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In 2002, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) published an issue of Peer Review that focused on contingent faculty and student learning. In his introduction to that issue, then-editor David Tritelli wrote, “Surprisingly, there has been very little study of the impact [of contingent faculty] on student learning. This is even more surprising—and alarming—given the likely correlation between what we know about how best to facilitate optimal student learning experiences and what we know about the material conditions of contingent instruction.”

Now, more than ten years later, in this issue we explore the evolving tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) roles and revisit many of the points touched upon in the 2002 issue. At this time when a reported 70 percent of faculty members fall into the NTTF category (when counting full- and part-time), it is even more important to determine how these changes are having an impact on student learning outcomes.

This Peer Review features articles on changing faculty roles from a range of perspectives:
- Susan Albertine outlines AAC&U’s faculty work history and looks toward the future of liberal education with a new faculty model
- Adrianna Kezar and Sean Gerke share results from a survey given to academic deans with the intention of better understanding their attitudes toward supporting NTTF
- Rebecca Dolinsky writes from the perspective of a three-year NTTF member who has decided to leave the contingency track in favor of a research career path
- David Paris contemplates the strengths and weaknesses of the traditional faculty role from the perspective of liberal arts colleges
- Andrew Tonge reports on how his campus’s mathematics department, which has a significant NTTF population, intentionally created a more inclusive and effective framework for faculty work
- Kris Roney and Sarah L. Ulerick use their experience in the AAC&U Roadmap project to report from the field on how faculty work is changing for the community college “corps of instruction”
- Kenneth P. Ruscio reflects as a president about the challenging lives of teacher-scholars on liberal arts college campuses and the enduring value of the teacher-scholar model
- John W. Curtis writes about research on gender differences in academic employment
- Maria Maisto’s Reality Check considers the “costs” of the unbundling of faculty work

The enduring graphic metaphor of faculty work as a three-leg stool—teaching, research, and service—was the inspiration for this issue’s cover illustration. We contemplated using a variety of images to get the point across, from cartoon figures being carried away by balloons to potted plants that were unable to put down roots. While each idea had its merits, none of them successfully captured the challenges and dilemmas faced by the twenty-first-century faculty. We finally settled on the idea of juxtaposing a faculty member on a steady three-leg stool with another tottering on a one-leg stool to illustrate how important it is that faculty have adequate support in order to do their job well.

AAC&U is dedicated to ensuring that all students benefit from an engaged liberal education. We work with our members to create the best teaching and learning environment through which all students’ can achieve their best outcomes. The only way that students can do their best is when faculty too are in the position to do their best. Therefore, as the roles of faculty, tenure- and non-tenure track, continue to change, we have to keep asking the tough questions about the impact of change on student learning. Susan Albertine poetically makes this point in the concluding lines of her framing article: “To carry out our mission, we will work hand in hand with all educators and we will envision the hands of future faculty—beckoning, engaged in work we can only begin to imagine.”

—SHELLEY JOHNSON CAREY
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Toward the Next Century of Leadership: A Future Faculty Model

Susan Albertine, vice president, Office of Diversity, Equity, and Student Success, AAC&U

In 1940, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC)—now the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)—issued a two-page document titled Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-Statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure). Today’s AAC&U members may not realize that our association joined AAUP to make that venerable statement. It was our document just as it was AAUP’s. The 1940 Statement, as it is called, has endured and evolved, a living document, widely respected in higher education. It served as the foundational text on academic freedom and tenure in the twentieth-century United States. To date no other statement has taken its place.

AAC&U’s Faculty Work History
The history of our work with faculty and our work for liberal education at the nexus of teaching and learning has much to tell us now, as we and our membership experience a period of unprecedented change in the academy. Issuing the 1940 Statement was not, as a matter of fact, AAC’s first action on behalf of the faculty. In 1915, AAC’s founding year, AAUP set forth a lengthy statement of principles on academic freedom and academic tenure. Beginning in the 1920s, AAC joined a conference committee to reformulate those principles, making the document shorter and presumably more useful. In 1925, AAC endorsed the revised document. AAUP signed it in 1926. What emerged as the 1940 Statement was actually a restatement of principles drafted as early as 1915. In our first decade as an association, that is, we stepped forward to lead the academy through a major phase of growth and change.

It was emphatically a period of change. From the 1890s through World War I, a new faculty was emerging, as the academy in the United States grew and diversified. The arts and sciences, as we now know them, and an array of professional disciplines were organized and named. The credit hour was also defined. The core curriculum or general education grew from roots in the liberal education of the pre-industrial era. These were interrelated developments that brought the academy across the threshold of the twentieth century, into the modern industrialized world. AAC itself came into being as liberal arts colleges, the majority of AAC’s founding members, redefined themselves in context of the sweeping changes of modernization.

AAC’s work on behalf of academic freedom and tenure, guided by the ideas and ideals of liberal education—in and beyond the liberal arts—continued and developed through the twentieth century. In 1969, representatives of AAUP and AAC attached a three-page commentary to the 1940 Statement. This document was issued formally as the 1970 Interpretive Comments. Both associations’ governing bodies met in 1989 and 1990 to adopt gender-neutral language throughout the text. No fewer than 209 higher education organizations, associations, and societies endorsed the document, the first in 1941, with nearly half joining in the 1960s and 1970s. Significantly, the last sixteen endorsements arrived as late as 2006. That was the same year in which the AAC&U Board of Directors issued Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility, a statement drafted by AAC&U senior scholar Jerry G. Gaff.

Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility intentionally built on the foundation of the 1940 Statement and addressed a dimension of academic freedom that had been scarcely visible in the original document: “the responsibilities of faculty members for educational programs.”

The statement intended to carry the 1940 principles forward and to develop a politically attuned line of thinking about academic freedom in the context of the times. It sought to inform public and campus discussions during a period of contentious debate over
teaching and learning, a debate centered on the politics of intellectual diversity in the undergraduate curriculum and on conservative efforts to suppress that diversity. Defining liberal education as an approach to college learning that empowers individuals and prepares them to deal with complexity, diversity, and change (http://www.acu.org/leap/What_is_liberal_education.cfm), AAC&U reaffirmed the connection between the intellectual, personal, and social outcomes of student learning and the academic freedom and professional responsibility of educators.

CROSSING ANOTHER THRESHOLD
As this issue of Peer Review goes to press, nearly a century after AAC was founded, the American academy is once again experiencing enormous change. Political disputes over academic freedom and control over the intellectual and social work of colleges and universities in the 1990s and early 2000s were a sign of the times. One decade into the twenty-first century, we are crossing another threshold. This time the driving forces include advancements in information technology, reductions in public investment in higher education, and acceleration of the effects of globalization. The meaning of liberal education across the diverse array of institutions that now constitute the American academy is highly contested, perhaps more so than ever before. AAC&U is actively engaged in the struggle to keep the goals of high-quality liberal learning accessible to all students in the diverse US population even as national goals aim for completion rates and job training as the highest goods. As for the twenty-first century faculty, they are a dramatically different group from the body envisioned in 1915, 1925, or 1940, or for that matter 1970 or 1990. The conditions under which faculty work and their overall responsibilities for educational programs and student learning are likewise vastly different.

A glance at the language of the 1940 Statement suggests how much has changed. Robust and reasoned, cogent, and confidently normative, the 1940 text stands as a dignified set of first principles. While the academy continues to respect these principles, their very language and their underlying assumptions hail from a different era. Addressing academic freedom, the 1940 Statement proclaims, “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations.”

In 2013, more than two-thirds of the faculty have no claim to academic freedom or recourse to “special obligations” as “officers” of academic institutions. More than two-thirds of the faculty in institutions of higher education in the United States do not have and cannot earn tenure. The majority of the contemporary faculty are employed on terms of contingency, most working on part-time contracts that do not pay a living wage or carry benefits. Since 1975 the ranks of people employed on part-time contingent contracts have ballooned by 300 percent. In the same period, tenured and tenure-track faculty have also risen in number, but by a much lower rate of 26 percent. The AAUP Faculty Salary Report for 2013 lists the median pay for a single course at $3,200 at research universities and $2,250 at community colleges. It also raises the percentage of the total faculty who work under terms of contingency to 76 percent (http://www.aauup.org/media-release/heres-news-aauup-releases-faculty-salary-report). For more faculty members than ever before, college has become—as a recent article in The Atlantic (Weissman 2013) put it—not a career or membership in a learned profession but a “gig.” The implications for student learning and the ideals of liberal education and inclusive excellence are substantial.

A NEW FACULTY MODEL
It is timely once again, at this moment, for AAC&U to step forward. We intend to speak and lead, to use the voice of the association to advance liberal education on behalf of educators’ academic freedom and professional responsibility. Just as liberal education itself is changing in the twenty-first century, this century demands a new faculty model, one that is flexible and dynamic for our times. Our mission-centric approach to the issues related to the growing reliance on both part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty is demonstrated through our ongoing work and appears explicitly in our 2013–2017 strategic plan, Big Questions, Urgent Challenges: Liberal Education and Americans’ Global Future. We are prepared to lead the work to discover what this model might be and to promote the change that can achieve it. In fact, in recent decades AAC&U has taken purposeful steps in precisely this direction.

Beginning in 1969, AAC&U (then AAC) introduced pioneering work to advance the standing of women and minority faculty, to recognize their roles in and contributions

Just as liberal education itself is changing in the twenty-first century, this century demands a new faculty model, one that is flexible and dynamic for our times.
to a pluralistic liberal education. Decades of work on the composition and diversity of the faculty ensued. The nexus of teaching and learning, with emphasis on faculty issues and topics, has brought integrity to AAC&U’s periodicals and meetings. “Faculty roles” or “faculty work” has for more than twenty years organized the content and themes of the four annual Network for Academic Renewal meetings.

In the late 1980s, AAC&U developed a number of important faculty-centered projects. Perhaps the best known is Preparing Future Faculty (PFF), a joint project with the Council of Graduate Schools, from 1993 to 2002. In a pilot begun in 1989, AAC&U tested the concept of a partnership intentionally drawn between research universities that prepare faculty and liberal arts colleges in which many new faculty teach. Intent on developing a model for faculty preparation, PFF encouraged higher education institutions “to re-think and to reorganize the preparation of doctoral students who aspire to become faculty.” Scaled up, the project itself focused on liberal education as the responsibility of faculty prepared to teach across the full diversity of American institutions. PFF organized seventeen “clusters,” involving eighty-eight institutions.

In 1997, AAC&U became a founding member of the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW). The coalition brings higher education associations, disciplinary associations, and faculty organizations together to address “issues associated with deteriorating faculty working conditions and their effect on college and university students in the United States.” As noted above, in 2006 AAC&U opened a new phase of activity with Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility. Then, in 2009, AAC&U published The Future of the Professoriate: Academic Freedom, Peer Review, and Shared Governance, written by Neil Hamilton and Jerry G. Gaff. The Future of the Professoriate is designed to “spur dialogue and action about ‘Intentional Leadership in the New Academy’” (v). Focusing on the faculty, the book develops explicit connections between the outcomes of liberal learning for the twenty-first century and the multiple functions and processes of educators’ work to reach those outcomes. It draws on AAC&U’s 2002 report, Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College, defining the “new academy” and making the case for purposeful educational pathways for a student body more diverse than ever before. AAC&U again offered new concepts and principles for the professoriate in recommendations articulated in College Learning for the New Global Century (2007), familiarly known as the LEAP Report—the foundational document guiding Liberal Education and America’s Promise, AAC&U’s signature initiative. Most importantly, The Future of the Professoriate makes particular and pointed recommendations to extend academic freedom and responsibility to contingent faculty, to include contingent faculty as “genuine peers,” and to give contingent faculty a hand in the shared governance of academic programs.

