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In the past five years, through the LEAP initiative, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has articulated and championed an ambitious set of outcomes for student learning, working with a range of constituencies and partners. However, as stated in the LEAP Report, College Learning for the New Global Century, “While recognized leaders can make higher achievement a priority, faculty and teachers who work directly with students are the only ones who can make it actually happen.”

This issue of Peer Review explores the rewards and challenges of faculty work from the vantage point of administrators and faculty from a wide range of institutions. Exploring multiple issues, including faculty recruitment, diversity, development, and retention, these articles consider the challenges that institutions and their faculties face as they consider how they will educate tomorrow’s students. And while the opportunities for future faculty are many, these articles also address the potential obstacles current and future faculty face. Given these challenges, where will we find faculty members to carry on the traditions of the academy? To create new traditions? To deliver our essential learning outcomes?

I didn’t have to look very far to find one candidate for the job. Rebecca Dolinsky, a newly minted PhD in sociology who currently works in the AAC&U development office, is taking a breath after her June graduation from the University of California, Santa Cruz, before launching her search on the academic job market. When I asked her why she wants to join the academy at this time of uncertainty, she enthusiastically shared her thoughts about the future of the faculty and her place in it.

“Teaching undergraduates is a very rewarding and fun experience for me. It is, indeed, a very difficult time right now, but I haven’t once wavered in my commitment to undergraduate education. I believe, wholeheartedly, in the opportunities offered by higher education—opportunities for young adults to learn and grow intellectually, to find their passions in life. Being one of the people who helps guide new generations of students down that exciting path is a privilege for me. I also really enjoy teaching from a sociological perspective. Sociology provides such a useful and important lens to help understand the shifting world that surrounds us,” she says. As her first step toward becoming a faculty member, Rebecca will be teaching as an adjunct at Loyola University Maryland this coming spring, with long-term goals of finding a tenure-track position and turning her dissertation into a book. With passionate and capable scholars like Rebecca entering the academy, the future of the faculty seems bright.

This issue of Peer Review, sponsored by the Faculty Resource Network (FRN), is presented in the spirit of this future cohort. I had the pleasure of working on it with Debra Szybinski, the group’s executive director, and Trace Jordan, FRN’s director of special projects. FRN hosts lectures, symposia, and intensive seminars, all of which are designed to improve the quality of teaching and learning at its member and affiliate institutions. Last November, I joined Debra and Trace at FRN’s fall 2009 national symposium, “Challenge as Opportunity: The Academy in the Best and Worst of Times” in Atlanta, Georgia. This meeting, held in conjunction with the Leadership Alliance consortium, brought together more than two hundred attendees from over eighty institutions on the Clark Atlanta University, Morehouse College, and Spelman College campuses.

At the symposium, I sat in on a session in which a group of writing committees and other conference participants reacted to and discussed short papers on several aspects of faculty matters. To further the conversation, Joe Berger, a moderator from the New York Times, posed provocative questions to committee chairs. The result of this exercise yielded the informative Practice articles found in this issue. Through the collected wisdom and experiences of authors from twenty-six institutions, this edition of Peer Review offers a long view on the changes we anticipate on our campuses, with strategies to meet them head on.

By partnering with FRN on this important topic, AAC&U continues our commitment to faculty issues. The future of the faculty may be unknown, but our forthcoming professors, if liberally educated, will be equipped to handle all of the challenges before them. To this point, AAC&U President Carol Geary Schneider’s words to the academy are as relevant today as they were when she wrote a Liberal Education President’s Message back in 2002: “Colleges and universities that pride themselves in offering a liberal education could themselves insist that their new faculty appointments also must be liberally—not narrowly—educated. And that, in itself, would be a cultural revolution with far-reaching consequences.”

—SHELLEY JOHNSON CAREY
Navigating the Future of the Professoriate

- **Debra Szybinski**, executive director, Faculty Resource Network, and executive director, Office of Faculty Resources, New York University
- **Trace Jordan**, associate director, Morse Academic Plan, and director of special projects, Faculty Resource Network, New York University

We are living in a time of profound change in the realm of American higher education. Students entering college today, often called “the Millennials” (Howe and Strauss 2007), are increasingly diverse, more technologically adept, and more globally aware than any previous generation. Traditional teaching methods, based on the model of faculty as repositories of knowledge, are not as successful with students who view knowledge as freely accessible through the Internet. There are increased pressures on the faculty to rework their pedagogical strategies for learners whose characteristics include the tendencies to comprehend visually, to shift attention easily, and to expect interaction and collaboration in the classroom. And, following the lead established by legislation requiring new standards in K–12 education, accrediting agencies are demanding increased accountability and evidence-based assessment of student learning. These are only some of the educational transformations that are taking place in colleges and universities. To further complicate matters, the current climate of financial insecurity has resulted in diminishing resources at the time they are most needed.

How do the faculty adjust to this morphing of the academy? Most members of the faculty who teach now were trained at a time when professors tended to be secure employees of colleges and universities, who taught full-time students mostly in their teens and twenties. This description no longer fits many faculty members and students. There is a growing divergence between the traditional conception of the professoriate and the changing realities of modern higher education. How we collectively respond to this tension will shape the future of the professoriate in the twenty-first century (Austin 2003).

In this issue of Peer Review, we attempt to navigate these uncharted waters with the goal of understanding the challenges and proposing creative yet realistic solutions. Our reflection on this subject coincides with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Faculty Resource Network (FRN), a consortium of diverse institutions that continues to have a positive impact annually on the professional lives of hundreds of faculty members, and, in turn, thousands of their students.

**THE FACULTY RESOURCE NETWORK**

The FRN was established at New York University in 1985 to address the challenge of how a large research institution can help small and medium-sized colleges address their pressing need for faculty development in the face of limited human and financial resources. With seed funding from the Ford Foundation, the FRN was created as a partnership dedicated to faculty development. Ten colleges in the New York metropolitan area became the founding members.

The early years of the 1990s ushered in the next phase of growth for the FRN. Ten historically black colleges and universities in the South joined the consortium with funding from the Pew Charitable Trusts, which led to a corresponding expansion in faculty development programs. In particular, the FRN summer faculty enrichment seminars have become our flagship program for cross-institutional collaboration within and across the disciplines, attracting approximately three hundred faculty participants to the New York University campus each June.

Over the years, additional colleges and universities joined the partnership and significantly enhanced its diversity. These new members included community colleges, Hispanic-serving institutions, a native Hawaiian-Pacific Islander institution, a military academy, and a tribal college. Today, the FRN’s membership stands at fifty-three institutions, spanning twenty states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

**FRAMING THE DIALOGUE**

We decided to hold a special forum on the future of the professoriate during the FRN’s Fall 2009 National Symposium in Atlanta,
Georgia, which was hosted jointly by Clark Atlanta University, Morehouse College, and Spelman College. The title of the symposium—Challenge as Opportunity: The Academy in the Best and Worst of Times—echoed the famous words of Charles Dickens from another time of upheaval and uncertainty. Our plan was to mark the occasion of the FRN’s anniversary with a discussion that would examine the current status and future prospects of the professoriate, with the goal of generating transformative solutions that would benefit both faculty members and their institutions.

To gain from the widest possible range of institutional perspectives, we invited our partner consortium, the Leadership Alliance (LA), to join with us in determining how to address this subject. The Leadership Alliance, based at Brown University, is an academic consortium of leading research and teaching institutions that was established in 1992 to address the shortage of underrepresented minorities in graduate programs at competitive universities. Through summer internships and annual national symposia, the LA has successfully mentored students across critical transitions along the academic pipeline.

In bringing together two consortia representing more than eighty colleges and universities, the first task we faced was identifying the most important issues to discuss within the wide range of possible topics. A steering committee composed of senior administrators and faculty members was convened from among the institutional membership of the FRN and the LA. All of the committee members had extensive experience with faculty recruitment, retention, and development. After several conference calls and e-mail exchanges, the steering committee converged on five key questions (table 1).

Once the questions were selected, five committees were formed to thoroughly examine each question and write position papers that would be presented at the joint FRN/LA forum at the National Symposium. The makeup of the committees reflected the diverse membership of the two consortia, including representatives from liberal arts colleges, community colleges, minority-serving institutions, and research universities. This structure provided a rare opportunity for dialogue among different types of institutions with widely varying academic missions, faculty, and student populations. We were curious to learn if certain faculty challenges were shared across this broad range of institutional types. If these challenges could be identified, it would be possible to pool our collective experience and insights to propose creative and practical solutions.

Out of these rich conversations, both within the committees and at the National Symposium, two themes emerged as defining issues for the future of the professoriate:

1. The need to provide ongoing professional development for faculty members at all career levels and at all ranks—including adjunct faculty—through mentoring, collaborations, and training in new pedagogical methods and technologies
2. The critical importance of increasing the diversity of the professoriate and of developing strategies for recruiting, retaining, mentoring, and promoting faculty members from underrepresented groups

SUPPORTING FACULTY

From the inception of the FRN, its members recognized that professional development is key to fostering and reinvigorating a sense of purpose within the faculty. In turn, a more energized and dynamic faculty offer a greater benefit to students and to the higher education community at large.

A common lament among faculty members is that they lack time—to learn new pedagogical strategies; to focus on scholarly research; to develop or revise curricula; to produce manuscripts; to write grant proposals; and to keep up with recent trends and new knowledge in their fields. Given the current economic pressures, institutions across the country continue to impose more demands on faculty. From heavier teaching loads to increased administrative roles to more responsibility for assessing student achievement, colleges and universities expect more from their faculty as they continue to cut back on resources. Thus, the need to carve out space and provide support for faculty development is more critical than ever.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. DISCUSSION QUESTIONS ON THE FUTURE OF THE PROFESSORIATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In what ways are higher education institutions, student populations, and faculty roles changing in the twenty-first century? What challenges and opportunities arise from these changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why are well-qualified candidates not entering the professoriate? How is this situation affecting the recruitment of minorities to faculty positions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How are different types of institutions meeting the challenges of diversifying their faculty within the context of their institutional missions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What steps are being taken by different types of institutions to retain and develop their faculty? How are institutions meeting faculty needs such as professional development, work–life balance, and family care?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does reliance on adjunct instructors affect our understanding and cultivation of the “professoriate” in higher education? How can institutions achieve the appropriate balance between traditional and part-time instructors?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaders in the field of faculty development have identified the top challenges facing faculty members and their institutions. As Mary Deane Sorcinelli (2007) has stated in this journal, the three primary factors driving the need for faculty development are:

- the changing professoriate
- the changing nature of the student body
- the changing nature of teaching, learning, and scholarship

This finding is based on a far-reaching survey of faculty developers at higher education institutions throughout the United States and Canada, which included research universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges (Sorcinelli et al. 2006).

In thinking of these challenges as opportunities, which is in keeping with the theme of our Atlanta conference, we find ourselves in a position to reimagine faculty development for the changing landscape of higher education in the twenty-first century. Although they address different questions, the five Practice articles, the Research article, and the Reality Check in this issue of Peer Review all contribute insights and propose strategies for supporting the faculty, which often overlap. This highlights what should be a guiding principle: We need strategies that address the totality of a faculty member’s experience, rather than solutions that are compartmentalized.

One challenge that a faculty member faces, such as new roles and responsibilities, often affects another, such as work-family balance. Our approach to dealing with these challenges, then, must be holistic.

**ACHIEVING DIVERSITY**

Having experienced the considerable benefits that derive when there is dialogue and collaboration among diverse groups of faculty from across a range of institutions—which is a hallmark of FRN programs—we are keenly aware of the rewards that are possible when our colleges and universities succeed in achieving faculty diversity in their departments and on their campuses.

