

Adapting by Design



Creating Faculty Roles and Defining Faculty Work to Ensure
an Intentional Future for Colleges and Universities

Adrianna Kezar and Daniel Maxey

EMBARGOED UNTIL 12:01am EST 2/20/2015

A report from The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success and the
University of Southern California Earl and Pauline Pullias Center for Higher Education

This work was made possible by the indispensable contributions of numerous scholars, practitioners, thought leaders in higher education, and leaders of national higher education organizations who have shared their perspectives with us and partnered with the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success over the last several years to examine changes in the faculty, their implications, and to begin to chart a course forward for the future of the academic profession. To all who have joined us in the important work of improving student and faculty success by improving academic professionalism for all members of the faculty, thank you.

We are especially grateful to Susan Albertine and the Association of American Colleges and Universities for their partnership with the Delphi Project since its inception. AAC&U has provided exceptional leadership in advancing a thoughtful dialogue about the future of the faculty and helping to shape the course of change.

We look forward to our continued work with existing partners and new ones as we promote a collaborative dialogue throughout the higher education sector about our shared future and its implications for students, institutions, and the academic profession.

Additional resources from the
Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success can be found at
www.thechangingfaculty.org

PREFACE

The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success was initiated to support a better understanding of factors that have led to a majority of faculty being hired off the tenure track, the impact of these circumstances on teaching and learning, and potential strategies for addressing issues of rising contingency together. It is a project of the Earl and Pauline Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California in partnership with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), as well as numerous other organizations representing a broad cross-section of stakeholders and interests across the higher education sector. The project has received generous funding from TIAA-CREF Research Institute, The Spencer Foundation, The Teagle Foundation, and Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The original study utilized a modified Delphi method approach, in which a group of experts is consulted and then brought together to develop solutions to complex national problems. Key experts representing a broad cross-section of institutional sectors, unions, professional and disciplinary organizations, as well as other perspectives and interests from higher education participated in the study. These participants completed surveys addressing key issues related to the changing composition of the professoriate, reliance on non-tenure-track faculty, and potential solutions—all within the context of broader challenges facing higher education, including declining state budgets, rapid changes within fields of study, changing student interests and demographics, and other issues. The participants were convened in May 2012 to discuss alternative approaches, to question underlying assumptions, and to contribute to the creation of solutions to change the nature of the professoriate. The findings were prepared and disseminated as a policy report.

More recently, the project has been guided by two meta-strategies developed by the original working group: 1) Creating a vision for new, future faculty models for improving student success, and 2) Building a broad base of stakeholder support for improving conditions facing non-tenure-track faculty. Much of our work over the past several years has focused on the second of these strategies. This report is an attempt to address the first imperative: to create a vision for new, future faculty models both by promoting campus-level change efforts and by initiating a national conversation about our direction as a profession. It follows meetings and discussions with numerous national thought leaders on higher education issues and several years of engaging administration and grassroots leaders from campuses across the country on issues of great concern to the faculty. The Delphi Project continues to develop partnerships with a wide range of higher education organizations and institutions in our efforts to achieve these goals.

AUDIENCE

The audience for this report is far-reaching and includes all stakeholders who are concerned about the future of higher education and the academic profession: faculty who want to take up the mantle of supporting the redevelopment of the profession; institutional leaders and senior administrators who, working with their faculties, can initiate productive and creative projects to strengthen their academic programs through a redesign of faculty work, roles, and related policies; graduate colleges who are actively preparing the next generation of scholars and leaders in our fields, as well as the graduate students who will eventually take on those roles; national higher education organizations that can facilitate critical and generative discussions among the various sectors or professional groups they represent; disciplinary societies that can advance dialogue about faculty roles, rewards systems, and norms, and about the ways these structures serve to advance or stifle change and the development of a sustainable faculty model; and policymakers who are interested in encouraging higher education leaders to reexamine the structure and roles of the faculty to support the attainment of state-level goals for education.

AN INTRODUCTION AND CALL TO ACTION

Leaders throughout American higher education are beginning to recognize the mounting challenges provoked by a period of substantial change for the faculties of colleges and universities—challenges that require us to reexamine and possibly to reconceive the academic profession. Over the last 40 years, the traditional model of the academic profession—full-time tenure-track professorships that focus on the triadic responsibilities of teaching, research, and service—has been eroded by a rising trend toward greater contingency. This trend has broken those responsibilities apart, with faculty members increasingly finding themselves focusing primarily on either teaching or research and having tenuous connections to the academic community on their own campuses and to other scholars in their disciplines more broadly. Tenure-track jobs, which were once the most prevalent appointments on campuses, are being supplanted by an ever-rising number of full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty positions. These contingent appointments now make up approximately 70% of faculty positions responsible for providing instruction in the nonprofit higher education sector (NCES, 2013); they represent an even greater share on some campuses.¹ This so-called “unraveling” of the American professoriate—the shift from the more traditional model of a professional faculty toward a mostly contingent academic workforce—is raising important systemic questions that go beyond the immediate concerns of faculty members who are losing both the status and support befitting a profession (Plater, 2008). First, what are the implications of rising contingency and of the alteration of traditional faculty roles in higher education, particularly for the educational missions of our institutions and our students’ success? Second, what will these changes mean in the long term for the academic profession and for the capability of higher education institutions to satisfy their own increasingly complex missions, as well as to serve the public good? And third, how can stakeholders—from the grassroots up through the leaders of institutions and national higher education organizations—collaboratively discuss and guide action on the issues facing their institutions in order to correct the course we are on?


What might the academic profession of the future look like if it is more intentionally designed to meet institutional goals?

A modest, but growing body of empirical research and literature is helping us to begin to answer the first question regarding the implications of rising contingency for our educational missions and student success. The findings are troubling, and they raise serious concerns about the ability of our institutions to deliver on goals to improve student outcomes. Poor working conditions (detailed later in this report) and a lack of support are common for today’s faculty, particularly among those in part-time or adjunct

¹ Across all nonprofit institutions, part-time or adjunct faculty represent 51.2% of instructional faculty, full-time non-tenure-track are 19.2%, and, tenured or tenure-track are 29.6%. The overall number of part-time faculty would be larger still, if graduate assistants providing instruction and non-tenure-track research faculty were included in these figures. Also, an even larger percentage of instructional faculty in the for-profit sector—approximately 99%—hold contingent positions.

positions.² This constrains the ability of these educators to provide an optimal educational environment to best foster student learning and success. As a result, numerous studies have found that growing reliance on adjunct faculty has a negative impact on student retention rates, successful transfers from two- to four-year institutions, student grade point averages, and graduation or completion rates, and this reliance limits opportunities for the faculty-student interactions that are so important to students’ development and success (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Gross & Goldhaber, 2009; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Harrington & Schibik, 2001; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Kezar & Maxey, 2014).³ In recent years, the adjunct faculty model has been utilized largely to achieve immediate cost savings; it has not been intentionally deployed with long-term institutional goals, particularly for teaching and learning, in mind.

Figure 1. Current Composition of Instructional Faculty, Nonprofit Institutions⁴



Source: National Center for Education Statistics (2013)

It may yet be too soon to answer or even to fully comprehend the implications of the second question—namely, what these changes might mean for the future of the academic profession and for the fulfillment of increasingly complex institutional missions. However, the current circumstances give ample cause for alarm on these concerns, and many higher education experts contend that we would be foolhardy to wait passively to find out how such changes will affect the academic profession in the long term. Less than one-third of faculty members across the higher education sector now are on the tenure-track or hold tenured appointments; the traditional faculty member, once described as “the professional *par excellence*” (Parsons, 1968, 545) is becoming scarce. And, although our institutions have

² The term *adjunct* is regularly used throughout this report to refer to part-time non-tenure-track faculty, whose working conditions often impose substantial constraints that limit faculty members’ capability to contribute to student success and institutional mission to maximum effect.

³ For more information on the connection between rising contingency in the academic workforce and student learning outcomes, please visit <http://www.thechangingfaculty.org>.

⁴ Excludes graduate assistants and postdoctoral fellows who may also provide instruction at some institutions.

retained a subset—albeit a shrinking one—of tenured and tenure-track faculty, there are signs of strain as these individuals take on an increasing and likely unsustainable level of responsibility for satisfying the multiple obligations of conducting research and providing administrative leadership and other forms of service for their institutions. These arrangements cannot possibly be sustained in the long run, and, indeed, they already pose significant challenges today. It is unclear at what pace or to what end this trend toward greater contingency will proceed in coming years. However, there is cause for concern that, with a continued decrease in tenured and tenure-track faculty—a trend that has already progressed consistently over many years—it will soon be the case that our institutions are no longer able to satisfy their complex missions, which extend well beyond teaching alone to encompass the demands of policymakers and the public. *Indeed, the core of our educational missions and the status of the academic profession may very well be at risk if we do not make changes.*

The bifurcated system of tenure-track and non-tenure-track or adjunct faculty, each with different working conditions, roles, and experiences as members of our academic communities, divides the professoriate into more and less privileged groups. It also reflects a situation wherein only a small subset of postsecondary educators—those who are tenured or on the tenure track—bear the typical characteristics of a profession (Sullivan, 2005).⁵ Although many adjunct faculty members have received the same specialized training as their tenure-track peers, they typically are not afforded the same status, autonomy in their working arrangements, or opportunities to make contributions to advance their institutions and the public good—at least not beyond what their tireless work with students inside and outside of the classroom will allow. Throughout the history of higher education in this country, our institutions have flourished because a strong foundation of academic professionals—the faculty—were provided with the means and support to make contributions to their institutions, to the community of scholars in their fields of study, and to the greater public good (Plater, 2008; Plater, Saltmarsh, & Rice, 2014).⁶ Today, a majority of the faculty has been stripped of the status, the privileges, and also the concomitant responsibilities that have helped to make our institutions of higher learning great—for many years, institutions that have been the envy of the world. Given their declining numbers and growing responsibilities, it is becoming difficult for those who remain in tenured and tenure-track positions to continue to uphold obligations for serving the public good that have long been associated with the academic profession. Therefore, the entire professoriate is compromised by today's situation, not just adjunct faculty members.

The current circumstances give ample cause for alarm on these concerns, and many higher education experts contend that we would be foolhardy to wait passively to find out how such changes will affect the academic profession in the long term.

⁵ Sullivan (2005) describes professions as characterized by three distinctive features: 1) specialized training in a field of codified knowledge; 2) a measure of status accompanied by the autonomy necessary to independently determine and regulate standards of practice; and, 3) a commitment to support the public good and welfare.

⁶ Kezar (2005) notes that, traditionally, higher education's public role has included educating citizens for democratic engagement, supporting local and regional communities, preserving and making available knowledge for the community, working in concert with other social institutions—such as government or healthcare—to foster shared missions, advancing knowledge through research, developing the arts and humanities, broadening access to ensure a diverse democracy, developing the intellectual talents of students, and creating leaders for various areas of the public sector.

Perhaps, we have “lost our sense of belonging to an ascertainable and manageable community of teacher-professors,” as Stanley Katz (2006) has warned. To address the third question about how stakeholders can begin to work together to solve these problems, we must seriously consider what effect these changes will have if they are allowed to continue unchecked. Will there be an academic profession to speak of for much longer if we do not respond? The consequences of these changes will affect all higher education stakeholders, including our students and the communities we serve. The erosion of a strong and well-established academic profession, in the absence of new visions to replace the status quo, has implications for a broader deterioration of the higher education enterprise as a whole; how can our institutions continue to produce high-quality research, learning outcomes, and leadership for society without maintaining and supporting a robust academic profession? At some point in the future, will we look back on once-great institutions and a bygone academic profession to realize that, by failing to act, we became the agents of our own unmaking? We hope not. Rather, we should all be compelled to work collaboratively to correct the course on which we find our institutions today.

How did we end up in this position? Changes in the composition of the faculty, the growing reliance on contingent labor, and the erosion of the academic profession, overall, have largely been the result of a haphazard response to a higher education landscape that is changing over time—a response lacking intentionality and planning for the long term. A number of factors are regularly cited as contributing to shifts in the composition of the faculty, much as such shifts have occurred in other sectors, toward greater reliance on contingent positions: economic changes and rising corporate influence, the massification of higher education, the introduction of new institutional types, dwindling public resources allocated to fund higher education, and technological advances, among others.⁷ It is exceedingly difficult to produce a thorough explanation of how this shift has occurred, why, and what exactly has caused it. Some scholars suggest that these changes have been intentional, reflecting a larger societal trend toward neoliberal philosophies, which has resulted in a greater use of corporate practices not just in higher education, but in other sectors and types of organizations, as well (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

It is time for us to initiate new discussions about the future of the faculty...

Even if we cannot fully comprehend the causes, we have to acknowledge the problems that we know exist and begin to chart a new course forward. Those who see the emergence of these problems as part of a larger neoliberal trend warn us that efforts to counter this trajectory must be aligned to overcome systemic, prevailing forces expressed in the decisions made by governing boards, presidents, and even many faculty members who have absorbed these new corporate values. Part of the reason a neoliberal philosophy has had such a powerful influence over changes in the faculty is that no new model has emerged to realign the faculty toward an ideology rooted in service to the public good. The traditional faculty model, long associated with such public service, has encountered changes that have affected faculty priorities and work roles. What we propose in this report is an effort to develop alternative faculty models to fill this void, countering the influence of neoliberal values over the professoriate and restoring our alignment to institutional missions and the public good. Without such alternative models to replace the status quo, the dominant influence of neoliberalism over the professoriate will continue unchecked. Rather than ignoring neoliberal philosophy, this report counters it by

⁷ For an overview of some of the factors and conditions driving change, see Kezar, 2013.

encouraging a collective effort to redesign faculty models and roles around a logic that emphasizes equity, student success, and high-quality education, while recognizing the role of faculty in meeting these goals and serving the broader needs of society.

Given the forces working against this change, efforts will need to involve movement among many groups working together to overcome what has essentially become the “new normal” in higher education. Waiting for a return to the past—the full restoration of the traditional tenure-track faculty as the majority of the professoriate—is almost certainly not an option. It may yet be possible, however, to save tenure by revisiting how it is utilized, although most commentators suggest that the combined effect of the forces mentioned above makes it very unlikely that we will ever return to a faculty model characterized by mostly tenure-track positions. This is not to say that tenure has no place in our future; tenure is an institution that in many ways has served higher education well, and many stakeholders are committed to ensuring that it endures. Yet, the question remains: where will we go from here? What might the academic profession of the future look like if it is more intentionally designed to meet institutional goals?

Historically, there have been few occasions for faculty roles to be debated or discussed broadly—and perhaps even fewer instances when faculty models and roles were conceived with any intentionality. The movement to organize the academic profession 100 years ago, resulting in the founding of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), is a most notable exception; the AAUP has continued to play a major role in establishing standards for the academic profession through the landmark 1915 *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure*, the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, and subsequent attempts at reinterpreting and updating those principles and other standards for the profession. Ernest Boyer’s contributions through the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered* have also advanced discussions about faculty roles; Boyer’s work has helped to improve our approaches to thinking about the professoriate and about the policies and practices that support academic personnel. Eugene Rice has carried this work forward through two projects, the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards and New Pathways, at the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE); Rice continues to influence thinking about faculty work today through his scholarship. Other scholars and higher education leaders have also contributed important insights.⁸ We believe that these statements and inquiries into the essential nature of faculty work have made an impact, moving us in the right direction toward a more complete conceptualization of the faculty and its roles. Yet, although these efforts transpired in the midst of similarly intense change in higher education, they were undertaken in a time when a majority of faculty members still held tenured or tenure-track appointments. As we have discussed, the reality today is starkly different than it was then.

It is time for us to initiate new discussions about the future of the faculty—about the types of faculty positions that are needed, as well as the roles of faculty members in serving our

Change does require us to be more deliberate—and deliberative—in how we design faculty models and roles to best meet the needs of higher education in the future.

⁸ Among them, we would include individuals such as Ann Austin, KerryAnn O’Meara, Judy Gappa, Andrea Trice, and William Plater, whose works and perspectives have contributed greatly to this report.

students, our institutions' missions, and the increasingly complex expectations of our society. These discussions may need to consider how faculty members in the future might move in and out of the academy, how teaching can be valued without being attached to traditional scholarship, and where concepts from Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* and other important works on the faculty can continue to be implemented across the academy. These discussions need to include diverse stakeholders; working collectively, we can provide forums to voice and recognize varied—and sometimes divergent—points of view, and also to identify points of consensus that can be leveraged to promote a shared agenda for the future. Shifts in faculty roles have occurred many times during the history of higher education (a few examples will be reviewed in Chapter 1; see also, Gehrke & Kezar, forthcoming 2015). Unfortunately, as history shows us, changes to faculty roles have often occurred with limited intentionality and inadequate attention to the implications for student learning and institutional goals. Such changes have been decided primarily on the side of the faculty or of the administrators, with little collaboration between these groups or with other stakeholders. This is not the way forward. Instead, we must collectively take responsibility for the future status of the academic profession, ensuring that all faculty members are regarded and treated as professionals and supported in making meaningful contributions to their institutions, to their fields of study, and to the public good.

If we continue on our current path by haphazardly responding to our changing environment and demands, we will either sustain the gradual decline of our profession, or we will invite frustrated policymakers and outsiders, who lack the appropriate perspective to effectively direct change, to recreate faculty careers and roles for us. The alternative is to intentionally design a faculty for the future and change our current course to match it. Such change does not necessarily mean that we have to abandon tenure, an institution that has served higher education well for many years; we do not take a position for or against tenure in this report. However, change does require us to be more deliberate—and deliberative—in how we design faculty models and roles to best meet the needs of higher education in the future, whether this involves slight modifications of the tenure system or the creation of something entirely new. In any event, a desire to maintain the tenure system at any cost cannot be an excuse to avoid addressing the many problems inherent in our current approach.

In this publication, we aim to spark a new discussion and more widespread debate about the future of the faculty. We believe that such a discussion ultimately needs to occur across the entire higher education sector and among multiple stakeholders, as Bill Plater (2008) and other partners in our work through the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success have suggested. It must include and engage individuals and groups who may at times be at odds over what should be done. However, we also recognize that this effort might be more likely to begin through the adoption and implementation of innovations at individual colleges, universities, and state systems. Experiments developed to reconceive faculty models and roles—those that already exist (see Chapter 7 for some examples) and others that are yet to emerge—will be an important source of inspiration and ideas for larger, future discussions about the faculty. Given that so many higher education stakeholders are currently strongly attached to the traditional tenure-track model, we might first need to see that some viable alternatives have been developed in order to embrace the possibility of change on a larger scale.

As is the case for any change across the sector, changes in faculty models and roles at the institutional level will need to be designed with the input of multiple stakeholders and different missions in mind; this is likely to lead to variations among—and even within—the

solutions pursued by different types of institutions.⁹ So, we do not imagine that a single model for the faculty of the future is likely to emerge. Furthermore, change at some institutions may be more incremental in character—requiring minor changes to existing models—whereas other institutions may be free to more creatively push the limits of the current professoriate and challenge longstanding norms as they pursue a model that meets their institutional goals. In any event, this report provides information that will help to promote discussion so that institutional leaders, from the grassroots to key decision-makers, can work toward addressing—or at least begin thinking about—concerns they face with the existing, bifurcated faculty model and visions for the attributes of the faculty of the future.

Part I reviews the history and current state of the faculty. In Chapter 1, we present a larger historical context of the changing faculty, which demonstrates how faculty roles have continuously shifted, but have largely never been designed with the input and demands of multiple stakeholders—internal and external—in mind. Chapter 2 reviews some of the problems that have been identified with the existing bifurcated system (i.e., tenure- and non-tenure-track) that comprises the presently dominant faculty model, examining how current arrangements are not well suited to help institutions effectively meet their most important goals. We focus our attention on the adjunct and tenure-track faculty models, as these are both presently and historically the most prevalent models. These two chapters on the history and critiques of existing models, in particular, are meant to provide important background information and a rationale to help make the case for a more intentional redesign of faculty roles.

