Strangers in the Academy:
Beginning Professors in Pursuit of (Academic) Freedom

By Susan Finley

In the short story, "The Artist at Work" (1955/1986), Albert Camus tells an allegorical tale about Jonas, an enormously successful young painter who generates a near cult following among art critics, art students, and the public at large. Alas, poor Jonas is cursed by his success. The public attention to his work leaves him with little time for painting, his home-studio overfills with family and visitors, and Jonas loses the benefits of solitude—time and space—necessary to his artistic success. Caught up in the turmoil of his life and unable to respond to the many conflicting demands made of him, he eventually becomes both less prolific and less accomplished an artist. As surely as they once loved him, the critics turn to condemn him. Eventually, he is left with only the affections of his family and his one true friend, Rateau. Desperate, Jonas builds a loft under the ceiling of his living room and becomes once again absorbed, now working day and night without adequate food or rest until, finally, he collapses from exhaustion. When Rateau ascends the loft to assess the final works that have brought about his friend's collapse, he finds only a single, blank canvas upon which Jonas has scrawled a lone word in very small print, so illegible that it cannot be said with any certainty whether he has written *solitary* or *solidary*.

Susan Finley is an adjunct professor in the Department of Teacher Education, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

The story of Jonas captures the tension inherent in the dialectical relation between individuals and their

societies: the mutual shaping that goes on between individuals and the social structures where they participate, the conflict between individual freedom and social determinism, the struggle to choose one's own existence within the confines of social structures, and the possibility that one's freely chosen actions will bring about events that were neither anticipated nor intended. "The Artist at Work" can be read as an allegory for "The Pretenure Teacher Educator at Work." The demands on pretenure faculty are many and diverse; these demands ensue from the institution, professional organizations, and the public at large, as well as from self-demands and one's own motivations and aspirations. Like the artist, the teacher educator does not live in isolation, but resides among friends and family; like the artist, the teacher educator receives little enough financial compensation; like the artist, emphasis is on productivity. "Publish or perish" is the rule of academe.

In this article, I make several interrelated arguments about the ways in which the "publish or perish" dictum compromises the academic freedoms of beginning teacher educators. I argue that "publish or perish" is especially troublesome when coupled with institutional expectations that beginning professors of education will be leaders in institutional efforts to restructure and reform educational systems. I also argue that such "publish or perish" compromises to the academic freedoms of beginning faculty constrain institutional change, prevent the building of communities of difference, and discourage new, minority professors' efforts to join the teaching education profession. Finally, I argue that "publish or perish" limits the academy to ameliorative (cosmetic) change rather than meaningful reforms that will strengthen and encourage democratic values in schooling in the United States of America (USA) and beyond.

I base my arguments in the experiences of Scott, Katharine, and John, three untenured but tenure track teacher educators working in a large research university in the Midwestern USA.[1]

Contexts

In the early to mid-1990s, Katharine, Scott, and John were hired into a thriving teacher education department in a land-grant university well-recognized for its teaching and research initiatives in education. On the national scene, within the proximate time-frame of their hiring, USA education had come under sharp criticism from lawmakers and the general public alike for a period of several years. Schools of education across the country were stepping back to evaluate and restructure their programs. The school of education where Katharine, Scott, and John went to work was no exception. The university became an early member of the Holmes Group and began aggressive efforts to meet its commitments to the goals of that organization.[2]

Two major thrusts to the Holmes initiatives greatly impacted teacher educators' practices in this school of education: First, the Holmes alignment spurred the

development of working partnerships between the teacher education department and Professional Development Schools (PDSs). These partnerships are with regular public schools that cooperate to provide a practical preparatory environment for novice teachers, a collaborative research environment for teachers and teacher educators, and partner Holmes schools and universities collaborate to provide ongoing learning opportunities for in-service teachers. In these PDS arrangements, teachers in K-12 schools and faculty in schools of education are expected to facilitate each other's learning while building toward teacher educator programs that, according to Holmes' reports, are more rigorous and connected—to liberal arts education, to research on learning and teaching, and to wise practice in the schools. Further, in response to the Holmes Group's recognition of and concern to rectify the over-representation of white, Anglo education professionals at every level of American schooling, the Holmes Group also introduced the "Holmes Scholars Network," an effort to provide scholarships, fellowships, or assistantships of full tuition and stipend to promising graduate students who are members of underrepresented groups in the ranks of professional educators.