In 2010, AAC&U launched Preparing Critical Faculty for the Future (PCFF), a project intended to provide professional and leadership development for women of color faculty in science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM), and in natural and behavioral science disciplines. Through this effort, PCFF aims to improve undergraduate STEM education at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and more broadly in higher education.

In 2011, AAC&U opened yet another new phase of work, this time explicitly addressing the rising numbers of faculty working on contingent contracts, whether full-time or part-time, and making the case for the connections between the working conditions for faculty and the achievement of liberal education outcomes for all students. The association created space within the 2011 annual meeting for the New Faculty Majority http://www.newfaculty.org/) and hosted their national summit during the 2012 AAC&U annual meeting.

Our newest project on behalf of the faculty began also in 2011, with the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (http://www.thechanging-faculty.org/). Cosponsored by AAC&U and the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California, the Delphi Project opened a first phase of work by convening a group of higher education leaders from a diverse range of institutions, organizations, and associations. Using a modified Delphi process, a method of building consensus, the project identified major themes and critical findings on the state of the faculty. It also gathered and presented research at the intersection of teaching and learning, drawing connections between working conditions for educators and the consequential effects on student success, including achievement of intended learning outcomes. Two meta-strategies emerged from the first phase of work. The Delphi leadership group achieved consensus on the need for a new vision. The academy must design, they said, a new model, a future faculty model. Concurrently, the leadership group agreed that it is essential
to support the existing faculty, including non-tenure-track faculty who face poor working conditions on most campuses. To achieve this goal, campus leaders need to understand the challenges to the work of non-tenure-track faculty because campus policies and practices do not support their performance (e.g., late scheduling of classes, no professional development). Poor policies are producing poor outcomes for students—notably reduced learning and engagement. The project is assembling resources and offering improved policies, including working examples and models that will help campus leaders design practices to support all faculty.

The Delphi Project makes the case that higher education bears a collective responsibility to help institutions of all types weather the change in working conditions for faculty and to do so ethically and purposefully—with an eye to resilient plans for the future. As the articles in this issue of Peer Review attest, we can see the need for much work ahead. But we have begun to move.

TRANSFORMING TRADITIONAL CAMPUSS-BASED STRUCTURES AND DESIGNS

Nearing the organization’s centennial in 2015, AAC&U can rightly claim to have exercised a century of leadership for academic freedom and responsibility and to have undertaken this leadership to advance undergraduate learning. As an organization, we have addressed tenure and the roles, rewards, and work of the faculty as long as the organization has existed. In 2013, amidst profound change, this legacy matters. It is rooted in our mission. The responsibility it carries deserves our association’s full attention. The AAC&U strategic plan envisions the work ahead: We will “engage faculty—full-time, part-time, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty—in pursuing goals and using practices that support both meanings of student success: expanded completion levels and demonstrated achievement of the expected learning outcomes students need for success in the twenty-first century” (10). We recognize that we are undertaking this work as traditional campus-based structures and designs are being transformed. Online and hybrid learning practices are well established and growing. The arrival of MOOCs and such concepts as the “flipped” classroom and “unbundled” learning, together with the potential currency of competencies to replace credit-hours, all raise new questions about the relationship between teaching and scholarship. In this context the meaning of the very word faculty is up for grabs, as the roles of educators diversify across an array of working conditions. We ignore these conditions at our peril.

AAC&U’s strategic plan concludes by making the case for specific action:

The continued increase in contingent faculty appointments is an “elephant in the room” for American higher education, threatening the future of scholarly community and putting at grave risk AAC&U’s commitment to high-quality liberal education and inclusive excellence for all. The strength of American higher education in the last century came from the integration of scholarship and teaching. That integration is central to one of the core goals of liberal education: teaching students the arts of evidence-based inquiry, analysis, and judgment. The link between teaching and research has been cut almost completely by the so-called “new providers” that many in policy and philanthropy see as models for efficiencies in “cost” and “delivery.” Even in the not-for-profit sector, the majority of teaching in now done by non-tenure-line faculty and/or graduate students.

How will our call for high-level attention to the issue play out in the coming years? Undergraduate liberal education is our lens for looking at the problems, changes, challenges to teaching, research, and service, to shared governance and academic freedom. Faculty members are an essential AAC&U constituency. But our membership profile and the cross-cutting nature of our association—all sectors and institutional types, administrators at all levels as well as faculty and staff, and policy makers—may enable us to play a uniquely credible role as these issues are addressed and solutions evolve.

AAC&U brings a credibility that many other groups do not, especially those that promote a one-dimensional solution, consider a single perspective, or cling unhelpfully to what may now, however regrettably, be outmoded demands. The time is right for AAC&U to step forward, to convene and lead an effort to produce a twenty-first-century statement of principles and to invest our most compassionate energies and commitments to foster change. The mission of AAC&U is to make liberal education and inclusive excellence the foundation for institutional purpose and educational practice in higher education. To carry out our mission, we will work hand in hand with all educators and we will envision the hands of future faculty—beckoning, engaged in work we can only begin to imagine.
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Creating a High-Quality Place to Teach, Learn, and Work

Adrianna Kezar, professor of higher education, University of Southern California
Sean Gehrke, researcher, Pullias Center for Higher Education, University of Southern California

Research has demonstrated that many campuses do not provide basic supports for non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF), including mentoring, multiyear contracts, professional development, orientation, materials and resources to teach, and administrative support (Baldwin and Chronister 2001; Gappa and Leslie 1993; Hollenshead et. al 2007). NTTF now account for more than 50 percent of the faculty at four-year institutions and two-thirds of the faculty nationally. Many teach full-time or have teaching loads close to full-time and aspire to tenure-track positions. Yet, we have little understanding why the majority of the faculty that are now employed at colleges and universities receive such minimal basic supports that are commonplace for tenure-track faculty. In many cases, they are doing the exact same work as tenure-track faculty in terms of instruction and service. And increasingly NTTF are also being placed on research lines where they are also conducting research similar to tenure-track faculty, particularly in science and medical fields. It is important to try to understand why the policies and practices in place for NTTF are so different from those adopted for tenured or tenure-track faculty. What drives such decisions or lack of action?

Recent research (Kezar 2013) demonstrates that the lack of supports that are basic to effective working conditions, as well as poor institutional policies such as last-minute hiring, is affecting NTTF’s opportunity to perform at a high-quality level. Last-minute scheduling of courses prevents NTTF from being prepared. Having to drive between multiple institutions affects faculty members’ ability to be available to students and leads to psychological fatigue that affects their teaching energy and quality. Lack of communication about institutional and departmental learning goals as well as absence from curriculum discussions prevents NTTF from linking their teaching to larger institutional learning goals. Rigidly pre-prepared syllabi on the one hand do not allow faculty to draw their own strengths in the classroom, and the lack of any sample syllabi on the other hand provides limited understanding of high-quality teaching expectations. The lack of basic infrastructure support such as access to Blackboard, clerical support, and training for online courses and other challenging teaching situations affects how NTTF prepare for and execute courses. While these are just a few examples, they illustrate the challenges presented by current policies and practices. And we also know that these working conditions are affecting student outcomes, such as graduation, transfer between two-year and four-year colleges, and retention (Eagan and Jaeger 2009; Ehrenberg and Zhang 2005; Jacoby 2006). For a detailed discussion of the impact on students, please see http://www.thechangingfaculty.org/.

In order to understand and address this challenge of limited support, we conducted a national survey of academic leaders (deans) to better understand how they think about support for NTTF. The research question we asked is: To what degree do deans provide supportive policies for NTTF? For example, do administrators feel that NTTF should be supported, and how? What might be hindering them from supporting NTTF? We have ample research that demonstrates we need to change practices; therefore it is important to understand why needed policies and practices have not emerged after twenty years of calls for reform. Some have suggested that policies and practices to better support NTTF are not provided because of limited funds.

This paper emerged out of a larger project called the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success. The Delphi Project is a national effort involving all major higher education stakeholders including policy makers, accreditation agencies,
academic leaders at all levels, unions, faculty groups, and disciplinary societies to address contingency and examine the changing composition of faculty and its impact on institutional and student outcomes. The project is working in partnership with the Association of American Colleges and Universities. The project website has more details about the broader efforts and regularly has new information about new work evolving out of the project.

THE STUDY
This study utilized data collected from a survey titled Values, Practices, and Faculty Hiring Decisions of Academic Leaders, which was designed to examine college deans’ views on the professoriate and values and beliefs pertaining to the use of NTTF. The survey also examined pressures influencing deans’ decision making around hiring and policies affecting NTTF. It contained forty-seven items, grouped into the following sections: faculty composition, faculty hiring practices, data related to faculty hiring, policies regarding full and part-time NTTF, and institutional and individual demographic questions. The survey items were developed to examine organizational processes, values of decision makers, and pressures that affect decision making noted in the decision-making literature.

In spring 2012, the survey was sent to the membership of American Conference of Academic Deans and the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, two membership organizations comprised of deans of colleges of arts and sciences and liberal arts colleges. These organizations were chosen for their national representation of academic deans at four-year institutions, the administrators often most responsible for hiring and setting policy for NTTF.

A total of 278 participants completed the survey, resulting in a 30 percent response rate after accounting for members from institutions that do not have tenure and multiple members from the same institution. Fifty percent of respondents were from private institutions; 22 percent were from doctoral institutions, 48 percent from master’s institutions, 25 percent from baccalaureate institutions, and 5 percent from associates, or other institutions. The results presented here largely focus on trend data from the study.

The survey examined both attitudes toward and the prevalence of offering the following policies for NTTF: orientation, medical benefits, family leave, office space, office supplies, administrative support, structured mentoring, professional development for teaching, professional development for research, paid sabbatical, multiyear contracts, opportunity to serve on committees, opportunity to advise students, and participation in institutional governance. For more detailed descriptions of methods, analyses, and findings, see Gehrke and Kezar (2013).

SUPPORTS PROVIDED: GLASS BOTH HALF-FULL AND HALF-EMPTY
The study identified that deans are increasingly providing supports for NTTF in the areas of orientation, office supplies, and administrative support, particularly for full-time NTTF members. However, the largest group of NTTF members on the campuses surveyed was part-time faculty. Part-time faculty are much less likely to receive support than full-time faculty. Nine of the policies providing support for part-time faculty exist on less than 23 percent of campuses in the study. Part-time faculty are most likely to receive orientation, office supplies, and office space. However, they rarely serve on committees, receive multiyear contracts or medical benefits, participate in institutional governance, or have the opportunity to advise students or be involved in professional development.

An examination of the policies provided for full-time NTTF is encouraging on the surface, as nine of the fourteen policies were in place on over 70 percent of the campuses in the study. However, some of the policies that have been found to be most important in supporting NTTF in teaching performance—specifically mentoring, professional development, and multiyear contracts (Kezar and Sam 2010)—are still lacking on close to half of the campuses in the sample.

The findings demonstrate that we have advanced since the days of Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) research where NTTF were completely invisible on campus and virtually no policies or practices existed to support them in their work. Increasingly, campuses are seeing that they need to provide policies and practices, particularly for full-time NTTF, whose numbers have grown in recent years. In the early 1990s, full-time NTTF were mostly an anomaly and now they are becoming increasingly common. Given their physical presence day-to-day on campuses (compared to part-time faculty), it is perhaps not surprising to see that changes are being made to support their work. This is encouraging and suggests that we are moving toward policies that can support a high-quality teaching, learning, and work environment. But the findings also suggest that there is much work to be done particularly related to part-time faculty support.

