

"Forget about academic fraud? Were you sexually harassed?",
By
Irving Hexham
© 2004

In Kenneth Westhues, ed., *Workplace Mobbing in Academe: Reports from Twenty Universities*, Lewiston, Edwin Mellen Press, 2004, pp. 218-237.

INTRODUCTION

Although a large and growing body of literature documents and discusses the implications of academic fraud by students,¹ fraud by established faculty members has received little or no attention.² This paper explores the question why academic Administrators often seem more than willing to press charges of sexual harassment against distinguished faculty members while doing everything in their power to avoid taking action in cases of serious academic fraud. In the closing section some practical suggestions are made to improve the situation in Canadian universities.

PART ONE: ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO ACADEMIC FRAUD AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Beware of Administrators Offering Help³

Over a decade ago a friend of mine, I will call her Professor Kingston, from a well known Eastern Canadian University, decided to organize an international academic conference on a topic of great public concern. To finance the conference she needed to obtain a Canadian Government Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Conference Grant (SSHRC). The author of several important books she wrote the grant application incorporating into it some of the

¹ Cf. Don McCabe, "CHEATING IN ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS: A DECADE OF RESEARCH," *Ethics & Behavior* (2001) 11, No. 3, 219-232. (with L.K. Trevino & K.D. Butterfield)

² My own impression of the situation was confirmed in personal correspondence with Don McCabe, Director of the Center for Academic Integrity at Duke University (5/7/2002)

³ The following account, which is based on the experience of a friend of mine, is true. The details have been changed to protect privacy.

findings of her recent research. Then, according to her university's regulations she needed to find an academic unit willing to host the conference.

At first she thought of hosting the conference through her own department but before the final preparations were made the head of a larger unit approached her suggesting that his unit was more suitable as the host for the type of interdisciplinary conference she had in mind. Excited that a well-respected scholar and head of a major academic unit, whom I will call Professor Snatch, wanted to support her work she agreed. As a result the head of this particular unit became the university official responsible for counter-signing her grant application.

When she took the application to Professor Snatch, he surprised her by saying that he would take a few days to read it and would then forward it to the university's research services duly signed. This arrangement, he suggested, would save her time because one of his secretaries would duplicate the signed grant without her having to do any more work. When she said that she preferred to do this work herself he insisted that this was normal procedure and that she need worry herself no longer.

Building a reputation on the backs of others

A few days later Professor Snatch's secretary, Ms. Faithful, called Professor Kingston to say that she had discovered a discrepancy in the budget. Therefore, she suggested that Professor Kingston go into the office to sort out the problem. Minutes later another telephone call informed Professor Kingston that there had been a bomb threat and that the office block in which the unit was situated was to be evacuated. Therefore, Ms Faithful said she would meet Professor Kingston at a local coffee bar.

When the two met, Ms Faithful presented Professor Kingston with a print copy of the grant folded over to the budget page. Professor Kingston quickly resolved the problem then, wanting to take a last look at her handiwork turned to the front page. To her horror she discovered that she was no longer the author of the grant. Instead someone had replaced the first page with another that made

Professor Snatch both the author of the grant and the university official that gave approval to the project.

Thinking that this must be some sort of secretarial mistake Professor Kingston immediately pointed out the problem to Ms. Faithful who explained that Professor Snatch had instructed her to make the changes. Ms. Faithful added that this was Professor Snatch's "normal practice" when submitting other people's conference grants for conferences to be hosted by his unit. When Professor Kingston asked "Why would anyone give him permission to claim the authorship of their own work?" Ms. Faithful replied "Didn't Professor Snatch ask your permission? I always thought this is what we were supposed to do and that everyone agreed to such an arrangement." When Professor Kingston said "Nobody ever suggested this to me and I would never agree to such an arrangement" a confused Ms. Faithful ruefully commented "Come to think of it I've never discussed this with anyone other than Professor Snatch. I just assumed everyone knew what was going on."

Still thinking that perhaps she had misunderstood something, Professor Kingston's next step was to call Professor Snatch who was working at his home office. He immediately told her that he had made the changes "to help" her obtain the grant. By submitting it in his name he insisted it had a much better chance of success than if it was submitted under her name. This, he said, was because he had an excellent success record for conference grants with SSHRC. When Professor Kingston protested that she too had an excellent success record with research grants, and preferred to take her chance with SSHRC by submitting the application under her name, Professor Snatch suggested that they meet for lunch to discuss the issue.