The Holmes project and its incumbent wave of restructuring efforts were introduced to the teacher education department at this Midwestern university by a new dean. This administrator was deeply committed to the Holmes' initiatives. Moreover, he expected all of the teacher education faculty to be "team players" who would work together toward the Holmes' efforts, regardless of the personal research interests of faculty, the alignment of faculty interests with the interests and needs of cooperating teachers in the PDS schools, or the rank of faculty in the teacher education department, or even without attention to the relative commitment of faculty to cooperative interaction with each other and with faculty colleagues and teachers in participating PDS schools.

Meanwhile, in addition to the school of education's involvement in these PDS collaborations, it also undertook a restructuring effort to introduce a five-year teacher certification program. The restructured curricular design calls for a fifth year preservice internship, again emphasizing the importance of practice in the preparation of future teachers. The planning and implementation of this new curriculum is taking place across a period of about ten years, with evaluation of the program a final phase that will begin as its first cohort of preservice teachers reaches their fifth year. Integrated teacher education is a secondary mission in this restructuring—integration of special education, of content area literacy, and of multiculturalism. All documents pertaining to the teaching of content areas in the newly revised program use the word "team" to describe faculty interactions. As part of the restructuring effort and to build the ethos of collaboration, the dean encouraged team teaching, collaborative mentoring, and team research projects. Collaborating teams of faculty are responsible for the design and implementation of the curriculum.

To Perish on the Sword of Service?

The Inherent Paradox of Practice Based Research

John (the first of the three research participants to be hired by the university) arrived after the school had formed its alliance with the Holmes Group, but near the beginning of both intensive PDS involvement and the school of education's efforts at restructuring. Katharine joined the faculty one year later, when the commitment to PDSs was especially strong. Scott, a Holmes Scholar at his graduate institution, came to the university three years after John and two years after Katharine.

Katharine, Scott, and John variously describe the dean who initiated these measures of restructuring and reform as "efficient," "dedicated," "Napoleonic," and as having wrought "a rein of terror." John believes that the dean's expectations were wholly "unreal," beginning with "an extraordinary demand for collaboration." He says:

> I was hired here to work in professional development schools by a dean and a department head who were pushing PDSs as part of a grand scheme in which the way work would happen in the future would be that faculty members in a college of education would lead a balanced life of teaching, researching, and service, all oriented around professional development schools. I happened to come at a time when the then-dean was trying to get everybody in the college to do essentially the same thing.

Instead, many faculty at all levels on the promotional ladder were less than committed to the emphasis on collaborative work. They simply did not participate in PDS practices and team research. One of the benefits of tenure, responded John, is the "ability to choose one's own research prerogatives."

Once in motion, however, the new programs maintained a certain momentum. The goals that had been set forth for intensive collaboration among faculty and with K-12 schools became the general plan that guided departmental activities over the next several years. The situation endured despite the rather short tenure of the dean, who moved on to another post. The second dean in the early employment years of Katharine, Scott, and John maintained many of the same goals, but without the extreme emphasis that all faculty must participate in collaborative working arrangements. Remaining are the restructuring teams and several teams working on funded research projects. Many faculty who work in these programs are committed to collaborative efforts. John is one of those faculty:

> We collaborate here because it is impossible for the school to attain its stated goals without collaboration. Each of the problems of restructuring and of PDS is bigger than any individual can take on. We are going to have to work together to get something done because we wouldn't achieve it if we didn't work together.

In contrast, Katharine speculates that the rhetoric of collaboration far outpaces the actual instances of successful collaborative working arrangements in the

department. Moreover, the more Katharine worked with these collaborating groups of faculty, the greater her distaste for the arrangement. She came to believe that collaborations instill a kind of conservatism in the department in which "whoever has the narrowest frame wins." New ideas, always subject to group compromise, were too readily dismissed. Besides, she began to recognize that there were numerous unspoken hierarchies among faculty groups. These superstructures turned what were supposed to be collaborative efforts among peers into projects in which there were those who directed and those who did what they were directed to do—and she claims that the lowest level of the hierarchy was determined solely on the basis of who did and who did not have tenure protection. For instance, Katharine objected to the tendency for tenured faculty to delegate recording and other such lower-level administrative tasks to pretenure faculty. In these roles, newer faculty not only did not advance their research skills under the direction of more senior advisors but, additionally, an inordinate amount of their time for research activity was absorbed by so many small tasks. The result was that participation in established research teams obstructed efforts by beginning faculty to launch their own research agendas. The advantage of the research teams to beginning faculty was the ability to walk into an existing research project and become one of the members of a team that periodically published or otherwise distributed their research findings. Beginning faculty were then included as contributors to the team's shared authorship. But, Katharine also found that it was a great disadvantage for her as a newcomer to be introduced to the "game-playing" that went on in the groups over issues of stature and control, as well as conflicting goals among "team" members that she believed required her to assign allegiance to one or another of the sparring groups of faculty.

