

Appendix F

Literature Summaries

**Carol Ann Borchert
Library**

Gappa, J.M., A.E. Austin, and A.G. Trice. *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley, 2007.

In *Rethinking Faculty Work*, the authors discuss various challenges to faculty members in current times, including increasing demands, a changing environment, and the necessity of new skills in addition to filling the traditional roles of teaching, research, and service. Institutions need to make the investment in their faculty or risk having them leave for better working conditions. Many faculty leave the academic world altogether, and Ph.D. candidates are more frequently choosing non-academic careers. Some of the major factors influencing universities today are fiscal constraints and changes in the way universities are financially supported. This results in a corporate outlook and more pressure for universities—and their faculty—to generate revenue. Growing student enrollment and diversity in the student body and faculty are also adding new pressures to the faculty and university. In the past twenty-five years, total student enrollments have increased 50%, to 17 million (p.11). Faculty must develop new skills to incorporate new technologies in their classrooms, and subject areas are becoming more interdisciplinary. Technology is also blurring the lines between work and personal life, as the faculty member could potentially be available around the clock for student consultation.

The authors examine three types of faculty in their analysis: tenure track, renewable contracts (or non-tenure track), and fixed-term or temporary (often part-time). These changes in the university environment have had several effects on faculty, including:

- Proliferation of faculty appointments off the tenure track
- Shifts in faculty members' control over and autonomy in their work
- Continuously expanding workloads
- Increasing fragmentation of faculty work, which undermines a sense of academic community
- Continuous need for faculty to engage in professional growth (p.22)

The authors examine the historical concept of the “ideal worker,” one who had support at home to handle household issues while the main breadwinner worked long hours for his employer. The ideal worker could relocate without having to worry about whether their spouse could also find work in a new location. Today's realities for a faculty member are much different, with household work and child care becoming a shared responsibility now that both spouses work. Early-career faculty face many difficulties such as maintaining a work-life balance and contending with unclear or changing expectations for tenure. The authors particularly examine the impact of childbearing on a woman's ability to achieve tenure. Faculty members from minority groups have additional pressures while trying to achieve tenure, such as token committee assignments, additional speaking engagements for student groups, and additional minority student advisees who might naturally gravitate to them as a mentor.

Universities are making more and more full-time non-tenure track (NTT) faculty appointments. The authors trace the history of the tenure model beginning with European

universities, leading up to the formation of the AAUP in 1915. In the 1960's the definition of a professional academic emerged as follows:

- Research was the central professional endeavor and focus of academic life.
 - Quality in the profession was maintained by peer review and professional autonomy.
 - The pursuit of knowledge was understood to be best organized by discipline within departments; professional rewards and mobility accrued to those who persisted in their specializations.
 - Reputations were established through national and international associations.
- (p.53)

The paradox of this is that although teaching is the primarily assigned duty of most faculty members, it is their research and service that most heavily weigh in the tenure decision. Teaching consumes most of the faculty's time, but is not the most valued or rewarded activity.

The authors examine the effect of unionization on the perceived necessity for tenure-track positions. Once the faculty unionize—and ensure job security—the need for tenure becomes more questionable. With the current diversity of faculty, are women and minorities finding themselves on an equitable playing field? Is an academic career still attractive? These diverse groups bring new priorities and circumstances into the workplace. The authors list some of the concerns new faculty have with the tenure-track system: “an incomprehensible tenure system, rigid timelines, lack of community, excessive workloads, and inability to achieve an integrated professional and personal life.” (p.82) There has been a shift from tenure-track to non-tenure track appointments, and the non-tenure track, or contract-renewable appointments can have some benefits for new faculty. NTT positions benefit faculty who serve in clinical or supervisory functions, where achieving tenure in their type of work is difficult if not impossible.

Three types of non-tenure track faculty are discussed in the text: alternative-career, integrated, and marginalized. Alternative-career faculty are often well-established in their field, considered comparable to the tenure-track faculty, and after a probationary period, are awarded multi-year, renewable contracts of three to ten years. In the integrated model, NTT faculty are also awarded multi-year contracts after a probationary period, but tend not to be viewed as equivalent in stature to tenure-track faculty. Their pay is often lower and their job assignments vary. Under the marginalized model, NTT faculty have contract-renewable appointments specifically for the purpose of staffing flexibility or cost savings, similar to part-time faculty. The authors discuss several reasons universities might choose to have part-time faculty. In the areas of business, law, and health sciences, part-time faculty working full-time in their professions can provide expertise and practical knowledge of current practices. Basic humanities and sciences, on the other hand, tend to hire part-time faculty to teach introductory classes. Part-time faculty provide institutional flexibility, and the authors believe this model is here to stay.