At a time when our society is deeply divided politically, religiously, economically, socially, and culturally, the academy must do a better job of advancing diversity and inclusiveness to fulfill its role in sustaining a democracy wherein all are valued and respected. Our entry into the century of global citizenship only reinforces the necessity of preparing our students to engage productively across difference.

The reasons we need to achieve faculty diversity are clear. The percentages of minorities and women within the faculty are well below their representation in the student bodies on our campuses, not to mention the general population. Also well-known are the multiple challenges that women and faculty of color confront in pursuing academic careers. Nonetheless, with the great push for access to higher education for underrepresented students, through President Obama’s agenda and the work supported by the major educational foundations such as Lumina and Gates, the need for faculty members who can serve as role models and mentors is ever more critical.

**CONCLUSION**

To end where we began, we are living in a period of major transition for our institutions of higher education. Large waves of faculty members are on the verge of retiring, and those who replace them must be prepared to meet the new challenges facing the professorate while representing the diversity of our population. If we continue to operate with the same campus politics, policies, and cultures, we will fail to afford ourselves of the greatest opportunity of all—to cultivate the promise of an entire generation.

*For the history, mission, programs, and current membership of the Faculty Resource Network, see [www.nyu.edu/frn](http://www.nyu.edu/frn). More information about the Leadership Alliance can be found at [www.theleadershipalliance.org](http://www.theleadershipalliance.org).*
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**The Future of the Professoriate: Academic Freedom, Peer Review, and Shared Governance**

Neil W. Hamilton and Jerry G. Gaff

The first in a new series of occasional papers from AAC&U, *The Future of the Professoriate* explores the concepts of academic freedom, peer review, and shared governance in light of ongoing changes in the academy that threaten to undermine them. The authors frame a series of especially urgent and timely questions about the future of the academic profession as well as propose specific directions for reform and strategies for revitalizing the profession’s social contract.

$15 members/$25 non-members
Changing Students, Faculty, and Institutions in the Twenty-First Century

Louise Hainline, dean of research and graduate studies, Brooklyn College, City University of New York
Michael Gaines, professor of biology, University of Miami
Cheryl Long Feather, research director, United Tribes Technical College
Elaine Padilla, distinguished service professor of sociology and anthropology, Rockland Community College, State University of New York
Esther Terry, provost, Bennett College for Women

The twenty-first century is now a decade old, and higher education is facing forces that are bound to affect how faculty teach and how students learn over the coming decades. This essay explores some anticipated changes in who and how we teach. We highlight innovations in both pedagogies and teaching-related technology, and discuss growing pressure to curtail the traditional liberal arts focus of undergraduate education. We also examine the implications of projections for changes in faculty and student demographics over the next ten years. Additionally, in this era of fiscal belt-tightening in almost every sector of higher education, we briefly touch on issues about the assessment of educational outcomes for student learning and the basic financial health of the higher education sector.

NEW PEDAGOGIES AND CURRICULA
What we know about learning is changing educational institutions, faculty roles, and student populations in the twenty-first century. The traditional teaching methodologies (e.g., lectures and tests) are becoming obsolete in a world that encourages people to think critically and creatively. New forms of pedagogy, active learning, self-guided instruction, and group work are transforming teaching approaches, moving them away from traditional lectures to passive audiences (Travis 1997). In response to this sea change, educators are beginning to accept the notion that “one size” does not fit all learning styles, and have started rethinking standard metrics such as “x hours of seat time a week for y weeks = z credits.” For example, the Circles Program at the University of Texas, El Paso, provides early gatekeeper classes delivered in small modules through which students can progress at different rates, repeating units if necessary before moving on. This self-guided instruction accommodates issues of preparation and outside responsibilities without compromising rigor, because it allows well-prepared students to accelerate through some courses and even graduate faster. The key to the success of the Circles Program is using mastery—rather than norm-referenced grading on a fixed schedule—to evaluate learning.

Student–faculty interactions are changing in step with new pedagogies (Anderson and Carta-Falsa 2002). The instructor is no longer the sage on stage in classrooms and lecture halls, and often serves multiple roles through interactions with students that include teacher, mentor, and adviser.

This new emphasis on active learning is reflected in a number of innovations. In lecture courses, individual response systems (clickers) are now commonplace. Strategies such as supplemental instruction and peer-led team teaching have been effective at engaging students through cooperative learning. As part of the active learning movement, undergraduates are encouraged to be discoverers rather than receptacles of knowledge, and consequently there is more involvement by faculty in undergraduate research mentoring. Different modes of teaching must take advantage of students’ various learning styles as student populations become more ethnically and economically diverse. Teachers will need to be sensitive to the full spectrum of diversity that our students and their respective communities present.

Another area that is changing rapidly is the integration of different disciplines. One example is the effort to integrate the science curriculum in entry-level courses in response to the publication
of Bio2010, an influential report by the National Research Council (2003) on restructuring the undergraduate biology curriculum for the twenty-first century. These initiatives are being fueled by funding agencies, including the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and the National Science Foundation’s Division of Undergraduate Education.

Finally, Web 2.0 technology (such as the social networking Web site Twitter and the photo-sharing Web site Flickr) is reshaping the educational landscape in the twenty-first century. Eventually, traditional lectures may be replaced by online learning communities. Faculty and students may no longer meet three times a week in a classroom but instead interact through learning communities in cyberspace.

The challenge in developing and institutionalizing innovative pedagogy and curricula is getting buy-in from three different sectors: administrators, faculty, and students. Real professional recognition for innovative and effective teaching, not just research productivity, must become part of the institutional culture. Innovative teaching should be an important component in tenure and promotion decisions. This will require linking teaching effectiveness to outcomes assessment. Traditional end-of-semester course evaluations will have to be replaced with more student-centered instruments such as students’ self-assessment of their own learning gains. There will need to be a concerted focus on faculty development to train instructors in new pedagogies utilizing active learning and educational technology. In addition, faculty from different disciplines should be encouraged to work together in groups to develop team-taught interdisciplinary courses. Many students have some discomfort when they are responsible for their own learning. This attitude of being an “accidental learner” must be replaced by a constructivist approach to learning. Faculty should provide the conceptual scaffolding in the discipline to enable students to think critically and discover new forms of knowledge on their own.

If we are to be successful, it will require a confluence of factors to create the “perfect educational storm.” Administrators have to be willing to commit funds for faculty release time to develop innovative curricula and must create mechanisms to give faculty from different disciplines course credit for team teaching. Institutions need to provide training in new teaching pedagogies, and faculty should be willing to learn and use these methods. They will have to abandon their “same old, same old” mentality and approaches. Students must take charge of their own learning rather than be passive observers in the classroom.

**LIMITLESS OPPORTUNITY FOR TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY CURRICULAR OFFERINGS**

Just as technologies have greatly influenced how we teach the twenty-first-century class, new knowledge has added to the possibilities for what we can teach, and this combination of new technologies and new knowledge has resulted in almost limitless opportunity for twenty-first-century curricular offerings. We can teach more because we know more; in some situations technology allows all of us to do a better job in the delivery of information. The academy also faces challenges in continuing to explain and help students embrace the traditional liberal arts and science disciplines. As students’ choices of academic majors turn to applied and professional interests consistent with their own and their families’ concerns about postcollege employment, we need to keep vital the values and intellectual skills associated with the traditional liberal arts. It would be a bleak world without poetry and song, but we also must understand and respect the motivations that drive students to practical and applied studies. The challenge is to provide a career-relevant education that also produces critical, enlightened thinkers and lifelong learners.

In light of the cost of education, undergraduate students in particular will be more and more impatient to focus on their majors immediately. Institutions of higher education must discover ways in which to deliver a more rounded education than is found in a narrow specialty, while still being mindful of time and cost. The opportunity this provides for institutions of higher learning is to collaborate more thoughtfully with the public sector in order to define and implement career skill sets within academic programs that meet the needs of an ever-changing workforce. At the same time, higher education needs to nurture both students’ minds and souls, and we must do more to affirm the notion of the intrinsic value of education.

In response to all these factors, we are proposing an interconnected bottom-up and top-down strategy of educational reform, with the ultimate beneficiaries being the students who will be better prepared to take on the challenges of the twenty-first century.

**TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY STUDENTS**

U.S. Census Bureau (2008) data predict that by 2050, 54 percent of the U.S. population will be individuals from groups currently called “minorities.” This change will clearly affect college enrollments. But enrollment numbers and demographics are difficult to predict because they are influenced by many factors, including the overall economic climate, legislation for support to attend college, the number of students in various age groups, and the rates of high school graduation of majority and minority students. The most extensive projections for higher education enrollments, from the U.S. Department of Education, extend only through 2018. Total undergraduate enrollment is expected to increase by 12 percent by 2018 (National Center for Educational Statistics 2009). Graduate enrollment and professional education will continue
to grow, but both will have much lower absolute numbers than those enrolled at the undergraduate level.

By these same projections, college populations will be getting slightly older over the next eight to ten years. Projections show only a 9 percent increase in the eighteen- to twenty-four-year-old cohort. Most of the enrollment increase for traditionally aged students is estimated to arise from an increase in high school graduates, which are also projected to increase by about 9 percent, as will enrollments of students over the age of thirty-five. Over the same interval, a 25 percent increase is projected for the twenty-five- to twenty-nine-year-old cohort. The trend for increased enrollment by women will continue—women make up about 57 percent of all higher education enrollments now, and this is projected to increase to 61.5 percent by 2018.

Ethnic diversity will also increase slightly over the next decade. The percentage of white non-Hispanic students is projected to decrease from 64 to 59 percent of total enrollment, while there will be gains in the proportion of total enrollment for blacks (13.0 to 14.5 percent); Hispanics (11.6 to 13.8 percent); Asian/Pacific Islanders (6.7 to 7.6 percent); and Native Americans (1.0 to 1.2 percent). Because of smaller absolute numbers for minority groups, white non-Hispanic students will continue as the largest group of enrolled students. However, within each minority group, there are projected to be significant increases in the percentage of students attending college. Should these trends persist, college students will become much more diverse in the coming decades, provided that higher education continues to be at least as accessible as it is currently.

The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE 2008) predicts that by 2015, compared with the previous decade, there will be increases of 54 percent in the number of Hispanic high school graduates, 32 percent for Asian and Pacific Islanders, 7 percent for Native Americans, 3 percent for black non-Hispanics and an 11 percent decline for white non-Hispanic high school graduates. Whether this will result in changes in college populations will depend on whether high school graduation rates for minority students increase in proportion to their population percentage, and whether their families can afford college. The percentage of high school graduates who go on to college relates directly to family income. The percentage of children from affluent families going to college is as high as 93 percent, but is only 63 percent for those with lower incomes. This underscores again how college enrollment is dependent on social and institutional support for low-income students. As the title of a 2008 WICHE report suggests, higher education is a vital “engine of economic opportunity,” provided we are able to continue to improve college attendance rates among all our students. This is a major challenge.

Higher education will need to adapt to a student population diverse on many dimensions. To be successful, our institutions need to be prepared to accept and respond to this diversity (Musil 1997). Lower income levels correlate with lower levels of initial preparation, so that many students will enter higher education through community colleges. Over 50 percent of minority undergraduates attend community college at some point. These students must be prepared to meet the challenge of a four-year college, as well as graduate and professional schools, to fulfill the promise that education offers society.

As K–12 preparation for college is increasingly a factor in college attendance, colleges need to redouble their efforts to participate in effective K–12 teacher preparation. With the expectation that more college graduates will enter graduate education in the next few decades, we also need to rethink the relative distribution of resources to master’s and doctoral education in the context of the types and numbers of employment positions for students with graduate degrees both within and outside of the academy.

**TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY FACULTY**

In this era of rapidly changing student demography and a fluctuating economy, the professoriate of the twenty-first century will continue to face interesting challenges and opportunities—an aging faculty, new colleagues and students with superior technical skills, and the potential for developing new and more effective teaching strategies. Faculty will also be held more accountable for learning as parents, accrediting and funding agencies, and legislators demand evidence that educational programs are improving learning.