In the remainder of the report, Part II, we present ideas for a more thoughtful and intentional approach, reconsidering faculty roles in a way that is attentive to fostering professionalism among the faculty, ensuring institutional needs are met, creating opportunities to integrate the interests and voices of the communities and other stakeholders we serve, and considering landscape factors in the overall higher education environment. Chapter 3 outlines a process model for institutions to consider the scope and content of a redesign of faculty roles incorporating essential elements for faculty work, the mission and goals of the institution and its stakeholders, and the broader contextual landscape in which the work takes place. While these recommendations focus the change process at the institutional level, we acknowledge in these final chapters that the issue of building the faculty of the future poses an “enterprise level” challenge that is ultimately most meaningfully changed at a broader level, by stakeholders working together throughout the sector of higher education nationwide. Yet, in our work we have often found that leaders feel more comfortable beginning to think about how they can pursue change at the institutional level, where they know they are more likely to make an impact; this is the level of change where we focus our attention here. In the final chapters, we also discuss recommendations to support change at the enterprise level.

In Chapter 4, we explore some essential elements of faculty models and roles that have been identified in the literature, and we see how these will contribute to restoring a more professional character to faculty work, including the concomitant responsibilities of faculty members for maintaining academic professionalism. We believe that faculty roles, even when they are designed around shared core principles, will need to be differentiated to meet particular institutional needs and stakeholder interests; this differentiation, by addressing the various roles that faculty must play to meet diverse needs of multiple stakeholders, will ultimately best serve the enterprise, overall. These issues are explored in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 describes some of

⁹ Different types of institutions also require faculty to devote varying levels of attention to teaching, research, and service; while we frequently accentuate the importance of teaching and student learning, we acknowledge that this is but one core part of higher education’s mission that is shared among our colleges and universities.

the landscape factors that are likely to influence discussions about future faculty models. Finally, Chapter 7 presents some of the existing experiments. Although these efforts have not yet been studied for efficacy, they may inspire some ideas about the possibility for change. We are not advocating any of these specific approaches as a solution, but, rather, we recognize that the work of envisioning a path forward is difficult without tangible examples of current alternatives to generate more inspired thinking about different approaches. We also acknowledge that such models cannot provide solutions universally applicable across every institution. There may, indeed, be *multiple paths forward to meet different institutions' missions and goals*.

In the final chapter, we address the collective responsibilities for making possible a redesign of the faculty model and faculty roles, including considerations about how to fund such a redesign. This chapter acknowledges that the work to reshape the faculty needs to be responsive to the needs that exist at the overall enterprise level. Our basic assumption here is clear: The best way to achieve well-designed faculty roles and models is through negotiation and discussion among multiple stakeholders. Such a future faculty model that is attentive to shared views and needs across stakeholders requires that those stakeholders share responsibilities in its creation and implementation.

While addressing a broad and varied audience of stakeholders with this report, we want to underscore one important point so it is not overlooked: ***Members of the faculty themselves—both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty—have to play the central role in reshaping and creating a new profession.*** While many may believe that tenure-track faculty members, in particular, are too invested in the traditional system to support change, these educators have valuable and necessary expertise that simply cannot be ignored—expertise about what faculty roles involve and how they support the satisfaction of institutional goals. As campus leaders take up the mantle for change, they can only be successful if they do so collaboratively with the faculty.

While this report draws upon the limited existing research and our own experiences in facilitating discussions about the future of the faculty, it is important to point out that there is still a dearth of research on faculty roles. Certainly, more research is needed to inform ongoing experimentation and guide decision-making about what will be the faculty models and roles for the future. This report engages extensively with areas in which research does not yet exist, but we feel justified by the need, in the face of an urgent situation with major national consequences, to act responsibly on what we do know while continuing to investigate what we do not. As new models do begin to emerge, foundations, federal agencies, and other funding groups who have given scant support to the study of faculty roles must play a part in meeting the need for new research on this work. The success of this effort requires that we research the viability of these models in order to inform subsequent changes. Doing so is important not just for the individual members of the faculty in the higher education sector, but we believe it is essential in order to successfully carry out the student success and completion agendas that are being promoted by so many influential groups today.

In the end, these recommendations are meant to ensure that individual institutions are well-prepared to meet their missions and goals, which are multiple and complex and include not only student learning and success, but also research and knowledge generation, mentoring, community leadership and engagement, and the training and preparation of the next generation of citizens and leaders. It is also our hope that local action will stimulate or provoke a more widespread and national conversation to address the future of the academic profession as a whole and the success of the broader higher education sector. Perhaps such action and

conversation will encourage foundations to step in and provide support for more formal dialogues and the examination of faculty roles that is so necessary for our future.

PART I

CHANGE IN THE FACULTY MODEL AND THE CURRENT STATE OF THE FACULTY

1

THE SHIFTING SCOPE OF FACULTY ROLES: A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHANGING FACULTY

We continue this discussion with a brief presentation of the history of the changing faculty. It may be difficult for us to embark upon a process toward change if we do not acknowledge the shifts in the faculty workforce and roles that have occurred with time. When thinking of the faculty today, most people inside and outside the higher education community often imagine the “traditional”—and even idyllic—life of a tenured professor who is involved in teaching, research, and service. However, this version of a faculty member is actually in the minority: only 30% of the faculty at public and private nonprofit higher education institutions hold tenure-track appointments. Furthermore, even those faculty members who do serve in tenured or tenure-track appointments often divide their time disproportionately among their roles. For example, some tenure-track faculty members spend as much as 80% of their time on research work, with very little time committed to teaching or service work.¹⁰ While it is clear that the popular, contemporary image of the faculty is incongruent with the current reality for a vast majority of faculty today, it may come as more of a surprise that this view also does not reflect the role that faculty members have had for much of the history of higher education in the United States. This idealized vision of faculty roles is a more recent—and perhaps already outdated—construction.

Faculty roles have shifted several times in the last 200 years; they have never been static.

In the 18th and early 19th centuries, faculty members were tutors who largely received temporary appointments; they frequently held these positions while waiting for clerical positions to open in parishes. Work as a tutor was not considered to be a lifelong career, but was typically an early step toward a career as a member of the clergy. Tutors provided general instruction in many different areas, working with students in a variety of capacities across their four years in college. For example, tutors often worked with students outside of the classroom to foster moral development. In fact, the development of good moral judgment and character among students comprised a significant portion of the faculty member’s role. Faculty were also involved in the day-to-day running of the school, often in areas that would resemble administrative work today. In the early 1800s, institutions began to employ some faculty members in more permanent positions with responsibility for particular areas of specialization, such as natural philosophy, divinity, or ancient languages. As a result, a segment of the faculty began to focus on a narrow

¹⁰ The average time spent on research among faculty at research institutions, however, is approximately one-third (Singell & Lillydahl, 1996).

area of study, rather than work through a broader curriculum; their work on students' moral development, however, continued. In these early years, research and scholarship were not an integral part of the faculty role, nor was the broader notion of service.

As the university model became dominant between the 1890s and 1940s, the faculty role changed again, and research became a more significant part of the typical faculty role. As faculty members shifted their attention from more student-focused endeavors to research, educational functions such as advising, student development, and moral development were split—or unbundled—from the faculty role. While many commentators today refer to the unbundling of faculty responsibilities as if it were a newer phenomenon, this has actually been happening for more than a century.

The newly unbundled educational responsibilities, which had formerly been fulfilled by faculty members, still needed to be addressed, however; this resulted in the emergence of the student personnel movement in the 1920s. Faculty members during this period also became increasingly less interested in conducting the day-to-day administrative work of their institutions (e.g., registration), and this development contributed to even more growth in the numbers and stature of professional administrators: chairs, deans, and other administrative staff positions. Although they largely removed themselves from administrative functions, faculty felt it was important to have input into institutional matters related to the curriculum, educational policy, personnel decisions, and the selection of academic administrators. They sought to maintain their involvement in institutional decision-making, and, on some campuses, they became integrated into governance work through the emergence of faculty senates. In addition, faculty members became more involved with community, regional, and national service as a result of their own research work, developing their expertise into public contributions on particular issues.

It is important to note that at the end of the 1800s, similar to today, there were many competing ideas about faculty roles. These concerns focused on the shift away from teaching, the abandonment of advising and student development responsibilities, the rise of a professional administration, and the movement that had led faculty members to associate themselves more with their disciplinary societies and national service and less with local institutional and community needs. Although consensus eventually formed around a faculty model that largely came to dominate at the university level, it is important not to lose sight of the many concerns that accompanied that emergence. Faculty and other leaders at some institutions, including liberal arts colleges, urban institutions, and historically black colleges, worried about the impact the university faculty model would have on their own institutional missions; so, many institutions did not adhere to the changes that were emerging at the time. Such concerns remained salient well into the 20th century, but they were largely ignored as the university faculty model became more prevalent.

During this same time period, the notions of tenure and of academic freedom emerged and became established. Faculty members were sometimes involved with controversial research or produced findings that were unpopular with powerful interests in society and industry; they were pressured not to conduct their research and were sometimes fired for speaking about their work or disseminating findings. Faculty members began to mobilize to protect their rights and to ensure they could successfully conduct important research—which often supported the public good—and to teach free of pressures about the content of their courses. In 1915, the newly formed American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which had been established in large part to facilitate national discussions and forge a new and collective academic professionalism, took up the issue of academic freedom, issuing a Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure. This built upon the

earlier work of a joint committee formed by the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society. Tenure came to be seen as an essential protection of academic freedom, with the added benefit of making the academic profession attractive by providing economic security.

At that time, faculty members collectively saw the need to identify ways to protect the freedom of thought and inquiry that are critical to being an effective scholar.

The debate over academic freedom continued. At the 1925 conferences of the AAUP and of the Association of American Colleges (today known as the Association of American Colleges and Universities), a new Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure was developed and adopted. Following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, in 1940 representatives of these two groups agreed upon yet another restatement of the principles set forth in the original document. This new declaration, known as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, has become the historic document upon which today's notions of academic freedom and tenure are based. Extensive discussions led to the addition of interpretive comments in 1970, but the statement remains the authoritative record on academic freedom and tenure, and it has been supported or endorsed by more than 200 educational organizations and scholarly groups over the years that followed.

Although the AAUP is most widely recognized for its historic work on academic freedom, it also played a prominent role in influencing the development of a more collective sense of academic professionalism beginning in the early part of the 20th Century. John Dewey, in his introductory address at the AAUP's first meeting, called for "a more intense consciousness of our common vocation, our common object, and common destiny" (Dewey, 1915, 151). In the midst of a period of transformative changes in higher education, the

AAUP and its members helped to unite academics from a broad array of disciplines and disparate institutions around common interests, as well as standards or principles that have come to define the profession. These principles included autonomy and academic freedom, but they also accentuated the concomitant obligations of academic professionals and institutions to regularly engage, consult, and serve the needs of the public—needs that were the basis of our long-standing social charter. Over time, the professoriate has become more isolated and individualistic—mirroring similar trends in American society overall. This shared sense of the balance between the privileges and the responsibilities of academic professionalism has faded and changed, prompting perennial calls for its restoration or redefinition (Kezar, 2004; Plater, 2008).

After World War II, the university model became fully instantiated throughout the enterprise, fueled by a new wave of federal support for universities and their research. Throughout the higher education sector, the influx of many veterans to college campuses resulted in unprecedented growth. In order to accommodate this growth, new kinds of institutions were developed; community colleges and other institutional types, such as technical colleges and urban institutions, were created and expanded. Many of these new or expanded institutions had less of an emphasis on conducting research, instead prioritizing teaching and learning. In the 1970s, the connection between research and teaching was further weakened through a new differentiation of faculty appointments and roles. An emphasis on vocational education led the community colleges to seek out faculty who had expertise in industrial or professional fields (e.g., journalism, automotive mechanics, electrical systems, nursing) to

assume part-time roles as adjunct faculty. Soon, this practice spread to other types of institutions. As the numbers of part-time faculty members grew throughout higher education, it increasingly became the norm for tenure-track faculty to teach more upper division and specialized courses; part-time faculty members were assigned to teach mostly introductory, liberal arts, and remedial education courses. Universities also began to experiment with the use of teaching assistants to provide some aspects of course delivery and assessment.

During the period after World War II, there were also increases in union activity on college and university campuses. In the 1960s, unionization and collective bargaining took root in part to address ongoing concerns about academic freedom and to ensure faculty members' continued role in shared governance and decision-making. Through union chapters and locals, faculty members organized to respond to threats to academic freedom, to fight reductions in their involvement in decision-making, and to protect working conditions as tenure began to erode. Unionization signaled a different relationship between faculty members and their institutions, in an era when traditional roles were unraveling and faculty were beginning to be seen more as managed professionals. Although unions and collective bargaining units typically only included tenure-track faculty, more recent years have seen union representation of part-time faculty also increasing.

In the last 15 years, there has been a further alteration of faculty roles. The teaching role itself has also been unbundled and disassembled into its constituent parts in some quarters. At many institutions, some aspects, such as grading, assessment, advising, and mentoring, have been pulled out and subsumed into the roles of other professionals. This approach, often referred to as instructional unbundling, has been predominantly in use at for-profit institutions, but the rapid rise of that sector and the increased competition in higher education as a whole has encouraged the spread of these ideas. Today, these practices are beginning to appear in nonprofit institutions, as well, where their adoption is facilitated by the expansion of information and communication technologies, declining public funding, and the continued massification of higher education as a whole. New technologies and periods of constrained resources for all types of institutions have prompted a reconsideration of faculty roles in this way, accompanied with promises of improving access and decreasing costs.

Through instructional unbundling and other measures, faculty roles—in particular teaching responsibilities—have once again been transformed, this time in the efforts of higher education institutions (both nonprofit and for-profit) to maximize the cost-effectiveness of operations. The assumption of these institutions is that employing technicians and instructional designers with specific, narrow areas of technological or pedagogical expertise can help to scale up class sizes and reduce the amount of paid time required of faculty members, thereby reducing the overall cost of providing instruction. Rather than hiring faculty members to develop and deliver entire courses, the range of functions associated with providing instruction has been unbundled so that only a few faculty members are hired to design course curricula; meanwhile, the delivery of content, advisement, and assessment of students is often left to other employees who are paid less and have less access to institutional support. These employees may not have the same content expertise or specialized training as traditional faculty members. Often such educators are hired on a contingent basis and lack any ongoing connection to the institution for which they are working—or, for that matter, any connection to the larger enterprise of higher education, the academic disciplines, or other communities and institutions of knowledge production.

What becomes clear from this brief historical overview is that faculty roles have shifted several times in the last 200 years; they have never been static. However, although change in

faculty roles has been a constant, roles have not always changed or been redesigned to best support the varied missions and goals of different institutions. Roles have mostly drifted and shifted over time, rather than being designed to meet specific aims. The dominance of the traditional university faculty model affected every type of institution and every type of faculty appointment, even though this one-size-fits-all approach was never universally appropriate for meeting the differentiated needs of institutions and faculties that have always served a range of different purposes.

Beyond the debates in the early- and mid-1900s, which led to important statements about academic freedom and tenure, there have been surprisingly few nationwide conversations about faculty models and roles. We must remember the impetus for those earlier movements to establish norms about academic freedom and tenure as a response to the suppression of scholarly work by powerful interests; faculty members made their voices heard because they were getting fired for conducting and sharing controversial research and scholarly ideas. At that time, faculty members collectively saw the need to identify ways to protect the freedom of thought and inquiry that are critical to being an effective scholar. Through this report, we aim to invoke today the same sort of thoughtful reflection about faculty roles that engendered the earlier statements on academic freedom and tenure. Such collective inquiry is necessary in order to ensure that our institutions are prepared to handle the current and future challenges that will continue to test—and, perhaps, to constrain—our capabilities to effectively serve our missions and students.

2

THE MESS WE'RE IN: PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CURRENT ADJUNCT AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MODELS

In order to have a productive conversation about new faculty models, we have to discuss some of the problems with our current models. This is an opportunity not just to reconcile the ethical and functional shortcomings of our current arrangements, but also to conceive a vision—or visions—for new faculty models and roles, and perhaps even for the academic profession as a whole. By sorting through the mess we are in, we can begin to develop models that will value the contributions of all faculty members, provide adequate support, and endeavor to protect academic freedom for all, while also responding to the needs of institutions, stakeholders inside and outside the academy, and the various forces and environmental challenges that will continue to affect the higher education sector. Thanks to energetic activism and advocacy by adjuncts and their allies, as well as a growing base of conceptual literature and empirical studies by educational researchers, there is growing awareness about problems associated with rising contingency and with the adjunct faculty model.¹¹

Concerns about the institution of tenure also merit serious consideration, especially those that have been raised about the relationship between tenure and academic freedom. These complex issues have been addressed too infrequently in discussions about our future. Furthermore, the dualism between the adjunct faculty model and the tenure-track model has often produced polarization and a bifurcation of the faculty; rather than fostering mutual respect and collaboration, the current models have too often bred incivility and a hierarchy that recognizes only the values and contributions of tenure-track faculty members over and above those of adjuncts.¹² Many studies of the experiences of non-tenure-track faculty demonstrate how this situation is problematic for departments, and how it creates a divisive culture that can impact the learning environments of students who see that the largest portion of their instructors are treated with disrespect (Kezar, 2013). The current divide between tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty that exists on many campuses, as well as among and within disciplines

¹¹ For more information about activism and advocacy for adjunct faculty, as well as information about research, we encourage you to visit the websites of the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (<http://www.thechangingfaculty.org>), New Faculty Majority (<http://www.newfaculty.com>), Campaign for the Future of Higher Education (<http://futureofhighered.org/>), Coalition on the Academic Workforce (<http://www.academicworkforce.org/>), American Federation of Teachers (<http://www.aft.org/>), Service Employees' International Union Adjunct Action campaign (<http://adjunctaction.org/>), and Modern Language Association's Academic Workforce Advocacy Kit (http://www.mla.org/advocacy_kit).

¹² Some commentators suggest that tenure-track faculty members are trying to maintain the integrity of the profession by denying non-tenure-track faculty the rights (involvement in governance) and appropriate working conditions that they enjoy in their own work. The thought is that allowing adjuncts to gain more power will compromise the profession. We acknowledge that this view exists, yet in our own research have found that denying adjuncts such rights does nothing to support or strengthen the tenure-track faculty, particularly in meeting diverse institutional goals (Kezar & Sam, 2012).

and academic programs, is not a model that reflects institutional goals or supports student success.

Examining some of the prevalent concerns and critiques about the two main faculty models today—adjunct and tenure-track—can help leaders in thinking about some of the ways that roles will need to change for the future. We begin by presenting some of the primary concerns raised about the most recent model to emerge: the adjunct faculty. The number of adjunct faculty has grown over several decades, and they have become the largest subset of the faculty nationwide. So, it seems important to address the problems with this model first. We follow this discussion with a review of concerns raised about the tenure-track model. Both models need to be evaluated in order to determine where we can make changes that not only respond to immediate concerns, but also meet the needs of the future.

Critiques of the Adjunct Faculty Model

The original reason for hiring adjunct faculty was to facilitate opportunities for practitioners to contribute to the education of students in a field of study, particularly in professional or vocational programs. Within this scope, adjunct faculty roles seemed appropriate; individuals with practical, real-world experience and knowledge from their fields were employed to help enrich the educational experience and instructional quality for students, supplementing the work of the permanent faculty. Individuals were hired on short-term contracts, received modest compensation and no benefits—an honorarium, in effect—and were not to be involved in service tasks, campus governance, and decision-making. Since individuals holding these positions would typically have jobs outside of the institution, issues like job security, a living wage, lack of access to benefits, and exclusion from decision-making about curricula and other such matters were not initially seen as significant problems.¹³

This is an opportunity not just to reconcile the ethical and functional shortcomings of our current arrangements, but also to conceive a vision—or visions—for new faculty models and roles, and perhaps even for the academic profession as a whole.