The authors cite Carnegie Foundation data from 1969 to 1997 indicating that faculty members are generally satisfied with their choice of profession in spite of its associated stress. (p.103) On the other hand, they later cite another article from 2005 stating that 31% of faculty members are considering other non-academic careers. (p.110) Job characteristics that faculty find attractive include the pursuit of knowledge, autonomy, freedom of thought and expression, and shared governance. There are variations in satisfaction across subpopulations (women, minorities, junior vs. senior faculty) with Caucasian males being the most satisfied and least likely to leave their positions. Sources of dissatisfaction include salaries and workloads. From 1972 to 2003, the average number of hours per workweek increased significantly. (p.108) Demand for faculty is increasing due to rising student enrollment and increased retirements. Institutions need to pay attention to the satisfaction level of their faculty and devise new means of recruitment and retention. The authors outline several factors that contribute to job satisfaction, many of them common sense: positive interactions with and support from institutional administration, humane treatment from deans and department chairs, overall climate of the department, a sense of community, recognition for their work, salary rewards and pay equity, autonomy, control over their career, professional growth, and a sense of accomplishment. The availability of tenure, job security, and geographic location were reasons cited for moving to a new position. The authors discussed Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and Hackman and Oldham's related job characteristics model. They then outlined similar needs they found by examining several such theories.

The authors conclude with a call to action. They outline several areas institutions can focus on now to attract and retain excellent faculty at relatively low cost. With the work environment changing so quickly, universities cannot afford to wait to implement these ideas. The faculty will only continue to become more diverse, and the overall fiscal situation is unlikely to improve soon.

Michael Lynch
Department of Criminology

Literature Review: Updated 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Data.
Submitted by: Michael J. Lynch, Criminology

Townsend, Barbara K., and Vicki J. Rosser. 2007. "Workload Issues and Measures of Faculty Productivity." *Thought & Action* XXIII, Fall: 7-20.

In this study, Townsend and Rosser (2007) updated available information on faculty productivity through 2004, employing data from the *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty* (NSOPF) sponsored by the national Center for Educational Statistics and the National Science Foundation. Rather than review this work in its entirety, several summary tables describing faculty productivity data are presented below. These data are for public colleges and universities for 1993 and 2004. all tables have been

modified. Some include measures I have added which could be calculated from the data presented in the article.

Work Week: Faculty work significantly longer than the average 40 hour work week. At all institutional types, faculty work more than 20% longer than 40 hours. At the extreme end, faculty at research institutions work, on average, 36.8% longer than 40 hours each week. It should be noted that these additional hours are unpaid work hours. It should also be noted that faculty with more intensive research schedules tend to work the longest hours, while faculty with heavier teaching assignments work the fewest number of hours, though these faculty continue to work in excess of 40 hours. For faculty as a whole, the number of work week hours increased by 3 percent from 1993 to 2004 (see Table 1).

Table 1. Average Faculty Work Week Hours

Institutional Types	1993	2004	% +/-	% over 40 Hours (1)
2-Year	46.66	49.17	5.4	22.9
Liberal Arts	53.16	51.63	- 2.9	29.1
Comprehensive	51.34	53.15	3.5	32.9
Other Ph.D.	54.34	53.17	-2.5	32.9
Research	55.20	54.71	-0.9	36.8
AVERAGE	50.61	52.13	3.0	30.32

1. Here I include a calculation of the percentage over 40 hours. This is defined as the number of hours, expressed as a percentage, worked beyond the average 40 hour work week by faculty. These may be assumed to be unpaid hours. This calculation does not reflect unpaid hours worked in the summer for those on 9 month contracts.

Weekly Classroom Hours. The number of hours faculty spent in the classroom varies across type of institution. Before describing this pattern further, it should be noted that classroom hours do not represent total class related work effort, but merely reflect the direct number of student contact hours required in an in-classroom format. For example, class related work effort also includes a wide variety of non-classroom hours such as: (1) examination construction and grading (the amount of time devoted to these tasks varies with the type of examinations, such as multiple choice, short answer and essay examinations); (2) entering; and calculating grades; (3) grading other required work for courses (e.g., homework, in-class writing assignments, group projects, term papers, and so on), (4) the supervision of independent study and independent research students; and (5) the supervision of honor's theses, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations.