A couple of days later the agreed meeting took place. Instead of making any concessions Professor Snatch simply reiterated his claim that he had an excellent success record and that the grant was far more likely to succeed under his name than under her name. When Professor Kingston refused to be convinced and insisted that Professor Snatch restore the original first page he became positively abusive and suggested that if she wanted to receive any

further SSHRC awards she ought to agree to his terms. Professor Kingston could hardly believe what she was hearing and left the meeting in a state of shock.

“Were you sexually harassed?”

Her next move was to arrange a meeting with the Vice President Academic to complain about what she believed was serious academic fraud on the part of Professor Snatch. At that meeting the VP Academic's one concern was whether she had been sexually harassed. When she said “No, he is harassing me academically not sexually” the VP immediately lost interest in the case and told her to reach her own agreement with Professor Snatch.

Faced with an impasse Professor Kingston informed the VP Academic that she had decided to inform SSHRC about the whole affair. This suggestion brought an immediate response and the VP Academic suddenly found a way to allow Professor Kingston to go ahead with her conference working through another academic unit. At the same time she was told not to contact SSHRC because this would do “great harm” to the reputation of the university. Professor Snatch, she was told, would now be disciplined.

Believing that the VP Academic had realized the true situation Professor Kingston agreed to the new arrangement only to find that although a new unit took over the conference Professor Snatch was allowed to continue to pressure her to work with him. At the same time Professor Kingston and her husband began receiving anonymous phone calls, where someone laughed into the phone but said nothing, at all hours of the day and night. When this was reported to the police she was told that they came from public telephone booths in the neighborhood of the university but that the police were unable to locate the caller. To this day Professor Kingston believes that Professor Snatch made the calls because they abruptly ended when it became clear that she would not yield to his pressure. On this matter, however, she has to admit she cannot be certain and that the timing of the calls could be a strange coincidence.

The Discovery of Plagiarism

By coincidence Professor Kingston's husband, Professor Wordsmith, worked in the same field as Professor Snatch, whom, until the dispute with his wife, he greatly respected and admired. When it became clear that Professor Snatch saw nothing wrong with his behavior Professor Wordsmith remembered that he had been struck by a strange turn of phrase in one of Professor Snatch's books. Explaining an academic dispute Professor Snatch had written that one of the protagonists "turned pink inside." The only other person Professor Wordsmith had ever heard using this peculiar expression was his own Ph.D. supervisor the late Professor Distinguished in England.

Prompted by the treatment of his wife's grant application Professor Wordsmith looked up the expression once again in Professor Snatch's book. Sure enough there was a footnote at the end of the paragraph to Professor Distinguished. But, when Professor Wordsmith checked the paragraph in question against the original he found that almost all of it was a direct quote from Professor Distinguished's book but without the necessary quotation marks. After making this discovery he checked various other passages only to find that almost every paragraph in all of Professor Snatch's various books were slightly changed quotations without the required quotation marks. Clearly, Professor Snatch was a plagiarist. To be absolutely sure he also ordered a copy of Professor Snatch's Ph.D. thesis by inter-library loan. Upon examination he found that it was also extensively plagiarized.

What is plagiarism?

What Professor Wordsmith saw in Professor Snatch's work was relatively easy to recognize and demonstrate. This was plagiarism that involved the direct appropriation of groups of words, phrases and entire sentences from other people's publications without due acknowledgement and the appropriate use of quotation marks.

Plagiarism, as Professor Wordsmith says, is the deliberate attempt to deceive the reader into thinking that they are reading the original work of an

author when in fact that author is simply reproducing the work of another It is the appropriation and representation as one's own the work and words of others. Academic plagiarism occurs when a writer repeatedly uses more than four words from a printed source without the use of quotation marks and a precise reference to the original source in a work presented as the writer's own research and scholarship. Continuous paraphrasing without serious interaction with another person's views by way of argument or the addition of new material and insights is also a form of plagiarism in academic work.