However, this has not been how things have played out. Although the sort of adjunct faculty member described in the preceding paragraph is often still utilized, particularly in professional education programs—and they still can make great contributions to the educational missions of institutions—the adjunct model has been expanded and exploited as a way to provide instruction to students at the lowest possible cost.¹⁴ Critics of the adjunct model contend that this growth and change in the purposes of the adjunct model has occurred without much apparent concern for how working conditions affect instructional quality. Over time, the positive

¹³ There are, however, still important questions to consider in judging the effectiveness of utilizing these sorts of faculty. For example, such professionals who teach in colleges and universities on adjunct contracts may have very little experience teaching and thus might lack familiarity with effective teaching strategies or pedagogies. Since they are employed only on a part-time basis and do not consider teaching to be their primary career, they may not seek out development opportunities to enhance their knowledge and skills when such opportunities are available to them. They may also lack awareness of institutional or departmental goals for teaching and student learning outcomes.

¹⁴ As was noted in the introduction, reliance on part-time or adjunct faculty has escalated to the point that these positions represent approximately half of the instructional faculty among nonprofit institutions.

and useful model for integrating people with practical knowledge and experience into the education of the next generation has become strained. These positions have increasingly been used to provide administrators with greater flexibility over the faculty workforce and to provide instruction to students without the long-term obligations associated with hiring tenure-track faculty—obligations such as providing access to professional development opportunities, office space and instructional resources, and inclusion in decision-making. The adjunct model served an important role in another time—and in many cases, it still does—but these positions have generally come to be abused and have deviated from their original purposes.

Several problems have been identified with overreliance on the adjunct faculty model, and they can inform future efforts at developing appropriate faculty models. These include the following points:

- 1. The use of the adjunct model to generate cost savings has resulted in inequities in compensation, access to benefits, working conditions, and involvement in the life of the department and campus.** Adjunct faculty members are customarily paid significantly less than other faculty members for the same work, and they are typically not provided access to health benefits (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Curtis, 2005; Hollenshead, et al., 2007; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). They also receive inadequate support from their institutions and departments and are excluded from activities such as governance and service. The main reasons for hiring them have shifted from putting practitioners in the classroom to creating a cheap, flexible, and expendable faculty workforce. The inequities encountered by many adjunct faculty members reflect a failure to value the commitments and contributions of these educators to our institutions, departments, and disciplines, and to students. The growth in numbers of adjunct faculty have also degraded the profession overall, as the pay, benefits, and other aspects of the role no longer reflect the status of a group of professionals. This makes faculty work, overall, less attractive over time, and it will impact the capability of the academy to attract talented individuals to pursue faculty jobs.
- 2. Research suggests constraints placed on adjunct faculty have an adverse effect on student success outcomes.** Studies suggest rising numbers of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education are negatively affecting student success (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Gross & Goldhaber, 2009; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Harrington & Schibik, 2001; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). The committed educators serving on adjunct faculty appointments are not to blame for these adverse effects on student learning, though. Rather, poor working conditions and a lack of support diminish their capacity to provide a high-quality learning environment and experience for students. The cumulative effect of such working conditions constrains individual instructors' abilities to have important faculty-student interactions and to apply their relevant talents, creativity, and subject knowledge to maximum effect inside and

outside the classroom (Baldwin, & Wawrzynski, 2011; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Jacoby, 2006; Umbach, 2007).¹⁵

3. **A lack of professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty members limits their access to and practice of effective pedagogies, high-impact practices, and innovative strategies to promote student learning, as well as current knowledge in their disciplines.** Many institutions do not provide professional development for non-tenure-track faculty, which affects their performance and ability to stay current on knowledge in their disciplines (Kezar & Sam, 2010). It also limits their knowledge about and use of emerging and innovative pedagogies and classroom strategies. This not only constrains their ability to offer the very best educational experience for their current students, a goal to which they are often very committed, but it hinders their ability to succeed when they apply for tenure-track positions. Professional development on campus is often limited, if it is offered at all, but it is even less common for non-tenure-track faculty to be eligible for or receive funds to travel off campus for conferences and workshops, or for the purpose of conducting research (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Even when professional development is available to non-tenure-track faculty, it is typically offered at times when they are unable to participate, or it is offered without pay for their time, so in order to participate they have to do so at their own expense.

4. **Adjunct faculty receive little, if any, constructive evaluation of their work to assess their effectiveness and allow them opportunities to improve.** Often the only feedback adjunct faculty members receive about their teaching comes from student evaluations (Marits, 1996). They typically do not benefit from formal or informal evaluations from department chairs or faculty colleagues, such as mentors who could observe and provide feedback about their instruction and possible areas for improvement. This denies adjuncts the opportunity to enhance their performance or to make improvements to the courses that they teach. Also, because adjunct faculty contracts are largely dependent on student evaluations, research has shown that even when they receive professional development, they are less likely to adopt new practices than faculty members with greater job security for fear that any changes would result in a decline in quality of evaluations, thus jeopardizing their continued employment (Rutz, et al., 2012). This concern is compounded by the fact that the use of challenging pedagogies that improve student learning are often resisted by students at first and result in lower faculty evaluations (Hall, Waitz, Brodeur, Soderholm, & Nasr, 2002; MacGregor, 1990; Mills & Cottell, 1997; Paswan & Young, 2002).

¹⁵ For additional information on research about the adverse impacts of adjunct faculty working conditions on student success, see the following Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success resources: *The Imperative for Change, Review of Selected Policies and Practices and Connections to Student Learning*, and *Faculty Matter: Selected Research on Connections between Faculty-Student Interaction and Student Success*. These resources can be found online at <http://resources.thechangingfaculty.org>.

5. **Since adjunct faculty members are often not included in orientation programs, faculty meetings, and decision making, they may not possess important information about academic policies and practices, programs available to students, the curriculum, or overall learning goals for their departments and institutions.** As the numbers of adjunct faculty continue to increase, there are proportionally fewer faculty members who understand the learning goals of their academic programs and institutions, as well as how those are related to the curriculum (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Although accreditors continue to press for the development of policies, practices, and curricula that foster student learning outcomes, institutions are decreasing their capacity to both develop and support the attainment of learning goals by excluding this important and growing segment of the faculty from participating in these activities.
6. **A lack of job security contributes to higher rates of turnover, creating a lack of stability for academic programs and their students.** There is often no process in place to ensure non-tenure-track faculty will be rehired or to notify them in advance of their contract status, even when they perform in an excellent manner. During any given semester, an adjunct faculty member may not know whether or not they will have work for the next semester, which may cause them to seek out other employment. They can also often be terminated or their appointments can be discontinued for no reason and with very little notice. The high turnover rate for adjuncts impairs the ability of students to find mentors and to develop relationships with faculty members. Such relationships are critical to student learning and self-efficacy, and their absence creates barriers to enacting key activities like writing letters of recommendation for students or helping with job placement (Benjamin, 2003). Such turnover also interferes with the formation and vitality of a community of scholars at an institution, particularly at institutions with very large part-time employment.
7. **The adjunct faculty model encourages institutions to view faculty members merely as tools for facilitating content delivery, downplaying the important contributions of educators to student learning—to the detriment of both the faculty and the students whose learning they support.** As institutions move away from cultivating a stable faculty that is knowledgeable about the entire curricular and programmatic experience, the profession becomes increasingly aimed toward information delivery. Faculty are no longer expected to teach competencies like critical thinking, writing, or quantitative reasoning in a way that develops across various courses toward successful learning outcomes. Instead classes are seen as discrete learning opportunities, where only particular content is delivered. Some worry that, as faculty roles have less of a scholarly component, there will be a breakdown between the generation of ideas and their delivery. When faculty members are viewed and treated as idea generators, they keep up with scholarly developments and work to contribute to furthering knowledge and understanding, even when conducting research is not their main role. But, we have little history to inform an understanding of how faculty will

perform when they are no longer considered scholars, and they are disconnected from knowledge generation so completely.

8. **The adjunct model distances faculty from their disciplinary (or inter-, cross-, and multi-disciplinary) roots and content knowledge by not providing support for them to participate in conferences or scholarly life.** While all faculty may not need to conduct traditional scholarship, it is important for faculty to remain current about advances in their fields. Most adjuncts are not supported in maintaining a connection to disciplinary societies or professional organizations that could foster such ongoing knowledge development. As a result, their knowledge can become outdated, hindering both their teaching and their prospects for future jobs.
9. **Dependence on the adjunct model makes it more difficult for institutions to meet their broader goals related to service, community engagement, leadership, and larger public good.** The fact that adjuncts' roles are largely limited to teaching alone—or sometimes, but less often, to research—means that they are not expected or paid to fulfill roles, traditionally served by faculty, that help higher education meet its greater mission and goals. For example, tenure-track faculty sometimes conduct civic engagement work that helps to meet important needs of communities by addressing health and economic challenges or enriching living conditions and raising civic awareness. Because they are not included in or empowered to pursue these types of activities, adjuncts are not able to support the broader service missions of institutions—missions that are often as important to society as the mission of delivering quality teaching and learning. Furthermore, since they do not enjoy the same level of job protection as full faculty, adjuncts cannot safely engage in constructive social critique—even in their classrooms—without the risk of losing their jobs.

There is a great need to address the effects of the growing reliance on adjunct faculty in higher education; to continue on our present course may diminish the success of numerous efforts across higher education to improve student learning and outcomes.¹⁶ A growing volume of reports and empirical research is contributing to greater awareness about these problems, which has the potential to promote action in this area. However, we have as yet not succeeded in stimulating a larger conversation about our faculty models or in mobilizing comprehensive changes in faculty roles for adjunct faculty. There are many examples of the work that must inform this effort. The Modern Language Association has questioned inequities of adjunct faculty employment since the 1980s. Research by Gappa and Leslie (1993) established the baseline for what we now know about part-time faculty; Baldwin and Chronister (2001) contributed to knowledge about full-time, non-tenure-track faculty. More recently, a report by the American Federation of Teachers (2009) highlighted the dramatic rise in numbers of non-tenure-track faculty to current levels. The Coalition on the Academic Workforce, New Faculty Majority, and Campaign for the Future of Higher Education have also prepared reports describing the poor working conditions of adjunct faculty (CAW, 2012; Street, Maisto, Merves, & Rhoades, 2012; Townsend, 2007).

¹⁶ We have in mind here the measurable student outcomes, such as completion or successful transfer, that have increasingly become the focus of efforts to improve higher education.

Additionally, a number of empirical studies by Harrington and Schibik (2001), Ehrenberg and Zhang (2004), and Gross and Goldhaber (2009) and others have sought to raise the alarm; studies have found that rising numbers of non-tenure-track faculty, particularly part-time positions, are associated with declining graduation and retention rates, fewer transfers from two-year colleges, and lower student GPAs. Jacoby (2006), Eagan and Jaeger (2008), and Jaeger and Eagan (2009) suggest that common institutional policies and practices for adjunct faculty exacerbate these problems by limiting how instructors can provide support to students. Most recently, The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success has been working with a broad range of stakeholder groups to examine these problems, to build awareness about the need for change, and to work collaboratively to find potential solutions. It has found that the consensus view of these stakeholders is that it is not the individuals in adjunct faculty roles, but rather the working conditions connected to their positions that contribute to these negative outcomes. There is still much work to be done.

Even though research and advocacy efforts have started to expose problems associated with adjunct faculty policies and practices, efforts to change them are scarce and isolated. Many stakeholder groups, particularly powerful ones such as governing boards, still do not understand that problems exist (Cross & Goldenberg, 2011). And yet, there are clear reasons to be concerned about the policies and practices related to adjunct faculty. The concerns outlined above demonstrate the need for the leaders of our institutions to systematically review the current adjunct faculty model when they consider the future structure of the faculty; they must ensure that new policies and practices are designed with attention to equity and to the impact of working conditions on student learning and other core aspects of the institutional mission.

Critiques of the Traditional Tenure-Track Model

While the adjunct model has received the most attention and criticism in recent years, there are also long-standing concerns with the tenure-track model that can be addressed by new models for the faculty. The major concerns with the once-dominant tenure-track faculty model, which have led to it falling out of popularity, have been well documented over the years. They include the following points:

1. **A disproportionate emphasis on conducting research and publishing have essentially downplayed the importance of teaching—the core part of the mission of most institutions.** Today's tenure-track faculty roles, which have been most influenced by the university faculty model that rose to dominance in the period after World War II, typically overemphasize responsibilities for research and publication—even within institutions that profess a strong mission for teaching (Massy & Zemsky, 1994). Even though there have been numerous calls to expand or reconsider the orientation of and rewards for tenure-track faculty, including Boyer's oft-cited *Scholarship Reconsidered*, rewards schemes at most institutions disproportionately continue to value and validate traditional forms of research and publication. Accordingly, these activities remain the central focus for tenure-track faculty.
2. **Institutions face a lack of flexibility to hire in new fields or to account for market fluctuations.** The lifetime protections of tenure have made it difficult for institution to adjust the size and expense of the academic workforce to respond to enrollment fluctuations, growth of new

fields, or enrollment declines in some areas and growth in others. Granting tenure entails that institutions must commit to paying the salary and benefits of faculty members for an indefinite period of time, since there is no mandatory retirement age. Facing declining state appropriations and periods of economic hardship, leaders of many institutions have found the tenure system to be poorly aligned with current economic realities in higher education.

3. **The tenure model limits emphasis on teaching and learning and incentives to improve and innovate teaching.** There has long been concern that tenure-track faculty are not sufficiently focused on student learning and outcomes, and that they are not motivated to innovate their teaching (Fairweather, 1996). Particularly as technology emerges as an important tool to facilitate more active learning, critics worry that tenure-track faculty lack incentives to continue to improve their pedagogy. As a result, important practices that we know to align with student learning are slow to be adopted, such as high-impact practices like service learning or undergraduate research. Tenure has repeatedly emerged in studies of the reasons that teaching innovations do not spread and propagate (Austin, 2011).
4. **The tenure structure pays little attention to important other roles faculty can play in service, civic engagement, and local leadership.** Particularly for institutions where research and scholarship are major functions or roles for faculty, critics worry that research is defined too narrowly to include only empirical research published in peer-reviewed journals. Boyer (1990) argues that there are many forms of scholarship, and that some may be more aligned with the teaching-oriented or local/regional institutions that have burgeoned since World War II. Applied research that supports local communities, community-based research, and the scholarship of teaching (i.e., research focused on improving one's own teaching) have been suggested as key focus areas that fit better with the mission of those institutions that have a service- and teaching-focused mission. There has also been concern expressed that existing faculty roles may not allow the flexibility for faculty members to commit to performing service roles, to contribute to civic engagement, and to provide leadership in support of higher education's public service mission and purpose.¹⁷ As civic engagement initiatives attempt to meet higher education's goals for developing citizens and democratic behaviors, the leaders of those initiatives often register concern about whether traditional tenure-track faculty roles are defined in ways that support work in the community. While adjuncts have virtually no capacity to fulfill such roles under the current arrangements, tenure-track faculty members at many institutions have ignored this important responsibility.

¹⁷ Data from the 1998 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) suggest that faculty spend less than 5% of their time engaging in scholarly and service work outside their institution (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

5. **Some alternative models suggest that academic freedom can be protected without tenure, at least as it is conceived of today.** Some innovators have challenged the necessary connection between the concepts of academic freedom and tenure (Byrne, 1997). Several initiatives and experiments, such as those at Evergreen State College and Hampshire College, have indicated that faculty members' academic freedom can be protected without tenure, through intentional institutional policies (Chait & Trower, 1997). These policies have appeared to be effective when they arise from consultation between faculty and administrators. Although tenure is often defended as a means for protecting academic freedom, faculty members without tenure at these institutions are typically covered by academic freedom policies, as well. However, a major obstacle remains in that non-tenure-track faculty at most institutions do not enjoy the same level of job security or access to due process as their tenure-track peers. Some institutions with no tenure system at all and others with a mix of tenured and non-tenured appointments have found ways to address the vulnerabilities associated with the absence of tenure protections. These arrangements often require a great deal of trust among the faculty and the administration, as well as clear policies and procedures for addressing potential violations of academic freedom.

6. **Faculty who are not yet tenured, but are on the tenure track (i.e., probationary faculty) often feel constrained in their focus.** Many faculty members have voiced concern that they must emphasize research, publication, and production of scholarship in order to gain tenure, while compromising teaching. While pursuing tenure, many faculty feel they cannot attend to other priorities that are important to them; they find themselves constrained according to the priorities of tenured faculty in their departments, who will make judgments for advancement and promotion. Even when faculty are tenured, associate professors may still feel pressure to conform to the disciplinary standards of more senior faculty. This situation may force more junior faculty to downplay important advising, outreach, service, leadership, or teaching interests in pursuit of goals that are deemed to be more important by their colleagues.

Various initiatives over time have tried to address these criticisms. For example, the Preparing Future Faculty project of the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools attempted to educate graduate students about the full scope of faculty roles and responsibilities and broader notions of scholarship, as well as to provide them with experiences that helped to communicate differences in mission and faculty roles that exist among the various types of institutions. Ernest Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered was another well-known and ambitious project that sought to expand the definition of scholarship to include a greater emphasis on engagement, applied research, and teaching. Both efforts were aimed primarily at tenure-track faculty. These initiatives resulted in some important innovations, but the faculty has changed dramatically in the years since this work occurred. The criticisms of the tenure model need to be addressed anew within the current context, with a holistic understanding of the full assortment of issues at hand—including both the problems we have observed with the traditional faculty model and those associated with the adjunct model that is currently its most prevalent alternative.

PART II

A PROCESS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR REDESIGNING FACULTY ROLES

One of our main criticisms of the current state of the faculty is that there has been a lack of intentionality in the design of the model that is currently in place; it bears little relationship to the evolving missions of today's institutions of higher education. As a result, many faculty members—adjuncts and tenure-track faculty alike—are constrained in terms of how they can help their institutions to meet important goals, including those related to promoting positive student learning outcomes. New faculty models—or in some cases, changes to the current models—are needed to ensure that the higher education sector can best meet the needs of its diverse institutional missions and of the students it seeks to serve. Unlike past changes to faculty roles, future change efforts must be collaborative and intentionally planned endeavors, attending to a broad range of institutional factors, stakeholder views, and a changing higher education landscape. Chapters 3 through 7 are aimed at institutional leaders—both faculty and administrators—while Chapter 8 and the conclusion describe the necessity for change to occur at the broader level of the overall enterprise of American higher education. These multiple registers need to work synergistically to support the development of a new academic profession. Institutional leaders must act on and respond to their specific institutional goals and missions, while disciplinary societies, accreditors, and the national higher education organizations are positioned to put support structures into place to help these new models as they emerge.

3


MOVING FORWARD BY WORKING BACKWARD: MODELING AN INTENTIONAL PROCESS FOR REDESIGNING FACULTY ROLES TO MEET DESIRED OUTCOMES

This chapter describes a process for higher education leaders to collectively determine the scope of a redesign of the faculty—whether that involves a tweaking of the current model or a more extensive set of changes that requires reimagining faculty roles and introducing new arrangements for faculty work. The degree of change that is necessary will depend on the current conditions at our institutions, and success will rest on the will and effort of various stakeholder groups working collaboratively to effect change in the faculty model.

Backward design is an intentional process that can help campus leaders to think carefully about desired outcomes—as expressed in an institution’s mission, goals, and values—and work backward to develop a model for the faculty that helps in attaining those outcomes (McTighe & Thomas, 2003; Wiggins & McTighe, 1998). Because this same type of process is often used for designing outcome-oriented curricula and learning experiences, it might already be familiar to faculty and academic staff (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998). The process involves three main steps: 1) Identifying the desired outcomes; 2) Examining the current faculty model; and, 3) Developing a plan for redesigning the faculty. In this chapter, we describe a process for backward design, and the following chapters present the essential elements that should be considered when actually developing a plan for redesigning the faculty. Thus, we start the process with a consideration of institutional culture, values, mission, vision, and goals. Next, drawing on what is already known about the existing faculty roles, we encourage you to consider what the faculty might look like if models and roles were intentionally designed to meet those goals.