Full-time faculty are graying, due, in part, to the fact that there is no mandatory retirement age for college faculty, coupled with the promise of lifetime employment to those who are tenured. In addition, retirement pensions have recently diminished. When they do retire, full-time faculty are often not being replaced by younger full-
time faculty; instead, institutions are hiring part-time or non-tenure-track, full-time faculty. The U.S. Department of Education estimates that "contingent" faculty comprised nearly two-thirds of the faculty in institutions of higher education in 2006. If fiscal exigencies and "do more with less" mandates persist, institutions might continue to resort to the hiring of more part-time faculty who may or may not be held to the same standards as full-time faculty. The future of tenure for full-time faculty may also be changing in the next decades, as more new full-time hires are given multiyear contracts with reviews at intervals to determine whether they will continue to be employed. These trends show no signs of abating and may threaten shared governance, in which decision making has usually been reserved for full-time tenure-track faculty along with academic administrators. This will be particularly crucial at the community college level, which continues to have a higher percentage of faculty members between the ages of 45 and 64 than does any other segment of the academy. These trends could seriously threaten the ability of colleges and universities to sustain their mission for scholarship and teaching.

FINANCE AND BUDGET

Although the landscape of higher education includes diverse types of institutions, such as those contributing to this report, every institution must operate within the same U.S. economy and respond to the same shifts in attitudes, priorities, and demands. As the economics of the United States and the world have changed and will continue to change, the challenges and opportunities that arise will force institutions of higher education to rethink operations and processes.

The economic recession currently causing tension in the United States has been preceded by many years of decline in public funding for institutions of higher education, reduced availability of financial aid for students, and pressure to develop programs designed to increase student access and retention. In response to this trend, President Barack Obama authorized the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). An analysis of this policy noted that the economic challenges are being addressed through a "significant infusion of one-time federal funds," but cautions that the funds be used wisely:

While states and institutions are facing difficult times, this crisis cannot be construed as a reason to abridge historic commitments to affordability, access, and investment in instructional improvements needed to meet future needs for educational attainment (National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education 2009).

Thus, one of the major challenges for institutions of higher education will be to leverage the short-term funding opportunities afforded by the ARRA in order to strengthen long-term financial health, while meeting the demands of changing demographics and workforce needs. As such, the opportunity arises to streamline processes and operations to attain this long-sought-after goal. In other words, as the policy statement recommends, "promote investment, not maintenance."

From lawmakers to funding agencies to students themselves, constituents of higher education are scrutinizing the costs of education in order to find the most cost-effective opportunities. Institutions of higher education have the opportunity to create or utilize new financial models that "cost out" educational inputs and outputs (e.g., the Delaware model, which seeks to quantify "who is teaching what to whom at what cost") in order to improve decision-making about the daily practice of education based on "value added" and cost considerations. These models allow institutions to make better-informed, though still difficult, decisions about eliminating ineffective programs and sustaining effective ones.

Finally, the economy is changing the roles of educational institutions, student populations and faculty roles by demanding the leveraging of resources and the integration of outcomes between the private and public sector. Preparing students to be productive members of today’s workforce will mean institutions must walk the tightrope between preprofessional subjects and the liberal arts and sciences, ensuring students meet workforce demands and learn the practical application of their knowledge. Programs such as earn-to-learn, work-study, and internships will demand a closer collaboration and consultation with the employers of the twenty-first-century workforce. The ivory tower, as academe has been called, is crumbling, just as the Berlin Wall toppled under the economic and societal pressures in an increasingly interconnected and complex world.
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The traditional tenure system has not changed significantly in the past one hundred years, despite major transformations in higher education and shifting demographics of the professoriate. Some institutions have incorporated “stop the clock” provisions for tenure, which allow pretenure faculty members to take one semester (or a year) to care for newborns, newly adopted children, or ill family members without this time counting against their tenure schedule (Committee on the Status of Women 2001; Quinn, Lange, and Olswang 2004). Other schools have adopted part-time tenure-track positions or established mentoring programs. However, most institutions retain a traditional tenure system.

There were only two instances in the twentieth century when policies regarding tenure were updated. In 1940, representatives from the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This revised document was known as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Nearly fifty years later, following a series of meetings in November 1989 and January 1990, these associations adopted changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.

It is imperative that scholars reexamine the core assumptions and values that dominate the academic profession in light of current realities. Only 35 percent of all university instructors hold tenure-track appointments (25 percent have tenure and 10 percent are probationary), and the remaining 65 percent are full-time non-tenure-track, part-time, and graduate assistants who provide an almost interchangeable contingent labor force (Benjamin 2008).

In her recent article on rethinking tenure, Cathy Trower (2009a) uses the perspective of a business analyst to examine the hierarchical organization of the academy. Gary Hamel, one of the world’s leading experts on business strategy, encourages organizations to identify where new opportunities may exist. He cautions that people at the top of any organization “have the least diversity of experience, the largest investment in the past and the greatest reverence for the industry’s dogma.” In academe, senior faculty members usually fit this description and, as Trower notes: “It is very difficult for those who rank lower in the organizational hierarchy to challenge the combined forces of precedence, position, and power precisely when change is most needed.”

ENTERING THE PROFESSORIATE

The increased numbers of part-time and non-tenure-track positions, coupled with the distressed economic climate at most institutions, make it challenging for recent PhDs in all fields to find tenure-track positions in which to begin their academic careers. This problem is particularly acute in the humanities, as was highlighted in a recent issue of the Chronicle Review titled, “The Crisis in Graduate Education in the Humanities.” Writing in this issue, Richard Greenwald suggests that the situation is especially discouraging for those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds: “[these students] were raised to believe that the more education they acquired, the better they would fare in life. And yet a starting professor’s salary in the humanities is barely lower-middle class” (B19). As Anthony Grafton (2010) observed in the New Republic, newly minted PhDs often find themselves “precariously employed
as ‘visiting assistant professors’ (‘visiting’ is a technical term for minimal benefits, more courses to teach and no security) or flying the freeways from one school to another, working as adjuncts for $1,500 or $2,000 a course” (32).

The path to a faculty career in the sciences is also challenging. Many scientists and engineers spend years in underpaid postdoctoral positions before moving on to the tenure track. Additionally, graduate students across disciplines, but particularly in the sciences and engineering, find that seeing the lives of their own professors up close causes them to reconsider their own decision to become faculty members. In an article titled, “Why Graduate Students Reject the Fast Track,” Mary Anne Mason, Marc Goulden, and Karie Frasch (2009) reported the results of a survey of more than 19,000 doctoral students in the University of California system. They found that many doctoral students in the sciences and technical fields change their minds about becoming faculty members over the course of their graduate study. The main concern mentioned by these doctoral students was work–life balance—women in particular often cited issues related to children as a reason for shifting their career goal away from becoming a research-focused faculty member. Work–life balance remains a crucial issue for building gender diversity across institutions and disciplines. As Mason concludes, “We need new thinking and a new model to attract and retain the next generation in academia” (16).

**INCREASING DIVERSITY IN THE PROFESSORATE**

The lack of institutional diversity and the low number of faculty of color in our colleges and universities is another issue of major concern. There seems to be a consensus that this is a problem, but no agreement on how to fix it. The reality of the underrepresentation of faculty of color in higher education nationally has been consistently lamented but benignly ignored. Data from the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES 2008) reflect the discouraging representation of full-time faculty of color: black/African Americans (5.6 percent), Hispanic/Latinos (3.5 percent), Asian Americans (9.1 percent), and American Indians (1.4 percent). While the authors of this article use the terms “people of color,” “faculty of color,” “historically underrepresented groups,” and “minorities” interchangeably, it is important to note that these terms may have different meanings depending on the institution. The U.S. Department of Education reported that in 1981, African Americans who held full-time faculty positions in higher education composed 4.2 percent of the faculty population. In 2003, over two decades later, this number slightly increased to 5.6 percent. At this rate of improvement, it will take more than 180 years for the black faculty percentage to reach parity with the black percentage of the U.S. population.

A recent study of minority faculty on the tenure track stresses the importance of “climate, culture, and collegiality” in creating a positive experience for new academics within their department and institution (Trower 2009b, 41). Also well-documented are the multiple challenges confronted by faculty of color that prevent their persistence and retention in the academy (Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood 2008). These challenges are manifested in both the personal and professional realms of faculty members’ lives. The racial climate of the campus or department can be a deterrent to the potential success of minority faculty at certain institutions. Homogeneous academic departments and campuses that do not have organizations to support the needs of people of color can be great obstacles to faculty of color transitioning smoothly into a new setting.

The feeling of isolation can also be a major factor as to why qualified people of color are underrepresented in the professoriate. During an AAC&U symposium called Keeping our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color in Higher Education, the symposium coordinator took an anonymous poll of the attendees using electronic response technology (“clickers”). According to the poll results, tenure-track faculty ranked “isolation” as the most important issue on which to focus in regard to lack of institutional support (Viernes Turner 1998).

The racial climate of the surrounding community can also negatively affect the interest of people of color in a particular college or university. Given that most faculty members will spend many years at one institution, it is extremely important that they find themselves in an environment that nurtures their social needs. Thus, lack of community is another factor that explains why African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans are underrepresented in the academy. Faculty members of color are often recruited in small numbers, which leads to a feeling of isolation in their communities. Often the paucity of their numbers compel them to feel like the “other”—a marginalized member of the campus and surrounding communities.
community who shares little cultural connection to colleagues and fellow citizens. Many faculty members of color and their families have told stories of having to drive for hours to find an appropriately trained hairstylist, ethnic foods in supermarkets, and houses of worship with familiar cultural traditions.

Moreover, faculty of color have lamented their pronounced discomfort as they seek to successfully fulfill their responsibilities as tenure-track professors. They have found themselves in confounding circumstances—including feeling alienated because of the small numbers of minority colleagues on campus; dejected because they cannot connect to a senior faculty mentor on campus to help them navigate their obligation to balance teaching, scholarship, and service; and sadly overwhelmed by an “innate” obligation that they have to mentor all of the minority students on campus to the detriment of maintaining their teaching and scholarship at quality levels (Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood 2008).

Heavy involvement in undergraduate and graduate teaching, along with administrative responsibilities, contributes to the burnout factor of historically underrepresented faculty. Without resources to support new faculty in their teaching, research, and service areas, review process outcomes for these faculty can be unfavorable. The lack of departmental support can be a major factor as to why faculty of color are underrepresented in the upper levels of the professoriate.

The experiences of minority faculty members have been studied by Jayakumar and colleagues (2009), based on a national survey of 37,582 faculty members that included 4,131 faculty of color (11 percent). They examined issues of campus racial environment, autonomy and independence, and the tenure process. The study revealed that faculty of color often have been challenged on the nature of their research—the focus on ethnic content, their use of alternative approaches rather than traditional research methods, and the significance of their research findings to the larger academic community. Negative attitudes toward the scholarship of faculty of color can adversely affect their ability to achieve tenure or promotion. The lack of faculty diversity can lead to misunderstandings of what qualifies as valuable research and service. The research agendas of minority faculty members are often perceived as “too different” from their white colleagues.

The aforementioned AAC&U symposium also examined the issue of bias in the academic workplace. During the interactive clicker survey, 45 percent of the participants ranked race and ethnicity bias as the most important issue for improving the recruitment and retention of faculty of color. As an example of racial bias, the symposium report noted that “white males are seen as having instant credibility and meriting attention. As a result, they accrue privilege, solely by virtue of their race and gender” (Viernes Turner 1998).