WHY IS SUPPORT PROVIDED OR NOT? DEANS’ VALUES TRUMP ALL
This study examined not only trends in offering support, but tried to understand how and why support is provided or not. The study specifically explored the relative importance of two different factors on decisions to provide support: deans’ values and external pressures such as limited funds or enrollment surges. Our study also examined organizational processes (e.g., data collection, consultation, planning) as they relate to hiring NTTF, which allows us to extrapolate their importance in making decisions to sup-
port NTTF. Through both statistical analyses and coding of open-ended responses, we found that the largest factor associated with whether the institution provided supportive policies for NTTF was deans’ values. If deans place value on supporting NTTF, then the policies are much more likely to be in place. Not only is this evident through surface comparisons of deans’ values and organizational offerings of support (in general, policies are less prevalent on campuses where deans value these policies less), but results of logistic regressions (controlling for institutional characteristics) provide further support for this assertion. In order for NTTF to be more supported, deans need to develop more supportive attitudes.

Also, one issue that arises in the literature is that conflict between individual and organizational values leads to change (Agle and Coldwell 1999; Deal and Kennedy 1982; Posner, Kouzes, and Schmidt 1985). Deans report that members of their organization (other leaders) do not encourage policies to support NTTF. Thus, if there is not a broader valuing within the organization for the need for NTTF to be supported in their jobs, there is little pressure for change. The current overall value system of higher education (at least among administrative leaders) does not identify support for NTTF as important. These findings suggest a need to create awareness and raise consciousness among deans and other key leaders who might influence deans (such as department chairs, provosts, and presidents) about the importance of support for NTTF to better achieve student learning outcomes. There is a growing research base about the negative impact of poor working conditions on students and campuses (see http://www.thechangingfaculty.org/) that can be used to raise consciousness among campus leaders. But who exactly is responsible for shifting values is unclear. Should accreditation agencies look more closely at the support that is provided for faculty, creating pressure for institutions? We know that accreditors are currently examining this issue. Should boards of trustees be informed of the issue and raise it on campus? The Association for Governing Boards is currently creating a guide for boards about what they should know about faculty and key policy issues related to NTTF. Should boards hold presidents accountable, which might provide more support within the senior ranks of the institution? Deans felt little encouragement from the senior administration for supporting NTTF. What seems clear from these data is that some form of influence or accountability is needed to shape the views of campus leaders—such as deans, provosts, and presidents—about the changing faculty.

THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL PRESSURES

While deans’ values were the strongest predictor of supportive polices and practices being in place, external pressures were also cited by deans and need attention if campuses are to better support NTTF. We asked why deans were unable to provide support for NTTF and the three most significant pressures described include declining budgets, lack of value from others in the institution (already noted), and contractual/unionization issues. Declining budgets made deans question the ability to provide supports, particularly ones that might incur costs. However, it should be noted that they often invoked declining budgets even on items that may have no cost to the institution, such as inclusion in governance, or that have very marginal costs, such as administrative support or office supplies.

FIGURE 1. PREVALENCE OF POLICIES FOR FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY FOR CAMPUSES IN STUDY
Deans may decline supportive policies before exploring how much they actually cost, if anything. While declining budgets played a role in their thinking and framing around whether to offer supports, the actual costs of some supports (beyond benefits or paid sabbatical) are quite marginal.

Perceived financial pressures can lead deans to not act on their value systems, resulting in policies not being put in place despite deans’ support for them. For example, deans generally agree that professional development for teaching should be provided for full-time faculty, but budgetary constraints are frequently cited as a reason that this support is not offered.

A second area cited as preventing deans from offering a policy or practice is upper administration’s views and values. Deans note that they report to individuals that do not believe support for NTTF is needed. For example, deans generally feel that structured mentoring should be provided to full-time faculty, yet more than a third of deans who report the lack of policy cite lack of priority from senior leadership. It is important to note that deans also indicate they do not confer regularly with presidents or provosts on decisions related to NTTF. Without much discussion and open dialogue on campuses, leaders may operate off perceived views rather than actual views related to support for NTTF. Is it possible that deans construe calls for being careful financially from senior leaders as lack of support for policies for NTTF?

Deans also cite contract and union issues as reasons for not offering certain policies specifically related to participatory policies, such as governance and advising students. However, the benefits of unionization were made clear by the regression models in the study. Belonging to a union increases the likelihood of NTTF receiving medical and family leave benefits and multiyear contracts. While unionization seems to limit the institutional involvement of NTTF, it does increase the likelihood of receiving personal benefits and job security. Therefore, unions have a mixed role in providing support for NTTF. Unions are trying to protect their members from participation in activities that they are not being paid for and to manage their workloads. However, there are union leaders who have bargained for compensation for student advising and involvement in governance. It may be that deans can speak to union leaders about the benefits of NTTF being involved in governance to improve curriculum and teaching environments and become aware of learning goals and objectives key to student learning. Union leaders may not be familiar with research and data about the impact of faculty being excluded from key institutional processes on the teaching and learning environment. Sharing data with union leaders might help build a bridge to allow for more supportive policies and practices.

**IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The implication of these competing pressures is that we need strategies and resources for deans who do want to make changes to support NTTF but feel that forces are preventing them from meeting this challenge. How can institutional budgets be re-examined to support all faculty? How might dialogues among different campus leaders be used to shift perspectives? In order to enhance such investigations and conversations, we have

---

**FIGURE 2. DEANS’ VALUES TOWARD PROVIDING SUPPORTIVE POLICIES FOR FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

![Chart showing comparative values of deans for providing supportive policies for full-time and part-time non-tenure-track faculty.](chart.png)

**NOTE:** Mean values measured on a 5-point Likert-like scale (1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree) assessing the extent to which deans feel NTTF should be provided with each policy.
developed resources and posted them on the Delphi Project for the Changing Faculty and Student Success website: http://www.thechangingfaculty.org/. One key resource is a guide to help people create a vision for the needed policies and practices that is based on examining data and inquiry: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on Our Campus: A Guide for Campus Task Forces to Better Understand Faculty Working Conditions and the Necessity for Change. This guide helps deans create task forces and conversations about the nature of and support for the professoriate. The guide asks questions about all the areas that we know are important for supporting faculty but allows campuses to examine the issues within their context. The guide also asks campus teams to collect and examine data so that they better understand the issue and make evidence-based decisions. The website also includes process guides (called Pathways to Change) that provide two-page overviews of campuses that have made changes for NTTF faculty (based on research) and help people see different pathways for creating change.

We also asked deans about strategy, dialogues, staffing plans, governance, and other key organizational tools for shaping core institutional decisions such as the makeup of the faculty and support for all faculty members. While literature on sound decision making in times of external threat and challenge suggests these processes are key to good decision making (Priem, Rasheed, and Kotlic 1995; Rajagopalan, Rasheed, and Datat 1993), they are used much less than desirable on campuses for decisions related to NTTF faculty.

We highly encourage deans to talk more to senior leaders about decisions around support and to provide data about the implications and negative outcomes that can result if institutions do not provide support. However, it may be that the individuals that deans report to do not believe NTTF need or deserve supportive policies. If that is the case, one implication of this study may be the importance of raising the consciousness of presidents and provosts about the problems of inadequate support for NTTF. While our questions focused mostly on strategy, dialogue, or planning as it relates to hiring (see Kezar and Gehrke 2013), one can extrapolate that these processes are also underused for guiding policies and practices.

CONCLUSIONS
Our research shows that despite deans citing economic pressures as reasons for not providing supports, their values still play the major role. Perhaps the conversation has focused on financial constraints for too long and it is time to address how deans come to develop their values pertaining to supporting employees. The influence of deans’ values on support for NTTF suggests that deans could play a larger role in advocating for supports in institutional discussions. Also, if deans were to develop more supportive attitudes toward NTTF, contract negotiations with unions could lead to better agreements with universities to provide more of these supports that enhance the teaching and learning environment.

Our conclusion from the survey is that deans can and should provide more support for NTTF. What we need is for them to truly believe in the value of supporting NTTF and then to use the guides provided by the Delphi project and the professional guidance offered by organizations like CCAS and ACAD to help them in brainstorming solutions. Then, we will have a high-quality place to teach, learn, and work.
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have spent over three years as a contingent faculty member at two institutions (a community college and a private liberal arts institution) over the course of my academic career. Graduating with a PhD in a recession has proved challenging and I imagine my entrée into contingency was similar to most: my deep love for teaching college students, in spite of the lack of stable jobs, is what set me on this path. The longer I stayed on the contingent track post-PhD, the more I came to realize that the situation for contingent faculty, as it currently stands, is untenable. I have decided to leave the contingent track in favor of a research career path (another passion of mine), and I wrote this article while pulling away from almost a decade of teaching in higher education. I have much to reflect upon with so many issues currently facing contingent faculty, but I want to start with perhaps the simplest issue—how do we reference this group of faculty members?

In the urgency to better understand the experiences of faculty who are teaching off the tenure track, academia has yet to collectively decide on the best term(s) to use in reference to this group. I find "full and part-time non-tenure-track faculty" and the acronym NTTF useful and I will use that terminology, along with "contingent faculty," throughout the rest of this piece. Not all institutions use this terminology, however. For instance, at an institution that I taught at for two-and-a-half years, all NTTF were publicly referred to as "affiliate professors." My title was "affiliate assistant professor," since I joined the institution shortly after receiving my PhD. A colleague of mine, who started teaching at the same institution after receiving tenure at another institution, was titled "affiliate associate professor." Some institutions simply prefer "instructor" or "adjunct." Although I don’t think one term can capture the full range of experiences for all full and part-time NTTF, I do think that too many terms are confusing. If the academy could agree on appropriate titles, this could help the academic community get on the same page about the realities facing this group of faculty members and the impact contingency has on student success.

**PRIORITIZING STUDENT SUCCESS IN AN ERA OF CONTINGENCY**

In order to address the impact of contingency on undergraduate student success, I would like to first underscore some of the limitations and constraints that NTTF face. Full-time NTTF currently make up 18.8 percent of all faculty, while part-time NTTF currently make up 47.7 percent of all faculty (The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success 2012), and the two faculty groups deal with issues that are particular to their separate experiences. Although both groups face job instability and are frequently divorced from the larger campus culture, part-time NTTF often teach at multiple institutions or are balancing their courses with employment outside of the academy, while full-time NTTF are often constrained by contract limits that can range from three to seven years at their institutions. These circumstances create untenable career paths and too often prevent NTTF from adequately serving undergraduate students due to their limited presence on and involvement in our nation’s campuses and their campus communities.

Part-time NTTF are especially limited in their availability to students, not only because they are balancing multiple employment positions, but some institutions are also now placing limitations on the number of hours (and, therefore, classes) that part-time faculty can work (and teach)—all in response to the Affordable Care Act. The Chronicle of Higher Education reports that institutions in some states, including Ohio, Virginia, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, are limiting part-time NTTF work hours to under thirty hours a week "in advance" (Dunn 2013) of a
January 2014 implementation date for the Affordable Care Act, which will require employers with more than fifty employees to provide health benefits to those who work at least thirty hours a week. These limitations are also being instituted in response to the Internal Revenue Service’s recent proposal that colleges and universities take into consideration the work hours that contingent faculty accumulate both inside and outside of the classroom in determining eligibility for healthcare benefits (June 2013). These work hour limitations are becoming a “trend,” according to Maria Maisto of New Faculty Majority (Strausheim 2008), and all of this equates not only to a decrease in full-time NTTF (in favor of more part-time NTTF), but also decreased faculty availability for student interaction, and decreased availability for grading. One NTTF member interviewed by The Chronicle stated that she “considered reducing the number of pages she requires for her essay assignments, to cut back on the grading time” (Dunn 2013). Administrators who are pushing for work hour limitations are using the rhetoric of institutional budget crises to effectively de-center student work, devalue high-impact practices (such as writing-intensive courses), and de-prioritize faculty well-being.

