ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING REPORT

Faculty Trends

April 2008

THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON

Planning, Assessment & Institutional Research Office

Overview

This scan summarizes and describes trends related to college and university faculty. Demographic data and contemporary scholarship are considered with respect to the current state of the profession and developments in higher education.

Executive Summary

Analysis of recent trends in higher education faculty indicate that

- Institutions nationwide are considering best practices in faculty hiring to replace anticipated large numbers of retirements, and possible shifts in their academic priorities in the midst of faculty transition and the enrollments of students with changing expectations of higher education.
- Retirements of tenured, full-time faculty hired in the 1960s and 1970s may open up the professorate; however, part-time faculty positions are a leading cause of overall higher education employment growth.
- Many in academia share concerns with the significant increase in the number of part-time and other contingent faculty. Some fear the nature of part-time employment may have negative impacts on curriculum and student learning.
- Increasing diversity amongst higher education faculty remains a priority for many institutions. Despite increasing numbers of women and minorities completing Ph.D.s, they are still outnumbered in tenure track positions.
- The academic job market has been undergoing a challenging period. In many disciplines tenure-track positions are difficult to come by, helping to contribute to the rise in numbers of adjunct faculty and longer post-doctoral temporary positions.
- The growth of the knowledge economy is also impacting the academic missions of institutions and the way they do business. The use of technology in the classroom – and as the classroom – is changing higher education and posing new challenges for all of those involved in the teaching and learning experience.
- The rise of the knowledge economy, along with technological advances, are impacting the nature of academic scholarship and giving rise to new intellectual property issues.
- Recruiting and retaining excellent faculty remains an issue for higher education in an era of increased competition between schools, a slow academic job market, and a projected increase in the numbers of older faculty reaching retirement.

Demographics

Numbers of higher education faculty in the United States have increased from approximately 700,000 in 1981 to about 1.1 million in 2001 (Morris 85; Ma 2). Current research indicates that faculty in American colleges and universities are increasingly near or past the traditional retirement age, a trend often referred to as the 'graying of the American faculty.' This trend "is partially due to the fact that many faculty members were hired in the 1960s and 1970s to educate the baby boomers and many were hired to fill full-time tenure-track positions. Because of the low turnover nature associated with the tenure system, most of these faculty members are still employed in higher education" (Ma 13).

The federal elimination of mandatory retirement in the 1990s has also played a role in increasing numbers of faculty over the retirement age.

James Morrison observes four key demographic shifts impacting U.S. higher education: changing ethnic patterns, with "Euro-descended Americans to make up less than half of the US population" in the near future; increasing numbers of students wishing to pursue higher education; increases in older and elderly populations across the nation as babyboomers leave middle age; and large numbers of current faculty reaching retirement age. Citing data from American Demographics[1], Morrison asserts that "within this decade, more than 20% of college and university faculty members will retire, thereby allowing new talent into the ranks of the professorate" (7). Institutions of higher learning face a unique opportunity to shape the faculty of the future; how the faculty hired in the 1960s and 1970s are replaced "will determine the structure the universities for many future decades" (Rich 43). These decisions can be guided by strong planning: "development of long-term faculty planning models would enable chancellors, presidents, and provosts to predict the expected number of retirements and thus new hiring opportunities" (Clark 4-5).

According to data from the 2004-2005 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey[2], over half of current faculty respondents are over the age of fifty. The number of University of Scranton faculty over this age is higher than those for the other three survey comparison groups. The table below describes full time undergraduate faculty respondent percentages for several institutional groupings. The age group with the highest percentage of respondents is in **bold**. Shading indicates the age groups which have the highest percentage of faculty.

Table 1: HERI Faculty Survey Data – Faculty by Age Group

Age Group	All Institutions	All 4-Year Universities	Catholic 4-year Colleges	University of Scranton
Less than 30	2.0%	1.7%	1.7%	.8%
30 - 34	6.8%	6.9%	6.5%	4.1%
35-39	10.5%	11.0%	10.7%	9.1%
40-44	11.9%	12.1%	11.3%	7.4%
45-49	14.4%	14.0%	13.7%	13.2%
50-54	17.0%	16.4%	**17%**	**25.6%**
55-59	**17.8%**	**17.2%**	15.8%	14.9%
60-64	12.6%	13.2%	13.0%	14.9%
65-69	4.9%	5.2%	6.7%	7.4%
70 or more	2.1%	2.3%	3.7%	2.5%
Total % over 50	*54.4%*	*54.3%*	*56%*	***65.3%***

[1] American Demographics (2001). "Indicators: impending retirement." *American Demographics*, August, p. 24.
[2] Data from a national response population of 40,670 faculty members at 421 colleges and universities. Source: Lindholm, et al. "The American College Teacher." For additional institutional analysis of HERI survey data from this year, see "HERI Faculty Survey 2004-2005 Report." PAIRO.

Longitudinal data from the University of Scranton describes changing faculty demographics over time. Though the number of full-time faculty has not changed much since 1994, the following table describes increases in the number of part-time faculty:

Table 2: University of Scranton Faculty 1994-2006

Year	Number FT Faculty	Number PT Faculty	Total Faculty
1994	241	142	383
1998	251	134	385
2002	244	132	376
2006	**254**	**195**	**449**

Table 3 below describes University faculty for these years by age group. Shading illustrates the aging of the faculty population between 1994 and 2006

Table 3: University of Scranton Faculty by Age Group, 1994-2006

Age Group	1994	1998	2002	2006
Less than 30	15	9	9	13
30-34	24	39	18	25
35-39	62	40	43	45
40-44	90	63	53	55
45-49	61	84	62	60
Subtotal	*252*	*235*	*185*	*198*
50-54	57	60	75	85
55-59	25	44	48	79
60-64	20	21	39	50
65-69	15	11	19	26
70+	14	14	10	11
Subtotal	*131*	*150*	*191*	*251*
Total	*383*	*385*	*376*	*449*

Table 4 below describes faculty for these years by gender. Though female faculty have increased in number during this time span, they are still outnumbered by their male counterparts. Between 2002 and 2006, the increase in female faculty outpaced similar growth for males.