Faculty at 2 year colleges spend the most time in the classroom – 12.7 hours on average. Interestingly, the average in class work load did not increase at 2 year colleges between 1993 and 2004. For most other groups, however, in class work

loads increased between 1993 and 2004 (with the exception of comprehensive universities).

Weekly classroom hours, however, provide only one measure of one aspect of faculty work loads, and, in many types of institutions, may provide a misleading measure of work load (since they exclude non-classroom teaching, research and community service measures of workload hours). For example, while faculty at 2-year colleges have the highest average in-class teaching load, they have the fewest work week hours. *Indeed, work week hours expand as teaching hours decline and research responsibilities are expanded.*

Table 2: Weekly Classroom Hours

Institutional Types	1993	2004	+/- Hours (%)
2 Year	12.7	12.7	0.0 (0.0)
Liberal Arts	10.04	10.51	0.47 (4.7)
Comprehensive	10.03	09.95	-0.08 (0.8)
Other Ph.D.	07.60	08.23	0.63 (8.3)
Research	06.44	06.96	0.52 (8.1)

Students Taught. It is commonplace for faculty assessments to refer not only to hours in the classroom as a primary assessment measure of faculty, but also to refer to the number of students taught. Clearly, these two measures of faculty productivity are highly correlated, as the number of courses a faculty member is required to teach will generally cause faculty to teach more students. This is true assuming constant class sizes across institutional types (classroom size will confound the relationship between assigned classes and number of students taught across types of institutions). Nevertheless, in traditional faculty productivity assessments (see table 3), faculty at 2 year institutions appear to produce the largest number of students (N = 92.69), with faculty at liberal arts universities producing the smallest number of students (N = 83.42). This relationship, however, requires clarification and more extensive analysis, as described in the following sections on students taught and classroom hours. As noted below, the data in table 3 is misleading because it should be standardized to allow comparisons across faculty at various institutional types/

Table 3: Students Taught.

Institutional Types	1993	2004	Per Classroom Hour (2004 only)
2 Year	98.65	92.69	07.3
Liberal Arts	67.88	83.41	07.9

Comprehensive	98.65	91.80	09.2
Other Ph.D.	79.57	88.67	10.8
Research	78.25	86.01	12.4

Students Taught and Classroom Hours. In reading through the data normally presented with respect to measuring faculty productivity, one ought to be struck by the lack of a standardized measure of students taught. Typically, this measure is unstandardized, and presented simply as the raw number of students taught. In this section, I address this weakness in the existing literature.

A simple count of the number of students taught provides a misleading measure of faculty productivity. Why? Simply because the number of students taught will obviously tend to increase with the number of classes taught. In other words, the number of student and the number of classes taught both measure similar dimensions of faculty productivity, and are dependent upon one another. A better measure, therefore, would combine these two indicators into one standardized measure that would be comparable across institutional types. There are two way to produce a standardized measure that corrects this problem. The first is to divide the number of students taught by classroom hours, deriving a standardized measure of the number of students taught per classroom hour. This data is found in table 4. The second would be to create a measure where the denominator is the number of required courses taught (see Table 5 and the section entitled, “Students Taught Per Required Course.”).

The standardized data found in table 4 tell a very different story than the unstandardized data presented in Table 3. In Table 4, research faculty produce the most students per classroom hour – more than 5 students per hour higher than 2-year faculty. Table 4 also indicates that 2-year faculty produce the smallest number of students per classroom hour – a result that is quite the opposite of the findings from the raw data alone.

Why is it that Table 3 and 4 tell opposite stories about faculty productivity with respect to student’s taught? The answer is simple: faculty at research universities might spend fewer actually hours in the classroom. However, the hours they spend in the classroom are spent in contact with large numbers of students. Thus, faculty at research universities offset the number of hours they teach through increased class sizes. Indeed, these faculty as so effective at doing so that they end up producing, on average, 69.9% more students per classroom hours than 2-yr faculty who teach more, and are required to spend more hours in the classroom. *In effect, the standardized measure illustrates that 2-year faculty and increased teaching loads produce inefficient outcomes. These outcomes make it appear that increased teaching loads solve a faculty productivity issues (classroom hours) when, in fact, they decrease productivity (fewer students per hour taught, a reduced number of hours worked, and as shown below, a reduced research output).*

Table 4: Students Taught per Classroom Hour

Institutional Types Per Classroom Hour (2004 only)

2 Year	07.3
Liberal Arts	07.9
Comprehensive	09.2
Other Ph.D.	10.8
Research	12.4

Students Taught Per Required Course. Another way to standardize teaching outputs and make them comparable across institutional types would be to standardize this measure based on the number of courses faculty at each institutional level are required to teach. These data are presented in Table 5.