These issues should be seriously considered during the hiring and tenure review of minority faculty members. Proactive measures must be taken to ensure that tenure review and promotion processes are uniform for all candidates and that racial or ethnic bias is not a factor. In addition, lack of support for tenure-track faculty of color can also lead to a denial of tenure and the dismissal of that faculty member. These difficulties prevent faculty of color from being awarded tenure and underscore why qualified minorities are underrepresented in the professoriate (Turner, Gonzalez, and Wood 2008).

THE FUTURE OF THE PROFESSORATE—A NATIONAL CALL TO ACTION

The challenges of the professoriate have been well-documented, and new challenges arise each academic year. Yet there is ample opportunity for colleges and universities to take a more serious look at the current state of the professoriate and devise ways to bring about meaningful change. Opportunities abound for faculty, staff, and administrators to reexamine the priorities for tenure, promotion, and accreditation. Research is important, but teaching must be given priority. Good teaching must be rewarded, and every effort must be made to assure that those who engage in good teaching receive the appropriate remuneration.

Ultimately, there has to be better mentoring of students at the undergraduate and graduate levels to prepare, expose, and encourage them to pursue an academic career. In the meantime, many institutions have adopted the following measures to achieve faculty diversity:

- Aggressively recruiting qualified candidates from historically underrepresented groups
- Eliminating the hostile environment that can exist during the recruitment and interview processes
- Working to increase the number of minority faculty in all disciplines, including science and technical fields
- Making joint appointments to interdisciplinary programs
- Mentoring junior faculty
- Developing, implementing, and maintaining programs that foster faculty retention
- Collaborating with federal and state funding agencies on initiatives to promote diversity

We also suggest the creation of an annual forum on the future of the professoriate, which would serve as a national call to action. This forum would allow scholars to leverage media and technology while educating the academy and the broader public about the traditional perceptions (and misperceptions) of the professoriate. This gathering would represent a unique opportunity to create an environment that fosters dialogue and provides a venue for scholars to address the ways diversity is important.
and how one’s prejudice (and bias) may be a negative influence. Such a forum would give faculty members and administrators the opportunity to examine diversity, and identify some of the best practices in recruiting and retaining diverse faculty members.

The future of the professoriate forum would also provide faculty members with a safe space in which to challenge and examine the idea of meritorious research. Faculty could discuss ways of retooling advisers to respect the broad nature of research, the importance of the lack of diversity in specific fields, and its impact on hiring, tenure and promotion. We would hope to explore how “action” research can be recognized, and highlight the importance of recognizing that who is at the table affects what is viable in the canon of research. We would also underscore the importance of developing a critical mass of minority faculty across the disciplines. The forum would also incorporate a leadership summit and feature a presidential roundtable with invited speakers.

This forum could underscore the importance of an institution’s climate for the success of minority faculty. Is there clear support for institutional diversity from the president and provost? Are academic departments and human resource offices partnering to address these challenges with the support of the administration, and if so, how? Is there a clear agenda and are the best candidates being pursued, while also seeking to achieve a diverse applicant pool? Are universities and colleges integrating and incorporating both their alumni and their staff, in addition to putting into play the resources of technology, social networks, and other media, in the effort to help achieve diversity?

Ultimately, this call to action could create an opportunity to have a national dialogue. Regional meetings could be hosted as a follow-up to provide the necessary training and “toolkit” that institutions will need to realize diversity initiatives.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the challenges we have identified can be seen as opportunities to rectify faculty of color’s disaffection with the academy while promoting their persistence, empowerment, and ultimate success. But the question remains: Is the higher education community willing to embrace these challenges seriously and labor intensively to resolve them?
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Diversifying the Faculty

The diversity of college and university faculties has been a subject of discussion, debate, and priority for several decades—particularly since the 1960s, when equity in higher education became a national priority as a result of the civil rights movement. Despite these discussions and the subsequent launching of several local and national programs to advance faculty diversity, the national report card on accomplishments remains unacceptably poor.

Why care about faculty diversity? Some would answer this often-asked question with a pragmatic justification. Since women constitute almost 60 percent of U.S. college students, and because minorities will exceed 50 percent of the U.S. population before 2050, we must do a better job of preparing and hiring more persons from these groups for faculty positions in order to provide diverse role models for the nation's changing demographics. More compelling, however, is the argument that all students are better educated and better prepared for leadership, citizenship, and professional competitiveness in multicultural America and the global community when they are exposed to diverse perspectives in their classrooms—a view that comprised a good portion of the social science foundation that undergirded the University of Michigan’s argument in support of affirmative action before the U.S. Supreme Court (Bollinger 2007).

Faculty diversity has been negatively influenced by the economic downturn (Gose 2009). In earlier days, many institutions addressed the issue of faculty diversity by throwing money at the problem (e.g., salary incentives for minority appointees, additional slots for minority hires, etc.). While these financial interventions had some degree of success, they probably have had mixed results over the long haul inasmuch as they are not always sustainable and they do not guarantee retention, promotion, or tenure.

National Data on Faculty Diversity

As mentioned in the previous article, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES 2008) reports that just under 20 percent of the nation’s professoriate consists of persons of color—blacks/African Americans (5.6 percent), Hispanic/Latinos (3.5 percent), Asian Americans (9.1 percent), and American Indians (1.4 percent). However, data from the U.S. Census Bureau show that minority groups constitute roughly one-third of the U.S. population (Census Bureau 2009). Even more disturbing, the presence of underrepresented minorities (URMs) is less than 10 percent in certain disciplines. Donna Nelson (2007) at the University of Oklahoma has surveyed the number of URMs (both men and women) in science and engineering faculties at the top research universities. These schools produce the lion’s share of the nation’s PhD graduates, many of whom join the nation’s professoriate. In many cases, an extremely low percentage of URMs populate the departmental faculties of the top fifty institutions. In some fields—mathematics, computer science, astronomy, and physics—URMs constitute a little above 2 percent of the professoriate in 2007. For certain disciplines (e.g., mathematics and electrical engineering), there has been a decline in URM representation on departmental faculties. Nelson’s data suggest that faculty diversity is not solely a “pipeline” problem. Instead, faculty hiring of URMs has not kept pace with their PhD attainment.

Similar data are reported for women in the professoriate. While women have made significant advances on college and university faculties in recent years, their faculty presence in many disciplines lags far behind that of men, particularly in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (with the exception of the biological sciences). In some disciplines (e.g., electrical engineering, mechanical engineering,
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Faculty at St. Joseph’s is 8 percent minority. The college is coed with about 5,000 students. Historically a women’s college, it is now rooted in the liberal arts. St. Joseph’s has an undergraduate and master’s college.

Staff diversity has been obtained from the Chronicle of Higher Education (2009). For the purpose of this survey, minority faculty include blacks/African Americans, Hispanic/Latinos, Asian Americans, and American Indians.

Howard University is a private, HBCU research university (high research activity) located in Washington, DC, with an approximate 90 percent enrollment of African American and black students from other parts of the African Diaspora. The Howard faculty is approximately 25 percent nonminority, with a large number of black/African American faculty members.

Saint Joseph’s College is a private undergraduate and master’s college rooted in the liberal arts. St. Joseph’s has campuses in Brooklyn, NY, and suburban Suffolk County, New York, the third most racially segregated county in the country. Historically a women’s college, it is now coed with about 5,000 students. The faculty at St. Joseph’s is 8 percent minority.

University of Virginia (UVA) is a public research university (very high research activity) located in Charlottesville, VA, with a minority faculty of approximately 12 percent. The current student enrollment is 13,762 undergraduate, 4,904 graduate, and 1,725 post-baccalaureate professional (law and medicine). Thirty-seven percent of the undergraduate student population and 15 percent at the graduate and professional level are ethnic minorities.

Vanderbilt University is a private research university (very high research activity) located in Nashville, TN, with a minority faculty of approximately 15 percent. The university hosts 6,584 undergraduates and 4,735 graduate and professional students within its ten schools and various professional degree programs.

Westchester Community College is one of sixty-four institutions in the State University of New York system. It is a public, multiracial two-year college located in a wealthy suburb of New York City, with close to a 50 percent minority student enrollment and 13 percent minority faculty presence.

EXAMINING FACULTY DIVERSITY AT FIVE INSTITUTIONS

For this paper, we performed an informal assessment at five different institutions (represented by the authors) to determine the current state of faculty diversity, strategies in place to enhance faculty diversity, and the challenges in accomplishing this goal. The campuses used in our survey are listed below and information on faculty diversity has been obtained from the Chronicle of Higher Education (2009). For the purpose of this survey, minority faculty include blacks/African Americans, Hispanic/Latinos, Asian Americans, and American Indians.

Howard University is a private, HBCU research university (high research activity) located in Washington, DC, with an approximate 90 percent enrollment of African American and black students from other parts of the African Diaspora. The Howard faculty is approximately 25 percent nonminority, with a large number of black/African American faculty members.

Saint Joseph’s College is a private undergraduate and master’s college rooted in the liberal arts. St. Joseph’s has campuses in Brooklyn, NY, and suburban Suffolk County, New York, the third most racially segregated county in the country. Historically a women’s college, it is now coed with about 5,000 students. The faculty at St. Joseph’s is 8 percent minority.

University of Virginia (UVA) is a public research university (very high research activity) located in Charlottesville, VA, with a minority faculty of approximately 12 percent. The current student enrollment is 13,762 undergraduate, 4,904 graduate, and 1,725 post-baccalaureate professional (law and medicine). Thirty-seven percent of the undergraduate student population and 15 percent at the graduate and professional level are ethnic minorities.

Vanderbilt University is a private research university (very high research activity) located in Nashville, TN, with a minority faculty of approximately 15 percent. The university hosts 6,584 undergraduates and 4,735 graduate and professional students within its ten schools and various professional degree programs.

Westchester Community College is one of sixty-four institutions in the State University of New York system. It is a public, multiracial two-year college located in a wealthy suburb of New York City, with close to a 50 percent minority student enrollment and 13 percent minority faculty presence.

WHAT ARE CAMPUSES DOING CURRENTLY?

Creating Administrative Structures and Positions to Advance Diversity

Some of the institutions in our analysis have established committees to tackle diversity issues. At Westchester, a campuswide Affirmative Action Committee was established in 1985. The college has a Presidential Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity that focuses its efforts on diversity issues, including diversifying its faculty. UVA created a President’s Commission on Diversity, which then instituted the position of vice president of diversity and chief diversity officer. The deans at UVA are also held accountable for enhancing a diverse faculty. To assist them in this goal, UVA created a vice provost for faculty development and a vice provost for faculty recruitment and retention.

St. Joseph’s has constituted a diversity committee made up of faculty, administra-
tors, students, and community leaders that addresses issues of diversity and campus climate, and also makes personnel and program suggestions. St. Joseph’s diversity committee is led by the coordinator of diversity initiatives and the director of the office of multiculturalism. The president of St. Joseph’s is a member of the Board to Erase Racism, an effective community organization that has addressed education and housing issues in Nassau and Suffolk counties. There is also a Diversity Initiatives budget that supports diversity projects such as speakers, climate studies, and international projects in diverse countries.

At Vanderbilt, several positions have been created from the dean/vice chancellor’s budget, including an associate dean for diversity, two associate deans for diversity (who are senior faculty), an associate dean for diversity in medical education, and an associate dean for diversity in graduate medical education and faculty affairs. There is also a strong commitment to faculty diversity by key department chairs, including chairs of medicine, surgery, and pediatrics. The climate for faculty diversity is enhanced by the institution’s emphasis on its legacy of diversity in the health sciences.

Focused Recruitment Strategies for Advancing Faculty Diversity

Each of the institutions surveyed uses its own measures to recruit and retain faculty of color, including offering financial incentives to departments and minority hires. Several make it a point to advertise faculty openings in publications targeted to the minority academic community—for example, Diverse Issues in Higher Education (formerly Black Issues) and Hispanic Outlook. Another strategy is to recruit at fairs and conferences where minority faculty candidates might be in attendance—for example, Compact for Faculty Diversity and the Leadership Alliance.