These collaborative working arrangements became a significant source of Katharine's growing frustration with her work as a teacher educator. She finally admitted:

> My notions of collaboration are killing me. They're flat out killing me.... It strikes me that the university keeps throwing at me a curriculum of cooperation and collaboration and I keep fighting it tooth and nail, trying to find ways to disentangle myself from the faculty at this university so that I can get on with my life.

Katharine further decries a system in which yearly evaluations require that each person break down a collaborative project to identify whatever elements they have contributed to the whole of the work, a process that Katharine terms "ridiculous" and that goes against every concept she has for working in collaboration—"That's the point of collaboration," she says, "working together to jointly construct something." For John, too, there is a great contradiction between the department's culture of cooperation and a rewards and promotion structure that most highly recognizes individual work. He says:

> There are no new ideas under the sun; yet, we have a score-keeping system that prizes individual work. We list individual publications. We face increased demands for collaboration, and we still keep score in monolithic ways!

John concurs with Katharine's claims that much of the work of collaboration falls most heavily on beginning professors. PDS work in particular becomes the domain of the untenured, he says. "Who's available to go to schools on a regular basis?" says John, "graduate students and assistant professors."

Scott faced an entirely different set of problems around issues of collaboration. Despite the department's emphasis on collaborative arrangements, Scott recalls:

> When I first came here the isolation almost killed me. For one thing, there were not that many African American people here. You could count on one hand the number of African American faculty in this college. From that perspective, there just aren't a lot of people here to talk about my interests and my research [special education inclusion and multiculturalism].

Ironically, in this hot-bed of collaboration, Scott has found it necessary to foster collaborative working relationships with faculty in other universities. Even the PDS project did not provide a collaborative setting adequate to integrate Scott into any of the established work groups in this school of education.

Initially, Scott's involvement with PDS work was limited to that of an occasional consultant. For instance, he would attend meetings of a group of special education teachers and share with them assessment instruments and initiate dialogue about inclusion between special education and general education teachers. He did feel some pressure from within the department to align himself more actively with a PDS initiative, but says that he was given great leeway in finding just the right setting for advancing his research. His objections to involving himself in the current PDS arrangements came down to an inherent conflict between what he understood to be his responsibility as an educator and the system that had been arranged. Where he was committed to a research and teaching agenda focused on eliminating the possibility that race, low-socioeconomic, and other social inhibitors might determine the quality of education for any student, the PDS projects he was invited to join were situated in relatively wealthy school settings, populated almost completely by white teachers and students.

Eventually, Scott found a place for himself in a Union City elementary school. He was the only faculty person involved in this new PDS arrangement. Although he had to drive more than an hour from the university to the school, the setting offered him the opportunity for working in an inner city school with a depressed socioeconomic base and a substantial population of African-American students. Besides, the teachers were in the process of attempting special education inclusion and they needed his support. He says:

> The work that I'm doing there is non-traditional which is me in a nutshell. It's more of an action research kind of thing; it's collaborative research. I go out there and I talk to the teachers. What are your needs? What do you want me to do? What do you want me to show you? That's what the research is. It's collaborative. It's not like going out there, sitting down, and taking notes as an onlooker. I'm involved with what they're doing, helping them to develop interventions and whatever.

Sometimes Scott worked with individual students in elementary classrooms at the Union City school where he would model inclusion techniques for both special education and grade level classroom teachers. On one occasion he admitted to crying in his car on his drive home after a particularly discouraging interaction with a twelve year old child who had not been taught to read but who he evaluated as teachable. In this research setting, he discovered a group of people who were receptive to his input and who greatly needed his services. Additionally, he found many situations that developed into stories he wanted to tell to other educators, as a teacher in his university classes and as a writer of research stories.