The data in this Table confirms the trends noted in Table 4 – faculty at research universities produce a larger number of students per hour of teaching because they tend to teach larger classes. Indeed, the average class size at a research university is 84.9% larger than the average class size at a 2-year college. *This measure indicates that research university faculty, with their reduced teaching hours and larger class sizes, are more efficient than faculty at 2-year colleges in terms of this type of outcome measure.*

Table 5: Students Taught per Required Course.

Institutional Types	Per Course (2004 only)
2 Year	18.76
Liberal Arts	22.42
Comprehensive	26.38
Other Ph.D.	29.76
Research	34.68

Scholarship and Productivity. Often, faculty productivity is measured as number of classes taught or total number of students taught because these indicators are easy to measure, and easy to understand. In truth, faculty members at different types of institutions also spend differing levels of time engaged in research, producing the kinds of knowledge society needs to solve problems ranging from mental health delivery and treatment issues, to educational service provision, the treatment of diseases, the control of crime, best engineering practices, and so on. These contributions are generally measured by other indicators of productivity that may not be familiar to the general public, or even well understood by them. For example, how much time does it take to write a book, an article or a grant? How much background work is required? How much education? What does the book, article or grant contribute to the knowledge base? These are not easily quantifiable indicators of productivity. But, simply because these measures are not easily understood or perfectly measured, does not mean that they should be neglected or rejected in favor of simple, teaching only productivity measures.

Townsend and Rosser present several measures of faculty scholarly productivity. These are summarized here in Table 6 (data for grants were unavailable).

As Table 6 illustrates, 2 year faculty produce the lowest scholarly output (0.93), at a rate that is 5.1 times lower than research faculty. It is difficult to standardize these outcomes since the data needed to do so (e.g., percent assignment for research) were not available in these data. *The trends in these scholarly productivity data are obvious – faculty who are required to teach more are less productive researchers.*

Table 6: Scholarship (2004 only; last 2 years)

Institutional Types	Refereed Articles	Other Articles	Books	Patents/ Software	Total
2 Year	0.25	0.41	0.24	0.03	0.93
Liberal Arts	0.96	0.94	0.31	0.03	2.24
Comprehensive	1.41	0.97	0.41	0.04	2.83
Other Ph.D.	1.98	1.17	0.56	0.06	3.77
Research	2.73	1.35	0.57	0.10	4.75

Summary:

Based on the review provided above, the following primary findings may be highlighted:

1. the number of hours in a faculty work week were, on average, higher in 2004 (52.13) than in 1993 (50.61).
2. faculty at nearly all university levels saw their work loads increase;
3. the average faculty member works substantially longer than 40 hours per week (12 hours longer);
4. the more courses faculty are required to teach, the LOWER their scholarly productivity, and the FEWER number of work week hours they average;
5. 2-year faculty appear to teach more students than other faculty. This is true when unstandardized measures are employed. Standardized measures indicate that Research, Ph.D. and Comprehensive University faculty all teach a substantially larger number of students per classroom hours and per course than 2-year faculty. Two- year institutional faculty have a higher aggregated number of students taught, but teach smaller classes.
6. The difference in teaching productivity between 2-year and other faculty appears only in raw numbers, and is made up for by increased efficiency of non-2 year faculty in terms of teaching larger courses.
7. In addition, teaching productivity measures exclude any consideration of scholarship. Faculty devoted to scholarship tend to put in longer work weeks, teach larger sections, and have higher standardized teaching outputs than 2-year faculty.

8. Attempts to modify the traditional faculty model, which is a blended model featuring research, teaching and service commitments, tends to reduce the number of hours faculty work, and increases teaching loads while lowering scholarly outputs and number of students taught per course and per class room hour.
9. With these facts in mind, the greatest productivity return seems to accrue from the balanced, traditional academic model. There are, for example, many unassessable outcomes associated with research productivity, such as its use and implementation by state governments, its contributions to technological advancements, its benefits to medical, psychological and educational practices and so on, which cannot be easily counted and wedged into a spread sheet account of faculty productivity. These productivity indicators should not, however, be ignored, since these comprise one of the most important contributions faculty make to society.

Michael Lynch

Summary of articles on changing roles in higher education from a special issue of *Daedalus*, 1997.

Faculty roles and responsibilities have long been debated, and the problem of defining faculty is intimately connected to the roles faculty are viewed as playing in society at large, and hence are also associated with the responsibilities faculty are assigned within Universities and colleges to met these social expectations.