Westchester has a rigorous search and screening process for all full-time hires and a member from the affirmative action committee serves on each faculty search. In
order to encourage a more diverse pool of applicants to join its faculty, Westchester also holds an Adjunct Job Fair.

Vanderbilt has taken a two-pronged approach to diversity. Vanderbilt officials assert that having a critical mass of students who feel supported will assist in the recruitment of minority faculty. Vanderbilt has developed an incentive plan with the dean, department chairs, and center directors geared toward increasing minority faculty (and students).

UVA uses extensive measures to recruit faculty of color. It has established associate or assistant deans for diversity within the college, professional schools, and graduate programs, who are charged with identifying and recruiting faculty and graduate students of color. Faculty search committees cannot go forward without diversity training from the office of Equal Opportunity Programs (EOP) and the vice president for faculty recruitment and retention, and these committees are required to focus on recruiting diverse faculty. In addition, a standing diversity committee on the Board of Visitors is charged with sustaining diversity as an institutional priority at the highest organizational level. Vice presidents and the provost report to the board on diversity initiatives and progress in faculty recruitment in addition to benchmarking demographic diversity change in comparison to schools within the Association of American Universities.

Howard publicizes the advantages of Washington, DC (a highly multicultural community with a large, highly educated African American population) as an attractive place for faculty to live and work. Howard also highlights its rich curriculum and research activity that focuses on African American and other underserved populations in health, education, economics, etc., as a method of encouraging a diverse applicant pool. The university sponsors an annual Preparing Future Faculty Institute for underrepresented minority doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows from across the country who wish to pursue careers in the professoriate.

St. Joseph's belongs to the Northeast Higher Education Recruitment Consortium and uses its membership as a tool to reach potential minority faculty members. It also reaches out to local African American church groups and the NAACP. At St. Joseph’s, faculty of color tend to recruit each other; as a result, the college is able to retain its minority faculty once they join. St. Joseph’s is now reaching out to the Hispanic community in similar ways.

**Mentoring New Faculty to Advance Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Minority Faculty**

Most institutions in our analysis utilize faculty mentoring programs and external alliances in order to retain their faculty of color. Minority faculty members at St. Joseph’s, for example, receive explicit mentoring support from the administration and other colleagues. Faculty members at UVA are mentored during the first three years of their appointments as a part of the university’s larger faculty development program. Vanderbilt has taken measures to support its female faculty by establishing a mentoring network for junior members. In addition, Vanderbilt has established a support system outside of the university through a collaboration with Meharry Medical College that offers joint research, training, and educational opportunities and experiences for faculty at both institutions.

Additionally, two of our institutions provide mentoring to those who have not yet stepped into a tenure-track role. At Westchester, the Dr. Julius Ford Fellowship Program provides mentoring to adjuncts of minority background in hopes that some of them may transition into full-time positions at the college or elsewhere. Academic departments also offer collegial mentoring to part-time instructors and new full-time faculty members of all ethnic backgrounds.

As mentioned above, Howard takes an active role in helping minority doctoral students achieve success as faculty members through its Preparing Future Faculty program.

**WHAT CHALLENGES DO CAMPUSES FACE?**

Campuses face different challenges based largely upon such factors as their location, mission, history, legacy, demographics, traditions—and their financial resources.

At Howard, an HBCU with a large multiracial faculty, some individuals feel there is no need to take additional measures to promote diversity, believing that diversity within the global black community suffices for Howard to claim that it supports faculty diversity. On the other hand, some faculty believe that global diversity does not substitute for national diversity and that a predominately minority academic community benefits from diverse voices from other groups—both minority and majority. This internal debate begs for a clearer definition of how to define and measure faculty diversity.

Geographic location is a significant consideration for recruitment and retention of minority faculty. Westchester is situated in one of the wealthiest counties in the country; this fact, compounded by the extremely high cost of living in the New York City area, compromises faculty diversity efforts. Diversity efforts at UVA are hampered by its location in a small college town with little community diversity. Conversely, Vanderbilt benefits from its proximity to a large, highly successful African American community and its proximity to three well-known HBCUs: Fisk University, Meharry Medical College, and Tennessee State University. Howard, while benefitting from its large African American population and multicultural climate, is challenged by a high cost of living in Washington, DC, combined with relatively low faculty salaries.

Despite committed leadership from the top, only a few at St. Joseph’s have taken up
the president’s offer to participate in the Erase Racism workshop. Also, programs that raise issues of diversity are not well attended. St. Joseph’s is located in an area with a very high cost of living, and although salaries are competitive for schools of similar size and classification, its real competitors for faculty hires are the city and state universities and community colleges. In addition, its branch campus is located in a community where faculty members are presently facing a powerful anti-immigrant movement, plus the fallout from a recent murder of a migrant worker and other acts of violence.

UVA’s decentralized system makes structural changes in regard to diversity very difficult to implement. Like other major research institutions, departmental cultures often foster a relative conservatism within disciplines in ways that make diversity projects difficult to facilitate. However, there have been gains in the overall total number of African American tenure hires since the creation of a Commission on Diversity.

Vanderbilt is also experiencing challenges, compounded by a lack of retention efforts that focus on new minority hires and an absence of minority department chairpersons. Like many institutions, Vanderbilt is also grappling with how to increase the number of tenured minority faculty and senior minority faculty, both through recruitment and by taking steps to ensure the success of its junior faculty. In a situation that is similar to UVA’s, the prestige of the institution fosters a culture in which change can be difficult to implement. The university asserts it has a commitment to diversity, but some charge that it must display this commitment through implementation and support for initiatives that bring about diversity.

As referenced above, the current economic downturn is affecting strides in achieving faculty diversity at many institutions. When colleges and universities reduce the number of non-tenure-track positions because of economic challenges, many fear this will negatively affect efforts to achieve and maintain faculty diversity. Since many minorities hold non-tenure-track positions on college and university campuses, cutting back on these positions would reduce the number of minority faculty instructors. Some institutions are using the economic downturn as a way to reassess the cost efficiency of their diversity programs. Many administrators question whether the effectiveness of these programs is proportional to the funding they are allotted. This has resulted in downgrading support for diversity efforts at several institutions.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In recent years, several strategies have been employed by colleges and universities to achieve greater faculty diversity. Most of these efforts have focused on increasing the “numbers” of persons from diverse groups on faculties—often by providing attractive financial incentives with mixed results over the long haul. Clearly, the acquisition of a critical mass of individuals from diverse groups is the important first step in achieving faculty diversity.

Of course, full faculty diversity requires far more than numbers. In order to achieve true faculty diversity, a climate for inclusion must permeate the entire institution. The “take aways” from our assessment of the current status of faculty diversity include:

- One size (strategy) doesn’t fit all institutions
- Institutions must match their rhetoric on faculty diversity with action
- Faculty diversity is enhanced by student diversity
- Faculty diversity is enhanced by having explicit policies, infrastructures and a reward system to support it
- Faculty diversity is enhanced by a diverse curriculum and support for research on diversity topics and issues
- While financial support is important, faculty diversity is enhanced by attention to faculty/staff diversity training and campus community preparation for diversity
- While recruitment of diverse faculty is important, mentoring and support leading to promotion and tenure of diverse faculty hires may be more important
- Campus, departmental, and community climate to support faculty diversity is essential for success

While considerable work is still needed to achieve the elusive goal of diversifying the American professoriate, this paper has summarized some of the major lessons that have been learned in pursuit of this goal at five different types of institutions. If other higher education institutions can profit from these lessons, there is potential for significantly increasing the results of our collective efforts in the months and years ahead.

The authors acknowledge the assistance of Evelyn Thomas, a doctoral student in mathematics at Howard University, for her assistance in preparing this article.
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Orlando Taylor is currently the president of the DC campus of the Chicago School of Professional Psychology.
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Supporting the Development of the Professoriate

Higher education institutions, regardless of mission or purpose, are evermore challenged to seek innovative ways to recruit, retain, and develop their faculty, particularly in light of new economic realities. All of our institutions share a commitment to attracting and supporting scholars who are critical to fulfilling our institutional missions in teaching, research, and service to our communities. This paper provides an overview of how the institutions we represent provide faculty support through the development of policies and practices that align institutional goals with faculty needs. Although we each brought perspectives from quite diverse institutions, we were struck by the similarities in the challenges we all face as we try to meet the professional and personal expectations of our faculty.

THE NEEDS OF THE NEW FACULTY

In all of our institutions, we have struggled with supporting increasingly diverse members of the faculty workforce, who enter our institutions under a variety of circumstances. Faculty members’ roles are rapidly evolving, requiring institutions to think strategically about providing them with opportunities and resources for professional development (Sorcinelli 2007). All of us continue to make significant commitments to tenured and tenure-track faculty, but we also have a growing cadre of nontenured faculty who are often disproportionately responsible for teaching our students. Some of these nontenured faculty members include lecturers, preceptors, adjuncts (part time or full time), visiting faculty, and instructors who are hired by institutions on a contractual basis.

Faculty orientation activities for new hires have been effective in ensuring that all faculty members are adequately informed of institutional resources, expectations, and unique academic cultures within schools and departments. As an example, new faculty members begin their employment at the U.S. Air Force Academy by attending a six-day short course called Faculty Orientation. The new hires are placed into a learning community consisting of eight to ten new faculty members and two experienced academy faculty (who serve as mentors and learning facilitators). During the orientation, each faculty member spends about two hours each day in the learning community and discusses a wide array of topic areas. They also attend a variety of workshops and seminars, all designed to introduce new members of the faculty to the academy’s expectations, culture, and teaching and learning strategies.

Another example of a faculty orientation activity is Harvard’s New Faculty Institute, designed to provide Harvard’s new faculty members with an easy transition into academic life. The institute...
is an opportunity to welcome new faculty members to the community of scholars at Harvard and provide them with opportunities to meet other faculty colleagues from across the university. Faculty panels during the orientation also allow new faculty recruits to meet senior and recently tenured faculty members from across a wide range of disciplines, with ample time to have questions addressed in a relatively informal setting. At Spelman College, the Junior Faculty Caucus introduces new faculty members to colleagues across the university through brown bag lunch discussions, which provide them with avenues to find mentors, get oriented to the institution, and raise concerns about challenges that are unique to new faculty.

In constrained economic climates, institutions often seek more innovative and cost-effective approaches to supporting the research and scholarship of their faculty. While funding is an important requirement, developing an infrastructure that fosters dialogue and collaboration among faculty members from across the disciplines is equally important and highly valued by the faculty participants.

**SUPPORTING FACULTY RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP**

In constrained economic climates, institutions often seek more innovative and cost-effective approaches to supporting the research and scholarship of their faculty. While funding is an important requirement, developing an infrastructure that fosters dialogue and collaboration among faculty members from across the disciplines is equally important and highly valued by the faculty participants. For example, there are various institutional initiatives that provide substantive support for faculty scholarship and development, including cross-disciplinary research support groups, as well as a series of grant-writing and other skill-building activities.

Institutions continue to seek new ways to support faculty research. For example, Wagner College has lowered its teaching load from eight to six courses a year in order to allow faculty members more time to pursue research during the academic year. At other institutions, new pretenure faculty members are not required to teach in their first term so that they have ample opportunity to attend conferences and develop new research collaborations at other institutions. For instance, Dillard University offers travel grants for its faculty to attend discipline-specific research, assessment, and technology conferences and workshops. Dillard also promotes collaborative participation and membership in programs sponsored by the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) faculty development programs, the Faculty Resource Network (FRN), and the HBCU Faculty Development Network.