A Disappointing Concession

Scott admits, however, that the turn-around time for publishing action-research is much greater than what the university expects. "You have an annual review every year and people expect for you to have something different in press or something different that has been accepted, or something different in progress." After more than a year of time invested in the Union City project, Scott admitted defeat and pulled out. "I'll go back," he says, "especially if I can get a grant to fund my working out there." Although he has not yet been successful in obtaining the necessary level of grant funding, Scott sees procurement of outside funding to be a powerful tool for his achieving academic freedom as an assistant professor. With that money he would be able to focus his research where he would most like to be involved–action research about inclusion. In the immediate future, however, he regrets that he needs to work more quickly toward publications than is possible in an action-research setting.

Scott's research became increasingly localized the longer he worked in this university setting. He explains that his colleagues have encouraged him toward self-reflective inquiry as a means to increase his research productivity. He also admits that he can publish more if he concentrates on topics that are close to home, such as teacher education curricula issues inspired by events in his own classrooms, then he can if he extends himself to work with practicing teachers in Union City. Scott reluctantly determined not to sustain regular involvement at Union City in the second year of the project because he was stretching himself too thin and not devoting enough time to his writing. Instead, he has spent his allotted time for that project writing in collaboration with one of the Union City teachers about their shared experiences in Union City. The resulting article has been accepted for publication. Of the change from active, on-site involvement, to a writing phase, Scott says: "I just had to stop, reflect, and write about this experience for my own growth and *of course* it was time to take care of the tenure business."

Despite Scott's success at publishing, his high performance ratings on internal productivity reviews, and his growing network of colleagues at a national level, he is reticent to commit to a life-long career in academe. Scott tells us that as an African-American educator:

> One of the biggest things that you have to deal with is establishing credibility. Many of the students come here never having had an African-American teacher, never having had an African-American professor, and when they walk into the classroom that's the first thing they see. When they see you, at first all they think about are all the stereotypes and overt generalizations that they had learned about African-American men....

"You have to be better than anyone else to be successful," Scott says.

> I got here because I had to be better than everyone else. I know that, for example, when I came here, everyone else in this college who came here with me had not finished their doctorates, they were like ABD [all but dissertation], I was the only one who came with a PhD in hand.

As a professor in this particular setting, Scott has become more and more discouraged about the role he can play as a teacher educator. More than likely, he believes, he will move on at some point to a position in which he will have greater autonomy to allocate his time in the ways that he sees fit. He is discouraged that writing for publication focuses so exclusively on professional journals, rather than on publications that will be read by a variety of readers—parents, teachers, administrators, and faculty—but he also notes that a tenure committee may only consider his professional publications in his tenure evaluation.

Scott believes that this Midwestern university is a richer place by virtue of his participation (or the participation of other African-American faculty); he argues that African Americans have particular, culturally defined practices that would benefit the university, including holistic problem-solving strategies, a history of supportive communities, and value systems that can foster new levels of respect for education in the communities that universities serve. He argues that story-telling is one of the structures of communication in African-American culture and that it should be encouraged in educational settings, including its application to educational research. Regrettably, he found little interest among his colleagues in African-American culture. Rather, positive responses to his racial identity, he believes, were limited to invitations for him to join university committees that needed a representative Black participant.

Dissension and Defeat: Misgivings About Academe

Scott frequently talks about leaving the teacher education profession to try to find a setting where he can be more effective in limiting the possibility that race, low-socioeconomic, and other social inhibitors will determine quality of education for any person. He would like to write a novel that takes up some of the racial and social issues that he believes are at the crux of educational renewal, but finds that there is no time for alternative forms of writing—the pressure to write for journal publication is just too great. Besides, efforts to publish qualitative research in story form have been thwarted by the peer review system among special education

researchers. In a conversation with one editor about an article that was turned down because of its research story format, the editor advised him to wait until after tenure for any publishing innovations.

The push to publish similarly prompted Katharine to withdraw from PDS work. Upon joining the department, she had willingly involved herself in a PDS project, working with a group of English literature teachers at a local high school. After several months' involvement, she determined to find a way to withdraw from the project. She discovered that the constant involvement with PDS was such a drain on her time that she could not meet departmental demands for research productivity. Moreover, the PDS project itself did not generate information that was particularly useful for writing and publishing.