Blatant plagiarism is plagiarism that hits you in the face. It is the type of fraud that can be seen immediately by anyone who cares to check the references used by a scholar against the text they claim to be citing. That is, it is plagiarism that is so obvious that anyone with a minimal degree of intelligence and a passion for learning is bound to spot it and this is what Professor Wordsmith discovered in Professor Snatch's work.

Taking plagiarism seriously

Allegations of plagiarism at Texas A&M University (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 5, 1999, p. A18-20) highlight the failure of academics and university administrators to address the issue of plagiarism with the seriousness it demands. For example, after reviewing the evidence Professor Michael Schwartz, a sociologist at the State University of New York, is reported to have said: "You have to be uncomfortable when exact words are used and not put into quotes. But this is not some kind of high crime"(op cit. p. A19). Defending this type of argument scholars like Professor Schwartz claim that they are "more concerned with the theft of ideas than of actual words" (op. cit).

This is a cop out. Surely Schwartz knows that individual words and ideas often overlap. It is far harder to prove plagiarism in terms of the use of similar words and the theft of ideas than it is to show that someone is using exact phrases from another person's work without quotation marks or appropriate references. It is almost impossible to prove the theft of ideas because they circulate within social communities and even when a communal influence is

absent similar circumstances often lead to the generation of similar ideas. Therefore, to insist on ideas while ignoring actual words simply makes it easy for academic plagiarists to ply their trade. The use of other people's words without quotation marks is far more easily recognized so too is the continuous paraphrasing of someone's work.

To avoid the obvious conclusion that a colleague is a fraud many academics argue that provided some reference to the original author is made then a writer cannot be accused of plagiarism even if they failed to tell their readers that they were actually quoting, without quotation marks, and not simply citing, another person's work. Legally this argument does not wash. The inclusion of a footnote or some other form of reference without appropriate quotation marks when the words of another author are being used is no defense against the charge of plagiarism as was clearly stated by the judge in the Case of *Napolitano v. Princeton University Trustees* (Cf. Ralph D. Mawdsley, *Legal Aspects of Plagiarism*, Kansas, National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1985).

Academics who defend plagiarism in this way are like the Bank Manager who says that the fact that an employee returned \$100,000 to the bank after successfully speculating on the Stock Exchange with the Bank's money is not an embezzler. Neither the police nor courts will accept this type of equivocation. Why should it be different with academic plagiarists?

The decision to report Professor Snatch's fraudulent work

Faced with continued hostility from Professor Snatch and the threat that his wife would never receive another SSHRC grant Professor Wordsmith made a formal complaint of academic fraud against Professor Snatch. In doing so he prepared a long dossier of over 50 pages containing numerous examples of plagiarism.

When he submitted his complaint to his Dean, the Dean was at pains to point out that if the complaint proved unfounded he, Professor Wordsmith, could face civil legal charges as well as disciplinary measures from the university. Therefore, the Dean suggested that he consider withdrawing the charge. From

Professor Wordsmith's perspective things seemed too far gone for that to happen and he was sure of his ground. So he went ahead with the charge thinking that it was the only way to protect himself and his wife from the threats of Professor Snatch.

Administrative Justice

The formal university hearing took almost four months to complete. During this time Professor Wordsmith took the precaution of watching the library copies of key texts to see if anyone on the Committee of Inquiry actually compared his dossier with the original texts. He also sent copies of his dossier to a small group of academics he trusted, including myself, asking for their candid opinions. In all cases they reported that there seemed to be a clear case against Professor Snatch and that the charges were fully justified.

A week before the inquiry his Dean phoned Professor Wordsmith to say that he had "just learnt" that the head of the Committee of Inquiry had served on an important SSHRC committee with Professor Snatch but he did not believe that this would color the man's judgment. When the inquiry took place Professor Wordsmith was not asked to appear before it. Nor, as far as he could tell, did anyone on the Committee take any of the key texts out of the library to check the claim of plagiarism against the original texts. Further, he learned from a colleague that the day before the inquiry Professor Snatch spent an entire afternoon discussing some undisclosed issue with the university lawyer.