The UNCF offers several faculty development programs for professors at its member colleges and universities. These programs, designed to strengthen and advance the academic careers of junior faculty, include the Mellon Faculty Career Enhancement Program, the Faculty International Summer Seminar, the Faculty Residency Program, and Faculty Enhancement Mini-Grants. Each provides opportunities for UNCF professors to pursue their research and training, pursuing advanced degrees, and improving their curricula and teaching skills.

**TEACHING AND LEARNING IN A DIVERSE ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT**

Colleges and universities with varying levels of resources are very much committed to helping faculty develop their professional skills in teaching and learning at all points of the academic pipeline. Some of these resources have been organized into centers for teaching and learning, such as Harvard’s Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, Spelman College’s Teaching Resources Center, the Air Force Academy’s Center for Educational Excellence, and Dillard’s newly developed Center for Teaching, Learning and Academic Technology. Dillard’s new center is supported by the Andrew Mellon Foundation and was designed to support professional development opportunities for faculty, including activities organized through faculty learning communities.

Spelman College convenes common meetings for faculty members to pursue collaborative course development. These meetings resulted in the implementation of courses for the Free Thinking Women’s Seminars, which expose students to the tenets of academic excellence, leadership, and service. At Wagner College, pedagogical circles provide collaborative and mutually beneficial opportunities to engage in discussions about teaching and learning, and each faculty member is provided with some funding each year to support pedagogical activities. At the Air Force Academy, where there are significant numbers of new faculty members each year, considerable energy...
and resources are focused on these new arrivals and on the more long-serving civilian faculty members who provide much-needed continuity. The Center for Educational Excellence at the Air Force Academy has two full-time faculty members who lead a comprehensive faculty development program at the institutional level. In addition, each academic department designates at least one faculty member within the department to lead department-level faculty development programs.

WORK–LIFE ISSUES
The changing demographics of the faculty at our institutions have made it imperative for us to pay close attention to work–life balance and quality of life issues. We all recognize that the quality of life of faculty members across the university—how they feel about their workload, professional climate, opportunities, ability to manage work and personal responsibilities, and overall satisfaction with the environment—has a huge impact on their career success. Our institutions are committed to providing effective policies, benefits, and services to help faculty members achieve their career goals while meeting their family responsibilities.

At the Air Force Academy, for example, almost all faculty members are on twelve-month appointments, eliminating the need for faculty to spend time securing funding for one or more summer months. Childcare is available on the academy grounds, and all faculty offices and classrooms are housed in a single academic building, facilitating teamwork and a sense of community.

One challenge of recruiting and retaining faculty members is the difficulty of helping them achieve a balance between their responsibilities as faculty members and their roles as dependent care providers for children or aging parents. Members of the Wagner College faculty can take advantage of the excellent early childhood center run by the education department. Furthermore, department chairs are generally flexible in arranging the teaching schedules of faculty members with family responsibilities, and the provost has on occasion given new parents a reduced teaching load.

Harvard University’s Office of Work/Life Resources (in Cambridge), the Office of Work and Family (in Longwood, at Harvard Medical School), and the Harvard School of Public Health Work/Life Liaison provide information and expert referrals to address concerns ranging from workplace stress to caring for a young child. These offices also maintain a childcare Web site that serves as a one-stop resource for Harvard affiliates looking for information on center-based care, family daycare, in-home providers, school/vacation summer camp programs, and regional public and private school information. The offices are staffed with work–family specialists, who operate in concert with affiliated childcare, eldercare, and social service providers. In addition to these resources, Harvard also provides a wide range of childcare scholarships, dependent care travel funds, and research-enabling grants for faculty members with dependent care responsibilities.

MENTORING AND DEVELOPING AN INCLUSIVE COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS
Mentoring and creating an inclusive academic climate is critical to developing scholars at all stages of the academic career ladder, which contributes to building academic excellence at our institutions. Mentoring is also an essential element in ensuring a productive and innovative faculty (Blau et al. 2010). Faculty mentoring programs that contribute to a supportive academic environment take many different forms, reflecting the values and traditions of individual schools and departments (June 2008). Successful faculty mentoring programs are attentive to differences across gender, race, ethnicity, culture, and generational lines, all of which can affect whether and how faculty receive mentoring and career guidance. Each faculty member has a role in creating and sustaining departmental cultures that support academic excellence.

Wagner College has taken steps to make the campus climate more welcoming to junior faculty. In 2004, the provost introduced a mentoring program that matches new full-time faculty members with mentors outside their department and schedules two receptions each semester, to which department chairs as well as new faculty members and their mentors are invited. To address concerns of junior faculty members more directly, the college also introduced a September workshop, sponsored by the Personnel Committee, to answer questions about the reappointment, promotion, and
tenure process and to offer advice on portfolio preparation.

Other examples of mentoring programs include the Junior Faculty Caucus at Spelman College, which provides guidance to junior faculty members on navigating the culture and policies at the institution, and Dillard’s faculty mentoring program, in which each new faculty member is assigned to a tenured faculty colleague who can provide help with tenure issues.

In spring 2008, the provost’s Office of Faculty Development and Diversity (FD&D) at Harvard launched a university-wide program on mentoring for Harvard pretenure faculty members, with a particular focus on the issues of concern for pretenure women and faculty of color. The goal of the project is to foster active mentoring relationships within an engaged, supportive network of faculty colleagues, meeting a need identified by women and other underrepresented groups. The FD&D staff works closely with the schools to develop and implement a broad array of opportunities for faculty members to receive mentoring support in a number of areas that are critical to their growth as scholars, such as understanding the promotion and tenure review process, book publishing, grant writing, managing a laboratory, and developing effective scholarly collaborations.

Using materials and information developed through the consultation, the FD&D office has begun a major effort to collect and disseminate materials and information about mentoring on its newly redesigned website.

RECOGNIZING FACULTY CONTRIBUTIONS TO RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

It is vital to the productivity and well-being of the faculty at our institutions that we appropriately recognize the many contributions that faculty members make to the academic community in small and large ways. It starts with ensuring faculty salary equity at all levels. The primary challenge to recruiting and retaining qualified and committed faculty, especially in highly competitive fields, is salary compensation. Salary equity studies need to be performed at our institutions to ensure that both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members are valued and given every opportunity to be supported professionally within their departments and at the institution as a whole.

Beyond compensation, there are numerous ways that faculty members can be recognized for their hard work and important contributions to the academy. At Spelman College, for instance, Presidential Awards are given to both senior and junior faculty members at the end of each academic year for their outstanding contributions to teaching, research and/or service. Other institutions have hosted faculty recognition ceremonies, such as an Annual Grantsmanship Ceremony, and organized book signing parties for faculty members who recently published books.

The policies and practices described above reflect the unique ways in which our institutions are addressing the challenges our faculty face. As institutions, we must be vigilant in identifying the changing needs of our faculty so that we can help them to thrive as scholars and teachers.
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The current challenges that face higher education are multifaceted and well-documented. Shrinking operational budgets, shriveling endowments, and increasing amounts of financial aid needed for students to enroll are the looming crises faced by many colleges. What’s more, institutions are challenged to uphold certain technological standards that are costly to install and maintain, and are also confronted by the call for accountability caused by two dimensions—government efforts to extend No Child Left Behind-like policies to higher education, and the rising cost of higher education, which often outpaces the rate of inflation and the increase in the average family income level. Last, for the traditional nonprofit “brick and mortar” institutions, there is growing competitive force coming from the “for-profit” institutions, which offer nontraditional class scheduling and nontraditional modality of instruction.

Despite these challenges, there are positive opportunities ahead for higher education. The importance of a college degree is touted more than ever, especially by the current presidential administration. There is a new appreciation of lifelong learning, which brings hope for increased enrollments and government funding. And there are also new opportunities in the global marketplace with potential collaborations with institutions overseas and partnerships with foreign governments.

When a historical lens is used to align the current challenges and opportunities to previous ones for higher educational institutions, there is one constant force that provides stability and the knowledge base for each institution: the professoriate. In the traditional college or university, full-time faculty members maintain their status through the quest for tenure and promotion. While over the years some have argued against tenure, citing it as detrimental to an institution's long-term survival, others have maintained that the tenure system ensures the best scholars and the best teachers.

There is no denying the value of a full-time tenured faculty, but when institutions are faced with tough economic times, larger-than-expected enrollments and new programs, do they hire full-time faculty? In most cases, the answer is no. Instead, institutions will turn to adjunct faculty. Adjuncts are an important piece of the professoriate and are heavily used, especially at community colleges and in professional programs. For as long as there have been adjuncts, there have been supporters of, and opponents to, their use. Today, as institutions are faced with the challenges listed above, a new call has been made to reexamine the role of adjuncts in the professoriate. With tough economic times and competition increasing from “for-profit” institutions, many fear that the role of the traditional full-time faculty member is diminishing and the role of adjuncts will increase.

This paper, prepared by five educators from across the United States, addresses the positive and negative issues surrounding the use of adjuncts in community colleges, private undergraduate institutions, and larger public research institutions. We represent the spectrum of higher education: geographically, our institutions are located from the north to the south and the east to the west; we include a large state university, a community college, and various private institutions in between; we are private, religiously affiliated, tuition driven, and public state-supported schools. While we have all been full-time faculty, some of us have been adjuncts, and we currently serve as full-time faculty members, full-time administrators, and part-time administrators and faculty. In fact, we like to think of ourselves as a microcosm of higher education in the United States. While we realize that what you find here are personal views concerning the role of the
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adjunct in the future of the professoriate, we believe they are representative of the views of many across the country.

ADJUNCTS AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSORATE
The increasing use of adjuncts in higher education has implications that bear perhaps most critically on community colleges, where more than 50 percent of the nation’s undergraduate students are enrolled. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2008), data compiled for 2003 showed that “two-thirds of faculty at community colleges were employed part time.” In a study of part-time faculty and community college graduation rates at 953 institutions, Jacoby (2006) found that community colleges with the heaviest reliance on part-time faculty had the lowest graduation rates. For example, community colleges with approximately 80 percent adjunct faculty had graduation rates of only about 20 percent. Given the “comprehensive” mission of most community colleges, which grant degrees for both career employment and transfer to four-year colleges and universities, nothing less than overall institutional effectiveness is on the line when graduation rates are taken as the measure of institutional, not to mention student, success.

Whether full-time or adjunct, the nature of the professoriate at community colleges differs greatly among institutions, depending on the type of programs offered as well as the college’s locale. Further, community colleges in or near large metropolitan areas often can hire both full-time and adjunct faculty with doctorates and other terminal degrees as well as records of scholarship. But, like their full-time colleagues, adjuncts at community colleges are expected to be first and foremost effective teachers.

The question then becomes whether community colleges provide the means to help their adjuncts meet that expectation. What are the qualifications for initial hire? How are adjuncts evaluated? What provisions are made for adjuncts to meet with their students or learn about the institutions in which they teach? Are adjuncts given opportunities for professional development? Are adjuncts part of a faculty union? The answers to each of these questions bear upon the larger assessment of whether a preponderance of adjunct faculty best serves a community college’s mission.

What is true of adjuncts at four-year institutions is true for them at community colleges. On the positive side, they are often the “outside” professionals teaching in the applied and specialized career fields such as nursing, paralegal, and design programs, where they bring the latest expertise to the classroom. In this role, too, they can be effective mentors and models to students. In addition, as members of the larger “community” that the community college serves, adjuncts can and do provide connections to the economic and political entities that fiscally support the community college.

On the negative side, staffing multi-section foundations courses and remedial courses with all-adjunct faculties begs the question of whether the institution is thereby best serving the needs of its students. Can a teacher be optimally effective if she has little or no time outside of class for students, or if she is not otherwise connected to the college operations? In virtually all studies of student engagement in higher education, a broad capacity for student-faculty interaction is a key factor in student retention.