AAC&U argues for the implementation of high-impact practices (HIPs), including writing-intensive courses, undergraduate research, and service learning, which emphasize “cumulative educational achievements across the multiple levels of the college curriculum” and foster institutional learning outcomes for the purposes of student success (Kuh 2008). As a contingent faculty member who was not involved in the development or monitoring of the institutional learning outcomes at the two campuses where I taught, AAC&U’s list of HIPs and Essential Learning Outcomes were invaluable in helping me craft my own learning objectives. I specifically prompted students to focus on critical thinking, analytical thinking, civic knowledge, integrative learning, and intercultural knowledge in my courses, which focused heavily on writing. At too many institutions, however, the connection between campus priorities for student success and contingent faculty work is tenuous—and this is not the fault of NTTF. Institutions need to provide NTTF with the necessary resources (access to faculty workshops, for instance) that engage faculty in campus teaching and learning priorities—and this work needs to be incentivized.

AAC&U’s own work on student learning outcomes is partly organized through the Quality Collaboratives (QC) project, which seeks to align high-quality education with degree completion by beta testing mapping and assessment of student learning outcomes using the Degree Qualifications Profile (or DQP—see http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) in the context of transfer between two- and four-year institutions. The learning outcomes presented in the DQP—broad and specialized knowledge, intellectual skills, applied learning, and civic learning—are structured to support cumulative student learning across the curriculum. Some of the institutions in the QC project are working with tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure-track faculty through project assessment of DQP learning outcomes. In fact, the QC project specifically recommends engagement with “professionals, including contingent and part-time faculty…” on “expected learning outcomes across both general and field-specific areas of learning.”

In addition to engagement with student learning outcomes, AAC&U’s measures of student success includes nationwide evidence about access, retention, completion, and learning achievement of underserved student groups in higher education.

Campus resources that affirm underserved students’ particular race, class, gender, sexual, and immigrant identities support student success initiatives—and so do faculty, including NTTF. Numerous NTTF teach about issues that have a direct impact on marginalized student groups, and these faculty members often serve as resources for these students. In fact, many underserved students approach NTTF for mentoring, and the longer these faculty members remain on campus, the more students identify these individuals as mentors. Campus administrators generally do not recognize or reward mentoring relationships between NTTF and marginalized students, and when contingent faculty-mentors leave their posts (either on their own accord or via contract limits), they leave a gap in student support.

THE CURRENT EMPLOYMENT LANDSCAPE

Now that I have explored some of the issues currently facing NTTF, and the impact of these issues on student success, I want to address the employment landscape for newly minted PhDs in the economic downturn. The 2011 Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities report, released by the National Science Foundation (NSF) in December 2012, highlights shifting trends in doctoral education since 1958, with a particular focus on individuals who received research doctorates during the 2010-2011 academic year. In the report, NSF describes a worrisome decline in postgraduation employment opportunities for PhD recipients:

“The proportion of doctorate recipients with definite commitments for employment or postdoctoral (postdoc) study fell in every broad science and engineering (S&E) field in 2011, the second consecutive year of decline. … The proportion… [also] fell in every broad non-S&E field of study in 2011, the third consecutive year of decline
in each of those fields” (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics 2012).

The report goes on to describe the decline in jobs for PhD recipients in “every broad S&E field” as being “at or near its lowest level of the past ten years.” Additionally, PhD recipients in the humanities are facing their lowest level of job opportunities “since 1997,” while PhD recipients “in education and other non-S&E fields” are facing a decline lower than “any point in the past two decades” (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics 2012). The data clearly point to the negative effects of the economic downturn on employment opportunities, yet the data also confirm that this issue has been trending for some time. From 1969 to 2009, the percentage of faculty off the tenure track has shifted from about 21.7 to 66.5 percent of all faculty members in US institutions (The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success 2012). Maria Maisto and Steve Street address the increasing reliance on contingency from the 1970s forward: “While the roots of contingent academic employment go back many decades, and surged in the early 1970s (Berry 2005), it was not until the 1980s that the higher education community really began to notice that contingency had exploded to a level of concern” (Maisto and Street 2011). Richard Boris, director of the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, also describes the reliance on NTTF from the 1980s forward as “a lure or a drug that” institutions “couldn’t wean themselves from” (Flaherty 2013).

What does this mean, in the current economic context? Although we can look to the NSF data as evidence of a surplus of PhD recipients in the United States, with an accompanied dilemma of how to employ this surplus of individuals, I would rather academic institutions (and other employers) think of these individuals as a pool of available, excellent talent. Academia has had this pool of talented individuals with the skills to teach and mentor our nation’s undergraduates at its disposal for years. Institutions need to start providing these individuals with sustainable career trajectories, which is truly in the best interest of everyone involved (since sustainable careers mean better working conditions, deeper engagement with campus priorities, and decreased faculty turnover). Institutions also need to open up job searches beyond new doctorate recipients—Inside Higher Ed described two job ads last year that called for candidates “who earned their PhDs in 2010 or after” (Basu 2012) to apply for open assistant professor positions.

Furthermore, racial and class backgrounds continue to serve as predictors for PhD attainment in the United States, adding a demographic layer to the issue of PhDs with insecure jobs or inequitable access to employment and bolstering the argument for inclusive excellence in the realm of doctorate programs. According to the NSF “As of 2011, about half of American Indian or Alaska Native, black or African American, and Hispanic or Latino doctorate recipients belonged to families in which neither parent had been awarded a college degree. In contrast, nearly three-fourths of Asian and white doctorate recipients came from families with at least one college-educated parent, and nearly half of Asian and white doctorate recipients had at least one parent with an advanced degree” (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics 2012). Alongside this racial and class inequality in doctorate programs, gender continues to serve as a predictor of salary level for doctorate recipients—men with doctorates currently earn a higher salary than women with doctorates “in just about any field” (Palmer 2013). Further, even though “in 2011, temporary visa holders represented the majority of doctorate recipients in engineering and over 40 percent of those in the physical sciences” (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics 2012), these individuals faced bigger obstacles to employment than their US counterparts (Weissmann 2013). Thus, when discussing the issues surrounding contingency, academicians need to additionally address the reality that historically privileged groups continue to have greater access to doctorate programs and (higher-paid) employment than do historically marginalized groups.

MOVING BEYOND A SEEMING IMPASSE

The picture may look bleak, but there are productive things happening to address the contingency issue and there are plenty of opportunities to shift the current academic culture. Part of this shift includes changing the way that institutions prepare future doctorate recipients for employment, both inside and outside of the academy. The American Historical Association (AHA) is trying to do just this, partially through a mini-conference on “the malleable PhD” held at its 2013 annual meeting, where participants discussed “a range of job opportunities outside the academy for historians, the role of graduate education in preparing students for those opportunities, and practical suggestions for history PhDs hoping to broaden their employment horizons” (Jones 2013). The AHA has refreshingly prioritized the contingency issue, and at this mini-conference, participants took exception to academic culture that has tended to “disparage employment outside the academy” (Jones 2013).
Many institutions also offer orientation sessions to NTTF, which (in my experience) provide information about the campus culture, campus resources, tips for the classroom, and an introduction to campus technologies. Although these orientation sessions provide a helpful foundation, they tend to reflect a limited, “incremental change” (Maisto and Street 2011) to the campus culture, and NTTF are often left to their own devices thereafter. For example, although I participated in the orientation session at one of the institutions at which I taught, I was never provided with an introduction to the campus technology within the classrooms, leading to numerous phone calls to campus technology services across most of the semesters I taught at that campus (including during actual class time). Institutions should, therefore, construct new (and equitable) ways of bringing NTTF deeper into the campus culture beyond these orientations. Institutions could offer NTTF incentivized workshops on institutional learning outcomes or campus technologies (to be offered at accessible times) throughout the academic year and campus administrators could find ways to recognize NTTF for service outside of the classroom (such as speaking on panels about topics that affect the campus community, mentoring students, or writing letters of recommendation).

The increasing reliance on NTTF has also perpetuated a two-tiered system in academia that has produced a divide between those who gain a tenure-track position and those who don’t. Maisto and Street further argue that there are “three classes of faculty rather than two,” with NTTF split between full-time and part-time (Maisto and Street 2011). While it’s true that NTTF and tenure-track faculty have their own particular issues to contend with, I have noted little visible support for issues affecting NTTF from tenured or tenure-track faculty on the campuses at which I have taught. This issue can go both ways—NTTF could also demonstrate more support for their colleagues on the tenure track. I can personally attest that it took an in-depth conversation with a friend on the tenure track to help me understand the pressures that some tenure-track faculty are facing in their efforts to gain tenure in an economic downturn, such as increased demands on research productivity, higher teaching loads, and a decreased sense of governance. Although NTTF research too often takes a back-burner amidst the scurry to secure stable income and benefits, NTTF can empathize with high teaching loads and are often left out of faculty governance altogether. These issues, although experienced differently, could become connecting points of solidarity between faculty on and off the tenure track. Both tiers of faculty might consider forming a unified faculty community on their campuses, in order to build empathy and understanding about their respective issues (a starting point for effective change). The American Association of University Professors has campus chapters that foster these types of communities, and faculty can also elect to meet informally. NTTF might also meet separately from tenured or tenure-track faculty, if they can find the time to build a collaborative.

There is too much at stake for academia when it comes to issues involving full and part-time non-tenure-track faculty, including nationwide student success, the “health” of the professoriate, and an “academic democracy” (Maisto and Street 2011) that recognizes that the success of all faculty is critical to success of all students. When I was a first-year undergraduate, I took an Introduction to Sociology course that made me fall deeply in love with the discipline, and I walked away from that course willing to do whatever I could to teach and inspire undergraduate students in much the same way that I was inspired all of those years ago. Yet, we now collectively

stand at the nexus of deep cuts to higher education and further instability of faculty roles. How is academia planning to inspire the next generation of faculty, if fair treatment and full participation in campus communities are tenuous dreams, at best?
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The Last Artisans?  
Traditional and Future Faculty Roles

David Paris, vice president, Office of Integrative Liberal Learning and the Global Commons, AAC&U

The articles in this issue of Peer Review variously describe the changes in the role of faculty members in undergraduate education and the conditions under which they work. The traditional faculty situation of full-time employment in a department with a fairly well-defined career track that includes tenure and protection of academic freedom is disappearing. Tenure-track positions have declined, and the adjuncts, instructors, and other non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) that now fill the faculty ranks are less secure and less well compensated. Moreover, many of the things faculty members used to do—course design, selection of materials, creation of assignments, and assessment—are increasingly being organized by administrators and specialists and then turned over to often peripatetic adjuncts. The faculty role, from terms and conditions of employment to the actual work of instruction, is, in current parlance, becoming “unbundled.”

Two obvious factors driving these changes are cost and technology. In all but a small minority of well-funded institutions, budgetary pressures, especially postrecession, make cutting personnel costs and even personnel an obvious, even necessary “managerial imperative” (Lazerson 2010, Ch. 4). The unbundling or elimination of the traditional faculty role is aided and abetted by technology that allows courses to be delivered more cheaply or even free as institutions increasingly go online and flirt with massive open online courses (MOOCs).

Those concerned about this brave new world have spent much energy and effort in trying to understand these changes and develop appropriate and effective responses to them. The work of the Delphi Project and the ongoing efforts of AAC&U are producing sound research and interesting possibilities. At the grass-roots level, efforts at unionizing adjuncts seem to be gaining some traction with good results. These admirable efforts nevertheless implicitly or explicitly recognize that we are unlikely, save in a few elite places, to see the traditional faculty role restored.