Note: When we reference campus leaders as the audience for this section, this should be understood as including faculty (both tenure-track and non-tenure-track) and administrators working together. As we noted in the introduction to this monograph, faculty knowledge is critical to the design process, and administrators also play a unique and important role—for example, by providing insight into policy and budget implications—that is necessary for this work.

Figure 2. Stages in an Adapted Backward Design Process



Adapted from Wiggins and McTighe (1998).

Step 1: Identify the Desired Outcomes

An intentional redesign of the faculty should begin with a consideration of collaboratively determined outcomes; it is an opportunity to purposefully structure faculty roles to attain important goals. Colleges and universities today serve increasingly complex missions and purposes. This first step in the redesign process is to take stock of the institution's priorities and goals, as well as priorities and goals contributed by government officials and by the communities the institution serves (e.g., students, parents, community leaders, and employers). In this way, the faculty can be effectively designed and engaged to fulfill many types of goals through intentionally constructed roles.

Some questions to consider:

- What are the guiding values and priorities of the campus community?
- What are the main priorities articulated in the institutional mission statement? What short- and long-term goals for the institution can be identified in the mission statement? What short- and long-term goals for the institution's service to the public can be identified?
- How do other statements, documents, or the history and culture of the institution reflect additional priorities and values of the institution?
- If the institution has determined specific benchmark goals, such as targets for graduation rates or improving time to completion, what are those goals?
- What other priorities for higher education have been identified by: Institutional leaders? Trustees? State leaders? Faculty leaders? Students and families? Accreditors? National and state departments of education? Community leaders? Business leaders?

Step 2: Examine the Current Faculty Model

After taking stock of shared priorities and goals, campus leaders should work to assemble a complete account of the current state of the faculty. The purpose of this exercise is to better understand the wide range of factors that facilitate or constrain the ability of faculty members to serve those desired goals. To this end, the current faculty models should be examined critically to see how the faculty is helping to serve the institutional mission and other stated goals and objectives. This stage requires data and—as in the first stage—collaboration to determine how the faculty model and roles are structured right now and to begin to identify areas where changes—large or small—might be needed. Will it suffice to make minor changes to the existing faculty models and roles, perhaps with only slight revision to the tenure system? Or, is a more extensive redesign necessary to allow the faculty to contribute to the institutional goals that have been identified? How this occurs and the types of data that are collected at each institution might be different.¹⁸ In any event, the process should involve multiple institutional stakeholders and take into account how roles, expectations, working conditions, institutional support, and personal satisfaction vary among the full complement of faculty positions.

Some questions to consider:

- What faculty models currently in use at the institution can be identified? What are the numbers of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty? What are the reasons for allocating appointments in this way—both the worthwhile reasons, as well as those that may be seen as objectionable?
- How are the current faculty models that are in place helping to satisfy the institutional mission and achieve other desired goals or outcomes? In which ways are they interfering?
- What skills and assets do faculty members possess? Are faculty members' skills, assets, and qualifications aligned to their duties? Are they being used effectively to attain desired outcomes?
- Are faculty encouraged to consider how their work serves the institutional mission? Or, the public good?
- How are tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty supported in helping the institution to attain desired outcomes—both those identified by the institution and by outside groups? How are they asked or encouraged to participate in meeting those outcomes? What role have they had in serving those goals?

Continued on next page.

¹⁸ The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success has created discussion guides for examining issues as they pertain to adjunct faculty, which could also be used for considering some of the same issues for other faculty members. See <http://guides.thechangingfaculty.org>. The Delphi Project's website, <http://www.thechangingfaculty.org>, also includes a sample campus climate survey and other resources that might be helpful in this stage of the process.

Some questions to consider (continued):


- What areas can be identified for improving upon the current model, particularly with regard to the alignment of the faculty models to the attainment of the institutional mission and goals or objectives? Or, the public good? What is required to achieve these improvements: modest changes or a more substantial redesign of the faculty?
- Does the change that is required to meet these goals entail merely tweaking the existing model, or is a more substantial change necessary?

Step 3: Develop a Plan for Redesigning the Faculty

The third step, developing a plan for redesigning the faculty, involves a more complex process. It entails that campus leaders identify the type of faculty that is needed to meet the outcomes and goals generated through the examination of institutional and community priorities. We believe that this redesign process requires reflecting upon and articulating four main considerations:

1. Core elements for professionalism in all faculty roles;
2. Institutional needs and mission;
3. Stakeholder input and institutional accountability; and,
4. Consideration of the higher education landscape and context.

Figure 3. Layers of Factors to Consider in the Design Process



These essential elements of faculty work will help to ensure that all faculty members, regardless of position or rank, can take an active role in advancing the institutional mission and goals, serving the public good, ensuring excellence, and contributing to the vitality of the academic profession and of the community of learners at their institutions.

The first of these considerations—the core of this work—is the need for all faculty positions to exhibit professionalism and enjoy respect and inclusion in the overall academic community of the institution. In the next chapter, we will enumerate an essential set of elements related to faculty work and to their working environment that promotes and encourages a greater sense of professionalism among the faculty as a whole. These essential elements of faculty work will help to ensure that all faculty members, regardless of position or rank, can take an active role in advancing the institutional mission and goals, serving the public good, ensuring excellence, and contributing to the vitality of the academic profession and of the community of learners at their institutions. This is the nucleus of the redesign process—a foundation upon which all other design considerations are constructed—and it is accompanied by obligations and responsibilities for faculty members, both individually and collectively.

Moving outward from the faculty core, the next two layers draw on the goals of the institution, both those defined internally and those that respond to the needs of community stakeholders. Faculty members' roles should be designed to fulfill the needs of the institution and contribute to the attainment of institution-specific mission, goals, and values; faculty should have access to appropriate information, resources, and support necessary to develop and maintain knowledge, skills, and work roles to contribute to these needs, missions, and goals. Beyond the institution, faculty roles must attend to a larger set of constituencies and concerns, as well. These areas must be addressed to ensure that we produce faculty models that are viable in the current context and will satisfy the important goals that are imposed on institutions by external groups and other factors. So, stakeholders—both internal and external—should be engaged in a discussion about the full range of needs and goals to be incorporated into the faculty model. In the past, changes in the faculty model have been driven mostly by internal actors—either by the faculty or by the administration—working largely in isolation. Today, redesigning the faculty to be attentive to a broader range

of needs requires input from each of the various groups that depend upon the work of the faculty. This step in the process is important for restoring and maintaining trust among the public and among other stakeholder groups. These institutional and stakeholder considerations will be addressed in Chapter 5.

Finally, moving to the outermost level of generalization, the redesign process needs to be attentive to the larger higher education landscape—the environmental factors and issues that are currently shaping changes in the sector, as a whole. These considerations will be discussed in Chapter 6.


By moving through the backward design process, campus leaders are empowered to identify the types of faculty positions that will exist and what roles and responsibilities will be

associated with those positions. The process is designed to outline the types of support and resources that will be needed to ensure that faculty are prepared to contribute to institutional goal attainment, and it will help leaders determine the appropriate mix of different faculty positions that will best meet the goals and outcomes identified. However, it is important to acknowledge that conditions for particular institutions and for the broader higher education environment will continue to change. For example, we know technology will continue to evolve, accountability pressures and demands for more rigorous assessment are likely to continue to mount, and budgeting may very well become more complicated. It is unlikely that the redesign process will be a neat and orderly activity that only occurs one time. In any event, this effort to change is long overdue. Given the contemporary crisis we face, institutions should endeavor to redesign faculty roles to meet today's needs and, as best they can, project some sort of path forward that ensures continued engagement with these shifting challenges.

In the following three chapters, we present a brief discussion of the main sets of factors that need to be considered in the redesign process—essential elements of faculty roles, institutional factors and stakeholder input, and landscape factors. We begin this discussion by describing essential elements for faculty work and workplaces that make up a core set of issues to consider. These elements comprise the foundation upon which any new faculty models or efforts to tweak the existing models should be based. Moving outward from the core, we address other layers that need to be considered as a part of the overall design process. We note the importance of attending to the needs and goals of the institution and of related stakeholders within and outside the institution. Finally, we turn to factors and issues shaping the higher education landscape.

4

THE CORE: ADOPTING ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS FOR PROFESSIONALISM IN FACULTY ROLES




A set of essential elements for all faculty positions should be at the core of any attempt to redesign the faculty, and these elements must be paired with individual responsibilities to aid in the attainment of institutional goals and the greater public good. This is an important starting point to ensure that any model—in all the various types of positions such a model outlines—provides satisfaction for faculty members, fosters commitment to the institution and to its mission, enhances the capability of institutions to recruit and retain talented faculty members, and optimizes the utilization of human and intellectual capital and potential possessed among the faculty as a whole (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). In turn, improving these conditions and the professionalism of faculty helps to promote goal attainment and furthers efforts in service of the public good. One of the more cogent attempts to outline a set of essential elements for faculty work and roles is found in Gappa, Austin, and Trice’s (2007) book, *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education’s Strategic Imperative*. In the book, the authors present a framework of essential elements of faculty roles that we believe provides a blueprint for redesigning a faculty model for the future. Gappa, Austin, and Trice developed the framework by convening advisory groups of scholars and administrators, reviewing models inside and outside higher education, and examining studies of faculty satisfaction and meaningful work. They call for five key

components that form the core of the faculty work experience, regardless of the institution or appointment type:

1. **Promoting equity among academic appointments**, including equitable compensation and access to benefits, opportunities for promotion, explicitly defined evaluation criteria, clear terms for notification of renewal or termination, processes for addressing grievances, and access to all of the information and tools needed for faculty members to do their jobs.
2. **Vigorously protecting academic freedom**—essential to the integrity of the faculty and of academic programs of our colleges and universities—for all faculty members. Faculty members also bear a responsibility to understand what academic freedom entails and to strive to honor the public's trust, which makes this important protection against political overreach possible.
3. **Ensuring flexibility in appointments**, helping faculty members to construct work arrangements that maximize their contributions to the institution, to their work, and to their students, while also enabling them to maintain balance among their work and personal lives in the face of increasingly complex roles and demands in the workplace.
4. **Fostering professional growth** by continuously engaging faculty members in development opportunities that help them to learn, excel in their fields, and do their very best work for their institutions, students, and the public.
5. **Promoting collegiality or a greater sense of community** in academic work, which respects the contributions of each member of the faculty and facilitates their involvement in governance and greater opportunities for collaboration and exchanging ideas.

Each element reflects an important attribute of productive and satisfying approaches to faculty work and workplaces. The elements are also interdependent and interact with one another; it is necessary to integrate all five elements into future faculty models in order to promote mutual satisfaction and success for faculty, institution, and constituents alike (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). These core characteristics are rooted in a kernel of **respect** for the contributions that all faculty members make to the academic community of an institution and to the students the institution strives to educate. Our own research has also validated the centrality of these five elements for productive faculty work; these elements have been discussed in major convenings of stakeholder groups and higher education thought leaders organized and hosted by the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success. These five essential elements should form the core characteristics for any faculty model, across appointment types, disciplines, or institutions at which faculty may serve.

Figure 4. Essential Elements for Fostering Faculty Professionalism



Adapted from Gappa, Austin, & Trice (2007)

Each of the five essential elements—equity, academic freedom, flexibility, professional growth, and collegiality—is comprised of a set of basic characteristics that should be incorporated into all faculty roles, regardless of position and institution type. These elements and their characteristics are described below. Each element also entails professional responsibilities and obligations to which individual faculty members are called to attend; these are faculty members’ contributions back to the institution and to the public good, which are described at the end of the chapter.

Equity

Equity pertains to the fair treatment of all faculty members, regardless of position or rank; the concept includes a number of considerations that guide how faculty members should be treated and valued. In an equitable workplace, each member of the faculty benefits from the positive working conditions that today are most commonly enjoyed by those who hold traditional tenure-track positions. For example, equity in the faculty model calls for all faculty members to receive equitable compensation for participating in similar work and access to comparable benefits, such as health insurance. Faculty should participate in governance and other decision-making in a manner that corresponds to their roles and is commensurate to the effects of such decisions on the conditions of their work (e.g., participation in curriculum design or a voice and vote in department meetings). A ladder of sequential ranks should be in place to provide opportunities for promotion for faculty members who excel in their work. All faculty members should be provided access to the information and resources needed to do their jobs, including orientation programming to introduce them to the institution and its policies when they are hired, some form of suitable office space, staff support, and office supplies and equipment.

Policies for hiring and employment should be set at the institutional level to ensure that faculty in different departments are not vulnerable to the shifting preferences and personal motivations of department chairs, but are treated the same across the institution. For example, establishing explicit evaluation criteria for faculty positions would help to remove some of the mystery around what is expected of faculty members, and it would ensure that their work and productivity are fairly assessed.

All faculty members should be given opportunities to improve upon their knowledge and skills through professional development programs and access to funding to participate in conferences and workshops outside the institution. All faculty members should also receive timely notification of renewal and termination. They should have access to grievance processes when they feel that policies and practices intended to protect them are being infringed.

Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) emphasize that equity in faculty employment does not mean that faculty members are treated uniformly. Not all faculty members have the same roles, nor should they; different contract types and positions address unique circumstances, and they come with distinct responsibilities. So, the details of faculty working conditions and experiences will vary. Faculty members have differing roles and expectations placed upon them, and their involvement in governance and decision-making, for example, should vary accordingly. All faculty members, however, should have opportunities to participate in ways that bring their skills and talents to bear in service of the institution and the public good within the scope of their duties. Still, equity can help to ensure that all faculty members—whether tenured, tenure-track, full-time non-tenure-track, or part-time—are valued for their contributions to the institution, are treated with respect and fairness, and derive satisfaction from their employment experience.

Some questions to consider:

- What are the current conditions at the institution as they pertain to equity among faculty members?
- How, if at all, might current inequities among faculty members affect the attainment of institutional goals, such as those for student learning and completion? How might they affect the public good?
- How might more equitable conditions be achieved for individuals occupying the different types of appointments or positions currently in place?
- If a new faculty model or set of models were developed, in what ways might equity be ensured through new types of appointments or positions?

Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is the right for all members of the faculty to express themselves freely in their research and publications, when discussing their subjects in the classroom, and when conveying their opinions as citizens, without the imposition of institutional censorship (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). This is a cornerstone of academic professionalism. It also

pertains to the ability of faculty members to have sufficient autonomy to make their own decisions in carrying out their work. Academic freedom is essential to the faculty role writ large, not just for faculty members who have tenure, but also for those who do not. When academic freedom is not protected for one group of faculty members, there are implications for the freedom of the whole faculty and for the quality and integrity of the institution's academic programs (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Byrne, 2001; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Internal due process and grievance procedures should be available to any faculty member seeking to address alleged violations of academic freedom.

Although academic freedom has been an important part of faculty work for several decades, its meaning and the scope of its protections are often misunderstood. Rights pertaining to academic freedom should be clearly defined in institutional policies and contracts; its protections should extend to all faculty members, regardless of their appointment type or rank. These rights should be explained to new faculty members when they are hired in orientations, contracts, and faculty handbooks. Further, faculty members' rights should be updated continually as the concept of academic freedom evolves to meet new circumstances emerging in academe and society; such changes should be regularly debated among the faculty and communicated through training sessions or workshops, publications, and institutional websites. Activities that are and are not protected by academic freedom should be clearly articulated for faculty members, so they may fully understand their rights, as well as their responsibilities.¹⁹

Since academic freedom has traditionally been institutionalized in processes of peer review and the employment protections associated with tenure, additional steps may need to be taken to ensure that the same rights are extended to those faculty members who hold appointments off the tenure track. This becomes particularly salient for adjuncts and their institutions as they navigate contract renewal or termination. Circumstances regularly arise that lead to the termination or non-renewal of non-tenure-track faculty members' employment; these include declines in enrollment, budget shortfalls, poor performance or breaches of contract, or changes in the curriculum that eliminate course offerings. Although these are often valid grounds to discontinue employment for these positions, all faculty members should be provided an explanation of the reasons that their contracts are not renewed. In cases where dismissal may be motivated by a violation of academic freedom, non-tenure-track faculty should have access to a grievance process to adjudicate their concerns.

Some questions to consider:

- What sorts of policies and practices are in place to protect academic freedom for members of the faculty?
- How, if at all, are academic freedom cases handled for different types of faculty appointments or positions?

Continued on next page.

¹⁹ The implications of uncertainty and of differing interpretations of the scope of academic freedom have been evident in several recent cases receiving national attention, including the University of Illinois' decision not to hire Steven Salaita, allegedly over controversial comments he made via social media.

Some questions to consider (continued):

- What efforts are currently taken to continually educate faculty members about their rights and responsibilities pertaining to academic freedom? What additional efforts could be made?
- How might academic freedom be better protected for individuals occupying different types of appointments or positions that exist?
- If a new faculty model or set of models were developed, in what ways might protections for academic freedom be institutionalized for new types of appointments or positions?

Flexibility

Gappa, Austin, and Trice define flexibility as “the ability of faculty members to construct work arrangements to maximize their contributions to their institutions as well as the meaningfulness of their work and personal lives” (2007, p. 141). Traditional faculty careers have been designed in a very linear fashion; tenure-track faculty members typically proceed through seven years to tenure and then have opportunities for promotions at standardized intervals. Additionally, full-time faculty work typically translates into 50 or more hours per week (AAUP, 1998; NCES, 2005). However, men and women often need—and desire—more flexible arrangements to meet their various personal and professional responsibilities, particularly to seek greater work-life balance or to respond to life challenges that demand their attention. Greater flexibility would allow faculty members to adjust their work schedules or take leaves in order to satisfy personal or familial obligations, such as by granting them the ability to move from tenure-track to non-tenure-track positions or from full-time to part-time positions, or by creating opportunities for job sharing. While both men and women can benefit from greater flexibility, women still shoulder the bulk of family responsibilities today, including childcare; for this reason, a work environment that does not offer flexibility actually disadvantages women.

Such options would enable faculty members to attend to various personal responsibilities and life circumstances, while reducing their stress levels so that they are more capable of performing at their highest level while at work. When individuals are stressed, their productivity and commitment to their institutions may decline. Thus, offering flexibility allows faculty members to meet personal and professional obligations, while also benefiting the mission and operations of the institution. Gappa and colleagues (2007) note a number of studies from the private sector that demonstrate the strategic benefits of allowing for greater flexibility for employers. These studies show that employees who take advantage of work flexibility programs report that they are more committed and are less prone to suffering from burnout than are employees who do not participate in such programs. Other studies show that there are high costs to employers when employees are not able to get the support they need to take care of family members who require additional attention. Ensuring a greater measure of flexibility can also be a useful tool for recruiting and retaining faculty. For these reasons, Gappa and colleagues (2007) state that flexibility is an important strategic element of the workplace.

Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) claim that by adopting policies that afford greater flexibility for faculty members, institutions will be on the cutting edge in redefining the meaning

of commitment to an institution; such institutions will be able to retain talented employees who might otherwise choose to leave the academy. However, the task of creating greater flexibility for faculty inevitably raises questions about how to ensure that the institution's needs are continuously met and about how to cover the cost of providing flexible work arrangements. These are questions that will need to be considered in the redesign process to ensure that the needs of the institution and of the faculty are met in such a way as to promote truly mutual benefit.

Some questions to consider:

- In what ways are flexibility incorporated into faculty roles for the appointments and positions currently in place?
- What would be the benefits of providing greater flexibility in the faculty role for faculty members?
- How could greater flexibility be provided for individuals occupying the different types of appointments or positions currently in place?
- If a new faculty model or set of models were developed, in which ways might flexibility be provided for in new types of appointments or positions?