When she left the PDS project, Katharine replaced some of her efforts with increased involvement with a faculty research team. She also began to spend more time with a project that she considered to be an important part of her own research agenda and necessary to proving her skills as a researcher at tenure review. In making her decision to withdraw from PDS work, Katharine tried to preserve the two things she thought the department would believe to be most important about her work: a commitment to research for publication and ongoing participation in collaborations with other faculty.

Katharine's plan to defer PDS work backfired. First, her dean responded angrily that she should make the PDS project the focus of her research. Next, she was rather soundly criticized in her annual productivity review by the Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation Committee for having curtailed her service work, thus throwing "out of balance" the integration of her research, teaching, and service commitments. The admonition revealed a departmental expectation that beginning faculty would sustain its PDS efforts. "My service is really only to the department," Katharine fumed, "the crying, gaping, open-mouthed department."

Like Scott, Katharine frequently considers the possibility of moving on from her current position. She speculates that she might enjoy being a teacher educator at a different university, probably one that is much smaller and that has more of a commitment to teaching over research. She is especially hopeful that other universities do not experience the organizational "dysfunction" that she believes plagues her current department. She believes that the structure and politics of the institution have become more important to some faculty than is their commitment to their students. She worries that the job of teacher educator, as it is organizationally defined in her current setting, is myopically centered on keeping the program "alive." "This stuff isn't real," Katharine asserts. "People treat it as if it's real. It's a construction, and it was supposed to be useful for something. It wasn't supposed to be something that you had to support, like on a life support system."

Katharine believes that the greatest expectation the department holds for its new faculty is substantial research productivity: "Research-wise the center simply expects you to crank it out all the time." Yet, Katharine, muses, for beginning teacher

educators to do the writing for publication that is expected of them, the system has to somehow eliminate departmental roadblocks that prevent their doing research and writing. She claims that the demands on beginning faculty are too great; in this, she include demands that require pretenure faculty to be leaders in efforts to restructure and reform schools and schools of education—and conflicting barriers to leadership—simultaneous with the push to produce published articles in professional journals. Katharine believes that the demands for publishing are largely undertaken to demonstrate the continuing prowess of the school and its faculty in national and international research arenas, rather than for communication with practicing educators.

Scott agrees. Of tenure review, he says:

> I think the bottom line is that you must have your articles, your publications.... If you're not publishing and you're not doing research—then, you're in trouble.

"The other thing is that, *here*, teaching is not valued, or as valued, as scholarly work," Scott says. Similarly, John insists that the school will accept poor teaching but that quality research is the one absolute for pretenure faculty. John says:

> It seems to be relatively easy to teach for years without ever feeling the same pressure to teach at the state of the art as you would feel pressured to conduct research at the state of the art—that you would not feel comfortable about being a professor and never reading any methodological articles, but you could, over a period of years, teach, although you've never read anything that would obviously help you with your teaching.

All three, Katharine, Scott, and John, agree that "publish or perish" is the one solid, absolute dictum prescribed in their department for professors who will undergo tenure review.

Academic Freedom and Pretenure Teacher Educators

Once, I heard a story about a pretenure professor who worked in a highly respected school of education, and who, for all of five years seemed the perfect "fit" with his department. Every day for the five years of his pre-tenure, this man dressed in a coat and tie and khaki slacks, the "uniform" of the school of education where he worked. In no way could Professor X be said to be flamboyant; no one would probably have even described him as "colorful." His research in the area of cognitive psychology was by-the-book statistical analyses of learning styles. When he went up for tenure, or so the story goes, it was a relatively painless matter in which everyone supposed he would be granted tenure, and so he was. The surprise came on the very day after his tenure was given. In walked our professor wearing leather motorcycle pants and jacket, his hair buzzed to a short stubble. Perhaps even more shocking to his colleagues was that, over the next year—and for the remaining years of his academic career—he began an intensive program of qualitative research, turning all of his former research on its ear, even to the extent of arguing that his earlier findings were misleading.

It seems to me unlikely that many faculty will undergo the metamorphosis of our Professor X; rather, I think it more probable that over the space of time of pretenure service assistant professors will work to assimilate their ideas to the model already in existence in their departments. Every effort will be made to "fit" and then to fit will become a habit. Or, they will simply leave the institution, as Scott has done. What is most distressing to me about the assimilation model of socialization is the loss to a department of professors like Scott—productive researchers with new ideas and whose cultural heritage should enrich the department as it is allowed to be exercised. Scott has made the point that the department is a stronger place if it accepts some of the values of African-American culture. Surely, the rhetoric of democratic action and equality within education in the USA can become the reality of communities in which differences are expected and respected, rather than worked out in attempts to create homogenetic practices and outlooks.