In the contemporary world, faculty are defined in various ways. The variations in these definitions are impacted by the social context in which these definitions are created, by who is doing the defining, and since the early 1980s, by recurring financial problems experienced by Universities and Colleges, especially State-operated Universities and Colleges, expansive growth of University systems and the student bodies they serve, and, specifically by efforts to implement a business model of organization within and upon Universities and Colleges.

One of the earliest and most in depth analyses of higher education, knowledge, and faculty roles was undertaken by the well known economist, Thorsten Veblen in his book, *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men* (1918; on-line version, socserv2.socsci.mcmaster.ca/~econ/ugcm/3ll3/veblen/higher). Veblen's book, a critique of higher education, holds that the joining of undergraduate and graduate education produces numerous problems that continually tend to undermine graduate education and the effort to generate and disseminate knowledge. Veblen noted that such a union also tends to marginalize undergraduate education for several reasons, including the focus on teaching at undergraduate institutions, the tendency to elevate teaching over knowledge production, and status differentials between graduate and undergraduate institutions. Consequently, there is pressure on undergraduate institutions, especially those that are state operated, to over-engage in teaching at the expense of knowledge production, which is further facilitated by state-imposed priorities on undergraduate education and the effort to

manage undergraduate teaching by hiring those of lesser academic standing for this purpose, which Veblen summarized in the following:

by ill-advised, or perhaps unadvised, imitation the younger universities have blundered into encumbering themselves with an undergraduate department to simulate this presumptively honourable pedigree, to the detriment both of the university and of the college so bound up with it. By this arrangement the college -- undergraduate department -- falls into the position of an appendage, a side issue, to be taken care of by afterthought on the part of a body of men whose chief legitimate interest runs -- should run -- on other things than the efficient management of such an undergraduate training-school, -- provided always that they are a bona fide university faculty, and not a body of secondary-school teachers masquerading under the assumed name of a university.

The motive to this inclusion of an undergraduate department in the newer universities appears commonly to have been a headlong eagerness on the part of the corporate authorities to show a complete establishment of the conventionally accepted pattern, and to enroll as many students as possible.

Because of these tendencies, Veblen argues that the undergraduate institution can now longer be considered part of the institution of higher learning, by which he means institutions devoted to the production and dissemination of knowledge. Even in 1918, Veblen wrote that the average undergraduate has no desire to learn more than is necessary to earn a degree, and is not attending college to learn the skills needed to produce new knowledge. Because of its nature, it is possible, Veblen argued, to reduce undergraduate work to a management styled system, consisting of units of work that can be completed in a designed and specific time frame. It is, however, not as easy to manage the production and dissemination of knowledge, or the work of a graduate faculty and graduate students. Nevertheless, because a management style can effectively be employed at the undergraduate level, there is “the temptation” to apply this management approach to other aspects of University life, such as graduate work, the “teaching” of graduate students, and the production of knowledge, and to invent systems for counting those contributions.

Veblen’s critique suggested that true Universities, institutions where knowledge is produced and disseminated, are the ideal, and should be constructed, not along management styled efficiency measures, but in accord with principles that allow the faculty the circumstances under which knowledge may be generated.

This ideal has not changed much in the nearly one-hundred years since Veblen’s analysis. What has changed, however, are the circumstances in which Universities now find themselves. In other words, the ideal behind the University remains intact; what has changed are the circumstances under which those who manage Universities have determined to be the goal of Universities – serving large populations of degree seeking undergraduates. In the modern University, the goal of serving large populations of degree seeking undergraduate has come into conflict with the role of the University – producing knowledge (Levine, 1997).

A significant source of this change has been the tendency toward increased specialization (Levine, 1997). This tendency has sharpened disciplinary boundaries. It has also led, unfortunately, to the fragmentation of knowledge, which in turn accelerates specialization, even within disciplines. The contemporary faculty member in a discipline may find her/himself surrounded by colleagues who are so specialized that they produce quite small pieces of knowledge which advance their particular interest rather than the discipline as a whole, or the breadth of knowledge.

Along with disciplinary specialization has come specialization within Colleges and Universities. Today, this includes the emergence of research Universities, once the primary form of University focus, now reduced to just another mechanism for knowledge dissemination. Included in this array of modern Universities are the (1) research University; (2) the doctoral intensive University; (3) the Master's level University; (4) the four year college; and (5) the 2 year or community college. This tendency toward specialization of Universities and Colleges has forced a redefinition of faculty, one that is more inclusive of a broader variety of faculty roles that fits within the structure of specialized Universities.