Professional Growth

Much like professionals in other fields, faculty members must have access to and continuously engage in opportunities to learn in order to excel in their fields and do their very best work. Faculty members must continue to hone their craft to keep up with new discoveries and forms of knowledge, an increasingly diverse student body, the constant emergence of new technologies, and changing expectations in academia as a whole. Promoting professional growth for faculty members at colleges and universities allows them to remain current in the knowledge of their fields, to engage with other scholars, and to be productive in their own work by exposing them to new research methods, pedagogies, practices, and strategies for improving teaching and learning in their courses. By offering professional development, institutions give faculty members opportunities to enhance or expand their knowledge bases, capabilities, and skill sets; this prepares them to address the challenges they will encounter in the course of their work, whether in conducting research, teaching students in the classroom, or designing activities to actively engage students in their own learning. Colleges and universities that invest in faculty development also reap benefits in the future health and success of the institution and its students. Investments in professional growth improve faculty morale and commitment. And, faculty members who demonstrate a commitment to their own continuous learning also serve as positive role models, inspiring their students to continue to learn, as well.

All faculty members need professional development to stay vibrant, productive, and knowledgeable. There are numerous ways to promote professional growth for faculty members, and a multi-faceted approach is almost certainly needed to meet the development needs of the faculty as a whole. Institutions can provide workshops on topics such as assessing learning outcomes, teaching underprepared students, and incorporating technology into teaching.

Mentoring programs can also facilitate faculty development by pairing experienced faculty members with newer colleagues. Unique professional growth plans, created by faculty members working with their department chairs, can help to identify goals and action plans for individual faculty members' development. Faculty members should also be encouraged to participate in disciplinary or field-based conferences to connect with and maintain knowledge in their fields. They should also be supported as members of disciplinary societies and professional organizations, staying connected through communications and access to publications related to their fields.

We also note that it is key to professional growth for all faculty to receive regular, substantive evaluations of their work. The majority of faculty members on campuses today hold non-tenure-track appointments, and they lack opportunities to receive constructive feedback from peers on the quality of their work. Even tenure-track faculty roles often lack any meaningful and substantive form of ongoing evaluation. For the faculty body to become and remain vibrant, there must be some form of feedback on the quality of faculty members' work given on a continuous basis, whether through peer evaluations of instruction for non-tenure-track faculty or post-tenure review for those who hold tenure. This is how institutions can identify areas where improvements can be made and invest in supporting faculty members to enhance the quality of their work.

Some questions to consider:

- How are graduate students currently being prepared to assume faculty roles? What changes in graduate education might be necessary to prepare them to successfully satisfy roles associated with future models?
- What opportunities for professional development exist to maintain a vibrant, productive, and knowledgeable faculty?
- What differences exist in terms of how professional development opportunities are provided to different types of faculty, such as to tenure-track versus adjunct faculty?
- Are the professional development opportunities available to different faculty members appropriate for helping them to contribute to institutional goal attainment?
- What would be the benefits of expanding the current professional development offerings and/or the range of individuals to whom they are available?
- How could appropriate, ongoing professional development opportunities be ensured for all faculty members?

Collegiality

Collegiality is a term that often comes up in discussions about the problems with our currently divided, bifurcated faculty models. In this context, collegiality refers to faculty members' sense of belonging to an academic community, often encapsulated in the respect that

the members have for one another and for the contributions that they each make to the institution and to their respective fields of study (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Collegiality and community in the academy are important characteristics of the contemporary academic workforce, and they are greatly desired by aspiring and early-career faculty members who are the future of the professoriate (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). Collegiality also requires more than simply being sociable with one's colleagues. The sense of belonging and mutual respect that are fostered by a collegial work environment make an important contribution to good morale among the faculty, to a sense of satisfaction, and to greater connectedness to the academic community and to the institution (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Rice & Austin, 1988).

Institutions can take various measures to promote collegiality among the members of the faculty. All faculty members should have opportunities to participate in governance at a level appropriate to their appointment status. Institutions can also foster collegiality by creating opportunities for faculty members to come together and create meaningful relationships with one another, often learning about one another's disciplines in the process. To this end, faculty members can be invited and encouraged to participate in a wide range of events and activities occurring around the campus. Faculty learning communities are also becoming more prevalent on campuses as a way to foster collegiality around core topics of interest, such as service learning, STEM reform, or service to diverse students. Faculty members' engagement with one another can result in unexpected creative collaborations and interdisciplinary learning, which can contribute to a better campus climate for learning as a whole. Extending collegiality to all members of the faculty can help adjuncts—and others who might feel that their contributions and perspectives are not always valued—to become more fully integrated into the academic community. For non-tenure-track faculty, collegiality can develop through access to a shared office space, where faculty members can meet and talk with other colleagues. Adjunct faculty can also be added to departmental email lists, invited to and encouraged to contribute at meetings and events, given opportunities to participate in professional development or mentoring with peers, and supported in other ways that help them to communicate with colleagues and to become a part of the campus community.


Some questions to consider:

- What steps can be taken at the institution to improve collegiality and community?
- What would be the benefits of improving these conditions and involving all faculty members equally?
- Are there policies and practices in place related to civility, bullying, and harassment?
- How could collegiality and community development be incorporated into a new faculty model or models?

Relating the Essential Elements to Faculty Responsibilities

Underlying the notion of professionalism is the central understanding that those individuals who are granted elevated status, autonomy, and other privileges in conducting their work also bear responsibilities to their organizations and to the public (Sullivan, 2005). The federal and state governments grant special privileges to professionals in any field, for example, as part of a sort of social compact in exchange for the public service and civic orientation of the field. In the case of the academic professions, higher education is intended to benefit the public good, not just the paying students who are enrolled. The product of the collective work of colleges and universities—of their faculties—supports the public’s welfare and vitality, such as by fostering democratic engagement. So, a fundamental characteristic of a profession is ensuring that a commitment to providing services or benefits to the greater public is maintained; this often is supported through the development and administration of standards for practice.

Figure 5. Relating the Essential Elements to Faculty Responsibilities



Underlying the notion of professionalism is the central understanding that those individuals who are granted elevated status, autonomy, and other privileges in conducting their work also bear responsibilities to their organizations and to the public (Sullivan, 2005). The federal and state governments grant special privileges to professionals in any field, for example, as part of a sort of social compact in exchange for the public service and civic orientation of the field. In the case of the academic professions, higher education is intended to benefit the public good, not just the paying students who are enrolled. The product of the collective work of colleges and universities—of their faculties—supports the public’s welfare and vitality, such as by fostering democratic engagement. So, a fundamental characteristic of a profession is

ensuring that a commitment to providing services or benefits to the greater public is maintained; this often is supported through the development and administration of standards for practice.

The task of developing new faculty models and roles seeks to restore some of the characteristics of professionalism in faculty work—characteristics that have been eroded by rising contingency and by the neoliberal structure of contemporary institutions. The revitalization of faculty professionalism, however, requires that essential elements of faculty work be paired with concomitant responsibilities for individual faculty members' service to their institutions and to the public. This shift must be reflected in formal standards or informal norms that emphasize faculty members' responsibilities to the public good through their own work and through their support for the work of the institution.

When we speak about the rights associated with academic freedom, for example, we must also address the academic responsibility that accompanies faculty work. Too frequently, faculty members interpret academic freedom as limiting the obligations they have to their institutions and to the public. What obligations do faculty members have to ensure that their work serves the public good? How is this work achieved? Sullivan (2005) notes that formal standards help to maintain rules and expectations for professionals, but the development of a collective ethos is a more effective way to ensure that such obligations are met. So, while institutional policies and protections should be clearly explained and understood by all institutional decision-makers (e.g., provosts, deans, and department chairs), it is also important that faculty members themselves take responsibility and vigorously reinforce, through professional norms, an understanding that academic freedom does not absolve faculty from participating in important collective efforts that support the institutional mission and student learning. In fact, the faculty position obliges them to work collectively with internal and external stakeholders toward achieving outcomes in service of the students, institutional mission, and the public. Faculty members must recognize the special privilege that is conferred to them through the consent of the public and honor the trust that is bestowed upon them by the government. Alongside their professional obligations to their disciplines, faculty should use the rights granted to them through academic freedom to improve the quality and integrity of institutions of higher learning and of the education they provide for their students.

The same sorts of standards—the spirit of obligation—can be seen arising from the remaining essential elements, as well, with similar weight and importance. The flexibility that is granted to faculty members should be honored and matched with productivity. For example, faculty members should commit the time and effort necessary to provide the highest quality of instruction to their students. As Hutchings and Shulman (1999) noted, “all faculty have an obligation to teach well, to engage students, and to foster important forms of student learning” (13). Those with roles that include research expectations are similarly obliged to produce and publish scholarly research that meets or exceeds disciplinary standards for rigor and quality. Colleges and universities depend on this faculty productivity to meet institutional missions, to preserve the public trust, and to support their financial solvency as sustainable institutions.


In the case of collegiality, the benefits that are enjoyed by faculty members should be extended through active and frequent service to the academic community: contributing to governance, enriching the life of the campus, and working to advance the missions and goals of the institution (e.g., participation in assessment efforts and curricular design). Similarly, opportunities for professional growth can be met with a willingness among the members of the faculty to maintain their knowledge and enhance their skills for teaching and research in order to best exercise their craft and ensure the preparation of the next generation. In terms of equity, faculty are obligated to help support broader equity goals for the institution—goals relating to

social mobility, access, and student achievement—as well as the larger equity issues in our society, where they can use their research and teaching to help to identify and understand issues around poverty, international development, or gaps in access to education, healthcare, and technology.

To revive the professional character of the faculty requires that we restore and incorporate the five essential elements in faculty work—in balance with the concomitant obligations presented above and reinforced through faculty standards and norms. Although these essential elements reflect potentially shared values that have historical precedence, the incorporation of these elements into faculty models and roles might vary greatly from one institution to another. Whether we choose to embrace them will affect how we prepare graduate students who will serve on the faculty in the future. The next section will explore institutional factors affecting the redesign process, as well as the importance of input from multiple stakeholder groups to ensure that the new faculty model addresses institutional and public needs.

5

INPUTS TO THE REDESIGN PROCESS: INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS AND STAKEHOLDER CONTRIBUTIONS



Institutional Factors

A number of institutional factors will contribute to discussions about redesigning the faculty model and roles; these include the institution’s mission and vision statements, the values that are represented in the institution’s community and culture or that are enshrined in other important statements or historical documents, the size and composition of the institution’s faculty and enrollments (both of which may fluctuate from time to time), and the institution’s budget. How each of these items is interpreted and valued will vary among members of the institution’s community—faculty, students, administrators, members of the board, and staff—so, efforts to examine these factors must draw on discussion among multiple stakeholders to ensure that the end results are in alignment with the understanding and priorities of the full campus community.

We believe that starting with the mission and vision statements of the institution is an important first step in this discussion. These statements, while sometimes tending to be vague or overly expansive, describe the institution’s essential character, the scope of its activities, its aims for core activities such as teaching and knowledge creation, its obligations for service, and

an articulation of its goals and aspirations. These mission-level motivators provide an important list of factors to consider in the service of faculty redesign. In addition to the formal mission and vision statements, many institutions have also articulated a set of core values existing in the institution's community and culture. These values may also prove to be important as a shared starting point for a discussion about roles, whether or not they are documented explicitly in public statements and written goals. For example, a Jesuit college may be highly committed to issues of social justice as core priorities of its community and a focal point for the shared beliefs of its members. Additional values, goals, and priorities might also be identifiable from key strategic initiatives of the institution, such as efforts to help improve student success, access, or completion.

The inquiry process should also take into account the different needs and demands of faculty across the various disciplines and academic programs of the institution. Just as a single faculty model might not fit all types of institutions, a single account of faculty roles may not be adequate across all programs to describe the varying demands for research and teaching or for involving different types of faculty members and practitioners in providing instruction to students. Currently, there already exists substantial variation among disciplines with regard to the proportions of tenure-track and non-tenure-track appointments at the national and institutional levels. Differences among disciplines and programs will need to be considered as part of any redesign efforts. In the course of engaging in dialogues within and across disciplines, we must also consider how the future faculty are to be prepared by graduate programs to fulfill the obligations associated with the faculty roles we envision for them.

Inevitably, it will also be necessary to consider issues such as the budget and projections for enrollment. The way the institution manages the budget—either centrally or through a decentralized model, such as responsibility-centered management—will have implications for how changes to faculty roles can be achieved and maintained over time. Fluctuations in enrollments might also affect the numbers and types of faculty that are needed to provide instruction to students; in many cases, enrollment management efforts can mitigate this instability by helping to predict or control changes in demand for faculty. The availability of funding to support changes will also, of course, be a key topic for consideration. In the final chapter, we review how this inquiry process can facilitate a broader discussion among internal and external stakeholders about mobilizing the resources necessary to undertake a redesign of the faculty, including the responsibilities and contributions that each group can make to this effort.

Some questions to consider:

- What are the guiding values and priorities of the campus community?
- What are the main priorities included in the institutional mission?
- What other priorities, values, or goals are reflected in other statements or in the history and culture of the institution?
- How is the faculty currently utilized to help achieve these priorities, values, or goals?

Continued on next page.

Some questions to consider (continued):

- How might the faculty be utilized more effectively in achieving the institution's goals? What are some ways the faculty models and roles could be changed or redesigned through collaborative and purposeful efforts to better meet these goals?
- How might projected changes in enrollments—overall, as well as in individual colleges and academic programs—present opportunities and impediments to potential attempts to change models and roles?
- How will the budget model in place (e.g., responsibility-centered management) affect how changes in the faculty model can be achieved?

Stakeholder Contributions and Institutional Accountability

Historically, changes to the faculty model have only been made with input from internal, institutional stakeholders; at various times, either the faculty or the administration has been the primary driver of change. In order to redesign the faculty model to be viable and sustainable for the long-term, we believe that multiple stakeholders—including both internal and external groups—need to have opportunities to provide their input about priorities for higher education institutions and faculty work; this will enable institutions to be more accountable to the diverse needs to which they must respond. Indeed, restoring professionalism in faculty work, as we suggest, demands social partnership. As William Sullivan (2005) puts it, professionalism “calls for the active participation and public concern on the part of citizens whom the professions serve.” This is to say that, if we are to be a profession, we have a responsibility to the stakeholders involved with and served by the important work that we do.

However, this does not mean that control of the redesign process should be ceded to external groups. Rather, in the course of redesigning the faculty, campus leaders must consider and respond to the main concerns expressed by both internal and external stakeholders. Engaging these views intentionally—and continuing to engage with these stakeholders in the future—will ensure that institutions are externally accountable to meeting key objectives and aspirations that are a part of their missions. The views of these stakeholders will also reflect many of the issues we will discuss in the following chapter on the changing landscape of higher education. Policymakers and members of the public tend to be attuned to different issues than internal stakeholders; such issues include economic or political constraints, workforce needs, the promotion of economic development, and public demands for accountability. To maintain public trust in the work of higher education institutions and the faculty, we must cultivate awareness of these issues and formulate concerted efforts to address them.

One of the primary stakeholder groups for any institution to consult is students, themselves—both undergraduates and graduate students. As students have been—and will continue to be—among those most affected by changes in the faculty, their input must certainly be considered. While most institutions avow that the quality of student learning and student success are paramount concerns, it is the design of faculty roles that will largely determine how these outcomes can be achieved. For example, all students derive substantial benefits from faculty-student interactions. So, students will likely wish to ensure they have ample opportunities

to access faculty for advice and encouragement in their studies, mentoring, consultation in considering potential career paths, and recommendation letters. Numerous studies have proven the benefits of these relationships between faculty members and their students—for first-generation students and students of color most of all. On issues such as these, the voices of students provide an important source of authentic input into how faculty roles can be best designed for student success.

Yet, students are not the only stakeholders beyond faculty members and administrators who should be consulted as part of a redesign of faculty roles. Because faculty members at many institutions are involved in conducting research and producing important scholarship, policymakers who utilize this work may have important insights about preserving the benefits of faculty work for the betterment of public policy and civic engagement. Policymakers may describe the potential for colleges to meet workforce needs, to help with leadership development, and to engage people in civic roles and responsibilities. They may also point to ways that faculty can help spur economic advances through research partnerships with industry. In addition to expressing goals, policymakers can also express concerns about accountability, affordability, access, or graduation rates that are on the minds of constituents. By discussing key state, regional, or local policy issues and concerns with academic leaders, these stakeholders can help campus leaders develop better notions about the best faculty roles and models to meet and address such issues. In the state of Maryland, for example, the campuses host policymakers each year for a few days to share ideas and to try to formulate some common goals. These discussions can and should include conversation about the best structures to enable the faculty to contribute to such goals.

Community leaders may similarly wish for faculty members to be engaged in work that helps to promote regional and local economic development. They may also be interested in creating greater opportunities for partnerships that address problems faced by community organizations and the citizens they represent. Many institutions today serve a more global populace; the communities they serve and the leaders they engage may exist beyond local, state, or even national boundaries. When considering who is included in the external community that is affected by this work, we must consider all the stakeholders connected to the institution, which increasingly may be international in scope. Business leaders and representatives from a variety of professions may also be able to contribute ideas about how faculty members can assist in educating students to be prepared to address problems faced in industry, the government, and the nonprofit sector.

We advocate for a sufficiently wide net to be cast in the inquiry process, involving as many relevant voices as possible in the design of faculty models and roles for the future.

A number of other stakeholders that are a part of the higher education sector also have a role. Regional and programmatic accreditors are higher education's primary means of assuring and improving the quality of institutions and academic programs. These organizations have long focused on issues relating to the faculty and on the role of the faculty in meeting important goals for educational quality and attainment. As such, accreditors will need to be key players in determining how changes in faculty models and roles affect—positively or negatively—factors such as instructional quality, student learning outcomes, and institutional ability to meet academic missions. They need not only have a role in measuring effectiveness after the fact; accreditors can also be proactive by developing guidelines and recommendations

that can inform changes being made on campuses, helping to ensure that any future faculty models make positive contributions, rather than diminish quality and outcomes. Boards of trustees also have a role as the public's representatives in the oversight and governance of institutions. Trustees can help to raise important questions and keep institutions accountable by seeing to it that the faculty model and roles are appropriately designed to contribute to the satisfaction of goals identified by communities, the state and national government, accreditors, and other external groups. As the final authority on institutional budgets, boards also play a key role in making sure that changes to the faculty are made within appropriate limits for expenditures, even pressuring leaders when necessary to find new and innovative ways to satisfy the diverse objectives and goals of the institution.


All of these perspectives—and perhaps others—are important to consider in order to ensure that faculty models for the future meet and remain accountable to the increasingly complex demands that are placed upon the faculty and institutions of higher learning as a whole. Incorporating these inputs into the redesign of the faculty also demonstrates the willingness of institutions to address stakeholder concerns. Ultimately, it will be up to the administrators and the faculty—the campus leaders driving the redesign process—to decide which stakeholders to engage in this work. We advocate for a sufficiently wide net to be cast in the inquiry process, involving as many relevant voices as possible in the design of faculty models and roles for the future. As is apparent in the example of the Maryland system, venues often already exist in which stakeholders come together; it is time for these venues to include a discussion of faculty roles.

Some questions to consider:

- In which ways might the different groups included here—students, policymakers, trustees, accreditors, and community and business leaders—be included in discussions about changing or redesigning faculty? How can each group be engaged in developing and implementing future models?
- What are the appropriate venues and ways to facilitate the inclusion of other stakeholders in this process? Are there existing structures in place that could be used to collect their input?
- Which other stakeholder groups might be consulted in this process?