Current conceptions of academic freedom have evolved from the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) 1915 Declaration of Principles of academic freedom and academic tenure (Rabban, 1993). The document identifies three features of academic freedom, all addressed to protecting the free speech rights of the individual professor. These are: "freedom of inquiry and research; freedom of teaching within the university or college; and freedom of extramural utterance and action" (1915 Declaration, p.1). Next, in its 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the AAUP added five elements of academic practice with regard to tenure. Included are admonitions against prolonging probationary status beyond seven years and the assurance that "during the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have." Yet, not every professor believes that they have the power and protection of academic freedom during their pretenure service. As Ralph S. Brown and Jordan E. Kurland (1993) observed:

> Merely setting forth these assertions does not...ensure academic freedom for faculty members who are subject to nonreappointment at an administration's pleasure, and one can fairly wonder whether, if tenure is vital for academic freedom, it is only the tenured whose academic freedom is truly protected.

I argue that Katharine, Scott, and John have had their academic freedoms as researchers abridged during their pretenure appointments. These freedoms have been threatened and usurped by a system that maintains power structures that create hierarchies of oppressors and their oppressed, that tolerates rhetoric over action, that stymies change with the exercise of power. It is a system that tends to stumble over its own feet, so to speak. Despite setting in motion initiatives to integrate research, teaching, and service through practice centered partnerships with schools, tenured faculty, for the most part, are not assuming the assignment of service in the schools, preferring to continue their established research practices. Meanwhile, pretenure faculty are jumping ship and leaving the schools in search of research projects geared more to publication than to practice.

There is a bold contradiction here between what this school of education claims to do (or at least aims to do) and what it actually does. It claims the desire to facilitate involvement of persons of underrepresented races and cultures as professional educators, but it establishes working partnerships in wealthy school districts with limited minority enrollment. When there is a minority professor who desires to improve educational services and bring equity to education by working in an impoverished district populated by minority students, no effort is made to facilitate his efforts. He works in "isolation." No colleague joins him to visit the poor, minority district where he does his research. He sends his articles to a friend on an opposite coast of the continent to get feedback on his writing. All of this in a school that touts "teamwork" or "collaboration" as its single greatest value.

As Katharine observed, the rhetoric of collaboration in this setting seems to be greater than its actual practice; likewise, academic freedom for untenured faculty may be a concept more given to rhetoric than to action. Consider Scott, whose desire to do action research was thwarted by the need for greater publication productivity prerequisite to tenure. Or, consider Katharine's observations that conservatism wins out in collaborations based on compromise, thus thwarting research innovations and discouraging new discoveries, new theories, and new practices. When beginning faculty set aside new approaches to researching or wait to ask questions that run against the grain of established thinking as they await tenure, the meaning of academic freedom is undermined to the extent that new ideas are not rewarded. William W. Van Alstyne (1993) precedes me in asserting that:

> A faculty, especially a research faculty, is employed professionally to test and propose revisions in the prevailing wisdom, not to inculcate the prevailing wisdom in others, store it as monks might do, or rewrite it in elegant detail. Its function is primarily one of critical review: to check conventional truth, to reexamine ("research") what may currently be thought but may be more or less unsound. Its purpose is likewise to train others to the same critical skills. Such a faculty inquires–as an obvious sort of example—whether original and seemingly authoritative sources have been mistranslated or misunderstood. (p. 87)

Many writers have expressed their concern that universities reward conformity over innovation (e.g., Finley, 1996; Reinharz, 1991; Thomson, 1993; Van Alstyne, 1993) and do not protect academic freedom of untenured faculty (e.g., Brown & Kurland, 1993). Scott may have said it best in a statement with regard to schooling African-American children, but in words that apply equally well in the context of faculty. He wrote:

> I am convinced that we must begin to examine and develop policies and practices that move beyond an assimilation model of education. Furthermore, we must begin to examine policy problems from sociocultural, socioeconomic, sociopolitical and historical perspectives if we are to achieve true equity in the American educational system.