As we consider future possibilities, it might be of value to pause and remind ourselves of the traditional faculty role by looking at it where it still exists—the liberal arts college. The art and craft of faculty work practiced there might help us evaluate new ideas about the faculty role as it might be emerging under the pressures of cost and the possibilities of technology. It might also provide us with some perspective on, and responses to, emerging and potentially radical alternatives.

BUNDLING AND ARTISANSHIP

The liberal arts college is often thought to reflect what “college” is—Delbanco calls this ideal “our American pastoral”—despite the fact that these institutions serve a small fraction of American students (2012, 11). Residential campuses create a small community of traditional-age students and offer the promise of personalized attention from faculty and administrators in and out of class, as well as numerous cocurricular opportunities. Most students also point out that in the often-isolated residential setting, they learn as much from their peers as their instructors—and perhaps on a broader range of subjects. As a common banner in college dormitories in the nineteenth century cheekily put it, “Don’t let your studies interfere with your education!” (Thelin 2004, 163).

Faculty members in these institutions, the large majority of whom are tenured and tenure track (usually more of the former than the latter), typically define their formal role through the traditional trinity of teaching, scholarship, and service. However, in these institutions, unlike in many or even most universities, teaching is given far more weight in personnel considerations, and spending a fair amount of time in advising and governance is not only typical but expected. In these and other activities beyond the classroom, there is an important, more or less explicit understanding that faculty members, administrators, and students form...
an intentional community. The expectation is that the constant academic and social interaction is an important part of what Delbanco calls “lateral learning” from peers and others in the community (2012, 54–57). Faculty members and others see themselves as mentors to, and friends of, their students. To be sure, these understandings are found at other institutions, but the particular situation of the small residential college facilitates and encourages these relationships.

With regard to teaching, faculty members individually have tremendous autonomy and nearly complete control over curricular materials and course content, pedagogical strategies and classroom tactics, and assessment. Although there may be some departmental or institutional requirements for offering certain courses or having certain assignments (e.g., in writing-intensive courses), the norm is for each faculty member to develop and teach courses according to his/her own best lights as part of a department’s disciplinary offerings. There are few specialists that assist faculty members in any aspect of this process, save perhaps for library assistance and technological support for a course management system. There are few if any design specialists for electronic materials, few or no assessment personnel, or technical staff to move courses into online platforms, etc.

Simply put, the idea of unbundling the faculty role, whether in terms and conditions of employment or in instruction, has not reached the shores of the small elite liberal arts colleges. Faculty members are fairly autonomous artisans who craft the process of learning in their own ways without much if any specialized help; the specialization and division of labor involved only pertains to their and their colleagues’ disciplinary training. Indeed, the faculty as a whole, like the disciplines/graduate schools that produce them, operates something like a medieval guild that provided entry to employment via apprenticeship, set craft standards, and resisted interference from authorities and potential competitors. Finally, the “bundled” role of faculty members at liberal arts colleges is dual, since it also extends to their broader role as community members relating to students in many ways beyond the classroom.

Does it work? If depth of belief and testimony are to be believed, these liberal arts colleges have a strong positive impact on their students (Chambliss forthcoming). “High-impact practices” may not be a term of art at these institutions, but they are commonly practiced. Perhaps inevitably by dint of size and character, students report higher levels of engagement than are found at most institutions, a combination of intentionality and serendipity on a small residential campus. The key ingredient to making it work is immersion in an intellectual community with multiple opportunities for personal interaction, mentoring, and “lateral learning.” Students often “major in a professor” (Jaschik 2013) and have many opportunities for one-on-one engagement and feedback. The sense of community developed among undergraduates extends beyond graduation. Maintaining connections with peers and with the faculty and the institution is common, including high rates of participation in annual giving, reflecting belief in the worth of the institution and program.

As ideal as these circumstances are, the model is not perfect. With a few notable exceptions, formal assessment of learning in these settings is rare, and it sometimes seems that such resistance correlates with elite status. Similarly, innovation in program or pedagogy is not necessarily an imperative, especially as mostly tenured faculty, with artisan-like confidence in their individual work and institutional role, often see little need to change what seems to work well. The success that is a product of both lavish resources and highly personal kind of artisanship is enviable but probably not widely replicable; this kind of education is simply too costly to be offered widely. It works, but primarily in some limited and privileged precincts.

A FUTURE FACULTY DYSTOPIA

If the traditional role is being preserved at elite liberal arts colleges, cost and technology are driving experimentation and disruption elsewhere. Recently the University of Southern New Hampshire’s College for America received accreditation from the New England Association of Colleges and Universities for a two-year degree in liberal studies (Parry 2013). That action received a lot of attention, because the degree would be awarded on the basis of the achievement of competencies rather than the accumulation of credit hours.

Competency-based programs are certainly not new (Field 2013), but this is “the first university eligible to award federal aid for a program untethered from the credit hour, the time-based unit that underlies courses and degrees” (Parry et. al 2013). Specifically, the program does not involve faculty members doing instruction, as “it lacks courses and traditional professors” (Parry et. al 2013). Students do self-paced work at various tasks, informed by online materials, tutorials, and problem sets presumably constructed by subject specialists and instructional designers. When students complete 120 tasks or sets of tasks that demonstrate competency the degree is awarded; there is no credit hour or time on task requirement. About the only recognizable direct faculty role in this process is in assessment of the performance of these tasks, though occasionally an individual “coach” might be in contact to help a student having difficulty. Otherwise the learning process is, so to speak, largely mechanized and routinized, the opposite of the more personal interaction in the artisanal process described above.
The appeal of this approach lies primarily in improved access and increased transparency. It improves access in two senses, cost and convenience. The degree costs as little as $2,500, which wouldn’t even pay for room and board at most residential colleges. Instruction is offered completely online, allowing the work to be done from almost anywhere. College for America has partnered with a number of corporations to support onsite locations where employees can pursue their degrees online after, and even sometimes during, work hours. The tasks and work involved in the degree should be transparent (although the lessons and tasks have yet to be made public) so that other educational institutions and future employers can see what the student has done. It is too early to answer the question of quality, “Does it work?” but the quality of the results should be able to be assessed.

For those concerned with the future faculty role, College for America might suggest a potential dystopian end point for the declining role of faculty members in undergraduate education. The faculty role is so “unbundled” in this case it all but disappears. Online resources are assembled and tasks constructed in cooperation with subject and other specialists. The resulting units are then offered widely, with the relatively limited personal contact just mentioned. Just as the artisans and guilds were replaced by more standard, mass, mechanized production, so too this kind of division of labor and use of technology could, if successful, further diminish the faculty role in undergraduate education.

Beyond the threat of supplanting the traditional faculty role, it might be objected that this approach, despite the virtues of access and transparency, has major overlapping pedagogical and social problems. Students may be able to complete the tasks using online materials, but there is little or no ongoing pedagogical process and no artisanship—the mentoring that would support deeper, longer-lasting development of skills and knowledge. It seems doubtful that the level of engagement and immersion at a residential institution that achieves its results can be matched by simply doing online tasks (though the evidence remains to be seen). From a broader, equity perspective, the development of this kind of program and perhaps other technology-driven approaches, such as MOOCs, hold out a future in which a rich, deep, closely supervised education is enjoyed by some, typically the better off, and not afforded, in several senses, to others. Although the strategy of College for America offers broader access and therefore serves equity in one way, it also reinforces inequities in the kind of education available to students.

Whatever the merits of these objections, technological experimentation and innovation like College for America is here to stay. The question, then, is what the faculty role might be—a question that, not surprisingly, folds into the broader question of the role of technology in structuring and delivering (“disrupting”) undergraduate education.

**NEGOTIATING A NEW FACYLTY ROLE**

Obviously there is a vast terrain that needs to be negotiated between the artisans in the liberal arts and the largely mechanized program of College for America. Initially, this question has been addressed as one of assessment—can online instruction in any of its many forms be as/more effective than face-to-face instruction? Like many social science questions, definite answers are hard to come by, but there is an emerging consensus that the best strategy may be a blended one that mixes online and face-to-face elements. This in turn has led to the more recent discussions about, and experiments with, “flipping the classroom,” in which materials and activities best delivered and completed online are pushed out of the classroom, with class time reserved for those activities (coaching) best done in face-to-face setting (Bowen 2012).

The moving target then is which activities belong in which domain and how they may be best combined. That is, where and how can instruction be routinized, and what kind of role can and should faculty members play in a world in which many aspects of instruction can now be found and done online? While online and adaptive learning have made huge strides, there are still many instructional tasks that ideally involve or even require human judgment. As Levy and Murnane (2013) note more generally about the role of computers in the work force, in the areas of “solving unstructured problems” (i.e., a lawyer writing a convincing legal brief) and “working with new information for use in problem solving” (i.e., a motel manager deciding whether a new air conditioner represents a useful upgrade), human judgment is needed to do the task well.

In an instructional context the implications of this are two-fold. First, some of the critical aspects of the faculty role involving judgment (artisanship) cannot be routinized or done through technology. For example, coaching students in doing inquiry—framing a problem in an interesting way, developing a research strategy, interpreting results, and giving feedback—is a task not likely to be subject to technology-based rules and pattern recognition. Perhaps equally important, the aim of undergraduate education in the economic situation Murnane and Levy describe is precisely the development of the capacities to work with unscripted problems and new information. Again, it is doubtful these capacities will be best developed through technology-dominated programs and materials, but again that is a question that demands hard thinking and evidence. At least it seems now that faculty involvement—artisanship—is still needed.
What this suggests is that faculty members need to negotiate their role on two related dimensions, the professional and the political. Professionally, faculty members are going to have to adopt and even embrace the idea of maximizing the potential of technology and the flipped classroom, even if the classroom itself is online. In training new faculty and retooling existing instructors, the way to serve both faculty and students is to develop and demonstrate the value of a combination of coaching and technology. Faculty members’ artisanship should be brought to bear and practiced in the classroom or online as a functional equivalent or enhancement of the kind of work found in a residential liberal arts college.

What is most dismaying about the current trends and changes in the faculty role is that institutions and their leaders apparently do not see the desirability of actually developing and deploying faculty to effectively take advantage of the new pedagogical possibilities. Fascination with technology and cost savings seems to have distracted administrators from thinking about what students need and what technology (and faculty) can offer. There is little or no investment in creating faculty members who can maximize the incredible potential technology creates.

It may be then that the faculty’s professional work has a political component. That is, in both advocating for and actually embracing the possibilities of the flipped classroom and similar instructional innovations, faculty members need to aggressively stake out what their professional role is and standards for it. To get institutions to respect this role, promote it, and create terms and conditions for work that allow it to occur will almost certainly require political organization of some sort, whether through existing professional mechanisms or nascent efforts at unionization.

When the guilds were overrun by industrial production it took a very long time and a great deal of struggle for labor to organize and achieve some modicum of appropriate terms and conditions for work. And, as recent events have shown, progress in the interests of labor is not guaranteed. The difference in the case of faculty is that “management” and “labor” have a shared interest in having a capable, professional, and decently treated workforce that can take advantage of the new possibilities opened up by technology. The “industrial” path we are treading and the treatment of faculty as piece workers in a quasi-industrial way serves our students, faculty, and society poorly. Reframing and redefining the artisanship of the faculty in a new era in a way that embraces technology and innovation is imperative. *
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Prim ing the Pump: Transforming the Structure of a Department

Andrew Tonge, chair of the Department of Mathematical Sciences, Kent State University

Most American university and college mathematics departments serve a major role in their institutions, as a significant number of first-year students take courses in these departments to meet part of their general education requirements. In many institutions, these courses are primarily taught by graduate teaching assistants or adjunct faculty; most tenured or tenure-track faculty have limited involvement or interest in these courses. As a result, an inherently unstable and somewhat marginalized instructional workforce is charged with the heavy responsibility of being the first point of contact with students—who are frequently underprepared—as they adapt to college expectations in courses where they are generally reluctant participants. Not surprisingly, outcomes are often unsatisfactory. This article reports on how and why the Department of Mathematical Sciences at Kent State University changed its approach to staffing introductory mathematics classes, and on the resulting transformation of student outcomes and the structure of the department.