6

SCANNING THE LANDSCAPE: KEY FACTORS SHAPING FACULTY CHANGE TODAY



As we have discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, institutions will need to design new faculty roles around the essential elements of faculty work, striving to meet complex institutional missions and goals with input from multiple stakeholders. This process will occur in an environment that places additional pressures and demands on higher education. In this chapter, we outline some of the various landscape factors that need to be considered when redesigning faculty roles. How will faculty retirements and new faculty hires influence change in the faculty model? Is graduate school adequately preparing future faculty for their new roles? How can professional development continue throughout faculty members' careers to allow them to make the best use of emerging pedagogies and classroom practices? How can we stay accountable to public expectations, even after the initial redesign, and weather economic uncertainty? Finally, what will technology and competition, particularly from the for-profit sector, mean for the future? This chapter is not intended to provide a complete accounting of the challenges that institutions are already facing or those that lie on the horizon; rather, it reflects some of the major contemporary factors throughout the higher education sector that will affect efforts to redesign the faculty model. We acknowledge that campus leaders should also be thinking about assessment, interdisciplinarity, and globalization—to take a few examples—but we choose to focus on a set of issues that will have an outsized impact on the process we think needs to be

undertaken. We assume campus leaders will think broadly about the range of landscape factors that are most important in their contexts, including those factors that may not be included here. As we review the landscape, it also becomes clear that we stand at an opportune time to act due to the upcoming wave of retirements and the rise of a new generation of faculty with fresh ideas about academe.

| | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Faculty Retirements | New Generation of Faculty | Graduate Preparation |
| Continuing Faculty Development | New Knowledge about Learning | Accountability for Public Expectations and Concerns |
| Economic Uncertainty | Technology | Increasing Competition |

Faculty Retirements and the New Generation of Faculty

Generational change among the faculty is creating a tremendous and time-sensitive opportunity to undertake an effort to redefine faculty models (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000; Rice, 2005). As the global economic recession ebbs, a large portion of the faculty—many of whom were hired in periods of substantial higher education expansion in the 1960s and 70s—are expected to retire. With so many faculty members leaving the profession in the coming years, now is a strategic time to introduce a new model that will win the approval of a generation of new faculty. While there are no absolute projections on when these retirements will occur, smart strategies to phase retirements could help to ensure that they occur somewhat gradually, providing the benefit of stability and continuity while new models and roles are phased in.

The faculty members who will retire in the coming years will be replaced by a new generation of faculty. Members of this generation have new ways of thinking about their work and about the changing faculty roles that they face; this can be a powerful catalyst for creating lasting change. This new generation will face greater competition and productivity expectations than their outgoing faculty counterparts did upon entering the field. However, these current graduate students and early-career faculty members are often more open to the use of technology, more interested in interdisciplinarity, and more focused on teaching than earlier generations (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). As a result, the changeover from today’s senior faculty, who entered the academy in another era, to the new generation of emerging faculty and higher education leaders may create a natural opportunity to bring fresh ideas about faculty roles and academic life into the discussion. Another reason to take advantage of this opportunity is that, without an intervention to intentionally redesign faculty roles, another, much less promising shift is possible. If we are not deliberate about how we respond to the wave of tenured faculty retirements, we may see the instructional shortfall filled by another period of aggressive growth in contingent positions.

Refocusing Graduate Education and Faculty Development on New Knowledge About Learning

Professional renewal begins with education (Sullivan, 2005). Therefore, we cannot count on the renewal brought by the next generation of faculty without also challenging how these

future faculty members are prepared during graduate school and how they will continue to develop knowledge and skills to support our institutions' teaching and learning missions. It is clear that the faculty members of the future will need to possess the knowledge and skills to use instructional technology, to contribute to assessment and data analytics, and to use teaching and learning research and emerging pedagogies to optimally support students' learning. Currently, graduate students are not typically trained in pedagogy or in other effective strategies for teaching and learning, such as new applications of technology to enhance instruction. Increasingly, our knowledge about how students learn is being advanced by research, but this information is not finding its way into the disciplinary curricula of graduate programs. As such, it is now a key time to examine how faculty are trained in the pedagogies of their disciplines and see whether such training can incorporate the various high-impact practices and teaching strategies that could revolutionize how the next generation of faculty members reach their students. The resources already exist to have this impact on future teaching; most disciplines rely on a few signature pedagogies, and higher education organizations like the Association of American Colleges and Universities have created many powerful resources to improve the quality of teaching and learning, through programs such as the Liberal Education and America's Promise initiative. In this moment of great opportunity, it is important to consider whether faculty should be required to go through ongoing professional development and evaluation—incentivized by their institutions—to ensure that they keep up with current pedagogical and disciplinary knowledge.

Public Expectations for Higher Education: Declining Confidence and Growing Demands for Accountability

Higher education institutions have been under increasing public pressure to prioritize undergraduate education and to focus the attention of the faculty on teaching. Such calls to emphasize and improve undergraduate education have been something of a constant for some time now. Political leaders and the public have grown leery of professional autonomy in higher education, and they want greater assurances that faculty members conduct academic work in ways that meet institutional missions and goals, particularly when it comes to educating students. The public has become concerned that faculty members are not focused enough on teaching and student success. Faculty roles that are designed in the future should attempt to harness this concern about student success and address it by making improvements and by demonstrating student learning and development through more rigorous and regular assessment.

There is also great public concern about the high dropout rates on college campuses—and whether or how our focus on research over teaching exacerbates this problem. The student population is becoming more diverse, with increasing populations of first-generation and non-traditional college students attending college today; these traditionally underserved students benefit most from having regular interactions and developing relationships with faculty members. Commentators have suggested that the declining emphasis on student advising and mentoring in faculty work will be most problematic for these students, although these are surely not the only students who are affected. New faculty roles should be designed to support student retention—reintegrating key, student-oriented roles that may have been dropped from faculty responsibilities over time. Teaching, assessment, advising, and mentoring are all key areas that need to be addressed in discussions of future faculty models. At a time when the public questions institutions' abilities to retain students and deliver high-quality education, attending to these issues will help to demonstrate and build quality in academic programs. Improved

programs will contribute to efforts to help students not only to attain degrees, but also to learn the knowledge and skills to succeed in their lives and careers.

Economic Challenges: Uncertain Revenue Streams and Cost Concerns

The foremost public concern expressed about higher education today is the rising costs of attending college, and economic challenges must be at the center of any discussion of the contemporary landscape of higher education. Government appropriations for higher education have traditionally accounted for a large share of revenues at public and private colleges and universities (Archibald & Feldman, 2012). For a variety of reasons, including economic crises such as the recent recession and mandates for states to fund public-sector pensions, healthcare, and prisons, these appropriations have fluctuated, but they have mostly declined over the past several years. Studies have shown that revenues from sources such as private foundation grants, interest income from investments of institutions' endowment funds, and other charitable donations were also adversely affected during the recession. In the face of these challenges, institutions are intensifying their efforts to attract revenue from foundations and donors, with limited success. Ongoing public divestment, particularly from public institutions, and increasing competition for external funding has often left colleges and universities with difficult decisions to make with regard to offsetting those losses; they must make cuts or raise revenues, and usually institutions do both.

Until states allocate adequate funding for higher education, institutions will continue to face pressure to find ways to create the lowest-cost faculty model possible, rather than work toward a model that is purposefully designed to support optimal outcomes for student success. Some states, recognizing the importance of higher education to their future economic prosperity, have taken the lead in increasing investments in postsecondary institutions. In some remarkable cases, this has resulted in greater allocations of funding to support instruction. For example, the recent California State University Graduation Initiative allocated funding for 700 new full-time faculty positions, plus additional funding to provide better support for faculty, in recognition of the essential role faculty play in promoting student learning, retention, and degree completion. We believe that this type of investment is critical for ensuring the future success of the higher education enterprise.

However, the tone of the current political climate—nationally and in some states—suggests hesitation over investing additional funds in higher education in the future. The rising cost of higher education tuition nationally has recently reemerged as a major topic in the political and social discourse (Archibald & Feldman, 2012). Naturally, the issue has gained the attention of students and families, who are most concerned about how they will pay for a college education. Elected officials across the political spectrum are also paying greater attention to this issue, and outside groups, from media to foundations, and members of the business community have joined the discussion. Although there is not a common understanding among these groups about which factors are most responsible for rising college costs, there is almost certainly a growing consensus that something needs to be done.

As we work to redefine faculty roles, we must either develop approaches that have the potential to decrease costs, or we must assure the public and elected leaders that new investments in higher education will prove to be wisely spent, through measurable improvement in the quality of instruction and student outcomes. In either event, faculty roles will need to be reconsidered with cost and productivity in mind, in an environment characterized by constrained resources and greater calls for accountability. Alternative models have the potential to have a

role in cutting costs—some examples are provided in Chapter 7—and should be explored and implemented, where appropriate. In concert with this effort, other areas of institutional budgets should also be examined, to ensure that priorities and funding are appropriately aligned to the mission; this will be discussed in Chapter 8. With the current proliferation of adjunct positions, it is also important to examine whether cost savings are actually being achieved, or if funds previously dedicated to faculty roles are merely being redirected to other areas. For example, as faculty roles have been unbundled, roles such as advising and other work that was traditionally a part of faculty members' duties have been reassigned to staff positions and paraprofessionals; student and academic affairs budgets have increased accordingly. The implications of these shifts in how and where funds are spent needs to be considered, especially as they relate to student learning.

Technology: A Persistent Influence for Change

Technology has already had a substantial impact on how faculty and students can access, engage with, and contribute to knowledge. It creates opportunities for collaboration in teaching and research that were not possible before, connecting educators near and far to one another and to an unlimited supply of information. In short, technology has become central to how faculty members conduct their work—in research, teaching, and service (Rice, 2005). Although educational technology has had a role in shaping modes of knowledge creation and content delivery for several years, it has only recently been used in ways that allow faculty members to be more productive, more accessible to students, and more integrated into the primary functions of instruction. Important experiments, such as those at the National Center for Academic Transformation, demonstrate the ways that technology might be used to rethink faculty roles. Some colleges and universities are also using technology to maximize faculty time on active teaching and minimize lecturing by flipping classrooms—making listening to lectures into homework and using class time for engaged learning—shifting faculty member's approach to teaching. Institutions such as Rio Salado College and Western Governors University are using technology to enable faculty to focus on key interpersonal functions such as mentoring students, while using technology and other types of professionals to provide support for information delivery and grading.

Even as technology has created new opportunities that affect the higher education landscape today, the pace of technological advance continues to accelerate, bringing new devices, platforms, and applications to market before earlier technologies have even been widely adopted. This pace of technological change is likely to bring about many as yet unanticipated changes for higher education and the faculty in the coming years.

Globalization

As institutions become increasingly international in their reach and scope, there is likely to be a growing impact on faculty roles; much like the potential impact of technology, exactly how globalization will affect institutions and faculty roles remains unclear (Plater, personal correspondence). However, factors such as industry-established global qualifications frameworks defining competence in fields of practice, MOOCs and other electronic course offerings with a global reach, joint degree programs, new forms of credentialing, trends in international student enrollment, international competition for faculty recruitment, and collaborative research spanning across borders will create new expectations for faculty

members' experience, expertise, professional development, and mobility. Increasing faculty mobility, for example, could affect how institutions in the United States are staffed in the future. In other fields and professions, the idea that there is a global workforce and talent pool has already become reality. American institutions are accustomed to being able to attract scholars (and students) from other countries, particularly in engineering and science fields, but increasing globalization may shift these patterns in the future. International competition for the best talent in the academic workforce is likely to shape how institutions go about recruiting and retaining top faculty talent.

As global competition for faculty talent increases, there could also be challenges to longstanding norms and practices associated with the faculty. As some aspects of faculty work are “unbundled,” such as advising or assessment of student learning, the academic equivalent of a call center in India or Australia might be created to provide 24-hour access to advising or to tutoring. Faculty with special expertise—such as language competency or high level abstract theory in certain disciplines—might hold joint appointments with the ability to teach, mentor, and supervise graduate students in the US without ever leaving their principal home institutions in France or China. Already popular, joint and dual degrees might proliferate based on specialized credentialing, offering a range of certifications and degrees through collaborations based on shared faculty across multiple borders. Technology offers the possibility of substantive engagement between people in real time as well as in asynchronous time; just consider some of the successfully globalized examples from the National Center for Academic Transformation.

Contributing to this trend, many countries are trying to decrease barriers to student migration and mobility by having greater standardization of curriculum and competencies. The Bologna Process and the Tuning Project are both large-scale efforts to allow for greater mobility of students in and across Europe—just two major examples of the work to enhance student mobility in an international context. Such processes also suggest alterations for faculty roles in the future: more time spent developing student learning outcomes and competencies, reviewing student credentials, and assessing prior learning and work.

Some questions to consider:

- How are projections for faculty retirements likely to affect the institution in coming years? What opportunities will retirements create for pursuing changes to faculty models and roles? What sorts of strategies, such as phased faculty retirements, might help to facilitate transitions when implementing new models?
- What sorts of roles, credentials, skills, knowledge, and experience will be sought in hiring new faculty members? What steps can be taken to begin incorporating changes in faculty roles as new hires are brought into the institution? How will they be supported throughout their careers to ensure they can make contributions to key institutional goals?
- How can future models and faculty roles continue to respond to the changing landscape after they are designed and implemented? What duties will faculty members have to the institution and others?

Continued on next page.

Some questions to consider (continued):

- How can a potential change or redesign of faculty models and roles help the institution to weather economic uncertainty such as changes in state appropriations or enrollments?
- What role can technology play in future faculty workforce and role redesign?
- What effect, if any, do globalization and international competition in the higher education sector have on the institution today? What impact might they have on the development of new faculty models and roles in the future?

7

EXPERIMENTS FROM THE FIELD AND ALTERNATIVE MODELS

Any yet-to-emerge efforts to redesign faculty models and roles will not be the first. Experiments have taken place over the years at institutions such as The Evergreen State College, Hampshire College, and the University of Texas of the Permian Basin, which have produced new contract types, roles, and appointments for faculty—often without including any form of tenure (Chait & Ford, 1982). These thoughtful experiments were often driven by innovations in thinking about goals for faculty work (e.g., to be more interdisciplinary or to focus more on teaching), but some new models have also been brought about by financial necessity. Beyond these historical examples of experimentation, there are other current campuses (and multi-campus projects and systems) experimenting with new models or approaches, although largely limited at present to small pilot studies that have not been scaled up. In general, such experiments have not yet been studied for efficacy or used to inform any major projects aimed at rethinking faculty roles. We recognize that additional experiments are likely emerging that remain undocumented to date. Our hope is that this report and the discussions it will prompt can lift up these emerging efforts and others to spread new ideas about how faculty models and roles might be changed for the future.

In this section we outline a few existing experiments, a combination of full models and potential components of future models that do not yet exist. We do not present these examples as the only options or as strict guidelines for the form and function of potential future faculty models, nor do we endorse any specific models or components among these. Additionally, it is important for us to note that many of these alternatives to the current, dominant faculty models and roles have not been thoroughly studied to understand how closely they are aligned to the essential faculty attributes we described earlier in this report. We simply present these experiments as ideas to inspire new and creative thinking about alternative approaches to the current models and, perhaps, to create renewed interest in studying such alternatives in order to better understand their benefits and to promote well-informed efforts to advance change. We begin with broader models that have been

We present these experiments as a reminder that there are alternative approaches already in place in higher education that deviate from the norm, and we hope that these models will inspire new and creative thinking about the future of the faculty.

adopted in part or in full on some campuses; the later examples we present are more isolated approaches or adaptations that do not quite constitute complete alternative faculty models, but may be of some help in promoting some creative thinking about different options and alternatives.

MODELS

As noted above, these first cases are among the most complete examples of alternative models that currently exist. The first two examples are likely the most familiar, since they have already shaped the work and roles of faculty on many campuses, although to different degrees.

Ernest Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered model

Ernest Boyer's vision for the faculty, as captured in his landmark work, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, helped to reframe discussions about a variety of aspects related to faculty roles and rewards. The report, organized around four key aspects of faculty roles—discovery, integration, application, and teaching—calls upon higher education leaders and the faculty to consider which aspects of faculty work are essential for improving the overall quality of education provided by our institutions, as well as how those activities are rewarded. Boyer's report enlarged the debate, and it contributed to the generation of fresh ideas about how to thoughtfully integrate personal and institutional priorities in the work of the faculty. *Scholarship Reconsidered* has shaped the higher education landscape and faculty roles in varying ways at different institutions; one of the first and most prominent examples of the implementation of Boyer's ideas is Portland State University, which is well known for having institutionalized these reforms in the mid-1990s (O'Meara, 2006; Rueter & Bauer, 2005). Beyond Portland, the Boyer model is widespread; Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) collected data at several hundred institutions that had adopted a Boyer faculty model with varying degrees of implementation.

In 1990, Portland State University began using Boyer's ideas to explore opportunities to expand the definitions of scholarship used to evaluate and reward faculty work (Rueter & Bauer, 2005). The reforms that emerged from that period have become part of a larger and continuing effort to transform the institution by more closely aligning the curriculum, academic programs, promotion and tenure guidelines, and community engagement to its unique urban mission (Zlotkowski & Williams, 2003). By drawing on Boyer's model of the professoriate for faculty policies and practices—and always focusing on service of the institution's distinctive mission—Portland State University has been able to maximize the unique contributions of its individual faculty members to the institution, its students, and the community. Multiple forms of scholarship are recognized now, and all faculty, regardless of rank, are responsible for articulating and continuously developing their own evolving agendas for scholarship (Portland State University, 1996). The university's Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases and similar policies at the department level specifically define the various scholarly activities and aspects of faculty work, including how they are evaluated. In this way, faculty members are fully apprised of expectations for their work and how it will be assessed.

The way that Portland State University has implemented these reforms to meet its urban mission also honors Boyer's (1990) call for colleges and universities to be less imitative, encouraging them to take pride in their unique attributes and missions. If other institutions more closely aligned their faculty roles to Boyer's model, it would similarly create opportunities to form

definitions of scholarship and faculty work that meet a broad array of distinctive missions and needs.

Summary Points:

- Emphasizes a more complete model for faculty scholarship and engagement through roles in discovery, integration, application, and teaching.
- Encourages and rewards faculty for engaging in a broad range of scholarly activities.
- The model has been implemented in varying degrees at institutions across the country.

Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty model

Full-time non-tenure-track faculty positions are an increasingly common fixture in higher education, and they are utilized at most higher education institutions today. When they are well supported, full-time non-tenure-track faculty can contribute to successful student outcomes similar to those achieved by tenure-track faculty (Figlio, Schapiro, & Soter, 2013).²⁰ Some thought leaders in higher education have advocated for hiring greater numbers of full-time non-tenure-track faculty with the goal of reducing our reliance on—and perhaps exploitation of—part-time faculty. While part-time positions are the most common hires today, we have seen in recent years a rise in full-time non-tenure-track positions, which now comprise a majority of all new full-time faculty hires, outpacing even tenure-track positions (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The profile of a full-time non-tenure-track faculty position is typically focused on only one area of the traditional trilogy of faculty responsibilities—teaching, research, or service. Under this model, faculty roles are specialized and unbundled. Most full-time non-tenure-track faculty positions—70%—are dedicated to teaching (Lechuga, 2006). In fact, full-time non-tenure-track faculty members now make up nearly one-fifth of instructional faculty positions across nonprofit institutions in the United States. Other positions are designed for research only, typically in the sciences and in health fields, where both clinical and research appointments off the tenure track are growing exponentially. Some non-tenure-track faculty positions are more administrative, focused, for example, on program development in a new area of study, such as health information systems. Originally, full-time non-tenure-track faculty positions were created to focus on special and short-term needs, such as fulfilling research grants, teaching in areas with growing enrollments, or program development. Given the use of these positions today, it is clear that, similar to the adjunct model, this appointment type has grown beyond its original intended purposes.

Full-time non-tenure-track faculty members typically are hired on an annual basis, but some have multi-year contracts, often for three to five years. Such longer contracts provide some job security, offer stability for planning courses and curricula, and allow more time for carrying out the service and leadership work formerly done by tenure-track faculty. For institutions, this model provides flexibility to make changes based on enrollments, revenues, and state budget allocations. Studies of full-time non-tenure-track faculty show that their working conditions tend to be closer to those of tenure-track faculty; they typically have just one institutional affiliation, are often eligible for health and other benefits, have salaries closer to those of tenure-track faculty, and are more knowledgeable about institutional goals and outcomes—they are present at their institutions and involved in campus activities and decision-making. Although these roles are already in use on many campuses, the numbers of full-time

²⁰ While this study was of a single and well-resourced institution, we anticipate further studies will also find similar outcomes, as other studies have identified that the main problems associated with non-tenure-track faculty are tied to poor working conditions, rather than to low-quality teaching skills.

non-tenure-track positions could be increased on other campuses, particularly as a means for reducing reliance on part-time or adjunct faculty work.