Table 4: University of Scranton faculty by gender – 1994-2006

Year	Female	Male	Total Faculty
1994	136	247	383
1998	151	234	385
2002	141	235	376
2006	**193**	**256**	**449**

Table 5 describes faculty for these years by ethnicity. The majority of Scranton faculty have historically been, and continue to be, white. The highest minority population is Asian/Pacific Islander.

Table 5: University of Scranton faculty by ethnicity – 1994 to 2006

Year	American Indian		Black		Hispanic		Nonresident Alien		Asian/Pacific Islander		White		Unknown	
1994	0	0.0%	1	.3%	3	.8%	3	.8%	18	4.7%	349	91%	9	2.3%
1998	1	.3%	4	1%	2	.5%	3	.8%	21	5.5%	349	90.6%	5	1.3%
2002	0	0.0%	1	.3%	1	.3%	5	1.3%	19	5.1%	346	92%	4	1.1%
2006	0	0.0%	2	.4%	2	.4%	7	1.6%	19	4.2%	417	92.9%	2	.4%

Diversity

Faculty in American higher education are "more diverse along the lines of gender, race/ethnicity, and national origin" today than ever before (Morris 86). Gose reports that "in 2005, 109,964 U.S. minority scholars held full-time faculty positions at American colleges and universities, up from 69,505 in 1995, according to the Education Department — a 58-percent increase. The proportion of minority scholars in the overall professoriate also rose, but not as much. The department found that 16.5 percent of scholars were from minority groups in 2005, up from 12.7 percent in 1995. The increase in the proportion of U.S. minority scholars lagged well behind the increase in raw numbers because the number of white and nonresident-alien scholars also rose during the decade." However, as Trower and Chait report "despite 30 years of affirmative action, and contrary the public perceptions, the American faculty profile, especially at preeminent universities, remains largely white and largely male" (33). Scholarship shows that the fields of science and engineering are particularly underrepresented, despite gains in the number of Ph.D.s earned by minorities and women in those fields[3]. Nelson observes that this cycle is likely to perpetuate as "women are less likely to enter and remain in science and engineering when they lack mentors and role models. In most science disciplines, the percentage of women among faculty recently hired is not comparable to that of recent women Ph.D.s."

In 2005, 57% of bachelors and 59% of master's degrees awarded in the United States were earned by women (*Condition of Education* 2007, 177), and in 2006, women accounted for 51% of doctoral recipients (*Survey of Earned Doctorates* 2006), leading Trower and Chait to assert that "the trouble for women is not the lack of numbers in the pipeline; the problem is that their status, once in the academy, is low" (34), as evidenced by their being more likely to hold lower rank than their male counterparts, and lack of parity in achieving tenure (34-5). Some paradoxes in college enrollments also contribute to low numbers of academic faculty. Though ethnic minorities, in particular Hispanics, are driving increases in undergraduate enrollment, smaller percentages of minority high school graduates go on to higher education than do whites (Milem). Higher numbers of minorities are going on to earn advanced degrees, though overall proportions of minority Ph.D. recipients are lower than those for non-minorities (Trower and Chait 35). Ethnic minorities face many of the same issues with rank and tenure as do females (35)[4].

[3] See: Nelson, Donna J, Ph.D. (2004; revised 2005, 2007). "A National Analysis of Diversity in Science and Engineering Faculties at Research Universities." University of Oklahoma.

[4] For more on women and minorities in academe, see: Aguirre, A. (2000). *Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

These difficulties for women and minority faculty may in part be due to the fact that "because white males tend to hold the senior positions of power in institutions, they become the culture bearer for new faculty members. Women and people of color more frequently have to compromise their personal values and beliefs to fit into the academic culture," and as a result are less likely to pursue this career, answering Van Ummersen's question, "why do women and students of color find the academic career so unappealing?" (29). For those who do enter into and remain in the profession, comparatively few go on to leadership roles; about nine percent of administrators in higher education were African American in 1999, about three percent of administrators in that year were Hispanic (Melendez 7). Those who do are often concentrated in academic support, student services, and diversity divisions (Melendez 7).

Efforts to correct these imbalances are gaining in speed particularly as student diversity[5] continues to rise: "given that the number and diversity of students in increasing, creating an institutional environment that values the recruitment and retention of an excellent and diverse faculty is more important than ever" (Van Ummersen 27). Smith and Moreno observe other reasons why diversity is important: "the desire to reflect student diversity cannot be the only rationale for diversifying the faculty. Diversity is a matter of equity in hiring and retention, as well as a central component of higher education's ability to develop more relevant and varied forms of knowledge…[faculty diversity is needed] in order to make fully informed decisions at all levels…a relatively homogenous faculty limits the future development of diversity in leadership, as most academic administrators come from faculty ranks." But achieving diversity in numbers is not the only issue for college faculty; another key element to making the most of the benefits of diversity in higher education rests with the extent to which faculty (and staff) "have internalized the diversity values of their diversities…and [to what extent these values] go beyond structural diversity to classroom and informal interactional diversity" (Maruyama and Moreno, 11).

