hikes in higher education. ■

Excerpted with permission of the editors. Hardeman, Keith T., "The Continuing War on Academic Freedom and Tenure: Will They Survive?" *Iowa Journal of Communication*, vol. 38, no. 2, Spring 2006.

*Disturbing Trends, continued from page 6*

Appropriations per \$1000 Personal Income & Per Capita (Grapevine, Illinois State University)

State	\$ Per \$1K PI	Rank	\$ Per Capita	Rank
IA	8.23	16	262.90	17
KS	8.51	14	274.91	11
AR	9.83	11	263.73	16
OK	8.10	17	235.65	20
IL	5.73	34	204.91	32
KY	10.21	9	289.32	10
TN	6.07	31	188.33	35
<b>MO</b>	<b>4.66</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>147.60</b>	<b>46</b>

**Missouri needs an investment formula for higher education tied to a reliable and adequate revenue source.**



## Public Higher Education In Missouri: *Disturbing Trends*

Compiled by John B. Harms, Missouri State University  
President, Missouri Conference of American Association of University Professors 2006

In the past 25 years, public financial support for higher education has declined by one-third, and students and their families have seen tuition and fees increase to make up the difference. In Missouri, these trends are more extreme than in most states. Consider the following facts about Missouri's public higher education:

- Missouri paid 81.6% of students' educational expenses in 1980 and only 46.0% in 2007.  
*President Nietzel, State of the University Address, Missouri State University*
- The percentage of Missouri's budget dedicated to higher education was 16.8% in 1980 and 12.7% in 2007.  
*President Nietzel, State of the University Address, Missouri State University*
- In FY2004, the national average for state funded tuition aid per FTE was \$305,000, while Missouri provided \$160,000 or 52.5% of the national average.  
*SHEEO, SHEF Report FY2004*
- Tuition at Missouri's public four-year colleges and universities increased 58% between FY2001 and FY2006.  
*Missouri Budget Project*
- Nationally, between FY2001 and FY2006, states averaged an increase in appropriations for higher education of 9.9%. In Missouri, appropriations *declined* 10.8% or \$103.3 million (from \$959.4 to \$856.1 million) during this same period.  
*Grapevine, Illinois State University*
- Nationally, in FY2006, state support for higher education increased 6%, while Missouri's increase was 0.1%.  
*President Nietzel, State of the University Address, Missouri State University*
- Missouri ranks 46<sup>th</sup> among all states in appropriations for higher education.  
*Grapevine, Illinois State University*

These facts indicate that Missouri is falling behind in public support of higher education. Compared to national averages, or what our surrounding seven states appropriate, Missouri is clearly falling behind.

*Continued on page 4 (inside)*