Today, most student and most faculty are affiliated with 2-year or community colleges, followed in number by those associated with 4-year colleges (Clark, 1997). Faculty at such colleges have roles that reflect the purposes of those institutions – teaching – and can be managed by business-like models of planning an efficiency, and mechanisms for recording measures of success consistent with a focus on teaching. These mechanisms include, for example, counting the number of courses taught, faculty-student ratios, credit-hours produced, as so on. Research indicated that the roles of faculty at such institutions are consistent with a focus on teaching, and few faculty at 2 and 4 year colleges engage in original research, publish books, monographs or edited works, or journal articles that contribute to the production and dissemination of knowledge (Clark, 1997).

At the same time, the expansion of specialized colleges, especially 2 and 4 year colleges, along with their emphasis on teaching, has produced what can be described as a stereotype of faculty work and faculty members (Clark, 1997). Faculty members are stereotyped as people who teach at those institutions, and is infused with the idea that teaching is the primary responsibility of a faculty member. This stereotype of faculty is widely held today (Oakley, 1997).

Another dimension of this stereotype relates to the idea that the modern faculty member has a diminished workload. Data on this issue reflect both support and contradictory evidence on this point.

Since the 1960s, faculty work loads are comprised of two opposing trends. At 2 year colleges in particular, faculty work loads, measured by number of work hours, have decreased despite the increased teaching responsibilities required of community college faculty. Still, by the early 1990s, 2-year college faculty had an average work week of 42 hours (Levine, 1997).

At the same time, faculty work loads at research Universities expanded (Levine, 1997). To be sure, faculty at research Universities now have reduced teaching loads. Teaching loads at research Universities decreased to allow more time for research work. Studies indicate that faculty at research Universities spend significantly more time working, measured in work week hours, than faculty at 2 or 4 year universities. Research

University faculty, for example, were found to average 56 hour work weeks (Levine, 1997). This is because the work of research faculty expands independently of the amount of time they are required to be in the classroom, and as a function of the commitment of research faculty to producing and disseminating, often in published form, the knowledge they generate.

In recent decades, the shift toward increased teaching loads has had a detrimental impact on knowledge production (Oakley, 1997). In addition, the shift in teaching loads has not only changed the composition of faculty generally across colleges and universities (from a research to a teaching orientation), it has also impacted faculty values related to teaching and the production of knowledge. Across all types of colleges and universities, the majority of faculty (70%) now place a higher value on teaching compared to research and knowledge production (Oakley, 1997). This has occurred because most college faculty are now employed at teaching oriented institutions where research plays only a small role in the assessment of faculty duties and in the assignment of responsibilities. This trend indicates a problem identified by Veblen in the early 1900s – a trend toward devaluing knowledge production that has accompanied a business oriented college teaching model. Oakley (1997) notes that the emphasis on teaching to the exclusion of research is evident in faculty research productivity measures across all types of colleges and universities. Specifically, Oakley noted that in the 1990s, 59% of faculty had never published or edited a book, while only 6% were “recidivists,” having published 6 or more books. In addition, nearly 60 percent of faculty had fewer than 5 career publications, and more than one-quarter had never published in a journal (Oakley, 1997).

Despite the trends in faculty work loads and evidence that research faculty work loads have expanded over time, the stereotype of reduced faculty work loads is the one that dominates discussion of reorganizing Universities. Indeed, this stereotype couples with increased economic hardships and declining state budgets experienced by the majority of state Universities since the early 1980s, is the one that prevails when discussions of reorganizing Universities is the focus of legislative inquiry and management of Universities and University systems. Given the stereotype of reduced faculty work loads, it is not surprising that the majority of contemporary University reforms focus on increasing faculty work loads by requiring increased teaching assignments. By focusing on teaching loads rather than work week hours and knowledge production responsibilities, legislators attempt to force increased teaching load assignments and, consequently, tend to alienate and demoralize faculty who are engaged in knowledge producing research. Studies indicate, in fact, that requiring increased teaching loads has just the opposite of their intended effect; that is, increased teaching loads tend to cause a decline in faculty work week hours. As an example, consider that a Carnegie Foundation study indicated that an increasingly large percentage of faculty now contemplate early retirement. This is especially true for faculty in institutions where expanded teaching roles have become commonplace. For instance, faculty at community colleges with expanded teaching assignments are much more likely to consider early retirement (49%) compared to faculty at research Universities (25%; Clark, 1997). This has been attributed to the reduced job satisfaction experienced among faculty with expanded teaching roles and reduced research and knowledge production roles (Clark, 1997).