Degree Paths & Hiring Trends

Data from the 2006 Survey of Earned Doctorates found that the number of doctorates[6] earned in the United States in 2006 (45,596) increased 5.1% from the previous year and is the highest in the history of the study. Women[7] received 45% of all doctorates in 2006; twenty percent were earned by minorities. Sixty-three percent (63%) were earned by U.S. citizens; of U.S. citizens, women earned 51% of doctorates. The median time to degree from baccalaureate completion to the receipt of the doctorate was 9.5 years. Between 2005 and 2006, the largest percent increases (12%) in the seven broad fields studied by the Survey[8] were within engineering and physical sciences. These two fields along with physical sciences and social sciences, which together form the larger science and engineering (S&E) category, account for 68% of all doctorates earned in 2006, and have experienced the highest

[5] Smith, Daryl G., Lisa E. Wolf, and Thomas Levitan (1994). Studying Diversity in Higher Education. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[6] For more on doctoral education in the United States, see: Thurgood, Lori et al. (June 2006). U.S. Doctorates in the 20th Century. National Science Foundation.

[7] For more on trends in female doctoral recipients since the 1970s, see: England, Paula et al. (January 2007). Why are some academic fields tipping toward female? *Sociology of Education* 80, 23-42.

[8] These fields include: Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, Engineering, Education, Humanities, and Other Fields.

percent increases amongst the seven categories since 2001. The total number of doctorates earned in the humanities and education decreased slightly from 2001 to 2006.

Though U.S. citizens received 63% of all research doctorates in 2006, foreign doctorates are on the rise. The 2006 Survey of Earned Doctorates reports an increase in the percentage of new doctorates awarded to individuals on temporary visas from 11% of those who reported citizenship in 1976 to 33% in 2006, and "the growing number of doctorates awarded to foreign students on temporary visas has accounted for virtually all the overall growth in the number of doctorate recipients since 1976" (20).

The Academic Job Market

Data shows that "the job market for new Ph.D.s appears less secure today than it was twenty or thirty years ago" (Zusman 134). For many academic fields, Ph.D. graduates outnumber the amount of job openings; "in most fields, a lower percentage of new Ph.D.s had jobs in 2002 than in the early 1970s or 1980s, although the situation was better than in the early 1990s, a low point in the Ph.D. market" (134). A number of articles published in the 1990s and the early part of this decade describe the stagnancy and even decline of hiring opportunities in may disciplines, particularly the humanities. Yet the level of opportunity for academic jobs continues to vary widely by discipline; in the field of history, for example, scholars are "cautiously optimistic" over a trend of increasing job openings (Wilson). Others observe that the academic job market, like most other employment markets, experiences its share of fluctuations for a number of reasons. In particular for academia, "imbalances often occur for a number of reasons, including the fact that the length of time required to earn a Ph.D. degree makes it difficult for the supply of workers with doctorates to respond quickly to changes in the demand for them" (Jones 25). And what some might term Ph.D. overproduction others consider a myth, largely because of the idea that "academia is the only appropriate place for a doctoral recipient to be employed" (Hamilton 28). The market for academic appointments will largely be influenced by economic and higher education funding issues, which academic program areas see growth in enrollment, and what types of institutions students choose to enroll in, among other factors (Zusman 137).

For many new doctoral recipients, this somewhat soft job market leads to larger number of acceptances of post-doctorate positions, particularly in the sciences: "nearly three-quarters of new biochemistry Ph.D.s, over half of physicists, and nearly a third of psychologists sought postdoctoral study positions in 2002, and the number of years spent in postdoctoral positions appears to be lengthening" (135). Some have pointed to these changing trends as indicative of a possible crisis in graduate education[9]: "The uncertain job market outlook for Ph.D.s, combined with competing demands for scarce public dollars, has prompted widespread demands for changes in graduate training, ranging from radical restructuring of the doctoral curriculum to sizable reductions in doctoral programs and enrollments" (Zusman 139). Rich observes that "pressures for change in the conditions that produce faculty are not all external. Major shifts in the topography of scholarship have been under way for many decades, with traditional fields of scholarship converging, diverging, and intersecting with new fields of scholarship. Patterns differ by fields, but the phenomenon is notable across most academic organizations" (44).

[9] For more on the issues in doctoral education, see: Walker, George et al. (2008). *The Formation of Scholars: Doctoral Education for the Twenty-First Century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Others are less concerned with perceived problems in the academic pipeline. Dr. George Walker of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate for the Advancement of Teaching has noted that the "expectations and external influences that impact the doctorate have changed, and its prudent and appropriate to look at each discipline to see if there are things that need to be handled differently" (Hamilton 28). Many Ph.D.s are willing to wait out this challenging period in anticipation of the "more tangible payoffs for Ph.D. recipients when they enter the labor force. Unemployment rates are consistently lower and earnings are significantly higher for people with a Ph.D. degree than they are for people with lower levels of educational attainment" (Jones 22).

According to the 2007-08 CUPA-HR salary survey, "increases in average salary by rank ranged from a low of 3.3% for new assistant professors at public institutions to a high of 4.0% for professor and associate professors both at public and private institutions, and for assistant professors at public institutions" (13). Full professors of law earned the highest average pay ($129,527) of all faculty in 2007-08, followed by faculty in engineering ($107,134) and business ($102,695) [14]. The survey reports that the three disciplines with the lowest average salaries for full professors were the fields of visual and performing arts, English, and parks, recreation, leisure, and fitness studies (15). Despite rising salaries, the AAUP cautions that salary percent increases be taken into context of rising inflation rates: "the increase in overall faculty salaries [between December 2006 and December 2007] thus lagged behind inflation for the third time in the last four years" (Where are the Priorities? 9). The report also cites the continuing gap between faculty salaries at public and private institutions; faculty at public institutions make less, on average, than their private college counterparts (11). The concern is not just about the money itself, but what impact those dollars have on recruiting faculty talent: "when public universities cannot compete in terms of salary and other resources, private universities may be able to attract the best and most productive scholars" (11).