Disparate Perceptions of a Department

Until recently, adjunct faculty and graduate teaching assistants taught most sections of our basic mathematics courses below the level of calculus. For many years, we have had around twenty-five tenured or tenure-track faculty, but at times we have employed more than sixty adjunct faculty, many of whom only taught our courses for a semester or two. High enrollments in introductory classes and heavy reliance on adjunct faculty to teach them can lead to disparate perceptions of a department. At Kent State, tenured and tenure-track mathematics faculty have always prided themselves on their scholarly accomplishments and on the quality of the programs they offer for undergraduate and graduate majors.

However, other departments can easily develop a different perspective, especially when their day-to-day interactions with mathematics are about the general education or remedial courses in which their majors may struggle. In addition, administrators’ perceptions can be influenced by national assessments of efficiency and quality, such as the Delaware Report. Some versions of this report explicitly state that the primary role of university mathematics departments is to teach service courses, the courses least valued by the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Enrollment data support that view. For example, in recent fall semesters there have been over 10,000 registrations for courses offered by the Department of Mathematical Sciences at Kent State University on the Kent campus. However, fewer than a quarter of these have been in graduate courses or in undergraduate courses at or above the level of calculus.

Perceptions are also shaped by outcomes. Historically, student success and persistence rates were distressingly low. Other departments tended to view introductory mathematics courses as obstacles for their students to overcome, rather than as opportunities for them to enrich their academic development.

Student dissatisfaction was high, and concerns were repeatedly voiced in the student newspaper. One notorious article from several years ago shone a spotlight on the grade distribution in a high-enrollment algebra course designed to prepare students for college algebra. Approximately 25 percent of the students received a grade of A, B, or C; 25 percent a D; 25 percent an F; and the remaining 25 percent withdrew from the course. These data are appalling, but the perspective becomes even bleaker when national data on success rates in subsequent mathematics courses are factored in. They show that students do not reliably pass a mathematics course unless they earn a grade of A or B in the immediate prerequisite course. As a consequence, it is unlikely that more than a quarter of the students who originally enrolled in this preparatory course would have gone on to pass a college algebra course, which for many would be a gatekeeper for eventual graduation.
MATHEMATICS—A PUMP NOT A FILTER

This sad state of affairs at Kent State was by no means unusual in American universities and colleges. Concerned faculty had for some time been developing “reformed” curricula and instructional paradigms in an attempt to improve outcomes. There was a migration away from traditional lecturing toward more student-centered approaches. This went hand in hand with a deliberate effort to emphasize conceptual understanding rather than procedural facility. Discovery learning, collaboration, and problem solving in realistic contexts became much more common in the mathematics classroom. The reform movements were supported by federal agencies, including the National Science Foundation (NSF), which publicized the importance of improving attainment in mathematics, even at the level of basic numeracy, as a basis for the successful development of an internationally competitive knowledge-based economy. The slogan of the day was: “Mathematics—a pump, not a filter!”

Our instructional framework, however, was a barrier to priming the pump. Many of the adjunct faculty in our pool had very traditional attitudes about how to teach mathematics and little motivation to revisit those attitudes, even though student outcomes were far from satisfactory. Most were quite limited in what they were qualified to teach. They were poorly paid, received minimal benefits, and could not rely on year-round employment. Their workload was constantly rising as the state reduced its support for higher education, forcing a progressive increase in class sizes from around twenty to around forty, or even higher. To make ends meet, most adjunct faculty needed to find other employment, and they sometimes taught at several local institutions. Their focus was by necessity short term, and their commitment to the discipline was limited, as was their openness to professional development, for which we had no funding.

All of these issues contributed to a serendipitous crisis: in fall 2000 and fall

Discovery learning, collaboration, and problem solving in realistic contexts became much more common in the mathematics classroom

2001, we were unable to find enough qualified adjunct faculty to teach our courses. The administration rose to the challenge and approved the hiring of several full-time non-tenure-track faculty (full-time NTTF), who enjoyed full benefits and taught thirty credit hours annually. After a short period, the number of such faculty stabilized in the high teens. Initial appointments were selected from the best part-time instructors we had available. As full-time faculty they taught much more than they had been able to before, and their new status made it possible for their teaching to become their primary professional focus. Not surprisingly, since we had generally replaced our weakest instructors with some of our strongest instructors, there was an immediate improvement in our students’ success rates.

**IMPROVEMENTS IN STUDENT SUCCESS**

Over the years, success rates—ABC rates—in beginning mathematics courses at Kent State have continued to improve. Most recently, about 70 percent of all students (80 percent of new first-year students) were successful in their first remedial course of the academic year, even though remedial courses are now taught in a large emporium setting rather than in small classes. At college level in recent fall semesters, the ABC rates have averaged about 65 percent in college algebra courses, and have been higher in alternative courses satisfying the general education requirement. While these rates still leave much room for improvement, they are, overall, much better than in the not-so-distant past. Hopefully, this development will help to change attitudes toward mathematics as a discipline, and the pump will start to do its job.

Although there were immediate improvements in student success, the continued and sustained rise is the result of other very positive changes brought about by the introduction of a significant number of full-time NTTF. In the 1990s, we had a handful of full-time NTTF who were charged with overseeing the beginning courses, but who were quite marginalized within the department. Now, the full-time NTTF constitute a significant proportion of the full-time faculty, and they are well integrated into the department. They form a dedicated workforce whose primary responsibility is to teach remedial and lower-division mathematics courses, a responsibility that is now recognized and valued as an important part of our mission. Along with this instructional responsibility, these faculty have embraced a commitment to the discipline, an enthusiasm for professional development, and an eagerness to engage in curricular development, including developing nontraditional courses and instructional paradigms designed to engage students, improve outcomes, and meet the needs of the future. Four of our full-time NTTF now have doctorates in mathematics, four have doctorates in mathematics education, and two more are actively pursuing an education doctorate: they have taken the initiative to improve their understanding of how and what to teach.
Many regularly attend professional conferences, and several are active participants in state-funded grant activities that aim to improve learning outcomes in the K–12 system as well as in higher education, and to bridge the gaps between the systems. Most actively support student-centered approaches to mathematics instruction. Their mathematical background and their depth of understanding is sufficiently strong that they can confidently discard the “sage on the stage” crutch in favor of meaningful dialogue to engage with their students. All this has worked in favor of our students. Their grades have improved, but more importantly they are now learning mathematics in ways that will help sustain their understanding well into the future.

The department has benefitted greatly from the integration of the full-time NTTF into its administrative structure. These faculty are now important participants in all departmental committees, except the graduate studies committee, providing a vital perspective that was missing before. Many of them work hard to generate proposals to keep the beginning mathematics curriculum current and relevant, and to inform tenured and tenure-track faculty of developments in this area that could affect the major’s programs. Several of these instructors also continue to act as course coordinators for multi-section courses, helping to maintain consistent standards from one section to another, mentoring inexperienced instructors, including new graduate teaching assistants, and serving as a principal point of contact for students who are unable to resolve issues with their instructors. In short, the full-time NTTF serve not only as instructors, but also as proponents for the basic mathematics courses. They promote curricular cohesion and help maintain the strong foundation that is essential for our instructional mission.

The administration has recognized the success of the introduction of full-time NTTF, who were originally concentrated in mathematics and English, and has extended their role across the university. These faculty are now well integrated into the life and mission of the university, with representation on most major committees, including the faculty senate. Recent contract changes have introduced a formal promotion process and different professional tracks to accommodate the diverse needs of various areas in the university. Such structures provide career pathways and help cement commitment to the disciplines and the institution. They provide a framework within which professional development is valued and rewarded, but our students are the ultimate beneficiaries.

A FURTHER STEP
Encouraged by the positive changes since the creation of a significant population of full-time NTTF, we have recently embarked on a further step in the professionalization of our instructor pool. About two years ago, we completed a transition to a framework where almost all of our part-time instructors are graduate students. The rare exceptions are key people who serve as liaisons with tutoring services across campus. With this change, almost all of our instructors are either full-time faculty or students actively pursuing a graduate degree. They are all fully committed to the discipline, which ultimately benefits the students they teach. This arrangement also allows us to enhance our graduate programs by supporting many more deserving students than was possible in the past, providing a clear route from partial support as part-time instructors to full support on an assistantship. All of these graduate students work closely with the full-time NTTF, who serve as very effective mentors to guide the students as they develop their teaching expertise.

The introduction of full-time NTTF on a large scale was initially a temporary response to a staffing crisis. However, the challenge was also an opportunity. Over time this group of faculty has become an important part of a healthier ecosystem within the Department of Mathematical Sciences at Kent State University, which now has fewer silos and functions more as an interactive community of committed professionals. Instructors of basic courses are considerably more invested in the discipline and in their professional development, and they are significantly better prepared to teach well and to promote continuous improvement in curricular and instructional paradigms. As a result, student success has increased markedly, and there is now much greater attention paid to excellence of instruction at all levels, including enhanced support for developing good and effective teaching by graduate students. The pump has been primed.
A Roadmap to Engaging Part-Time Faculty in High-Impact Practices

Kristen Roney, associate vice president and dean, University College, University of North Georgia
Sarah L. Ulerick, division dean, Science; Lane Community College

Part-time faculty account for more than two-thirds of the corps of instruction for community colleges in the United States. This figure has steadily increased from 46.3 percent in 2003 and constitutes a radical change from 1975, when that percentage was only 30.2 percent (American Association of University Professors 2006). While the hiring of part-time faculty certainly increases institutional financial flexibility in times of rapid enrollment changes, recent studies indicate that community college students who have a significant percentage of their coursework taught by part-time instructors experience lower transfer and degree completion rates. With funding formulas and accreditation standards increasingly focused on student completion as an indicator of institutional performance and mission fulfillment, these data should capture the attention of college leaders. If we rely heavily on the part-time faculty teaching corps and do not provide necessary support—even to allow for such faculty to have significant presence on campus—how can we expect to achieve our goals for the quality and completion agendas?

We want to emphasize from the outset that such concerns should not be construed as criticism of part-time faculty generally, only institutional practices that fail to support this group of faculty and the reality that “part-time” means less time on campus to be engaged with students or to be involved with conversations about curriculum and learning. Although our contexts are very different—one of us is from a community college and the other from a university—we find that both of our institutions rely heavily on part-time faculty and their expertise and passion for teaching. We suggest that much of the student success gap has less to do with the classic stereotype of the harried, distracted, and underpaid part-timer, and far more to do with a lack of institutional intentionality in professional development for part-time faculty, a decided lack of access to institutional resources, and a failure to include these faculty in curricular and policy decisions. We concur with the Delphi Project in The Changing Faculty and Student Success report: “In order to create change, we need to challenge the myth that current employment approaches are working. Current practices make it more difficult to serve the institutional mission and are also morally bankrupt” (2013, 16). Rather than viewing part-time faculty as a problem, we advise a careful review of institutional factors that support or fail to support the work of such a substantial percentage of the faculty teaching in our colleges.

WORKING CONDITIONS AND IMPACT ON COMPLETION AND SUCCESS

A review of the existing literature on the impact of high reliance on part-time faculty points to a single, unshakable conclusion: in a great many instances, we treat these faculty poorly. The typical part-time faculty member

- earns a median per course pay of $2,700 (Coalition on the Academic Workforce 2012);
- shares an office and most likely a computer and phone with other part-time faculty (if any office space is provided at all);
- gains little in the way of credential-associated pay advances or benefits from higher wages based on years of service or other mechanisms for advancement;
- has minimal inclusion in academic decision making; and,
- receives few professional development opportunities or incentives.