About six weeks after the close of the Inquiry the Dean informed Professor Wordsmith that he had received the Committee's report but was undecided what to do about it. When Professor Wordsmith asked what conclusions had been drawn the Dean told him that he was not free to disclose any further information. In fact it was another six months, during which time Professor Wordsmith was very worried in case the Committee had ruled against him, before he heard anything further. Then, after his third or fourth request for information, the Dean told him that the Committee had concluded that he did have a case and that the

charges were not malicious. As a result he need not fear legal or disciplinary action based on his complaint.

Nevertheless, the Dean said that the Committee had decided the examples of plagiarism submitted to it were actually due to carelessness brought on by the overwork of a distinguished scholar. This despite the fact that many of the examples came directly from Professor Snatch's own Ph.D. thesis and included typographical errors copied from the works he plagiarized. Further, the Committee diverted attention from the main charge by concentrating on a number of minor technical issues in the complaint that avoided serious discussion of the central issue of academic fraud.

After receiving this information it was unclear to Professor Wordsmith why his Dean had taken so long to inform him about the results of the Investigation. Sometime later Professor Wordsmith heard on the university grapevine that the V.P Academic was very angry about Professor Snatch's fraud but unwilling to take public action for fear of alienating granting agencies like SSHRC which are known to have strict standards about academic honesty. As a result, according to the grapevine, pressure was put on Professor Snatch to move to another university. This he did some months later when he obtained an excellent position in Western Canada that in reality was a form of promotion.

The consequences: SSHRC Grants

Professors Kingston and Wordsmith on the other hand did not receive another SSHRC research grant for almost nine years. Of course, they cannot prove that this was due to Professor Snatch's intervention. What they can show is that they made repeated applications and on several occasions received excellent external reviews but were always downgraded at the Committee level. Further, it was clear to them that although Professor Snatch did not sit on any of these Committees some of his friends did. This is not to suggest that he told anyone not to support them. What they think most likely is that he, or friends of his, simply spread rumors about them and generally downgraded their work.

Beyond the problem with SSHRC, which it must be stressed was not the fault of SSHRC officers who were kept in the dark about this issue, Professor Kingston did not seem to suffer any real problems. Professor Wordsmith's situation was very different. Sometime after the Inquiry was complete and Professor Snatch had left the university his Head of Department came to see him on university business. A chance remark provoked an outburst of venom in which the head accused him of trying to harm Professor Snatch.

Believing that he was unable to openly discuss the matter due to university rules Professor Wordsmith arranged a meeting between himself, his Dean, and the Head of Department. The outcome was disappointing because the Dean refused to say anything of significance and left the situation more or less as it was before the meeting. To be fair to the Dean it needs to be pointed out that he indicated that the reason he was unable to say anything was that he was following instructions from someone else, presumably the VP Academic or even the university President.

The consequences: administrative harassment

Over the next ten years Professor Wordsmith suffered continual mild but very real harassment. This took the form of unsubstantiated reports of student complaints and various other minor but irritating issues being raised about his marking and other issues. He also learnt from his graduate students that a later Head of Department, who was also a friend of Professor Snatch, invited them into his office where they were quizzed about their relationship with Professor Wordsmith and asked if they had any complaints. Fortunately they did not and were actually annoyed by what they saw as an attempt to recruit them to spy on Professor Wordsmith.

After the failure of this Head to solicit complaints from graduate students Professor Wordsmith found that other of his graduate students were subjected to harassment by some faculty members. He also found that very few students who applied to work with him were ever accepted into the department's program.

Although he complained about this situation neither the Dean nor anyone else was prepared to take his complaints seriously.

Faced with clear administrative hostility Professor Wordsmith began to wonder whether he had overreacted in the case of Professor Snatch. Although the plagiarism was clear perhaps there was something he didn't know. Perhaps this type of work was far more common and acceptable in Canada and the United States than in Europe. After all some people defended the plagiarisms of Martin Luther-King on the grounds that he was a preacher and preachers tend to borrow from others. Therefore, he began to doubt his own judgments. To check himself and his understanding of scholarship Professor Wordsmith then began to examine the works of a number of other prominent scholars of the same rank and standing in his field as Professor Snatch. To his relief he discovered that all of them maintained the same standards of scholarship that he considered normal.