Several institutions are currently undertaking efforts to convert some of their adjunct faculty positions to positions with full-time non-tenure-track contracts. Several years ago, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) combined many part-time positions to create full-time appointments that offer better salaries, benefits, and opportunities for promotion; these lecturers also receive better support, such as professional development funds to attend conferences, and they are included in faculty governance and departmental decision-making. Southern New Hampshire University's College of Online and Continuing Education, which serves 37,000 students and has typically relied on a large number of adjunct faculty to provide instruction, also recently announced plans to expand a pilot program to hire 45 new full-time faculty members, who will focus on teaching and providing direct student support (Kolowich, 2014).²¹ This program's instructors, who will work remotely, will each teach four courses during five eight-week terms and receive a non-teaching term to develop courses and participate in other activities. Instructors will receive a salary that is modest in comparison to tenure-track faculty, but it will still be much more than typical adjunct salaries in their fields. Their jobs will be potentially more stable than those of adjuncts, and they will also receive benefits from the institution. The institution also notes it is committed to protecting their academic freedom.

Summary Points:

- Provides greater job security to faculty members who are employed off the tenure track, as well as better pay and access to benefits.
- Ensures that these faculty members receive access to professional development and are more meaningfully engaged in service activities and the life of the campus community.

Medical School model

The prospect of greater flexibility and support in faculty roles, often institutionalized through long-term non-tenure-track contracts, holds some promise for increasing the efficacy of current, adjunct-dependent faculty models. Such a shift has already taken place in most medical schools, which could serve as a model for higher education more broadly. Volatility in the health care market—such as greater financial uncertainty, changes in health care delivery and reimbursement, and changing workforce demands—have caused medical schools to continually reconsider their faculty models and the policies and practices governing faculty roles over the last several decades (Bunton & Mallon, 2007). Medical schools have made a number of major shifts in the last ten years, including moving away from a hierarchy of seniority status, addressing inequitable working conditions, and creating more differentiation among employee tracks and roles to better fit the needs of medical education and alleviate internal tensions among roles (Bunton & Mallon, 2007).

New faculty positions and pathways have been created to meet the complex missions of medical schools, which often include providing patient care and conducting research, in addition to educating future medical professionals. Faculty positions are commonly organized into three main tracks: research, education, and clinical. Faculty members holding appointments in any of these three tracks have primary responsibilities for that particular area of practice, but they may still spend some of their time attending to the others, as determined in their contracts. The tracks are afforded equal status, and institutions have worked to redefine past cultural norms

²¹ None of the faculty members in the College of Online and Continuing Education hold tenure-track appointments.

that prioritized research—and, often, clinical practice as well—over education. Faculty members are also commonly included in the governance process and given voting rights, regardless of track, position, or rank. Finally, all three tracks are usually ensured equitable working conditions, with similar salaries, benefits, and support in the workplace. Increasingly, these positions are non-tenure-track; the number of tenured and tenure-track appointments, while still present, have been limited by the availability of funding (Bickel, 1991; Bunton & Mallon, 2007). As such, tenure-track appointments are often reserved for a small number of faculty members who conduct basic science research—on the research track—as a way to protect their academic freedom. Even in these positions, greater flexibility has been incorporated through tenure clock-stopping policies and probationary period extensions. In some models, an alternate “undeclared” track allows early-career faculty in tenure-track positions additional time to secure research grants or set up research labs before formally beginning their probationary periods.

Some critics suggest that this may not be a viable model for consideration outside of medical schools, because medical schools are unique units with different budgetary circumstances and missions. Still, some of the types of changes that have been made might be useful to consider for leaders in other areas; such a discussion might inspire additional innovations and changes to improve the faculty for the future.

Summary Points:

- Breaks down hierarchies in status among the faculty and draws upon the different contributions of faculty members with varying sets of skills and expertise through three specialized faculty tracks. Faculty members have equitable working conditions, with similar salaries, benefits, and support in the workplace, as well as opportunities to participate in governance.
- Ensures that faculty can be effectively engaged in helping to meet a broad range of institutional missions and goals.

Interdisciplinary Faculty Collaboration model

Some institutions have designed faculty models and roles that emphasize greater interdisciplinarity. The Evergreen State College, for example, has long been known for its focus on interdisciplinarity and designs for undergraduate education that promote high-quality teaching and learning. Evergreen’s coordinated study programs—15-credit-hour programs that span the entire term—are collaborative teaching arrangements that bring instructors from different disciplines together to teach students in interdisciplinary learning communities (Smith, 1988). Teaching in the program constitutes a full course load for each of the three or four faculty members involved, and it is a full term of credits for the students in the course. The faculty members work as a team to collaboratively plan and teach the courses in the coordinated study program, which typically enroll 70-80 students. This approach has been suggested as a relatively low-cost way to improve the curriculum and increase student engagement, commitment, and retention, while also fostering faculty vitality (Smith, 1988).

These arrangements have also contributed to greater collegiality and community among the faculty participating in collaborative teaching; the feelings of isolation that faculty on many campuses experience are overcome, as faculty members work together and relate to one another as specialists, educators, and collaborators (National Institute of Education, 1984; Smith, 1988). Evergreen faculty members benefit from extensive professional development opportunities and, at times, they have opportunities to participate in exchange visits to other campuses to work in similar interdisciplinary teaching teams. These faculty development

experiences expand their knowledge and help them to build new skills through working with a new group of faculty members and students on a variety of topics of study. The culture of collegiality is further promoted by a social contract, signed by all students, faculty, administrators, and staff, that outlines individual and community rights and responsibilities.

The Evergreen State College is a unique institution; it has never had a tenure track in place for the faculty (however, more than 70% of the faculty are employed in full-time positions) and students do not receive traditional grades. Yet, proponents advocate that the collaborative and interdisciplinary model that has been developed there could be implemented at other institutions. Through the Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, which was founded at and is housed by Evergreen, this approach has been shared with numerous other institutions throughout the state of Washington and the rest of the country.

Summary Points:

- Promotes interdisciplinarity, as well as greater collegiality and collaboration across units, by utilizing team teaching approaches that expose faculty and students alike to different perspectives inside and outside the classroom.
- Engages faculty members in extensive professional development and opportunities to work with colleagues on other campuses in order to share effective practices and learn from different approaches.
- Provides meaningful engagement of faculty in a range of scholarly activities and development opportunities, even though a tenure-track model has never been in place at the institution.

APPROACHES AND ADAPTATIONS

Whereas the models above provide more complete, fully implemented designs for the faculty, the following examples are approaches and adaptations that have been adopted as experimental modifications to current faculty roles. Although these do not constitute more complete faculty models, they may still offer interesting ideas or inspiration for components that could be included in a future faculty model. These approaches and adaptations show how leaders at some institutions have started to work at the margins to experiment and innovate in order to address their institutions' challenges and contribute to more thoughtfully designed and sustainable arrangements.

Creativity Contracts

The idea of the creativity contract is another one of the core concepts presented in Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*. At institutions utilizing creativity contracts, faculty members work with their department chairs or program directors to define professional goals to be pursued over a period of usually three or five years, within the scope of their current positions (Boyer, 1990). During that time, faculty members might shift the primary focus of their work from one scholarly activity to another; for example, a faculty member might focus most of her attention on traditional research activities for several years, then spend a year gathering a broad base of literature and writing a textbook. The faculty member might next transition into more of a teaching role for the remainder of the contract. When negotiating her next creativity contract term, she might choose to take the knowledge she has gained from an intensive focus on teaching to help with redesigning the curriculum and creating new course materials, before she then transitions back into focusing primarily on conducting and publishing research. These more flexible role arrangements allow faculty members to pursue a variety of scholarly activities over

a period of time, rather than engage with the same set of activities continuously for many years. Thus, expectations placed on faculty members and the criteria used to evaluate productivity may become highly customized under creativity contracts, varying according to the goals that are mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the department chair, dean, or other academic administrator.

O'Meara (2005) notes that adoption of such arrangements has increased over the last several years among colleges and universities, and they have been most popular at research universities. Creativity contracts have not been adopted as frequently as some other types of innovations, but chief academic officers at a growing number of institutions have reported incorporating flexible workload programs—based in part on the ideas of the creativity contract—into their faculty models. Creativity contracts have been a way to help stimulate innovations among the faculty and to protect faculty members from burning out as a result of increasing—and, some might say, unrealistic—expectations that they excel in the often disconnected areas of their work—research, teaching, and service—all at once.

Summary Points:

- Expectations and goals for faculty members' work are determined in consultation with department chairs for a period of several years.
- Allows faculty members to participate in a broader range of scholarly activities over the course of their careers, and rewards them for engaging in new and creative work beyond traditional roles for teaching, research, and service obligations from time to time.

Technology-Assisted Instruction

Some approaches make greater use of technology and paraprofessionals to enable the faculty better to meet institutional goals. For example, in recent years the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT) has promoted a different method for providing instruction that utilizes pedagogical practices, information technology, and paraprofessionals (e.g., technicians, instructional designers, and course assistants) to reduce costs, while simultaneously improving students' engagement in their own learning and increasing the amount of individualized attention students receive.²² The model reduces costs by cutting down on the amount of time faculty members spend formulating and delivering courses, freeing up time for activities that are better matched to their expertise, such as research or helping students develop critical thinking skills by applying material in class. This ensures that faculty members can attend to their work more actively and effectively; it strips out some of the tasks related to teaching that can be better facilitated by technology or paraprofessionals. Interactive online lectures and small group work are utilized, for example, to allow faculty members to make better use of time in the classroom; traditional lectures where students passively take notes on the instructor's presentation can be replaced with more active teaching and learning approaches that improve student learning. Courses that have been redesigned according to this strategy range from fully online courses to more traditional courses that incorporate instructional software and online activities to enhance the quality of instruction.

Another way that the NCAT approach helps to reduce faculty time spent providing instruction is by making greater use of paraprofessionals. While faculty members still have the principal role in their courses, additional instructional personnel can be employed to support

²² Institutions where the NCAT course redesign approach has been implemented have seen significant cost reductions—an average of 34%—and increased course completion rates, improved retention, and greater satisfaction among students and faculty members.

development and delivery of content and to provide individualized assistance and feedback to students. New positions have included undergraduate learning assistants, course assistants, early intervention specialists, preceptors, and course coordinators. Often, these paraprofessionals are well-trained individuals with expertise in effective pedagogies; their skills in designing course assignments and engaging students may exceed those of the faculty members they support. These additional instructional personnel build relationships with the students in the courses and provide direct assistance by tracking their progress and working one-on-one to support learning.

Summary Points:

- Utilizes a range of innovative pedagogical practices, information technology, and paraprofessionals to help actively engage students in the learning process.
- Frees up time for instructors to devote to providing direct support to students who need it, as well as participating in other activities such as research and service.

Collaborative Hybrid approach

Rio Salado College, another online college with some hybrid courses, has a mostly part-time faculty model, with a small group of about 25 full-time faculty that provides leadership for the overall curriculum. There is only one full-time faculty member in each core discipline or field, and that person helps provide support by managing the part-time faculty within each area. Classroom technology, student advising, testing, and other assessment strategies have been unbundled into separate divisions. Faculty members' roles are narrowly focused on course development and teaching the curriculum—content delivery and applying their knowledge in courses. The institution places a strong emphasis on creating collaboration across the various units—technology, assessment, faculty, advising, and support. Leaders at Rio Salado acknowledge that this level of collaboration is quite unusual in higher education, and that it would be hard to export this model to other institutions. The institution was structured and designed to be collaborative from its inception. The student population at Rio Salado is largely comprised of women over 30 who are returning to get degrees or certifications; most students work full time, have a family, and are trying to manage multiple responsibilities.

Rio Salado has a unique mission designed to serve particular student populations. Its innovative approaches to teaching and learning reflect those specific circumstances. The revised models of faculty roles was produced to fit more closely to the goals college leaders are trying to achieve. However, Rio Salado's leaders have been able to launch these strategies in part because the institution was established as entirely new; it has not been a task of shifting the policies and structures already in place at an existing institution.

Summary Points:

- Although many of the faculty at Rio Salado College are employed on a part-time basis, the institution draws upon a group of full-time faculty to direct the curriculum and provide support to instructors.
- Classroom technology, student advising, testing, and other assessment strategies have been unbundled into separate divisions.
- Active collaboration among full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and other units tasked with supporting instruction and student support is expected.

Shared Faculty Consortium Agreements

In some cases, colleges and universities are working together to meet collective and individual institutional needs. For example, a decades-old consortium agreement among five neighboring colleges in New England has created opportunities for faculty members with full-time appointments to be hired to provide instruction at multiple institutions, rather than each institution hiring its own part-time faculty to meet the same needs (Five Colleges Consortium, 2014; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).²³ Budget constraints limited the capabilities of each individual institution to hire new faculty, so the five colleges combined resources to hire a group of professors who are shared among them. Although the colleges started out by exchanging professors from their existing faculties, they are now jointly hiring full-time faculty members; some of these faculty members are on the tenure-track, and others are full-time non-tenure-track faculty with three-year contracts and the possibility of transitioning into tenure-track appointments.

These shared professors call one of the five institutions home; at their home institutions, they teach on a part-time basis, hold office hours, and are evaluated for contract renewal or tenure. Additionally, every semester each of these professors teaches an additional course at one of the other four colleges. Faculty members are able to access facilities and resources at each of the institutions where they teach; when they are away from their home institution, they utilize shared office space to ensure they have a place to work and meet with students, as needed. The colleges in the consortium also maintain a shared series of faculty seminars where faculty members from the five institutions can come together to discuss their scholarly interests and other issues pertaining to the curriculum.

Summary Points:

- Consortium agreements between institutions allows faculty members who would otherwise be employed on separate part-time contracts to be hired on a full-time basis with responsibilities for providing teaching and service at multiple institutions.
- Allows for greater job security for employees, but also continuity and flexibility for the institutions. The agreements also permit these faculty members to draw upon resources and services at each of the institutions they work with, as well as to receive opportunities for evaluation and promotion at their home institution.

It is important to note that many of these models and approaches do not meet all of our criteria for strengthening the role of faculty in serving the public good, nor do they meet all the requirements of professionalism and the five essential elements we have outlined above. Whereas the Interdisciplinary Faculty Collaboration model and Five Colleges Consortium approach do meet many of the criteria, the approaches used at Western Governors University and Rio Salado College do not—at least not explicitly. These alternative models and approaches are not perfect, although they do have their merits. One of the challenges we face in crafting new faculty models and roles for the future is the inability to see past the current faculty model. Therefore, we present these experiments as a reminder that there are alternative approaches already in place in higher education that deviate from the norm, and we hope that these models will inspire new and creative thinking—and, perhaps some debate and discussion—about the future of the faculty. Campus leaders might borrow aspects of these models, while working through the redesign process to come up with their own new ideas.

²³ The shared faculty arrangements are part of a larger resource-sharing agreement among the five colleges. Information about the Five Colleges Consortium can be found at <http://www.fivecolleges.edu/>.

There are also many important ideas about changes in the academic profession that have not yet been formally implemented anywhere, but that need to be introduced and included in these discussions, as well. For example, some suggest that faculty careers in the future may be more impermanent; faculty may increasingly move back and forth between higher education and industry or other professions outside the academy. It may not always be the preferred model for faculty to spend their entire careers working within a single academic institution. Some professional schools and non-traditional fields have greater potential for this type of exchange to occur; in fact, this sort of movement may already be happening. However, recent reports from disciplinary societies and other groups involved in the preparation of doctoral students suggest that graduate students are increasingly interested in jobs outside of higher education and may desire greater flexibility to pursue multiple career pathways over the course of their lives.

8

COLLECTIVE INPUT, SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES: FUNDING THE FUTURE FACULTY

If changes are pursued to redesign the faculty model—or even just to tweak the existing tenure system—there will be questions about how to fund these efforts. Many of the challenges that are emerging from the current dominant faculty models—tenure-track and adjunct—stem from an assumption held by many that the lowest-cost model is inherently the most desirable. The implication that often accompanies this view is that faculty—particularly adjunct faculty—are the only ones who should sacrifice to keep personnel costs at manageable levels. Higher education leaders and the faculty have a responsibility for prudent stewardship of the resources invested in our colleges and universities; on this point all should be in agreement. However, it is important to ensure that the faculty model in which institutions invest is appropriately designed and supported to meet both the research, teaching, and service missions of our institutions and the outcomes that are expected by students, families, policymakers, community leaders, and the public at large. In this report, we have advocated that institutional change efforts solicit input from a broader range of stakeholders than has been involved in any earlier attempt to redesign or change faculty models and roles. We believe that this pluralism of views is essential for designing the faculty model to be viable in the long term and to respond to concerns and calls for accountability that seem to grow more persistent as time goes on. It is a much-needed gesture of goodwill for the academy to demonstrate its willingness to reach out to public stakeholders, showing our critics that we have a genuine concern that our future faculty models deliver on the ambitious promises we make in our institutional mission and vision statements. It will also help our institutions by aligning the work of the faculty a little more closely with the needs of our communities and society, thus providing more faithful service to the public good. This is the right thing for us to do, but our institutions—and, more importantly, the tuition-paying students and their families—should not be expected to shoulder this burden on their own.

Just as realigning faculty roles brings benefits not only to administrators and the faculty, but to the public, as well, this process can only be supported by shared responsibility. If the model is redesigned to best serve such a wide range of stakeholders, then the costs should be shared. In this chapter, we briefly describe how various stakeholders can partner to fund a redesign of faculty models and roles. Yet, there will need to be systems of accountability and encouragement to ensure that the cost for this work does not fall on any single group. If this happens, it is unlikely that the new faculty model can sustain itself in the future. Adequate funding and continued public collaboration are absolutely necessary for these efforts to succeed.

Taxpayer Responsibility

In many states, funding for public higher education has declined over the last several decades, particularly as pressures to fund other public obligations—e.g., pensions, healthcare, and prisons—have grown. Higher education has often weathered substantial cuts, and the burden of paying for the operations of our institutions has increasingly shifted to private sources of funding—especially tuition. Until states begin to allocate adequate funding for higher education, institutions will continue to feel pressure to create the lowest-cost faculty model, rather than the faculty model that is most capable of achieving the institutional research, teaching, and service missions. The leaders of a few states understand this, and they have taken the lead in allocating additional funding for higher education institutions; they recognize that the investments will support their states' strategic goals for workforce development and economic prosperity. As this new state funding is made available, some institutions have already started to invest more money in the faculty. For example, the recent California State University Graduation Initiative has allocated funding for 700 new full-time faculty positions and additional funds to provide better support for existing faculty members. Leaders of that system have recognized that these investments will enable the faculty of the future to play an essential role in achieving goals for student learning, retention, and completion. We believe that such investments are critical to ensure the future success of the higher education enterprise, but also to support the success of our communities, our states, and the nation as a whole.

Pluralism of views is essential for designing the faculty model to be viable in the long term and to respond to concerns and calls for accountability that seem to grow more persistent as time goes on.

Institutional Responsibility

If the higher education sector is to receive a greater allocation of public funds, our institutions are going to have to do a better job of prioritizing funding for instruction and ensuring that the faculty we have in place is appropriately designed and supported to meet many other goals. Historically, the last 30 years have seen institutional expenditures for athletics, auxiliary services, and research increase substantially as a share of institutional budgets. Expenditures in non-instructional academic areas, such as student and academic services, have also grown in response to calls for greater student completion. During the same period, expenditures for instruction have typically remained flat—and they have even decreased in some cases. The public has expressed ample concern about college costs and expenditures in recent years, but it has not been instruction or spending on the faculty that has driven up those costs; rather, costs have soared due to a variety of other expenditures, some of which are only tangentially related to institutional missions. While declining public appropriations, and the accompanying shift to more heavily tuition-based funding models, have been responsible for much of the increase in college costs, it is also the case that institutional priorities for non-essential programs, such as athletics, have also contributed.