ADJUNCTS AND THE SMALL, PRIVATE COLLEGE
Today’s undergraduate population has evolved from the traditional cadre of high school students coming of age through their college experiences. Along with these individuals are adult learners—professional and nonprofessional members—some of whom pursue their studies far from campus through distance education. Faculty must be responsive not only to the institutions they serve but also to the unique needs and expectations of the students who compose that institution. This is particularly the case for small, private schools with teaching, learning, and student development at the heart of their enterprise. The contribution of adjunct faculty in this context should be assessed according to their capacity to enrich and enhance student progression, particularly as it relates to students’ experiences of course delivery and instruction, scholarship, and mentoring beyond classroom interactions.

Perhaps the most compelling feature that shapes the nature of the professoriate for small colleges and universities is institutional mission. Most faith-based and private institutions are heavily mission-driven and promote their mission as a calling card to students who embrace their core values, social causes, and philosophical principles. For many small institutions, the faculty play a prominent role in communicating the university’s mission to students by enlivening those objectives through their professorial roles.

Serving a mission-driven institution is a personal commitment that often entails considerable time and effort apart from courses. This is realized through committee work, advising, interdisciplinary collaboration, administrative responsibilities, and other activities not typically assigned to adjunct faculty. Adjuncts are not expected to have the campus presence that characterizes faculty who have or are pursuing tenure. This is further evidenced by the fact that many adjuncts are employed by several different institutions through balanced schedules and prioritized commitments.
The level of faculty engagement and responsiveness has come to be a facet of institutional quality and effectiveness. Many accrediting agencies require a minimum percentage of full-time faculty and specific targets for faculty with terminal degrees in the disciplines in which they teach. Accreditation can also depend upon the extent to which a college or university can demonstrate faculty responsibility for the curriculum and faculty perspectives in the process of shared governance. At least to the extent of validation from professional organizations and accrediting bodies, there is a clear preference for more full-time PhD’s in the professoriate, regardless of the institution’s size or research efforts. Given the convenience and affordability of adjuncts, however, smaller colleges and universities can leverage the benefits of utilizing adjunct and part-time instructors, but not to the extent that the institutional mission is neglected or students’ needs outside of class time are ignored.

Along with the relationship to the institutional mission, the mandate to produce scholarship and research is among the primary factors that distinguish tenured and tenure-track faculty from adjuncts. Through scholarship in their respective fields, many tenured and full-time tenure-track faculty (most of whom spend half of their professional time pursuing research) are familiar with the latest concepts and trends in their respective disciplines. These faculty members are often able to spark students’ interest in the field and may inspire students to pursue postgraduate work (Kirk and Spector 2009).

While larger, research-intensive institutions rely heavily on faculty to produce and publish scholarship that brings the school recognition and funding, there is a greater challenge for smaller schools to help faculty members effectively balance teaching and research. Small and large institutions equally recognize the value of exposing students to the benefits and rewards of the research process, and student participation in research substantially enhances student learning and often paves the way for graduate and professional studies. Collaborative research projects are simply one of the means by which small colleges and universities rely on faculty to mentor and guide students.

Colleges and universities have gone to great lengths to accommodate all students, from traditional first-year freshmen to adult learners, by extending their business hours, developing online curricula, and relying on technology to foster more scope and flexibility in the options for higher education. Typically, small colleges and universities distinguish themselves through their ability to be responsive to all types of students by offering them personalized service through faculty members and staff who work specifically to ensure their success.

There are many instances where adjuncts successfully function as part of the university’s professoriate. Some accrue many years of service at one institution and are knowledgeable about their field and the university’s mission and values. Others bring a level of professional experience and perspective that transcend traditional academic instruction. Students come to rely on these faculty members and see no difference between the support they receive from a full-time faculty member and the committed adjunct. While universities would hope to cultivate adjuncts along these lines, the very nature of adjunct faculty can undermine significant institutional investment beyond compensation for instruction at small private campuses.

**ADJUNCTS AND PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS**

While many undergraduate colleges and universities focus on student development and general education, professional schools also focus on disciplines that emphasize practical solutions to real-world problems and situations. In this environment, the corps of adjunct professors plays a unique role. For example, many engineering departments at research universities have historically relied on practicing adjuncts to help meet regulatory and industrial concerns.

While research universities and undergraduate colleges execute their historical mission of teaching engineering fundamentals, and are breaking ground on various new technologies, modern engineering faculty by and large have little to no practical design experience, and an overwhelming majority are not licensed. As a result, many engineering departments rely on licensed professional engineers, who may not have PhD’s, to teach design and specialty courses. Indeed, the culture of engineering education is maintained by a symbiotic relationship with industrial partners, vested in the production of a skilled and “mission-ready” workforce, in which contemporary adjuncts have played a unique and significant role.

This may present an unbalanced relationship, where “magnanimous” adjuncts are paid well below their otherwise billable market rates to teach what is essentially their most valued skill: reliable contemporary design practices. Savvy engineering firms and manufacturers, however, realize clear benefits from releasing practicing engineers to teach in colleges and universities—insider access to upcoming talent and an interface with cutting-edge research. While economic contractions have no doubt squeezed the domestic engineering workforce in recent years, demands for technical education remain high—particularly in the international marketplace.

The value-added role of the adjunct engineering faculty corps in undergraduate engineering education is tremendously respected in both industrial and academic
spheres, so the ratio of adjuncts to full time faculty has not historically changed during varying economic conditions. Although engineering departments are experiencing financial challenges in both public and private universities, there is little systemic indication that the ratios of core engineering faculty to their adjunct counterparts will change in the foreseeable future.

**ADJUNTS AND THE FUTURE OF THE PROFESSORIATE**

There is no doubt that adjuncts will continue to play an important role at the university for a number of very positive reasons. First, they sometimes offer a professional expertise that is outside of the experience of most faculty members. Also, adjuncts offer their students examples from their profession, which helps to build practical connections between the subject matter and their chosen careers. Finally, while some adjuncts make a career of a series of part-time jobs, just as many adjuncts teach only because they like to teach (AFT Higher Education 2010).

For the student, the teacher who actually enjoys the work is always a blessing, whether that teacher is a full-time faculty member or an adjunct.

On the other hand, it is not usually expected that adjuncts mentor their students—though many do. This is important at institutions where mentoring is an integral part of fostering student success, and doubly important at institutions that measure how well they have communicated their mission and values to their students. Adjuncts will generally not have the time or often the inclination to make those priorities important to their teaching.

Moreover, it is also helpful to remember that while adjuncts are an important part of professional education because of their expertise, they are not required to commit to scholarly work. In some fields, this can become an important issue when there are major changes in the field and, as a result, changes in the curriculum are needed. Faculty members are responsible for the curriculum, and most would agree that such a responsibility is best carried out by full-time faculty.

Because adjunct faculty will continue as part of the professoriate and will dominate the for-profit universities, the important question for those who teach in a traditional undergraduate program is how to increase the positive attributes of adjunct professors and mitigate against what is less positive.

Some—perhaps many—adjuncts would argue that making all faculty full time would end the problem, but one of the attractive aspects of adjunct labor is its very temporariness.

If institutions offering traditional undergraduate coursework will use adjunct faculty, there must be a concomitant effort to supervise their work. Adjuncts need to know what the curricular, performance, and mentoring standards are. Students should expect adjuncts to deliver content that is overseen by full-time faculty, teach the material in an interesting and professional manner, and be available for discussion outside of class. To accomplish these goals, the university must direct resources in support of adjunct faculty.

While most adjunct faculty are not interested in attending university meetings, the offer should be made. As much as possible, adjuncts must be considered part of the faculty, and, when their expertise is useful, asked for their contribution.

These are small suggestions designed to make adjunct faculty a continuing positive presence on campus. Adjuncts are not a threat to the professoriate, but positive contributors to the academic community. Institutions will continue to seek out the service of adjunct professors for the reasons we have discussed. What is important for universities and the professoriate to acknowledge is that the adjunct faculty member, like the full-time faculty member, enriches the educational experience.

**REFERENCES**


A New Generation of Faculty: Similar Core Values in a Different World

Cathy A. Trower, senior research associate and research director at the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), Harvard Graduate School of Education

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) was established in 2007 in response to the explosion of hiring and turnover costs and to persistent challenges in diversifying the academy. It is a consortium of over 150 colleges, universities, and systems across North America committed to making the academic workplace more attractive and equitable for early-career faculty—the cohort most critical to the long-term future of their institutions.

COACHE gives presidents, provosts, and deans both peer diagnostics and concrete solutions for informing efficient, effective investment in their faculty. The member institutions focus on issues critical to faculty success and on steps academic policymakers can take to improve faculty recruitment, development, and retention.

The core element of COACHE is the Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, which was designed, tested, and validated in focus groups and a rigorous pilot study. Each section of the COACHE instrument is built to generate a report not simply of “interesting” data, but of actionable diagnoses. The COACHE model is designed to take participating institutions from data collection to policy action in less than one year. Because of COACHE, we know what more than 15,000 tenure-track faculty think; highlights are presented in this paper.

WHAT ALWAYS MATTERED STILL MATTERS, BUT TIMES HAVE CHANGED
What’s important to pretenure faculty—clear and reasonable tenure requirements, support for effective teaching, scholarship, and professional development, work–life balance or integration, and a sense of community and collegiality—is not new and is not specific to Gen Xers (born 1964–1980); rather, these themes have been at the heart of the academic enterprise for decades. However, a lot has changed for those working on tenure-track lines (Trower 2008) since 1940 when the American Association of University Professors codified tenure and academic freedom (AAUP 2006).

What’s different today? Just a few major factors: knowledge production and dissemination (there are new methods, technologies, and venues for publication); resources (institutional, state, and system-wide budget cuts); increased competition for grant funding and different funding sources; longer lead times for getting published (in top-tier journals in many disciplines and by university presses); increased pressures for transparency and accountability; and a ratcheting up of expectations for all faculty, including teaching, research, service, and, at some institutions, outreach.

On the personal side, there is increasingly a 24/7 expectation for faculty work and accessibility to students. Furthermore, the new norm for faculty with partners is the dual-career household; few faculty members have a spouse or partner who stays at home to raise children. The demographics and learning needs of students have changed dramatically. In fact, just about everything is different today except the tenure system (Trower 2009).

While tenure-track faculty may want the same things as their predecessors, younger Boomers (born 1956–1963) and Gen X faculty live and work in a very different world than older Boomers (born 1946–1955) and Traditionalists (born before 1946). Because of this, Gen Xers, in particular, have been vocal about wanting increased flexibility, greater integration of their work and home lives, more transparency of tenure and promotion processes, a more welcoming, diverse, and supportive workplace/department, and more frequent and helpful feedback about progress.

TENURE IS STILL THE GOAL, AND SO IS STAYING PUT
Those who study generations and make comparisons between them have wondered whether Gen Xers will have loyalty to the companies for which they work, since data show that most in this
age group have already moved around more than older generations, and find it less troubling to do so. A common perception of Gen Xers is that they lack commitment to their jobs and employers, and are constantly seeking “the next best thing.” It is natural, therefore, to wonder if Gen X faculty themselves hold this viewpoint.

COACHE data show that a relatively small percentage (13 percent) of pretenure faculty report they will likely leave their institution after achieving tenure there. Of those who plan to leave their current institution after achieving tenure, the majority (70 percent) plan to move on to another academic institution—one in a better geographic location (e.g., closer to family; better city/community/schools; lower cost of living), that pays better, that is more prestigious, or that offers more dual-career opportunities, childcare, or parental leave.

In addition to survey data, interviews also have revealed that most tenure-track faculty seek “roots not rungs” (COACHE 2010). When asked about their intentions to stay or leave, most of those Gen X faculty interviewed (Helms 2010) reported no desire to leave. One placed the likelihood at zero, saying “something pretty drastic would have to happen” such as an “immediate tenured position at a more prestigious institution that’s in a location that my wife and I can both be employed,” which just “won’t happen.” Another placed the likelihood of leaving as “extremely low” saying, “I’ve [actually] had two [other] schools approach me this year, and I’m not inclined to go anywhere. I’m homegrown from this school” and “invested” in its success and the people the institution has hired.