One unforeseen consequence of expanded student enrollment has been the increased inclusion of students who are unprepared for the rigors of a college education (Levine, 1997). In addition, expanded enrollment has caused other problems for colleges and universities, such as the need to expand psychological services, an area that is often underfunded on college campuses. In the early 1990s, for example, sixty percent of college and university students reported using institutionally provided psychological services (Levine, 1997).

The business model approach that has been favored as the guiding principle behind University reforms over the past two to three decades, including enhanced efforts to make faculty more accountable for their time, has expanded the use of paper-work evaluations and outcome measures. These measures have caused faculty to become more aware of how much time they actually spend working, which has had the unintended consequence of reducing faculty work week hours. The business model, in other words, has been a force behind declining faculty work week time, and has contributed to rather than solved the declining faculty work week.

The contemporary business model that has been applied to Universities has not only alienated faculty and reduced the number of hours faculty work – hours faculty freely put in before such business oriented models or ideologies were imposed on Universities – it has created additional strains for University faculty who are increasingly asked to pursue external funding sources. The pressure to pursue grants conflicts with other requirements the business model makes on faculty, especially the requirement for increased teaching loads and the redefinition of faculty in the business model as teaching service providers. Increased teaching loads reduce the number of hours faculty have to devote to research in general, and discourage grant writing because of the high level of competition for a dwindling set of resources.

Over the past two decades, it has become clear that the business model of administration, when applied to Universities and Colleges, tends to exacerbate rather than solve the problems it was implemented to address. Universities and Colleges have extended their specialization trends to market programs leading to increased student enrollment in a time of cyclical budgetary shortfalls. These trends also increase faculty-student ratios, a sign that Universities and Colleges are more interested in serving a mass of students than perhaps providing a quality educational experience. Expanded enrollments and faculty-student ratios also create pressure on State legislators to provide continually expanding funding for teaching services at Universities and Colleges. Unfortunately, the pressure to expand State services is felt by legislators with respect to a number of areas. Over the past three decades, educational budgets have often fallen short, and seem to reflect an ironic form of competition with the budgetary growth in criminal justice service provision, such as the expansion of police and correctional services, which tend to receive priority (Levine, 1997). This trend has continued across many states despite evidence that the expansion of these competing state services, especially criminal justice services, are ineffective in so much as they fail to significantly impact the rate of criminal offending (Lynch, 2007).

Within the contemporary University context, resource scarcity coupled with expanded teaching service pressures have forced Universities and Colleges to increasingly on part-time or adjunct faculty, and non-tenure line instructors. While expanded reliance on these faculty enhances the University's ability to offer courses and

serve a larger student body, part-time faculty have limited availability which, in turn, contributes to student dissatisfaction with the quality of undergraduate instruction. Moreover, the expansion of teaching services provided by funding part-time faculty has been facilitated at the expense of funding for full-time faculty, impacting the ability of Universities to provide the kinds of research that produces new knowledge and community services (since part-time faculty are excluded from the requirement of community service).

The problems reviewed above also have profound effects on graduate education and the ability of University faculty to provide adequate resources for graduate educational classroom hours (Clark, 1997). Pushed to increase faculty-student ratios and the generation of student hours, faculty take on increased undergraduate teaching assignments, reducing course selection for graduate students and forcing expanded graduate class size. Moreover, much graduate teaching takes place outside of the classroom, and such work is often overlooked and discounted in the business model approaches that have been applied to Universities.

Finally, it is worth noting that the business model applied to Universities has tended to polarize faculty within institutions, pitting research against teaching faculty (Clark, 1997). Moreover, the business model approach has weakened core University cultural values, isolating faculty and promoting disciplinary fracturing (Clark, 1997). As Clark noted (1997:35) “All-encompassing academic values are increasingly hard to find in American academic life” (p. 35). Moreover, Clark asserted that “In a large, decentralized and competitive system of higher education, apace with great differentiation of institutions and disciplines, student growth and knowledge growth have badly fractured the American academic profession. . . . The ever-extending differentiation . . . integral to the success of [the American University system] produces a host of academic subworlds that downgrade the academic profession overall. They establish conditions hostile to the best features of professionalism.” (1997:37).

Clark, Burton R. 1997. “Small Worlds, Different Worlds: The Uniqueness and Troubles of American Academic Professions.” *Daedalus* 126,4: 20-42.