Campuses would benefit from examining their expenses and revenue streams and comparing them to the national statistics, compiled in reports created by organizations such as the Delta Cost Project (<http://www.deltacostproject.org/>). Reports such as these allow campuses

to contextualize their allocations to different priorities, relative to national averages. Institutions can also review Delta Cost Project data that suggest that expenditures on the academic mission and instruction have mostly remained flat or declined over the last 30 years, while expenses in other categories are increasing, sometimes dramatically. In light of these data, the economic imperative to hire cheap faculty labor can be interpreted as a choice to pursue other institutional objectives, such as becoming more competitive in sports, in research, or in fundraising and marketing. A recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education noted a study by Jeff Smith that suggested that, at dozens of institutions, one out of every five tuition dollars goes to fund athletics programs (Blumenstyk, 2014). The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success has also prepared resources, such as *Dispelling the Myths: Locating the Resources Needed to Support Non-Tenure-Track Faculty*, which provide examples of institutions and state systems that have undertaken efforts to examine their budgets and prioritize the academic mission by redirecting funds to provide better support for instruction.

Foundations' Responsibility

As we noted in the introduction, there have only been a few research studies conducted to contribute to our understanding of faculty models and roles. More research will surely be needed to provide evidence that can stimulate new experimentation and guide decision-making, as leaders set out to determine the right faculty models for their institutions' and communities' diverse and increasingly complex needs. Research can also be helpful to determine the viability and scalability of new models that emerge through the process described in this report. In any event, it will be difficult to proceed unless we close the substantial gap in research on these topics. Higher education leaders should appeal to foundations, federal agencies, and other funding groups to increase support of research to study faculty roles, as well as to study the relationship between roles and issues such as student success. Foundations and other such groups have a stake in the future vitality of the faculty, and they should take on a role in this work by promoting and funding research to inform changes, particularly early on. This will ensure that evidence is available to make sound decisions that serve our institutions, the faculty, and, most importantly, our students and communities well in the long term.

In addition to providing funding to support necessary research, foundations can also have an important role in supporting institutions' efforts to develop and implement new faculty models.

Faculty Responsibility

Faculty members must be willing to consider models that help lower institutional costs. The current rise in adjunct and contingent faculty positions has placed a disproportionate burden on new faculty, and this has in part been a result of the unwillingness of tenure-track faculty to engage in conversations about ways to reconstruct faculty roles to lower institutions' costs. There has been resistance to compromises that could help meet the challenges that institutions currently face, such as decreasing public funding, enrollment fluctuations, public concern around graduation and retention, and other pressures that lead institutions to alter or modify faculty roles. Rather than engaging in discussion, established faculty members have shunned administrators who have sought to make changes, considering them to be "dangerous." Votes of no confidence and threats of unionization have often been the results when administrators have initiated a discussion of alteration of faculty roles. Tenure-track faculty

members should be willing to engage in conversations about different models, especially long-term contracts that retain firm protections for academic freedom, integrate technology more smoothly, and revamp reward structures to increase priorities for key activities such as teaching. Meanwhile, non-tenure-track faculty members should not become enamored with the tenure-track faculty role as the only acceptable model for their own futures. Openness to other models that can support institutional missions and student success will help the enterprise be successful, and it is the only way to improve conditions for the majority of current faculty, as well.

CONCLUSION

In this report, we have sought to put forward the argument that change is necessary, and we have provided a process for undertaking an effort to redesign faculty roles—or at least to tune the existing model that is in place to better meet the goals of our institutions. We have attempted to take into account a wide range of important factors that should be discussed and considered along the way; however, this process can ultimately only unfold according to the particular interests and needs of an institution, the individuals who work there, and the communities that are served. The backward design process—identifying the desired outcomes, examining the current faculty model, and developing a plan for redesigning the faculty—presents a method for considering what the faculty ought to look like in order for an institution to address its various stakeholder priorities and the important aspects of its mission.

We believe that the goals of this work are more likely to be achieved when a diverse group of stakeholders are involved and engaged in the redesign process. For that reason, we recommend, as an important first step, to assemble a diverse and collaborative team—perhaps a commission or task force—that includes individuals who can speak to the interests of students, the faculty, administrators, policymakers, community members, and other stakeholders. This team will need to identify important goals contained in the institutional mission and culture, and it will have to incorporate into discussion mandates from government entities and issues that are voiced by stakeholders. The campus leaders who engage in these discussions will have an important responsibility to consider how the faculty currently in place might be helping or hindering attainment of those goals. For this step, you might find it helpful to reference the Delphi Project’s resources, including the discussion guide *Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on Our Campus: A Guide for Campus Task Forces to Better Understand Faculty*

By engaging in discussions across various higher education stakeholder constituencies, multiple voices can contribute to the larger movement to reimagine the future of the faculty.

Working Conditions and the Necessity of Change. It will also be necessary to consider how the essential elements of faculty roles can be supported at the institution, while taking into account how different factors might continue to shape faculty work for years to come. The outcomes of this process will have the potential to affect every part of the institution. In order to be successful, many different stakeholders will need to be continuously engaged in discussion, contributing their thoughts and ideas to the development of a proposal for changing the faculty; this will build an important sense of ownership for helping to implement the new plan.

We are optimistic about the potential for this process to improve institutions’ efforts to achieve the aspirations set forth in their missions and to serve the public good. Some institutions have already undertaken efforts to more intentionally draw upon the talents of the

faculty, coming up with new faculty models and roles with these goals in mind. We presented several examples of alternative approaches that have been developed and implemented. It is our hope that by following through the backward design process, more institutions will formulate

their own innovative approaches and alternatives to the current faculty arrangements, contributing additional examples upon which the next campuses to engage in this process can build. With widespread retirements looming, there is currently great potential for change on campuses; taking action at this time may even present a competitive advantage, as the next generation of faculty bring to their institutions new approaches and ideas about faculty work.

We have deliberately tailored this report as a resource to facilitate thoughtful discussions and intentional efforts to change faculty models at the institutional level. However, we also believe that a broader, more systemic discussion about the future of the faculty must ultimately take place to guide changes across higher education, overall. We are confident this can happen if higher education stakeholders can look past their differences and disagreements and acknowledge that a shift away from the current bifurcated system we have in place today would be in the best interest not only for the faculty, but also for our students, for our communities, and for the long-term viability of our institutions and of the enterprise of higher learning. Perhaps the alternative models and roles that are emerging or have already emerged, such as those described in Chapter 7, can serve to inform and inspire future attempts to create a vision and a plan for the future faculty at the institutional and systemic levels.

For more widespread changes to occur—beyond experimental innovations at isolated institutions—there is a need for many other stakeholder groups to join discussions, contribute their ideas, and direct their efforts toward a collaborative movement to redesign faculty models and roles for the betterment of the enterprise as a whole. The scope and scale of this potential discussion, were it to occur, would be unrivaled in the history of higher education, and it would require the involvement of many more stakeholders, including national higher education organizations, membership associations, disciplinary societies, leaders from an array of different institutional types and missions, academic unions, trustees, policymakers, and others.

The issues that could be taken up by this wider gathering of stakeholders could compliment what we describe in this report, with each participant bringing capacities that would be pivotal to advancing discussion, thought, and action. Deliberations to promote necessary changes in faculty models and roles—at the sector-wide level—could draw on the following contributions:

1. An organization like the Council of Graduate Schools would be well suited to lead a discussion among graduate colleges and disciplinary societies about the numbers of Ph.D. students enrolled and degrees awarded, the interests and ambitions of graduate students today, and the appropriate preparation of graduate students required to fulfill changing faculty roles. These stakeholders of graduate education might also facilitate deliberation about the types of degrees that are needed for the faculty of the future. Do all faculty at all institutions need to hold a Ph.D.?
2. Disciplinary societies could have a greater role in promoting policies and practices that offer short-term support to faculty who are not on the tenure track, perhaps modeling their efforts on the longstanding work of the Modern Language Association on this issue.²⁴ Additionally, disciplinary societies could have a role in discussions about larger changes in faculty

²⁴ For more information on the efforts of the Modern Language Association, we recommend the MLA's Academic Workforce Advocacy Kit, available online at http://www.mla.org/advocacy_kit.

models and roles, identifying the faculty structures that may be necessary to meet the unique needs of their fields.

3. Regional and specialized accreditation organizations could examine and revise standards that relate to the faculty, and they could encourage institutions to engage in discussions of faculty redesign that lead to greater changes at the institution level.²⁵
4. State policymakers and federal agencies might examine their collection of data about faculty and encourage institutional leaders to use such data to promote discussions about how the faculty can better meet state goals and the public good.
5. The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges could facilitate the publication of resources for trustees, driving discussions that educate members of higher education boards about the problems associated with the current faculty model, about the challenges facing higher education in the future, and about ways to engage leaders of their institutions in a dialogue that can produce productive change on their campuses. Organizations like the American Council of Education might lead similar discussions with presidents and academic leaders, while serving as a hub for leaders to share innovative new ideas they have implemented on their campuses.
6. The American Association of University Professors and other higher education stakeholder organizations can facilitate joint discussions about the implications that a new faculty model would have for the future of tenure and academic freedom, exploring ways that these important principles—which have served higher education institutions and the public well for many years—can have a role moving forward. These discussions could also develop a better understanding among faculty about the concomitant responsibility—the responsibility to ensure that institutions serve the public good and maintain public trust—that accompanies academic freedom and the many other privileges faculty enjoy.
7. Organizations representing graduate students, including academic unions, disciplinary societies, and other groups, could engage their members in discussions about what current graduate students expect to achieve in their work as potential future faculty members. These discussions could help to identify what graduate students need from their institutions in order to achieve their goals and ambitions for serving their fields of study, institutions, students, and the public.
8. Organizations representing institutional researchers and human resources professionals could help to create and disseminate standards for data collection on the faculty to ensure that institutional leaders have access to the information they need to make important decisions about short- and long-term changes in the faculty. Human resources

²⁵ For recommendations, please see Kezar, Maxey, and Eaton, 2014, available online at http://www.uscrossier.org/pullias/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/CHEA_Examination_Changing_Faculty_2013.pdf

professionals could also catalogue and share best practices for addressing the needs of faculty and their institutions under both the current model and potential alternative models, thus ensuring that institutions have tools to draw upon for a smooth transition when undertaking changes.

9. Associations representing specific types of institutions, such as community colleges or land-grant universities, could also have a role in facilitating discussions about what changes in faculty models and roles might look like or mean for institutions in their sectors. This could help to define some clear standards among institutions that share similar missions and goals and serve similar constituencies, helping to promote wise decision-making that fully evaluates the implications of such changes for these institutions.
10. Finally, the faculty—the whole of the faculty—has a responsibility, at both institutional and sector-wide levels, to engage their colleagues in discussion about the future and to work collaboratively with other stakeholders to reconceive their roles and redefine what it means to be an academic professional in the 21st century, restoring respect for the profession by leading the effort to reform.

By engaging in discussions across various higher education stakeholder constituencies, multiple voices can contribute to the larger movement to reimagine the future of the faculty. New ideas can spur creative approaches to meet the needs of our institutions, to support the talented people who keep them running, and to benefit the communities they serve. This, we believe, is the most important step for moving forward—deliberate dialogue, followed by collective, intentional action.

REFERENCES

- American Federation of Teachers. (2009). *The American academic: The state of higher education workforce 1997-2007*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.
- Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2012). Explaining increases in higher education costs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 79(3), 268-295.
- Austin, A. (2011). *Promoting evidence-based change in undergraduate science education*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies National Research Council Board on Science Education.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; What we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1485-1509.
- Barnes, L. L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(4), 457-469.
- Benjamin, E. (2003). *Exploring the Role of Contingent Instructional Staff in Undergraduate Learning*. *New Directions for Higher Education* (No. 123). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bettinger, E., & Long, B. T. (2010). Does cheaper mean better? The impact of using adjunct instructors on student outcomes. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(3), 598-613.
- Bickel, J. (1991). The changing faces of promotion and tenure at U.S. medical schools. *Academic Medicine*, 66(5), 249-56.
- Blumenstyk, G. (2014). *American higher education in crisis? What everyone needs to know*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bunton, S. A., & Mallon, W. (2007). The continued evolution of faculty appointment and tenure policies at U.S. medical schools. *Academic Medicine*, 82(3), 281-289.
- Byrne, J. P. (2001). Academic freedom of part-time faculty. *Journal of College and University Law*, 27, 583.
- Byrne, J. P. (1997). *Academic freedom without tenure? Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Chait, R. P., & Ford, A. P. (1982). *Beyond traditional tenure: A guide to sound policies and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chait, R., & Trower, C. A. (1997). *Where tenure does not reign: Campuses with contract systems*. *New Pathways Working Paper Series*, no. 3. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

- Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (2012). A portrait of part-time faculty members: A summary of findings on part-time faculty respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce survey of contingent faculty members and instructors. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf
- Curtis, J. (2005). Inequities persist for women and non-tenure-track faculty: economic status of the profession, 2004-5. *Academe*, 91(2), 19-98.
- Dewey, J. (1915). The American Association of University Professors: Introductory address. *Science*, 41(1048), 147-151.
- Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2008). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, No. 0361-0365.
- Ehrenberg, R. L., & Zhang, L. (2004). Do tenured and non-tenure track faculty matter? National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper No. 10695.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Figlio, D. N., Schapiro, M. O., & Soter, K. B. (2013). Are tenure track professors better teachers? National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper No. 19406.
- Five Colleges Consortium. (2014). About the consortium. Retrieved from <https://www.fivecolleges.edu/consortium>.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gehrke, S., & Kezar, A. (in press). Unbundling the faculty role: A historical, theoretical and empirical review. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*.
- Gross, B., & Goldhaber, D. (2009). Community college transfer and articulation policies: Looking beneath the surface. Center on Reinventing Public Education, Working Paper No. 2009-1.
- Hall, S. R., Waitz, I., Brodeur, D. R., Soderholm, D. H., & Nasr, R. (2002). Adoption of active learning in a lecture-based engineering class. In *Frontiers in Education*, 2002. FIE 2002. 32nd Annual (Vol. 1, pp. T2A-9). IEEE.
- Harrington, C., & Schibik, T. (2001). Caveat Emptor: Is there a relationship between part-time faculty utilization and student learning retention? *Association for Institutional Research Files On-Line*, 91.
- Hollenshead, C., Waltman, J., August, L., Miller, J., Smith, G., & Bell, A. (2007). *Making the best of both worlds: Findings from a national institution-level survey on non-tenure-track faculty*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change*, 31(5), 10-15.

- Jacoby, D. (2006). The effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1081-1103.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review*, 36(3), 167-194.
- Katz, S. N. (2006). What has happened to the professoriate. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(7), B8-B11.
- Kezar, A. (2013). *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*. New York: Routledge.
- Kezar, A. J. (2005). Challenges for higher education in serving the public good. In A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, & J. C. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 23-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A. (2004). Obtaining integrity?: Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(4), 429-459.
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Faculty matter: So why doesn't everyone think so? *Thought & Action*, 2014, 29-44.
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2012). Governance as a catalyst for change: Creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy*, 24, 500-533.
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experiences, and plans of action. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 36(4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolowich, S. (2014). Southern New Hampshire U. designs a new template for faculty jobs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 60(35).
- Lechuga, V. M. (2006). *The changing landscape of the academic profession: The culture of faculty at for-profit colleges and universities*. New York: Routledge.
- MacGregor, J. (1990). Collaborative learning: Shared inquiry as a process of reform. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 1990(42), 19-30.
- Marits, E. J. (1996). Professional development of adjunct faculty. In V. Bianco-Mathis, & N. Chalofsky (Eds.), *The Adjunct Faculty Handbook* (pp. 221-226). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Massy, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1994). Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the "academic ratchet." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65, 1-22.
- McTighe, J., & Thomas, R. S. (2003). Backward design for forward action. *Educational Leadership*, 60(5), 52-55.
- Millis, B. J., & Cottell Jr., P. G. (1997). *Cooperative learning for higher education faculty*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04): Background characteristics, work activities, and compensation of instructional faculty and staff: Fall 2003. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.
- National Institute of Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education. Final report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.
- O'Meara, K. (2005). Effects of encouraging multiple forms of scholarship nationwide and across institutional types. In K.A. O'Meara & R.E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Meara, K. (2006). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Have academic cultures really changed? In J. Braxton (Ed.), *Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship* (pp. 77-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Paswan, A. K., & Young, J. A. (2002). Student evaluation of instructor: A nomological investigation using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 24(3), 193-202.
- Parsons, T. (1968). The professions. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), *The encyclopaedia of social sciences*. New York: Macmillan.
- Plater, W. M. (2008). The twenty-first-century professoriate. *Academe*, 94(4), 35-40.
- Plater, W., Saltmarsh, J., & Rice, R. E. (2014). Reflections on the public good and academic professionalism. In G. G. Shaker (Ed.), *Faculty work and the public good: Philanthropy, engagement, and academic professionalism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Portland State University. (1996). Policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty for tenure, promotion, and merit increases. Retrieved from <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/files/PT%20Guidelines%20%204-23-2014.pdf>.
- Rice, R. E. (2005). The future of the scholarly work of faculty. In K. O'Meara and R. E. Rice (Eds.), *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship* (pp. 303-312). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rice, R. E., & Austin, A. E. (1988). High faculty morale: What exemplary colleges do right. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 20(2), 50-58.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation. *Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Rueter, J., & Bauer, T. N. (2005). Identifying and managing university assets: A campus study of Portland State University. *PDXScholar*.
- Rutz, C., Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., & Willett, G. (2012). Faculty professional development and student learning: What is the relationship? *Change*, 44(3), 40-47.

- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, B. L. (1988). *The Washington Center: A grass roots approach to faculty development and curricular reform*. To Improve the Academy. Paper 158.
- Street, S., Maisto, M., Merves, E., & Rhoades, G. (2012). *Who is Professor "Staff?" and how can this person teach so many classes?* Center for the Future of Higher Education.
- Sullivan, W. (2005). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Toutkoushian, R. K., & Bellas, M. L. (2003). The effects of part-time employment and gender on faculty earnings and satisfaction: Evidence from the NSOPF: 93. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(2), 172-195.
- Townsend, R. (2007). *Summary of Data from Surveys by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce*. Coalition on the Academic Workforce.
- Umbach, P. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 91-123.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Zlotkowski, E., & Williams, D. (2003). The faculty role in civic engagement. *Peer Review*, 5(3), 9-11.

About the Earl and Pauline Pullias Center for Higher Education

The Pullias Center for Higher Education is an interdisciplinary research unit led by Co-Directors William G. Tierney and Adrianna Kezar. The Center was established to engage the postsecondary-education community actively, and to serve as an important intellectual center within the Rossier School of Education; it draws significant support and commitment from the administration.

With a generous bequest from the Pullias Family estate, the newly named Earl and Pauline Pullias Center for Higher Education at the USC Rossier School of Education has been established (the center was previously known as the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis). The gift allows one of the world's leading research centers on higher education to continue its tradition of focusing on research, policy, and practice to improve the field.

Dr. Earl V. Pullias was one of the founding faculty of USC's department of higher education in 1957. He was the author of more than 100 research articles, primarily focused on philosophical issues in higher education, and the author and co-author of numerous books.

Mission

The mission of the Pullias Center for Higher Education is to bring a multidisciplinary perspective to complex social, political, and economic issues in higher education. The Center is located within the Rossier School of Education at USC. Since 1996 the center has engaged in action-oriented research projects regarding successful college outreach programs, financial aid and access for low- to moderate-income students of color, use of technology to supplement college counseling services, effective postsecondary governance, emerging organizational forms such as for-profit institutions, and the retention of doctoral students of color.

Goal

The goal of the Pullias Center is to provide analysis of significant issues to support efforts to improve postsecondary education. Such issues intersect many boundaries. The Center is currently engaged in research projects regarding effective postsecondary governance, emerging organizational forms such as for-profit institutions, financial aid and access for students of color, successful college outreach programs, the educational trajectories of community college students, and the retention of doctoral students of color.

The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success
2015