A statement by one faculty member nicely summarized the overall sentiment of the participants:

I want some stability. I want a place to call home. I want to put some deep roots in, and fully invest, and commit, and serve a community (Helms 2010, 6).

STANDARDS FOR EXCELLENCE ARE HIGHER AND MAKE “BALANCE” ELUSIVE IN THE EARLY YEARS

Faculty of every generation have a great deal to say about the three primary areas of faculty work—teaching, research, and service—and how the focus of one’s work necessarily changes over the course of an academic career. While views about who should do what and when may vary by institutional type (e.g., greater focus on teaching at liberal arts colleges compared to research universities) and by rank (e.g., probationary faculty are typically protected from doing a lot of service, and at many research universities they have a lighter teaching load than their senior colleagues), one thing all seem to agree on is that it’s tougher now than it used to be—the expectations for excellence in all areas are higher than ever before. Consistently, in interviews with junior faculty, I hear that time is their most valuable commodity and time management is their greatest challenge. The challenge to spend the most time on what matters most to achieving tenure (whether that’s research or teaching, depending on institutional mission) without neglecting something else that’s important, or alienating departmental colleagues by saying no to additional teaching or service work, is paramount and sometimes a struggle.

SUPPORT FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BEFORE AND AFTER TENURE IS DESIRED

Most faculty members of every age think about their academic career as a long-term proposition; lifetime job security, after all, is a benefit of tenure. Doctoral students work for many years to earn the necessary academic credentials and spend several years in a probationary period striving for tenure; therefore, the costs of shifting to a career outside the academy are quite high.

Our earlier work (Austin, Sorcinelli, and Trower 2001; Trower 2000, 2002) showed a certain amount of ambivalence about tenure among junior faculty that still exists today. Tenure-track faculty worry about clearing tenure’s hurdles and then stagnating, either because of burnout or lack of incentive. Said one associate professor in a recent (unpublished) interview, “Is this all there is? Is this what I worked so hard to achieve?” Such sentiments are not uncommon.

Prior to tenure, junior faculty place high importance on travel funds to present papers or conduct research (4.53 on a scale where 5 indicates “very important” and 1 indicates “very unimportant”), professional assistance with finding external grants (4.09), and peer reviews of teaching and/or creative work (4.05). Also important, though to a lesser extent, is professional assistance to improve teaching (3.70).

After tenure, associate professors tell us they would like professional development to help them achieve full professor status—whatever that entails at their campus. Most typically, they would like guidance from senior colleagues, resources for research and travel, assistance getting large grants, and high-quality graduate student assistance.

MENTORING MATTERS, MAYBE MORE THAN EVER

In fact, mentoring is necessary and expected. Faculty members we’ve interviewed talk a great deal about both formal and informal mentors and are quick to say that one size mentoring does not fit all. Because formal and informal mentoring differ, these concepts require definition. Formal mentoring provides a process by which protégés are matched with a mentor or team of mentors. Formal mentoring implies an expectation to coach and be coached, to advise and be advised. Many pretenure faculty members have come to expect formal mentoring and prefer to work at institutions that provide it. An informal mentor is one who advises or coaches others without being part of a
formal program; informal mentoring “just happens” and may occur alongside formal mentoring (Trower 2007).

COACHE survey results show that informal mentoring is rated as more important to pretenure faculty success than formal mentoring; on a 5-point scale where 5 indicates “very important” and 1 indicates “very unimportant,” the scores are 4.32 and 3.87, respectively (a statistically significant difference.) Informal mentoring occurs organically, not because of any official program. Females feel that both forms of mentoring are more important to their success than males but rate informal mentoring even higher than formal. Pretenure faculty also reported that informal mentoring on their campuses is also more effective than formal mentoring, with scores of 3.49 and 2.93, respectively. As a recent COACHE report noted:

Pretenure faculty are no different than most others when it comes to needing support from people they trust on the job as well as institutional support in other forms (time, money, resources). But they do differ in what they want from a mentor. Indeed, some say they do not want or need a mentor at all; the choice is acutely personal. It is also unrealistic to expect that one or two assigned mentors will provide all of the guidance and advice an early-career faculty member needs to succeed (Trower and Gallagher 2008).

WORK–LIFE BALANCE STILL MATTERS, BUT IT IS EVER MORE ELUSIVE

Most professionals would say that it’s important to them to be able to strike some sort of balance between their work and their home lives. A recent survey of over 9,000 full-time faculty at thirteen top research universities showed that 72 percent have employed partners whose careers need to be taken into consideration and 36 percent have an academic partner (Schiebinger, Henderson, and Gilmartin 2008). Because so many academics are partnered with other academics—something especially true for women scientists—dual-career issues are often at the forefront of challenges tenure-track faculty face. The COACHE survey asks pretenure faculty to rate the effectiveness of their institution’s spousal-partner hiring program, and the average rating is 2.66 (on a 5-point scale where 5 indicates “very effective” and 1 indicates “very ineffective”).

An item on the COACHE survey, satisfaction with “balance between professional time and personal or family time,” is consistently one of the lowest-rated (an average of 2.88 on a 5-point scale where 5 indicates “very satisfied” and 1 indicates “very unsatisfied”). For those with children, two other items that consistently receive low agreement ratings are: “The institution does what it can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible” (3.00) and “The institution does what it can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible” (2.84).

A SENSE OF COLLEGIALLY AND COMMUNITY STILL MATTER, BUT NETWORKS ARE BROADER

In her paper, Helms (2010) said that the quest for a sense of community may very well be the “essence of Generation X.” …it is perhaps the lack of community, and Xers’ attempts to find it, that truly define the generation, providing a unifying theme for their experiences, and encapsulating what has changed for them from previous generations (Helms 2010, 20).

Autonomy has long been a defining desirable aspect of academic life for most faculty members. Older generations of faculty have long been content to live a “life of the mind” that, by some younger faculty standards, seems rather remote and isolating. Gen X faculty are likely to enjoy collaboration and many have extensive networks of colleagues around the world, something technology has enabled. Their relationships with students are reportedly less formal, arising, in part, as a result of twenty-four-hour access through e-mail.

Gen X is more mobile than prior generations, but not necessarily by choice. Because there are fewer tenure-track jobs and because these faculty members are likely to have a spouse or partner who also works outside the home, they oftentimes have to move to accommodate the family. Many Xers place a premium on working efficiently because they have so much to juggle. They long for time with students and colleagues, but there’s just not much to go around.

The COACHE survey asks tenure-track faculty members to rate their satisfaction (5 indicates “very satisfied” and 1 indicates “very dissatisfied”) with the amount of personal and professional interaction they have with peers (other pretenure faculty) and with tenured faculty; results are shown in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: SATISFACTION WITH PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of personal interaction you have with pretenure faculty in your department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of professional interaction you have with pretenure faculty in your department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of personal interaction you have with tenured faculty in your department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of professional interaction you have with tenured faculty in your department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION
In conclusion, there will be increasing demands on the part of the public for accountability and transparency surrounding the costs and benefits of higher education. The academy will be pressed to educate an increasing number of first-generation students. Institutions will continue to expect high faculty productivity in the classroom, the laboratory, and beyond.

What will be the future of tenure-track faculty?
- The tenure track will continue to exist, albeit with smaller numbers, and a declining percentage of all faculty will hold tenure-track lines.
- The demand for better teachers able to work with students of various backgrounds, preparation, and learning needs will intensify.
- There will be increased pressure on tenure-track faculty to excel in research even as traditional publication venues decline.

My hope is that the academy will make the needed changes to policies and practices so that the best and brightest will continue to be attracted to faculty positions. This will require significant changes to the current one-size-fits-all approach to tenure, including: more flexibility (including different paths to tenure, with some faculty concentrating on teaching and some on research); better work-family and dual-career policies; concerted efforts to ensure that mentoring happens and is effective; an increased focus on collaborative teaching and research; and rewards for interdisciplinary research as well as research with undergraduate and graduate students.
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Regardless of an institution’s size, mission, location, or focus, higher education faculty are a remarkable and unique group of individuals. Across disciplines and fields, there is no arena more richly diverse than the professoriate. America’s colleges and universities mirror the political, cultural, and ideological diversity of society itself. We all work, on a daily basis, to balance the demands of the educational enterprise with the diverse talents, interests, and approaches embodied by our faculty.

Much has changed in the fifty or so years that I have worked in higher education, the greater part of those years as the president of one institution—Xavier University of Louisiana. America’s campuses have changed dramatically through new programs and instructional improvements, and the revolutionary impact of technology. Nonetheless, faculty remain as vital to the development of a democratic and informed society today as when Socrates first engaged minds in the shade of an olive tree many ages ago.

The model of higher education has evolved, in some ways radically, but has at its core the need for qualified instructors and a cadre of students who are interested in learning from them.

At the heart of the matter is quality teaching, meaningful experiences, and learning that is measurable and relevant. Each school must provide evidence of the difference it makes, the value added of the college experience. We cannot rely on default college attendance as a rite of passage to adulthood. Now more than ever, we must be clearer about what distinguishes our school from others. The quality of the faculty will be a critical component in appealing to those students whose educational goals align with our respective missions and programs.

As institutions of higher education, there are certain challenging questions that we must collectively consider:

- What is our “shared vision,” the common purpose for higher education in this country today?
- Why do we do what we do?
- What role do we play in supporting the common good and general welfare we honor in this nation’s constitution?
- Recognizing that higher education is a multibillion-dollar industry, with costs that increase annually, how do we reconcile education as both a mission and a business?

The answers to many of these questions lie with the quality of an institution’s faculty. The teachable moment, the intellectual exchange between instructor and student—that is where the magic happens—or doesn’t. Good faculty, be they adjuncts, tenure track, or tenured, tend to have a much broader and nobler understanding of their profession than the details in their contract.

I leave you with a few nuggets of academic clarity I have managed to discern in my years at Xavier. This five-point reality check will hopefully identify what is essential for all of us with stakes in higher education, whether we are administrators, faculty, staff or simply concerned citizens.

1. Never forget our reason for being: students are our priority. We exist to educate students.
2. The teaching and learning environment, policies, processes, and the way we do business must enhance the education of our students.
3. We must create an institutional culture that respects and honors quality, integrity, and excellence in all human development.
4. We must exhibit every day that we care, and expect students as well to care about developing their God-given talents.
5. We understand that there will be failures, but we make every effort to prevent them and learn what we can from them when they occur.

We cannot accomplish these goals alone. Work hard and collectively at your institutions to be superlative in some things, exceptional in others, and good overall. This is a simple but useful standard for gauging the general health of an institution, but equally applicable as a reality check by which to view faculty, regardless of their classifications or terms of appointment.
AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises 1,200 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.

AAC&U Membership 2010
(1,240 members)
- Masters 29%
- Associates 11%
- Res & Doc 17%
- Other* 16%
- Baccalaureate 27%
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NETWORK FOR ACADEMIC RENEWAL

AAC&U Working Conferences for 2010–2011

Facing the Divides: Diversity, Learning, and Pathways to Inclusive Excellence
Houston, Texas
October 21–23, 2010

Creativity, Inquiry, and Discovery: Undergraduate Research In and Across the Disciplines
Durham, North Carolina
November 11–13, 2010

General Education 3.0: Next-Level Practices Now
Chicago, Illinois
March 3–5, 2011

Engaged STEM Learning: From Promising to Pervasive Practices
Miami, Florida
March 24–26, 2011

Network for Academic Renewal:
Exploring together the latest advances in teaching and learning, faculty work and leadership, diversity and inclusive excellence, general education reform, curricular and cocurricular connections, and assessment for learning in undergraduate education.