Rise of Part-time Faculty

In 1998, Finkelstein et al defined the "new academic generation" as having faculty status, teach full-time, identify their principal activity as teaching, research, or administration, and have experienced less than seven years in a full-time position (11). Yet the emerging majority of instructional professionals within higher education do not meet all of these criteria; "faculty members are now classified in a growing number of categories with new titles and with distinct responsibilities, rights, and privileges" (*Contingent Appointments*, 98). A key trend in college instruction is the increase in the number of part-time faculty and of those who are not on a tenure track. "As the faculty hired in the 1960s and 1970s retire, new appointments are increasingly non-traditional. One part of the revolution is increase in part-time appointments with almost 50% of the current one million faculty members nationwide in a part-time position. A second piece of the silent revolution is the dramatic increase in full-time, off-tenure-track employment occurring through the 1990s, now amounting to one-half of all full-time hires" (Morris 86)[10]. From 1987-2001, the proportion of full-time faculty decreased from 66% to 55.5% (Ma 2). Data from the 2004 National Postsecondary Study of Faculty show that 44% of faculty and instructional staff were employed part-time in 2003 (Cataldi 3); in 2005, it had reached 48% (IPEDS).

[10] See also: Ehrenberg, Ronald G. and Liang Zhang. (April 2004). "The Changing Nature of Faculty Employment." TIAA CREF Institute.

Data shows the relationship between growth of part-time faculty and those who are non-tenure-track: between 1975 and 1995, full-time faculty counts increased by 27%, while part-time staff increased 103%; those on the tenure track increased by 25%, and non-tenure-track appointments increased by 92% (Benjamin 5). The percentage of adjunct and other contingent faculty varies by discipline, with high numbers in fields such as English composition, where large numbers of undergraduates need to pass through gateway courses[11]. In 2006, the American Association of University Professors inaugurated an index to track the placement of contingent faculty at American colleges and universities (Gravois). The 2006 report of the Index predicts that this trend will continue, "since the tenured faculty of the coming decade would emerge from [current] tenure-track positions" (Curtis and Jacobe 6). This concerns many in the field of academia, as "the nature of contingent employment prevents these teachers from helping to shape the academy as a whole, and curricula at their individual institutions, and they are now the majority of faculty nationwide" (16).

Some suggest that these changes in faculty hiring practices are the result of funding challenges. Another reason may be the large numbers of Ph.D.s entering the job market; this market condition "may be related to the increased proportion of new Ph.D.s taking a first postdoctoral position as well as to the lengthened duration of individuals' postdoctoral experience" (Ma 9). In many academic fields, "there are already too many Ph.D.s awarded for the full-time academic posts available creating a surplus of likely jobseekers. That pool becomes adjuncts, who command wages and benefits so low that universities find them irresistible hires" (Pope). But these cost savings may not translate to what Benjamin describes as "cost effectiveness" inasmuch as these faculty may detract from educational quality (6), and that their low pay, limited benefits, and lack of institutional support and professional development opportunities may negatively impact their commitment to the classroom (7) and their relationship to the larger academic environment at the institution. Some have observed the lesser degree of involvement part-time faculty experience in other traditional faculty pursuits: "Rarely do universities expect non-tenure track staff to do the same amount of research, teaching, and service as tenured faculty," and some view "the rise of non-tenured positions as an impediment to [faculty] collegiality because of the inequities in status, pay, and security between tenured and contract faculty" (Holub). Curtis and Jacobe observe that "the central problem of contingent academic is not the people who fill these positions, as they are most often able teachers and scholars forced into these positions by the structure of academic employment. The problem lies in the nature of contingent work, its lack of support structures and the constraints on academic freedom for faculty in these positions" (6). They describe the life of the part-time faculty member:

> Part-time faculty are rarely provided with the institutional support they need to be effective teachers and scholars. They often lack offices, campus telephones, network computer access, campus e-mail or individual faculty Web sites. In some cases they do not even have library access…They are paid for the specific classes they teach, and are often on campus only for those schedule class meetings, rushing off to teach the next course at another campus or to another job entirely…This makes it difficult for students to contact them outside of class, unless the faculty members themselves provide personal telephone numbers, e-mail addresses, and/or Web sites – for which the institution does not provide support (8).

[11] For more information on contingent faculty and various disciplines, see: *Disciplinary Research on Contingent Faculty*. http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2006/ND/Feat/sidebar2.htm

The relationship between increasing part-time appointments and student success remains a topic of debate. Benjamin asserts that "over-reliance on part-time and other 'contingent[12]' instructional staff diminishes faculty involvement in undergraduate learning," yet data shows that "staff with part-time, contingent appointments compose a substantial majority of those staff who provide lower-division instruction[13]" (4-5). Due to their unique relationship to their institutions, these faculty are seen to "have neither the time nor the motivation to mentor students outside of class or become involved in student activities" (Holub). A recent study suggests that first year students are "significantly more likely to drop out if their high-stakes 'gatekeeper courses' are taught by part-time adjuncts" (Glenn). The AAUP policy statement on *Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession* notes concerns such as these, and suggests guidelines for achieving a successful transition for what the group terms a currently "unstable academic environment characterized by over-reliance on contingent faculty appointments to a stable academic environment characterized by a predominantly tenure-line faculty" (108). These steps include: assessing the current situation, defining and describing the goal, considering appropriate criteria for tenure, stabilizing the institution, designing a deliberate approach, and recognizing costs and planning for necessary resources (108-109).