After making this discovery Professor Wordsmith received a manuscript for review from a well-known commercial publisher. When he read it he immediately saw that it was plagiarized. Therefore, he called the editor who had sent him the manuscript to discuss the situation. The editor's comments surprised him. He said that the press regularly received manuscripts that contained plagiarism and that he estimated that between 10% and 20% of academics were fraudulent. Therefore the press had a strict policy of rejecting such works. Then the editor added that to his dismay he often found that such works were picked up by academic presses and published without any changes to the manuscript.

On the basis of this conversation Professor Wordsmith carried out some further tests on the works of less prominent people including the head of department who was harassing him. This time he found that, as the editor suggested, between 10% and 15%, of the texts he examined showed signs of blatant plagiarism. Later he read Wilfried Decoo's *Crisis on Campus* (2002) further confirming his findings. Because he does not see himself as a whistle-

blower Professor Wordsmith did not report these cases, rather he began to think of practical ways to prevent such abuses in the future.

Therefore at a meeting of his faculty he suggested that they ought to adopt a new policy governing future applicants for academic posts. Among other things he argued that applicants ought, as is the practice in Europe, provide the university with a certified copy of their degree certificates and submit copies of all their major publications for examination by the appointments committee. This idea was scornfully dismissed by the Dean who responded with the comment that Professor Wordsmith appeared to lack trust in his colleagues.

The Dean also said that Professor Wordsmith showed a lamentable lack of collegiality. If someone applied for a job from another Canadian university it had to be assumed that their referees and graduate committee had thoroughly checked their work. Therefore there was no need for an appointments committee to carry out its own investigation. The fact that such checks are routine in most universities throughout the world because experience shows people cheat was dismissed on the grounds that to appear to question someone's credentials is unacceptable.

When Professor Wordsmith related this event to a colleague in another faculty the man responded by saying that he had sat on a Ph.D. thesis committee as an external examiner when a case of plagiarism arose. He decided to fail the student but the Dean of that particular faculty supported by the Dean of Graduate Studies intervened, he was removed from the committee, and the thesis was passed.

Is racism a factor in Administrative harassment?

Professor Wordsmith is an immigrant to Canada from Australia where he obtained all of his degrees. He worked for several years in Australia and the United States before emigrating to Canada. Thinking about his own case and that of his wife made him aware that in every instance where charges of misconduct were pressed by administrators at his own university they were made against professors who were outsiders. That is they either obtained their

graduate degrees and/or were born outside of Canada. When he asked colleagues at other universities if the same pattern held true in their experience all of them said that it did. From this observation he believes that his university is in the grip of what nineteenth century people called racism and as far as he can see, from the admittedly limited amount of evidence available to him, so too are most Canadian universities.

In its original nineteenth century meaning “racism” was not restricted, as it is today, to questions of skin color. Rather it included all forms of discrimination based on ethnic and national characteristics. Thus conflicts between white South Africans of English and Dutch origins were seen as a “race problem” as were similar tensions between English and French Canadians. Seen in this light it seems plausible that a racist elite very largely controls academic life in Canadian universities. This elite appears to dislike and discriminate against professors who were born and/or obtained their graduate degrees outside of Canada. Harsh as this judgment may sound it is the only way he can explain the fact that every accusation of sexual harassment that led to severe punishment involved someone who was either educated and/or born outside of Canada.

What constitutes “sexual harassment”?

To a very large extent, Professor Wordsmith observes, academic Administrators decide which cases of sexual harassment they will treat seriously and which they will dismiss as unimportant. This is clearly the case because he knows of several instances where Canadian born professors have flaunted their affairs with female students without any action being taken against them. The difference between these cases and other cases where a professor is disciplined, usually for making some sort of remark that is deemed unacceptable, appears to depend entirely on the attitude of the Administrator concerned and not on the seriousness of the complaint.

In at least three cases he knows female students who complained to the appropriate Heads of Departments and Deans only to find that they became the subject of derision. Warned by the Administrator to whom they confided that

taking their case outside the university would involve high legal costs, and ruin any hope that they had of an academic career, in every case the students involved abandoned their complaints and quest for justice.