As a result of simple gaps in institutional support—access to adequate offices or e-mail or contact with full-time colleagues—student learning suffers. The gaps have very real effects on student success measures: research by M. Kevin Eagan, Jr., and Audrey Jaeger consistently reveals a negative correlation between high exposures to part-time faculty and both graduation (2009) and transfer completion (2009) for community college students. For community colleges, academic administrators need to examine closely how they support the work of their part-time faculty.
REPORTS FROM THE FIELD: AAC&U ROADMAP COLLEGES

In this section we share “reports from the field” from several of the AAC&U’s Developing a Community College Roadmap project colleges. The Roadmap project supports community colleges to enhance student success through intentional best practices across academic and student affairs. In preparation for this article, AAC&U’s Roadmap project campuses were surveyed at the High-Impact Practices (HIPs) and Student Success Institute in June 2013. Additionally, both authors are engaged in their campuses’ Roadmap projects.

Lane Community College

Lane Community College is a large comprehensive community college serving a nearly 5,000 square mile district in western Oregon. A few demographics of our faculty illustrate how the recent enrollment surge influenced staffing patterns. In 2007–08, prior to the first wave of the enrollment surge, Lane had 555 faculty, of whom 42 percent were contracted (full-time) and 58 percent were part-time. Four years later we had hired an additional 127 faculty; of these, 83 percent were part-time, bringing the full-time/part-time ratio to 37 percent to 63 percent.

When we look at sections taught by part-time faculty we see the direct impact of these hiring patterns. In the Science Division, for example, 59 percent of transfer sections were taught by part-time faculty in 2007–08; in 2011–12, this percentage had increased to 66 percent. A memorandum of understanding between the college and the faculty association allowed both full-time and part-time faculty to teach “overloads” of up to two classes above a normal load. For full-time faculty at Lane a normal load is typically nine to twelve classes over three quarters. For part-time faculty, the load was five to seven classes over three quarters, depending upon credit-load. With the overloads the lines between workload, but not pay levels, of contracted and part-time faculty begin to blur.

At Lane, many adjuncts are long-time employees and care deeply about course outcomes and student success. Like their full-time counterparts, they teach the way they want to, using pedagogies they feel best support student learning. Outside the classroom there is less commonality. Full-time faculty are on campus more. They have larger, private offices, some with windows! They are likely to have a newer desk and a decent desk chair with one or more side chairs for students who visit during up to five designated office hours each week. By contrast, part-time faculty have few office hours, share their offices and office equipment with up to four “time-sharing” colleagues, get the hand-me-down desks and chairs, rarely attend discipline or division meetings, and often feel detached from the work of the college.

All faculties are represented by the Lane Community College Education Association (LCCEA). The faculty union has successfully bargained many provisions that support the work of part-time faculty. These include a structure for part-time faculty seniority and step-advances in pay; access to faculty professional development funds and activities, such as faculty interest groups; and developmental faculty evaluations that support the professional growth of faculty. Beyond these measures, part-time faculty may request curriculum development funding for projects of value to their disciplines and may participate in funded projects sponsored by learning communities, the assessment team, and other sources of funding on campus. Project funding ranges from anywhere from $300 to $3,000 depending upon the objectives; even small projects allow faculty members to work with others on topics relevant to engaged learning and assessment in the classroom. Increasingly college committees are developing membership by-laws that include at least one part-time faculty member in funded roles. Both full-time and part-time faculty can receive faculty recognition awards which are based on student nominations. These are steps in the right direction to engage part-time faculty as contributors to the broad work of the college.

The University of North Georgia

The University of North Georgia (UNG) is a public institution in a right-to-work state, serving some thirty counties in northeast Georgia. UNG, a newly consolidated institution, is a public master’s institution that maintains a significant emphasis on associate’s and transfer-bound students through the University College. As of fall 2012 (prior to consolidation), part-time faculty at UNG accounted for approximately 43 percent of the instructional faculty; for University College campuses, the percentage was 52 percent. Part-time faculty at UNG and within the University System of Georgia (USG) are typically limited to a teaching load of less than half of that of full-time faculty, which amounts to about fifteen credit hours per academic year for UNG, and system policy forbids exceeding these credit hour limits through employment at multiple USG institutions. Our part-time faculty members have access to shared offices and office support, usually with comparable equipment. Some of the offices do have the ever-coveted windows, but many lack places to lock away personal items. All UNG faculty are assigned institutional e-mail addresses, phone numbers (though sharing the numbers limits their usefulness), and access to the student information system on all of UNG’s campuses.

All part-time faculty at UNG are required to attend an orientation and are assigned a faculty mentor, though support for the mentorship program has declined as the budgets have tightened. The orientation covers expectations, the handbook, FERPA, and other essentials. Though part-time faculty were not included in our professional development model within our Roadmap project, our work within it has made clear the need to extend development in engaged pedagogies to the entire faculty. UNG’s part-time faculty are encouraged to attend on-campus professional development opportunities, but attendance is not incentivized, so exposure to development...
focused on high-impact practices (HIPs) may be very limited. Further, while students evaluate UNG faculty every semester, robust peer evaluations are less common and could be valuable in assessing how widespread HIPs are within the part-time faculty. However, many of our part-time faculty, as with Lane’s, have been with the institution for several years, and we witness time and again their deep commitment to student learning and to professional development, which they often seek out for themselves. To that end, we are fortunate to have an administration supportive of recognizing the teaching success of part-time faculty through annual awards.

More Stories from the Field
Lane and UNG offer differing stories about the opportunities for part-time faculty support, but they collect within them many of the common practices we found within Roadmap institutions. Here again we found a range of situations, but several of these community colleges do mandate or provide professional development opportunities for their part-time faculty. Two particularly noteworthy institutions are Brookdale Community College (BCC) and the Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC). BCC does not mandate professional development nor incentivize it, but part-time faculty are encouraged to attend summer workshops, and the college runs a statewide adjunct network in New Jersey. CCBC has a well-regarded institutional commitment to culturally responsive teaching, and they reach out to part-time faculty to ensure their development within this framework. Such simple commitments, where the only incentive available may be food, can go far to improve both the situation for part-time faculty and the student learning in their classrooms.

STEERING IN A NEW DIRECTION: SUPPORTING AND ENGAGING PART-TIME FACULTY
What makes the Roadmap campus experiences so intriguing is that the projects each campus developed, or are in the process of developing, are fundamentally rooted in George Kuh’s work on HIPs as means of engaging students. Many of the HIPs are classroom-based, in keeping with the substantial research by Vincent Tinto and others that reminds us that “for many students, especially in community colleges, if involvement does not occur in the classroom, it is unlikely to occur at all” (Tinto 2012, 68). Pedagogies and practices of engagement, such as service learning, diversity/global studies, and project-based learning, require professional development support for all faculty. Most of us did not experience these ourselves as students, and we were less likely to experience rich, authentic assessments related to engaged learning. We know that well-constructed HIPs are transformative for student learning, so connecting part-time faculty to these practices seems an obvious thing to do. However, the too common practices of single-term contracts and just-in-time hiring, as well as weak or non-existent formative evaluation procedures, may themselves inhibit pedagogical exploration (Kezar 2012; Rhoades 2013). What can well-intentioned colleges do to improve the working conditions of the growing part-time faculty and student engagement with them? Here are a few suggestions we can offer, based on our read of the literature and our practical experiences as academic administrators and former faculty members, both full-time and part-time:

1. Examine existing professional development structures, including those supported by committees, divisions, or disciplines to see how opportunities can be expanded to include part-time faculty. Can a relatively small investment of funding broaden your inclusivity?

2. Examine “power and privilege” differences in the “geospatial” aspects of faculty work. Can you replace worn out computers, desks, and chairs to make faculty life for all members more equitable?

3. Evaluate the orientation, mentoring, and recognition opportunities for part-time faculty. Does the orientation position part-time faculty to be integrated into the life of the institution? Are engaged pedagogies discussed? Is the mentoring program formal or casual? Do your recognition systems value all faculty? Can contract structures be altered for long-time part-time faculty members to cover multiple years or multiple terms?

What we know about why students succeed and the significance of their engaging with faculty demands that we create spaces and situations where such opportunities can occur. An institutional roadmap toward improving conditions for two-thirds of our faculties will help higher education improve student outcomes and, more importantly, help students to reach their educational goals.
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What Does it Mean to Be a Teacher–Scholar?

Kenneth P. Ruscio, president, Washington and Lee University

While this issue centers on the changing roles of faculty, I believe that it also fitting to look at traditional faculty models. While changes in the academy, due to economic constraints and the adoption of new technology, no doubt mean shifts in faculty roles and responsibilities, I contend that the core principles of the academic profession are timeless.

Each fall, at the same time that we are welcoming a new class of students to campus, we also are greeting a group of new faculty, many embarking on their first academic appointments. What shall we tell them today about their futures? How do we guide them toward success in this work they’ve chosen?

In my view, we should encourage them to commit fully to a teacher–scholar model. If they do, I believe they can thrive. Why teacher–scholar?

On every college and university campus, perennial discussions take place about the proper relationship and balance between instruction and research. At liberal arts colleges, those discussions have a special importance, because the commitment to undergraduate education is a crucial institutional priority, and because the allocation of resources between teaching and scholarship is bound to be different at such colleges than at larger universities with more expansive and more complicated missions.

We intentionally call our faculty “teacher–scholar” at Washington and Lee and have frequent conversations about exactly what that term means, or should mean. Naturally, it means different things in different disciplines and at different times in an academic career. As a university president, I give the term special meaning because of the responsibilities I hold in connection with decisions about tenure and promotion, and because of my duty to provide adequate support for the faculty’s professional development.

EMBRACING THE TEACHER–SCHOLAR MODEL

At Washington and Lee, we want every member of our faculty to be a successful teacher–scholar. And teaching comes first. Our professors have a common and deep commitment to students. They strive to discover students’ aptitudes and to nurture those students’ intellectual interests into passions that will shape their lives. The faculty takes pride in their teaching; the institution celebrates the timeless task of revealing to young minds the joy of learning and its constant challenges.

But scholarship matters, too. For liberal arts colleges everywhere, the model of scholarship is distinctive, suited especially to a college where the ultimate prize is the passion for learning we see among our graduates.

Teaching introductory courses (and I mean really teaching them), conversing with colleagues outside your field on a regular basis, attending public lectures, meeting with visitors in different disciplines—all of that is bound to result in scholarship that is original and creative, genuinely interesting and imaginative. The teacher–scholar model in a liberal arts college is not an adaptation of the research-university approach to a constrained organizational setting. It is not Berkeley-lite. Instead it is a model with virtues all its own, pursued in a setting that affords advantages unavailable elsewhere.

The dash between teacher and scholar is meant to be a link, not a line of demarcation. Scholarship and creative endeavors enrich our teaching and are essential to instruction of the highest quality. Participation in scholarly communities keeps us current, connects us to wider worlds, and reminds the teacher of the learner’s experience: mastering new material; meeting with resistance or rebuffs; receiving and responding to criticism; and finding ways to communicate effectively to different groups.

Scholarly engagement usually produces published writings and professional presentations. A hallmark of the liberal arts college, however, is that conversation about new scholarship also takes...
place in our classrooms, in our offices, in our hallways—in our homes anywhere that we exchange ideas with students. Scholarship sometimes grows directly out of relationships between students and faculty. Excellent students frequently serve as assistants in laboratories, colleagues in clinics, assistants in research projects, or collaborators in artistic performance.