Others voice concern with the ways in which contingent faculty[14] are regarded and rewarded for the work they do. Keith Hoeller, co-founder of the Washington Part-Time Faculty Association, observes the "second class status" of adjuncts, remarking that "higher education institutions now employee a half a million adjunct professors nationwide…According to the American Association of University Professors, 'part-time non-tenure-track faculty are paid approximately 64 percent less per hour' than their full-time counterparts. Many adjuncts do not enjoy health-care or retirement benefits, and few have any job security from quarter to quarter, let alone from year to year" (Hoeller). In effort to address these issues, a number of part-time faculty and graduate student instructors have attempted to organize their efforts to improve working conditions and pay for contingent academic labor, with mixed success. Labor disputes at several high-profile universities, such as Georgetown and the University of Maryland[15], have attempted to address what is seen as exploitation and inequity of treatment for this group of professionals. And, "In the last decade, the three major faculty organizations – the AAUP, the American Federation of teachers, and the National Education Association – have emphasized organizing and collective bargaining as the means to improve the lot of adjuncts" (Hoeller).

The Changing Role of the Faculty

As the higher education landscape shifts, faculty are being asked to reconsider their traditional roles: "…as changing demographics and technology alter the context of higher education, the mindset of faculty members will have to change as well. Specifically, instead of viewing themselves primarily as

[12] Defined as both full- and part-time faculty who are not on a tenure track.

[13] See also: Baldwin, R.G. and Chronister, J.L. (2001). Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP.
Jabobe, Monica. (2006). Contingent faculty across the disciplines. Academe.

[14] See also: Berry, Joe. (2005). Reclaiming the Ivory Tower: Organizing Adjuncts to Change Higher Education. New York: Monthly Review Press.

[15] See: June, Audrey Williams. (February 29, 2008). Maryland bills would hand labor rights to TA's, adjuncts. The Chronicle of Higher Education. www.chronicle.com

content providers in their teaching role, professors will see themselves as designers of learning experiences for an increasingly diverse student population" (Morrison 9).

This change has not been sudden: "faculty roles and responsibilities in American higher education have not remained static. As institutions of higher education developed in early America, faculty played an integral role in students' lives. During the 18th an 19th centuries, instructors were responsible not only for the intellectual development of students but also their moral and spiritual growth. According to Finkelstein (1984), they were to be both teachers and 'shepherds' to the students. During the past few decades, along with the demise of *in loco parentis*, the number of institutions expecting faculty to be shepherds has declined" (Trice), giving rise to the growing ranks of student affairs professionals. The relationship between faculty and student affairs professionals has been a traditionally territorial one, with faculty assuming responsibility for student learning and student affairs staff focusing on the non-curricular and developmental needs of students. That role has been steadily changing over recent decades. Scholars and professionals are increasingly seeing the role of the student affairs professional as a partner in the academic enterprise, sharing with faculty in the responsibility for student learning.

Faculty work has long been organized around three categories: teaching, research, and service. Depending upon the type of institution the faculty member is employed at (for instance, a Doctoral/Research or Liberal Arts institution), the balance of these three elements may vary. Altbach suggests that the discussion about this degree of balance is "one of the main debates" about the academic profession today (299). As evidenced by growing numbers of faculty productivity[16] and workload studies, it is clear that higher education institutions, and in some cases, states and state university systems, are concerned about how much time faculty are spending on each of these three pursuits. Most the debate appears to focus on teaching versus research as faculty's primary activity. "Many outside the academy, and quite a few within, have argued that there should be more emphasis on teaching in the American higher education system," questioning the value of much of today's academic research production (Altbach 299). Fairweather states that "research accomplishment, the most 'cosmopolitan' academic function, has social and economic value. Research visibility certainly enhances institutional stature among peers…Political and public support for academic institutions, however, rests on perceived institutional commitment to 'local functions,' especially teaching and learning" (26). In response to rising pressures, "although most faculty still spend more time teaching than doing research, the new generation of doctorates seems more oriented toward research than their senior counterparts…National surveys report a growing emphasis on research even among new Ph.D.s in comprehensive colleges and universities, where teaching requirements are typically heavier than at research universities or selective liberal arts colleges" (Youn). In 1990, Ernest Boyer[17] introduced an expanded definition of scholarship, addressing not only the traditional form of scholarship (discover) to include the scholarship of application, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching; Boyer's legacy continues to be discussed and applied in more current discussion about the interrelationship of teaching and research.

[16] The University of Delaware's National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity (commonly referred to as the Delaware Study) is a long-time and commonly used tool to track faculty productivity.

[17] For scholarship on applying Boyer's domains in faculty productivity analysis, see: Braxton, John M., ed. (Spring 2006). Analyzing Faculty Work and Rewards: Using Boyer's Four Domains of Scholarship. New Directions for Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This debate about the balance of research and teaching and overall faculty productivity contributes to ongoing dialogue about promotion and tenure practices in higher education. The institution of tenure has long been employed to "provides that no person contiguously retained as a full-time faculty member beyond a specified lengthy period of probationary service may thereafter be dismissed *without adequate cause,*" providing a mechanism for job and economic security for faculty (Finkin 4). And, as Benjamin observes, to emphasize "professional excellence and the social quest for truth," ensuring that faculty have academic freedom, "a tradition in American higher education in which faculty are given freedom to teach, research, and speak freely outside the classroom without censure as long as they adhere to the responsibilities and obligations provided under academic freedom" (Roepnack & Lewis 221). Tenure is "a statement of formal assurance that thereafter the individual's professional security and academic freedom will not be placed in question without the observance of full academic due process" (Finkin 4). The American Association of University Professors maintains a policy on *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure* to guide colleges and universities on effective procedures.