Professor Wordsmith also observes that when cases of supposed sexual harassment were pursued there was considerable evidence that other faculty members, Heads of Department, and even Deans, actively encouraged student complaints. Further students who made such complaints received considerable material benefits in terms of research grants and paid teaching assignments. But other students who refused to play ball by not responding to hints that they ought to complain about a particular professor found that they were treated as second-class citizens who received only the very minimum financial support from their departments.

Professor Wordsmith says that in all the cases he has witnessed complaints were pressed against scholars with outstanding research and publishing records by Heads of Department who were academically weak both in terms of their graduate education and subsequent publications. On the other hand the victims of the complaints were very active scholars educated at first class institutions. This leads him to conclude that an element of jealousy is involved in the decision whether to press or dismiss complaints involving charges of sexual harassment against a professor.

PART TWO: REFLECTIONS ON THE CRISIS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

University Administrators and academic fraud

If university Administrators use sexual harassment as a way of enhancing their power, as Professor Wordsmith believes they do, the question immediately arises as to why they avoid making similar use of charges of plagiarism? Indeed why do they avoid confronting the issue if between 10% and 20% of academics gained their positions on the basis of fraudulently obtained credentials? The answer to these questions seems to be that the discovery of blatant plagiarism in the work of an established faculty member raises serious questions about the entire academic enterprise.

To admit that a long-time faculty member's work contains blatant plagiarism is also to admit that numerous people failed to do their jobs properly in the first place. The fact is that from the time a student enters university to his or her ultimate promotion to the rank of full professor his or her work is theoretically put under the microscope numerous times. Therefore, admitting that blatant plagiarism exists in such a person's work is to admit that many other scholars have failed in their duty as M.A. and Ph.D. supervisors, members of examining committees for graduate degrees, as members of hiring and promotion committees and as Heads of Department and Deans.

In most cases it is a relatively simple task to check for blatant plagiarism. All it involves is testing a random sample of a writer's references against the texts they cite. Yet, apparently checking a student's work for plagiarism is far too hard for many supervisors who allow theses that contain blatant plagiarism, obvious to anyone who does a basic check, to be accepted as passable theses. This means these people ought to be held responsible for not doing their jobs. But, of course, no one bothers to reprimand an academic who approves a fraudulent thesis.

Equally important is the fact that before anyone becomes a full professor they must go through what is theoretically a rigorous selection process. The graduating Ph.D. student has to convince a selection committee that they are worth employing. Surely, it is reasonable to assume that before hiring someone a university department assigns at least some of its members to read the work of all interviewees to ensure that it is of a high quality. But, as can be seen from the evidence presented by Professor Wordsmith this does not happen. Once again asking professors to guard against academic fraud by tightening up the hiring process is too much for most of them who are too busy to do their jobs properly. Such people it seems select candidates on their apparent collegiality rather than actual achievements.

After the hiring process is over assistant professors must apply for tenure after three or so years of teaching. At that time all of their work is supposed to be reviewed and critically analyzed. Clearly, this does not happen in many cases because far too many plagiarists are granted tenure. Once tenured another

series of supposedly rigorous hurdles have to be overcome for promotion to associate and then full professor. At each stage the candidate's work is submitted to the Head of Department, an Examining Committee and the Dean. Nevertheless, for all the rigors of the process few people are ever caught out as frauds. This can only mean that most heads, committee members, and Deans are far too trusting and actually fail to thoroughly check a candidate's work.

It also needs to be noted that many academics asked to review manuscripts for publishers or grants for granting agencies clearly read these documents and comment on the arguments presented without checking for plagiarism or other forms of fraud. Therefore the "peer-review" process is actually not working. To be fair some publishers do catch plagiarisms and reject manuscripts only to find that another publisher or journal picks it up.⁴

All of this leads us to recognize that the prevalence of academic fraud calls into question the entire peer review system for academic journals and books. When frauds act as reviewers the system is clearly flawed. Further the fact that so many blatant frauds get published shows that few reviewers ever check the sources used by colleagues.

If Professor Wordsmith's observations are correct then academic fraud and the misuse of sexual harassment charges is evidence that Canadian universities are in crisis. Therefore it is time to make some practical suggestions that, if implemented, will help reduce the possibility academic fraud and the misuse of power by administrators.