Intellectual energy comes not only from faculty talking with able students but also from faculty talking with fellow faculty. Some of this activity is not clearly research or teaching, but it represents the spirit of creativity and curiosity that supports both. For instance, there is the English professor who audits colleagues’ psychology courses so that she can write about empathy in literature. There is the chemistry professor who studies art history so that he can better solve questions about the chemistry of art restoration. And there is the mathematics professor who learns biology in order to introduce science problems into calculus courses.

Though there are many ways in which teaching and scholarship are closely intertwined, there is also a tendency to separate the two activities and to emphasize scholarship over teaching in faculty evaluation. That comes because publications and professional activities are easily counted and measured by metrics that do not necessarily reveal the impact that they have in the classroom. At Washington and Lee, we try to avoid that temptation. We refuse to specify a number of articles, books, presentations or grants that constitute a threshold for success in scholarship. We try to make our standards for the review of academic performance flexible and fair—flexible, because we belong to different schools and different disciplines and apply criteria appropriate to different stages in our careers; fair, because reasonable colleagues across campus can witness and document the essential elements of progress as teacher-scholars.

THE CHALLENGING LIVES OF TEACHER-SCHOLARS
While we celebrate and facilitate the integration of teaching and scholarship, and resist the temptation to separate those activities in faculty evaluation, we also recognize that good research and writing sometimes involve travel, solitude, or collaboration with distant colleagues. And so we provide travel support, summer research stipends, sabbatical opportunities, and assistance in securing outside funding for worthy projects. Here the ideal is not the seamless integration of teaching and scholarship, but the smooth transition between periods of time that, for good reasons, emphasize one or the other.

When we greet those new faculty members, we are clear that we expect them to succeed in the classroom and to prosper in scholarly endeavors. But we also understand that the life of the teacher–scholar can be challenging. Expecting faculty to be effective instructors and contributing researchers, while finding creative ways to keep those activities connected, is asking a great deal. Requesting that they simultaneously serve the university community and larger, off-campus audiences only adds to the challenge.

Yet, in a busy career as a teacher–scholar, people bear burdens out of love of learning, a passion for seeking and expressing the truth as best they can, and a commitment to serve institutions with long and distinguished histories of introducing young people to the lifelong enrichment of the liberal arts.

By embracing the teacher–scholar model, this newest generation of faculty can find their greatest fulfillment. And they will enhance the value of the institutions that they serve.
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What Roles Are We Modeling?  
Gendered Academic Employment and Its Consequences

John W. Curtis, director of research and public policy, American Association of University Professors

In looking through photos that my daughter posted recently from her university summer field school experience, I was struck that most of her fellow students (but not the lead professor) were women. My daughter is working on her bachelor’s degree in natural resources conservation at a rural Midwestern university, a field and location not always associated with plentiful opportunities for women. As a father I was pleased, but as a researcher on gender equity in academic employment, I pondered some of the broader implications. In this essay I consider the gendered nature of academic employment and the effect of that model on women as students and graduates considering their own careers. I presented much of the data on academic employment discussed here in a more detailed previous analysis (Curtis 2011), although I’ve updated the figures here wherever possible. The focus in this essay goes beyond documenting the continuing inequities to a consideration of the impact of that situation on the aspirations of the women who now make up the majority of our college student population.

ONGOING SHIFT TO CONTINGENT EMPLOYMENT
The most salient trend in the academic workforce over the last three or four decades has been the ongoing shift to contingent employment, reaching 76 percent of all instructional staff positions nationwide as of fall 2011. This category includes faculty members employed full or part time off the tenure track, along with graduate student employees; it should also include postdoctoral fellowships, but the available data do not allow us to count those positions accurately in the census of academic employment. All of these positions are contingent in that they are limited-term, insecure, mostly underpaid, and inadequately supported by their institutions.

Women have entered the academic workforce in large numbers during the same period in which contingency has emerged as the normative employment situation. Between 1976 and 2009, the number of women employed in instructional staff positions at degree-granting colleges and universities grew by 266 percent, whereas the number of men employed increased by only 62 percent during the same period. However, even as the overall academic workforce became increasingly contingent, women have found themselves disproportionately in these less secure and less rewarding positions. Women faculty members are more likely than men to be employed in part-time positions, and women faculty members in full-time positions are more likely to be off the tenure track. Although women hold 44 percent of all full-time faculty positions, they comprise only 29 percent of full professors, and the proportion is even lower in many disciplines and in most departments at major research universities.

The overrepresentation of women in contingent appointments shows in their earnings, as well. Among full-time faculty members, women earn salaries on average that are 80 percent of what men earn, and this proportion has been remarkably consistent for more than thirty-five years now. The gender pay disadvantage has several components: women are less likely than men to hold positions at research universities that pay the highest salaries; they are more likely to be in disciplines that pay lower salaries; and as noted above, they are less likely to reach the most senior rank. According to the most extensive analysis available, wages among part-time faculty are roughly equal for men and women on average (Coalition on the Academic Workforce 2012). However, since women are disproportionately employed in these low-paid part-time positions, a true compilation of all academic earnings by gender would show a disadvantage even greater than 20 percent.

JUST A MATTER OF TIME?
In contrast to the employment and earnings situation for their instructors, the most recent data on women as students and graduates of higher education seem to offer the promise that it’s “just a matter of
time” before women achieve parity in the academic workforce and in other fields. Women comprise between 55 and 60 percent of total enrollment at the various levels of degree-granting institutions nationwide. They now earn the majority of degrees awarded at all levels from associate’s to doctoral. And the limited data available on graduation rates indicate that women are more likely than their male cohorts to complete degrees once they enroll. Indeed, the success of women in enrolling and excelling in higher education has been so dramatic that the series of Gender Equity in Higher Education reports issued by the American Council on Education since 2000 have been focused on “the issue of male achievement” and the “gender gap” between apparently high-achieving women and their seemingly disadvantaged male counterparts (King 2010).

Sociologist Ann Mullen provides a counterpoint to this depiction of “feminization” in higher education:

To some, the fact that women earn 57 percent of all degrees to men’s 43 percent suggests the gender pendulum has swung too far. They claim that if the ratio still favored men, there would be widespread protest. But such claims fail to see the full picture: though women earn more degrees than men, the gender integration of higher education is far from complete. Men and women still diverge in the fields of study they choose, their experiences during college, and the kinds of jobs they get after graduating. (Mullen 2012, 38)

We would all like to think that the world of gendered access to academic achievement and career success has changed, and it has in so many ways. Barriers to entry in academia and employment that were brick walls just a few years ago have become more porous, although it’s important to note that the “glass ceiling” in many professions has hardly been shattered. Yet recent analysis by the American Association of University Women indicates that women college graduates are still subjected to an earnings disadvantage right from the beginning of their employment (Corbett and Hill 2012).

Blatant examples of discrimination against women in education and employment are becoming less common—but I continue to be astounded by the examples documented by Joan Williams and her colleagues in developing the field of family responsibilities discrimination law (Williams 2010). The question I’d like to raise is more subtle: To what extent do the gendered roles of academics serve as a model for the students we are educating?

In addition to the gendered nature of academic employment detailed above, the work done by women faculty members also differs from that of their male counterparts. A number of research analyses have documented that women full-time faculty members do more teaching and more service work than do men. They spend more of their time advising students and less time on research. As a consequence, the individual woman student might have more intense interaction with women faculty members, but what will she observe in that interaction? Whether employed full-time and carrying a heavier load of less-rewarded work, or employed in a precarious contingent position, faculty women disproportionately model limited prospects in their academic careers.

THE IMPACT OF FACULTY ROLE MODELS ON GRADUATE STUDENT CAREER ASPIRATIONS

Mary Ann Mason and her colleagues have summed up a decade of groundbreaking research on the interactions among gender, family, and career outcomes in academia in a new book, Do Babies Matter? Gender and Family in the Ivory Tower. Among other specific topics, they consider the impact of faculty role models on graduate student career aspirations:

About half of all doctoral students are now women, but a far smaller proportion will become tenure-track faculty members. …Despite their large (and growing) numbers, women students find themselves in a male world. In many disciplines, few of their advisors are women, and even fewer are mothers. The top administrators are likely to be men as well. This leaves women graduate students with few role models and with profound doubts about how to go about combining families with high-powered research careers. (Mason et al. 2013, 24–5)

Much of this observation could be extended to the roles modeled for women undergraduates by their instructors and faculty advisors, as well. Thus, the stubborn disadvantages experienced by women in academic employment have potential repercussions beyond their own careers and families. If the career experience of her faculty role models is one of lower earning potential and continued barriers to advancement into senior positions—or even to a stable career—what signals does that send about her own career aspirations to the supposedly unfettered woman student? Until we are truly able to eliminate gender inequity in academic employment and provide role models that our women students can emulate without reservation, our hopes for their attaining their unlimited potential are tinged with doubt.
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Ethereality Check

Maria Maisto, president, New Faculty Majority

Recently, when a Midwestern blizzard threatened to derail my participation in a conference, the organizers decided to hook me up via Skype. I dialed in and soon my face appeared on my colleague’s computer screen. I commented that it was appropriate that I, a so-called “part-time” faculty member, was present in a disembodied form, unable to be fully engaged in the conference. I noted that some publications on non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) appropriately describe us as “Invisible Faculty” and “Ghosts in the Classroom.”

“Part-time” has taken on this existential meaning (also seen in expressions like “she’s a part-time person”) because higher education does not understand how to use that designation accurately. The current debate over how to count faculty work hours to determine eligibility for healthcare under the Affordable Care Act highlights this problem. Teaching even only two classes can (and does, if one is using high-impact practices) take full-time hours. Yet too many institutions disregard their obligation to compensate instructors for those hours, ignoring the physical and material resources (access to authentic professional support, healthcare, retirement benefits) that adjunct faculty—full-time persons—need in order to teach well.

Defining all NTTF work qualitatively, not quantitatively—as “just teaching” rather than as an appropriately reconstituted combination of teaching, research, and service—is an attempt to save costs by “unbundling” faculty work. Yet trying to disaggregate faculty work by function, rather than giving all faculty, whether full- or part-time, an appropriate balance of responsibilities and compensation, has compromised the integrity and effectiveness of that work. It has led to an ever-larger NTTF workforce and has had enormous, often hidden, costs.

Here’s how. Unbundling the activities necessary to education does not preclude the need for the expense of connecting those activities coherently. There are administrative costs to employing a much larger, more fluid number of people to serve in all of the stripped down, less supported, unbundled roles—and to ensuring that they all interact effectively. For example, advisors cannot counsel students about course selection without knowing the majority-transient faculty on their campuses. Tutors can’t reinforce what faculty teach if they can’t meet to discuss curriculum and pedagogy. Additionally, the economic insecurity of contingent employment has academic costs when faculty are intimidated into being less rigorous in the classroom; public health costs when adjuncts avoid having pay docked for absence by coming to work sick; environmental costs when faculty commute to several institutions to earn enough to survive; and even public safety costs when faculty must remember different emergency procedures for multiple schools simultaneously.

The harm done to faculty and their students as a result of the practices that have “unbundled” faculty into disembodied ghosts is documented through efforts like the Delphi Project. Students directly experience the effects of adjuncts’ institutional ethereality when they don’t know whether instructors will be on the course schedule, available to meet for mentoring or tutoring outside of class, involved in curriculum decisions, up-to-date on the latest research in the field, or able to write recommendations.

Unbundling faculty roles by creating a majority-contingent faculty has been misguided and destructive. It severely splinters the “three legs of the stool” representing faculty work—teaching, research, and service—without regard for the purpose of that work, which is the social contract of supporting both individual students and the common good. “Unbundling” weakens the faculty, and we all know what happens when people—in this case, students—sit or stand on stools with weakened legs. It is as precarious and unsettling as being a disembodied presence at a gathering in which everyone else is participating fully.
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