Critics of the tenure system observe that it "creates excessive social, as well as individual, costs because unproductive tenured faculty limit opportunities for new faculty and programmatic innovation" (Benjamin). Some are concerned that tenure also provides protection for "ideologues desperate to remain in control of their departments;" critics wonder if tenure is in fact necessary to protect academic freedom, which some argue is already protected by First Amendment rights (Roepnack & Lewis 222, 225). Yet some scholars provide evidence that institutions without a tenure process have little if any discernable difference in faculty turnover. The tenure debate became a public one after fallout from inflammatory remarks of Harvard president Lawrence Summers, and tenured faculty member Ward Churchill regarding victims of the September 11th attacks – his views traditionally having been protected by the tenure system. Fallout has let the Colorado legislature to call for a review of the state's institutions' tenure processes (Fogg). Some are concerned that tenure provides protection for "unproductive faculty taking up space, or ideologues desperate to remain in control of their departments" (Roepnack & Lewis, 222). To what extent contingent faculty should be protected by the auspices of academic freedom and a tenure or tenure-type system – and in what ways the rise of contingent is impacting the traditional paths and policies for faculty promotion and tenure - is also under scrutiny (Jashik). [18]

The contribution of academic scholarship to the social good is another contemporary issue in academe, particularly because some nations are challenging traditional U.S. academics, particularly in technology and scientific innovation: "on a global scale, both the need and demand for higher education have increased, but U.S. global hegemony over higher education, particularly leadership in graduate education and scientific research, has diminished. In a technologically flat world, all universities, but especially research universities, now must compete more aggressively, and U.S. universities are losing ground" (Rich 37). Some suggest that to remain competitive, U.S. higher education needs to considerably review its structure: "responding effectively to new demands

[18] For more on contemporary issues regarding tenure, see also: Fogg, Piper. (November 25, 2005). Higher education 2015: The state of tenure. Chronicle of higher education.
Chait, Richard P. (2002). *The Questions of Tenure*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

requires a restructuring of universities, but the most important part of that restructuring is not in business practices. Rather, the key restructuring needs to be in the allocation of the most important (and most expensive) academic assets, the faculty, and specifically in the structure of faculty appointments and organization in creative ways that better serve societal and scholarly needs" (38). This is one piece of a larger conversation about how knowledge is created and shared, and the rise of what is known as the knowledge economy, a term popularized by Peter Drucker as early as 1969[19]. Modern scholars have defined the term as "production and services based on knowledge-intensive activities that contribute to an accelerated pace of technical and scientific advance, as well as rapid obsolescence" (Powell and Snellman 199). Altbach emphasizes the importance of this trend in shaping the future of the academy:

> "Research is a central part of the mission of many universities and the academic system generally. Decisions that will be in contention in the future will concern the control and funding of research, the relationship of research to the broader curriculum and teaching, [and] the uses made of university-based research…Further, the system of knowledge dissemination, including journals and books and computer-based data systems, is rapidly changing. Who should control the new data networks? How will traditional means of communication, such as journals, survive in this new climate? How will the scientific systems avoid being overwhelmed by the proliferation of data? Who will pay for the costs of knowledge dissemination?" (29).

No discussion of the knowledge economy can be complete without reference to technology. Gumpert and Chun describe the various changes technology has had on the academy, beginning with fifth century B.C. concerns with the adoption of writing as learning tool, mass printing in the fifteenth century, the television in the 20th century, and the computer (397-9). Just as technology has a growing impact on the business of scholarship as Altbach describes, it has a sizable impact on the processes of teaching and learning, including its "social organization," the roles of the various participants in the educational exercise and how they interact (Gumport and Chun 407).

Increasing numbers of faculty are utilizing media in their classroom. Many students never step foot on the college campus, preferring instead to enroll in courses and degree programs online. Hartman et al observe that "most faculty members did not seek careers in the academic because of a strong love of technology or a propensity for adapting to rapid change; yet they now find themselves facing not only the inexorable advance of technology in their personal and professional lives but also the presence in their classrooms of technology-savvy Net generation students" (62). Though technology is impacting all faculty, it may not be impacting all faculty to the same extent; the academy today, given high numbers of faculty who are reaching traditional retirement age, may have faculty who crafted their dissertations using longhand or typewriters along side those who have only used a computer to complete their own academic work. Hartman et al applies Everett M. Rogers diffusions of innovations model to faculty, observing that the degree to which faculty adopt technology will have a considerable impact on the types and level of technological support and development they need from their institutions. It is precisely this variety of needs that is challenging campus IT departments to identify solutions to a myriad of faculty support issues.

---

[19]Drucker, Peter. (1969). *The Age of Discontinuity; Guidelines to Our Changing Society*. New York: Harper and Row. .

The impact is not only on the teaching and learning experience, but in the way in which faculty approach their working day: "Although the full impact of information technology on faculty roles and work may not be discernable for another generation, incipient realignments are already demonstrable…there is [an] impact on faculty workload. Faculty have had to learn new technologies and instrumentalities and revise course content more often, since student are no longer dependent on them exclusively for access to the latest information on course topics; and their courses have become in some sense much more 'public'. They must content with email and consequent 24/7 accessibility to students, deal with the ubiquitous technical snafus, and even assume new kinds of secretarial duties as the departmental typist and filer fast disappears and professors are expected to word process their own syllabi and writing and maintain their own electronic files" (Schuster and Finkelstein 108). Technology use in teaching and research also introduces concerns related to intellectual property rights[20]. Recent changes to federal copyright laws via the DMCA and TEACH Act provide some guidance, they "are relatively silent on the ownerships of works created with new technologies" (Ulius 62). Institutions and their faculty continue to review best practices for ensuring the intellectual property is protected in a day of increased portability and distribution.