Levine, Arthur. 1997. “How the Academic Profession is Changing.” *Daedalus* 126,4: 1-19.

Lynch, Michael J. 2007. *Big Prisons, Big Dreams: Crime and the Failure of the US Prison System*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Oakley, Francis. 1997. “The Elusive Academic Profession: Complexity and Change.” *Daedalus* 126,4: 49-63.

Veblen, Thorsten. 1918.[1957] *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. New York: Sagamore Press. (on-line version, etext.virginia.edu/etcbin/toccer-new2?id=VebHigh.xml&images=images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=front).

Vickie Caruana

Doctoral Student in Department of Special Education

Brief summary of faculty roles prepared as part of larger review for the Rewards Subcommittee

It is difficult to make a basic determination of what faculty value because there exists a determined, institutional-level tension between the disinterested and the more engaged (Boardman & Ponomarev, 2007). The connections between what faculty value, how they're rewarded and their productivity and commitment are important to understand especially when an institution is interested in restructuring its system of rewards. There is incongruity between what the institution values and what individual faculty value. This being said, is there hope for shared values? We question whether or not this is the hope we should even pursue. The ethos of an institution conceptualizes, operationalizes and then often pervades its advertised values leaving individual scholars to wrestle with residual dissonance.

University faculty is not a homogeneous group. Universities no longer have a one-track mind when it comes to faculty appointments. Not all appointments result in tenure. Along with this differentiated faculty comes differentiated roles and reward structures. According to Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey & Staples (2006), "colleges and universities are offering a wide variety of faculty appointment types, each with its own unique hiring procedures, ranges, and promotion benefits" and as a consequence, unique reward systems. Differentiated reward structures are a common response to differentiated faculty. The hope for the one true reward structure, a result of a common value system, is still out of reach.

Another reason it is difficult to distinguish faculty values as a group is that missions differ across institution types and among colleges within institutions. When these missions differ, faculty value tenure and rewards more, which in turn affect how they pursue their work (p. 115). Differing missions result in differing expectations which may lead to uncomfortable ambiguity. Faculty struggle with this ambiguity and what results are “conflicts between institutional rhetoric and the realities of reward structures, and the emphasis on research to the detriment of teaching and service in promotion and tenure decisions” (O’Meara, 2002, p. 57).

Finally, existing values of faculty do not easily change when the institution shifts its mission. “Just because a college changes its written definition of scholarship” and rewards “does not mean that institutional members wake up the next day with a new view of faculty work” (p. 58). “Prisoners of their own thinking” (Senge, 1990, p. 27), faculty hold values about their “roles, scholarship, and institutional identity that contradict the values inherent in the new reward structure” (O’Meara, 2002, p. 59). Values and beliefs are the foundation of reward systems. Acknowledging that first sheds light on an ever-increasing phenomenon – more diverse faculty with differing missions. O’Meara concludes her study by stating that their findings “underscore the argument others have made that the values and beliefs sustaining traditional academic reward structures do not support the professional interests of a diverse faculty nor a diverse mission” (p. 75).

References

- Battles, D. (2002). *Faculty Roles & Rewards: Questions and Answers*. Georgia Southern University Academic Affairs Newsletter. Retrieved on March 10, 2009 from http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/newsletter/aanews_11-02.html.
- Bland, C.J., Center, B.A., Finstad, D.A., Risbey, K.R., & Staples, J. (2006). *The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in*

- research and doctoral institutions*. The Journal of Higher Education, v77, n1, pp. 90-123.
- Boardman, P.C. & Ponomariov, B.L. (2007). *Reward systems and NSF university research centers: the impact of tenure on university scientists' valuation of applied and commercially relevant research*. The Journal of Higher Education, v78, n1, pp. 51-70.
- Chism, N. (2006). *Teaching awards: what do they award?* The Journal of Higher Education, v77, n4, pp. 589-617.
- Grob, J. & Zublin, C. (2005). *Faculty Advisor Recognition and Rewards: Learn the Very Basics before Trying to Hit the Jackpot*. Presented at NACADA 2005 National Conference.
- Harvard University Faculty Climate Survey 2006/7. Retrieved on March 10, 2009 from <http://www.faculty.harvard.edu/01/0151.html>.
- Levin, J.S. (2006). *Faculty work: tensions between educational and economic values*. The Journal of Higher Education, v77, n1, pp. 62-88.
- O'Meara, K. (2002). *Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship*. The Review of Higher Education, v26, n1, pp. 57-80.
- Wergin, J.F. (2001). *Beyond carrots and sticks*. Liberal Education, v87, n1.