The central problem seems to be that many university administrators are actually failed teachers and researchers who went into administration because it was the only way they were able to gain promotion to the rank of Full Professor. Among this group he also believes a significant number are probably academic frauds because by entering administration they are able to protect themselves from possible discovery. As managers many of these people are as incompetent as they were as university teachers and researchers. Yet because academic

⁴ A senior editor at a major American publishing company told me that his company frequently rejects manuscripts because of plagiarism only to find that they are published without any alteration by other presses.

administrators are exempt from any external review process they are able to consolidate power and avoid the scrutiny they deserve.

University administration and the present crisis

To appreciate how the present crisis developed it is clearly necessary to understand the way the administration of Canadian universities has developed since the 1960's. Traditionally, and even today in Continental Europe, university administration was divided between the practical day to day running of what is essentially a large business enterprise and academic affairs. The day to day management of universities was left to professional managers and administrative staff hired for their skills as managers. Academic affairs, such as decisions about hiring new faculty, promotion through the ranks, course design and curriculum, were left to academics.

Under this arrangement academics normally held full time teaching and research appointments while administering academic departments and even faculties. At the faculty level a Dean was often, but not always, given some course release and was only appointed for a short period of time between one and three years. Presidents and Academic Vice-Presidents were given more course release but even then were expected to maintain some teaching responsibilities and continue as active researchers. Here too the period of appointment was relatively short with the expectation that after completing their term of office they would return to a normal teaching department.

In this situation issues of salaries, space allocation, budgeting, etc. were not the responsibility of academics, such as Heads of Department and Deans, but rather of the Central Administration that was staffed by non-academic professional managers and support staff. Thus there was a clear distinction between academic and day-to-day decision-making.

The late 1940's and 1950's saw rapid population growth leading to demands for the expansion of higher education that began in the mid-1960 and continued well into the 1970's. To meet the demand for new university and college places graduate schools expanded rapidly with the result that many ill

qualified people were hired by universities in a desperate attempt to meet the demands of an ever increasing student population. After obtaining their doctorates and entering the ranks of the full time faculty it came as a shock to many people that they were expected to be both good teachers and with a publication record that proved their research abilities.

The only escape from the pressures of research was to enter academic administration and claim that administrative and teaching duties prevented ongoing research and publishing activities. Once this was conceded by university administrations the next step was to argue that to expect administrators, such as Heads of Department and Deans, to continue working with a full teaching load was too much. Therefore, they were gradually given an increasing amount of release time until today it is normal for a Head of Department to teach only one course per term or, very often, per year and for Deans to do no teaching at all. The success of these maneuvers, which took place over a long period of time, led other faculty to follow suit and create even more administrative positions that released them from the normal expectations of teaching and research. Thus posts like undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, associate dean, etc. rapidly developed.

Because good teachers and researchers are primarily interested in teaching and research few objected to deadwood faculty moving into administrative positions. At least in such posts they fulfilled some type of role and took some pressure off other faculty. But, as the deadwood occupied academic administration it quickly became clear that the only way they could justify course release and freedom from publishing expectations was by assuming new roles and authority.

Increasingly, from the 1970's on, tasks that were once performed by secretaries and officers of the Central Administration were transferred to academic administrators. In the process the cost of such tasks escalated because highly paid professors were doing the work of support staff who received a third of their income. At the same time as academics moved into new

areas of administration the salaries of academic administrators began to increase.

Traditionally Heads of Department were given a small honorarium for their administrative responsibilities. Officially this is still the situation. In fact, Heads of Department are now given large annual increments to compensate for the fact that because of their administrative duties they were unable to compete with other faculty for annual increments based on their teaching and publication record. Since such administrative increments are a permanent addition to a person's salary the reward for administration is high indeed. As a result many people who ought to be earning salaries under \$80,000 in terms of their actual achievements are drawing salaries of around \$120,000 as a result of their administrative activities.

Anyone who doubts these claims has only to check the cv's and list of publications of Heads of Department, Deans, Vice-Presidents and even university Presidents. Contrary to the public perception many people in university administrative positions are actually very poor academics with abysmal research records. Yet increasingly it is these very people who sit on Government boards and committees that decide the future of higher education in Canada.