Faculty Departure Trends

The growing trend of faculty remaining at their institutions beyond the traditional age of retirement is causing many institutions review issues of faculty employment. Clark asserts that "continued employment beyond age 70 also has the potential of slowing promotional prospects, reducing the number of new hires, and increasing labor costs. However, delayed retirement might help institutions respond to increased numbers of students and maintain an important resource" (7). The implementation of faculty phased-retirement programs[21] - which provide faculty opportunities to ease into retirement by reduced workloads, and include a variety of incentives - are on the rise in higher education. This popular type of retirement package "avoids the trauma of full, cold-turkey retirement and allows faculty to manage that challenge more gradually" (Leslie and Janson 44). The retirement of senior faculty can also help institutions to save money; in March 2008 University of Rhode Island officials announced increasing financial retirement incentives in hopes of saving dollars that it would normally use to compensate these higher-paid senior faculty. The university's Provost also references the need to "strategically define a set of academic priorities…We need to decide what are needs are in the new economy, new advances in research and new modes of learning that we find with contemporary students" (Jordan).

But not all faculty departures are due to retirement[22]; retaining quality faculty remains an issue for many campuses. Johnsrud and Rosser have studied faculty morale and its relationship to departure, and have found that "morale is a primary factor in faculty members' intention to leave their positions, their institutions, and their profession. There are other factors… faculty members make decisions to leave for a variety of personal and professional reasons" (538). A study by Barnes et al indicates that two important factors predicting faculty intent to leave were "a sense of frustration due to time

[20] See: Slaughter, Sheila and Gary Rhoades. (2005). Markets in higher education. (486-516). *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Philip G. Altbach et al, eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
[21] For more information on faculty retirement programs, see: Conley, Valerie Martin. (2007). "Survey of Changes in Faculty Retirement Policies 2007." AAUP. www.aaup.org
[22] See also: Weiler, William C. (1985). Why do faculty members leave a university? *Research in Higher Education* 23 (3), 270-278.

commitments and a lack of a sense of community at one's institution… thus the intrinsic rewards related to work schedule and being in an intellectually stimulating and collegial environment were very important in the sample's desire to remain employed as faculty members" (466-7). A recent report from the American Council on Education, *An Agenda for Excellence*, states that many faculty "are forced to [leave academia] because of the tightening academic job market in a wide range of disciplines. Others, especially women, find themselves in adjunct and non-tenure-rack positions – despite low pay, minimal or no benefits, and lack of potential for job security – for a better balance between personal/family life and professional life" (5). The *Agenda for Excellence* report suggests the following barriers to retention and advancement for faculty: "the traditional career path, based on societal norms from an earlier era (i.e. the experience of white male academics), inhibits the success of many women with spouses and children…Many PhDs, particularly women, report barriers to re-entry into tenure track positions after having left the professorate for a period of time…Although a number of institutions have established policies to help faculty members work-family conflicts, most junior faculty members do not take advantage of them because they fear discrimination in future promotion and tenure decisions" (5). And, as the report suggests, "increasingly, white males also are finding a need to better manage the professional and personal spheres of their lives- for dependent health care, health, and a host of other personal reasons" (5).

Agenda for Excellence suggests a number of options for institutions to consider that may help increase faculty satisfaction, effectiveness, and retention, including policies reducing challenges to those pursuing re-entry into the tenure track, creating incentives for the development of more collegial environments, reviewing criteria for promotion and tenure with particular regard for flexibility, broadening concepts of scholarship, examining issues related to faculty work/life balance[23], and creating renewal and development opportunities for faculty (10-11). Others observe that helping new Ph.D.s to transition from the emphasis on research in their doctoral programs to the blend of research, teaching, and service faculty face may aid in retention. Mentoring programs can help incoming faculty adapt, and "connecting incoming faculty to other early-career faculty across the institution provides them with a network of colleagues who have experience negotiating similar issues" (Reder 12).

Conclusion

As Rich observes, "Universities are communities of scholars; how these communities are constituted, how they operate, and what they produce define the character and greatly determine the success of universities" (Rich 43). As the nature and delivery of higher education continues to evolve, the work environment of today's faculty is much different from that of even twenty years ago. As Conley observes, "changing student characteristics require that higher education not only *replace* current faculty as they retire, but also *regenerate* the faculty workforce for the 21st century" (1). Colleges and universities should consider carefully their faculty hiring, retention, and development programs to ensure the continuity of quality of this core resource.

---

[23] For more on balancing work and family life in academe, see:

Curtis, John. W. (2005). The Challenge of Balancing Faculty Careers and Family Work. New Directions for Higher Education, 130. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Association of University Professors. (2008). Balancing Family & Academic Work. www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/WF/

Resources

Altbach, Philip G. (2005). Harsh realities: The professorate faces a new century. (287-314). *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Philip G. Altbach et al, eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

American Association of University Professors. (March-April 2008). Where are the priorities? *Academe* 94 (2), 8-34.

---. (2006). AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006. www.aaup.org

---. (2003). Contingent appointments and the academic profession. www.aaup.org

American Council on Education. (2005). *An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers*. www.acenet.edu

Barnes, Laura L. B., Menna O. Agago, and William T. Coombs. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education* 39 (4), 457-469.

Benjamin, Ernst. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Peer Review*, 5 (1).

---. Some implications of tenure for the profession and society. American Association of University Professors. www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/tenure/benjamintenureimps.htm?PDF=1

Boyer, Ernest. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate. New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cataldi, Emily Forrest et al. (May 2005). 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Report on Faculty and Instructional Staff 2003. National Center for Education Statistics.

Clark, Robert (April 2004). Recruitment, Retention and Retirement: Changing Faculty Demographics and the Need for New Policies. TIAA CREF Institute.

College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (February 2008). 2007-08 National Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline and Rank for Four Year Colleges and Universities. http://www.cupahr.org/surveys/files/salary0708/NFSS08ExecutiveSummary.pdf

Conley, Valerie. (February 2008). Regenerating the faculty workforce: A significant leadership challenge and a public policy concern. TIAA-CREF Institute.

Curtis, John W. and Monica F. Jacobe. (2006). Consequences: an increasingly contingent faculty. AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006. www.aaup.org.

Fairweather, James S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education 73* (1), 26-48.

Finkelstein, Martin J., Robert K. Seal and Jack H. Schuster. (1998). *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transition*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

---. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II.* Columbus: Ohio State UP.

Finkin, Matthew W., ed. (1996). *The Case for Tenure.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fogg, Piper. (January 6, 2006). All eyes on tenure. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. www.chronicle.com

Glenn, David. (March 27, 2008). Gatekeeper courses should not be assigned to part-time instructors, research suggests. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. www.chronicle.com

Gose, Ben. (September 28, 2007). The professorate is increasingly diverse, but that didn't happen by accident. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. http://chronicle.com/free/v54/i05/05b00101.htm

Gravois, John. (December 15, 2006). Tracking the invisible faculty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. www.chronicle.com.

Gumport, Patricia J. and Marc Chunn. (2005). Technology and higher education. (393-421). *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Philip G. Altbach et al, eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hamilton, Kendra. (July 3, 2003). Is there a crisis in graduate education? *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 20 (10), 20-28.

Hartman, Joel L. et al. (2007). Faculty 2.0. *Educause Review* 42 (5), 62-72.

Hoeller, Keith. (June 16, 2006) The proper advocates for adjuncts. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. www.chronicle.com

Holub, Tamara. (2003). Contract faculty in higher education. ERIC Digest.

IPEDS. (2005). Fall Staff Survey. www.nces.ed.gov/ipeds

Jashcik, Scott. (April 2, 2007). Redefining academic freedom. Inside HigherEd. www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2007/04/02/adjuncts

Johnsrud, Linda and Vicki J. Rosser. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: a multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education* 73 (4), 518-542.

Jones, Elka. (Winter 2002-03). Beyond supply and demand: assessing the Ph.D. job market. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*.

Jordan, Jennifer D. (March 25, 2008). URI boosts incentive to encourage more retirements. The *Providence Journal*. www.projo.com

Leslie, David W. and Janson, Natasha. (2005). Easing the exit: an aging professorate likes options. *Change*, 37 (6), 41-47.

Lindholm, Jennifer et al. (2005). The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 2004-2005 HERI Faculty Survey. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.

Ma, Jennifer. (November 2004). Recent trends and issues in faculty demographics and employment patterns. TIAA-CREF Institute.

Maruyama, Geoffrey and Jose Moreno. (2000). University faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom. *Does Diversity Make a Difference? Three Research Studies on Diversity in College Classrooms.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and American Association of University Professors.

Melendez, Sara. (2004). From humble beginnings comes great achievement. *Reflections on 20 Years of Minorities in Education and the ACE Annual Status Report.* American Council on Education.

Milem, Jeffrey. (2000). "Why race matters." Academe Online. American Association of University Professors. http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2000/SO/Feat/mile.htm

Morris, Libby V. (2005). "Dramatic changes in faculty demographics." *Innovative Higher Education,* 30 (2), 85-87).

Morrison, James. (2003). "US Higher education in transition." *On the Horizon* 11 (1), 6-10.

Nealy, Michelle. (October 31, 2007). "Study: Minority faculty severely underrepresented in top 100 STEM departments." *Diverse Online*. www.diverseeducation.com

Nerad, Maresi, Elizabeth Rudd, Emory Morrison and Joseph Picciano. (2007). Social Science PhDs—Five+ Years Out: A National Survey of PhDs in Six Fields—Highlights Report. CIRGE Report 2007-01. CIRGE: Seattle, WA. www.cirge.washington.edu

Powell, Walter W. and Kaisa Snellman. (2004). The knowledge economy. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30, 199-220.

Pope, Justin. (January 20, 2008). Analysis: universities overproduce Ph.D.s. Associated Press.

Reder, Michael. (2007). Does your college *really* support teaching and learning? *Peer Review* 9 (4), 9-13.

Rich, Daniel. (2006). Academic leadership and the restructuring of higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 134, 7-48.

Roepnack, BethRene and Chance W. Lewis. (2007). Academic freedom and academic tenure: can they survive the market place of ideas? *Journal of Academic Ethics* 5, 221-232.

Schuster, Jack H. and Martin J. Finkelstein. (2006). *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, Daryl G. and Moreno, Jose F. (September 29, 2006). Hiring the next generation of professors: will myths remain excuses? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. www.chronicle.com

Survey of Earned Doctorates. (2006). National Opinion Research Center (NORC). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Trice, Andrea. (1997 Sept/Oct). Trends in faculty teaching goals: A longitudinal study of change. *Journal of College Student Development*.

Trower, C.A. and R.P. Chait. (2002 March/April). Faculty diversity: too little for too long. *Harvard Magazine*, 104 (4), 33-37.

Ulius, Sara. (2003). Intellectual property ownership in distributed learning. *Educause Review* 38 (4), 62-3.

Van Ummersen, Claire A. (2005). No talent left behind: attracting and retaining a diverse faculty. *Change*, 37 (6), 27-31.

Wilson, Robin. (January 27, 2006). History job market is hot – for now. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. http://chronicle.com/free/v52/i21/21a01201.htm

Youn, Ted. I. K. (2005). The academic job market is bad for all of us. The American Association of University Professors. www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2005/ND/Feat/youn.htm?PF=1

Zusman, Ami. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. (115-160). *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Philip G. Altbach, et al eds. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

THE UNIVERSITY OF
SCRANTON
A JESUIT UNIVERSITY

Planning, Assessment & Institutional Research Office

www.scranton.edu/planning