Regenerating Canadian Universities

To regenerate Canada's universities Professor Wordsmith believes that the Government needs to address the issue of university administration by failed academics and replace the present system with good management. To this end he proposes following reforms:

- 1) The day to day running of universities ought to be administered by professional managers and support staff without academic pretensions. Given the fact that Full Professor turned administrators earn far more than normal managers this step alone will save the Province a large amount of money possibly halving the current costs of academic administration. The separation of academic administration from other forms of administration involving the day to

day running of the university will result in better management, an increase in the number of faculty available for teaching duties, and huge financial savings.

2) Academic administration ought to be restricted to academic issues such as decisions about curriculum, research agendas, and so on. To use highly paid academics to decide issues like the allocation of space and even the way rooms are to be decorated is a waste of time and money when the job can be done at much less cost by non-academic staff.

3) No academic under the rank of Dean ought to be given release time from teaching except where they have brought in special funding to finance a research and writing project. All other administrative tasks, such as advising students, ought to be regarded as part of a faculty member's normal duties. The implementation of this requirement would immediately see a considerable increase of the number of courses offered by departments as everyone carried a full teaching load. As a result in most departments it would be like hiring at least one or more new faculty members.

4) Deans ought to be expected to teach at least one course per term and continue to maintain a research and publishing program. Further at least one of the courses taught by a Dean ought to be a relatively large undergraduate class to avoid them escaping from teaching duties by "supervising" a few graduate students where in reality they do no teaching.

5) Academics who become Vice Presidents ought to be required to teach one normal undergraduate class in their field each year and maintain a reduced research and publishing program to ensure that they do not lose touch with the realities of university life.

6) University Presidents ought to be seen as figureheads who represent the university in the community. Therefore, there is no need for an able academic to

become the President and the job is most likely best done by a well-respected community figure with experience outside of academia.

7) Since academics in State universities are public servants all salaries ought to be published and publicly available. The cv's and list of publications of all faculty ought to be published in a standard format on the Internet and all of the basic publications of faculty members, including copies of their M.A. and Ph.D. theses ought to be available on the open shelves of the university library where they are employed. Such a procedure will quickly show who is really working and allow questions to be raised about the appropriateness of academic appointments thus hindering the ability of deadwood to move into key academic posts.

8) All promotions through academic ranks ought to be based on academic criteria alone. No one ought to be promoted from Assistant to Associate or Associate to Full Professor on the basis of administrative work. The basic administrative tasks required to run an academic department ought to be seen as a normal part of any academic job that everyone does. Similarly, good teaching, which is sometimes promoted as a substitute for research, ought to be excluded from promotion criteria because all professors should to be good teachers.

Every faculty member ought to be a good teacher and share in normal administrative duties. Doing something that is part of the job ought not to be grounds for promotion. Failure by a faculty member to fulfill normal administrative tasks and/or poor teaching ought to prevent promotion. Thus someone who fails to advise students or is a poor teacher ought not to be promoted. Similarly, someone who spends a lot of time with students and is a good teacher does not deserve to be promoted unless they produce solid research that shows up in academic publications.

9) Since innovation and creative thinking is essential for research it is vital that departments do not become ingrown. Therefore, all faculty hiring involving tenure track, appointments must be done on an open basis involving national and international advertising. Departments ought to seek a diverse faculty. No more

than 15% of a department's faculty members ought to be former students of that department. Most important of all faculty must be hired on the basis of academic achievement and merit.

10) Academics accused of academic fraud usually claim that they are unable to fight the charges in court because university administrators have access to seemingly unlimited funds that allow them to drag out legal cases thus making it impossible for an ordinary person to challenge them in court. There is also evidence that when administrators, like Professor Snatch, are accused of misconduct such as plagiarism they are provided with advice from university lawyers. Yet no one seems to keep a check on university legal fees. Indeed few published university budgets give any indication of how much is spent on legal fees and why the expenditure was necessary. To prevent what appears to be the blatant abuse of public funds in defending the indefensible a close watch ought to be kept on university spending in this area and the use of university lawyers to provide support to administrators.

11) Finally, Provincial Governments ought to establish a university Ombudsman who can keep a sharp watch over the activities of administrators who at present appear to be totally unaccountable to anyone other than themselves.