

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A Guide for Trustees, Leaders, and Aspiring
Leaders of Two- and Four-Year Institutions

Robert M. Hendrickson, Jason E. Lane,

James T. Harris, and Richard H. Dorman

Foreword by Stanley O. Ikenberry

2013

Sy/llus

STERLING, VIRGINIA

13

THE FACULTY

The faculty at a college or university plays an essential role in fulfilling the institution's mission of the advancement of knowledge and education of citizens. While an institution's mission is based in part on its environmental niche within society, its faculty is responsible for the translation of the mission into academic programs and activities. In its execution of this responsibility, the faculty puts into practice the three guiding principles of this book: being mission driven, practicing environmental adaptability in alignment with that mission, and perpetuating democratic partnerships. These three themes inform this chapter's discussion of cultural influences on faculty work, the faculty's institutional role, the nature of faculty work, emerging changes to the role, employment issues, and professional development of the faculty.

Cultural Influences on Faculty Work

Just as higher education institutions, colleges and schools, and academic departments are influenced by a variety of environments, faculty members operate in a number of cultural environments that significantly influence their work. Austin (1994) identified five of these cultures: the culture of the academic profession, the culture of the academy as an organization, the culture of the discipline, the culture of the institution type, and the culture of a particular department.

According to Austin (1994), the culture of the academic profession is a value system that is universal to all academics. It mandates that academics pursue truth, advance knowledge, and promote learning (p. 48). The culture of the academy as an organization differentiates academic institutions from other organizations through norms of collegiality and autonomy and notions

of governance, decision making, and the distribution of authority and influence (p. 49), which are keys to the concept of shared governance discussed at length in chapter 11. The culture of the discipline influences a faculty member's identity and values system. This values system is established during graduate school (Austin, 2002) and is reinforced and perpetuated by disciplinary professional associations. Allegiance to disciplinary culture, embraced through graduate education, can be a barrier to faculty members' fulfillment of the mission of the institution that employs them.

The culture of institutional type also influences faculty work. Austin (1994) described the effect of this culture in this way:

The employing institution affects the responsibility, opportunities and rewards available to faculty. In particular, the type of institution in which a faculty member is employed affects his or her relationship to the discipline and its culture, how the new faculty member is socialized, what work is viewed as important and what standards of excellence are used. (p. 50)

Specifically, Austin (1994) suggested that faculty members at research universities, comprehensive institutions, and liberal arts colleges tend to identify more strongly with their disciplines, while community college faculty members relate more closely to their institutions (p. 49). Failure to compromise between disciplinary and institutional cultures can lead to employer-employee conflicts and may affect the institution's ability to execute its mission.

Just as specific institution types perpetuate particular cultures, Austin (1994) identified the culture of a particular department, each with a unique set of values and norms. Departmental culture is in part defined by the other cultures in which faculty members operate, and it varies across academic departments in a school or college. These differences may be accounted for based on variations in the cultures of fields, disciplines, and subdisciplines, but they also emanate from each department's unique history, membership, and leadership.

The Faculty's Institutional Role

The faculty role is typically conceptualized as tripartite: teaching, research, and service. However, a fourth faculty role springs from professors' teaching, research, and service activities. Faculty members work at the boundary of

their institution and its external environment, meaning they serve as boundary spanners.

Faculty members' teaching role includes classroom instruction, one-on-one work with students, and student advising. All these activities are intended to facilitate students' knowledge acquisition. What is actually taught is influenced by the culture of the discipline and the needs of the external environment where graduates will ultimately live and work. Faculty members' research activities also bring them into contact with the external environment. Whether they practice basic research for advancement of knowledge and theory or applied research to connect theory to practice, faculty members' scholarly inquiry—and the process of sharing its results through publication—is a means of engagement with the environment. Faculty members also interact with the environment through their service activities, which include involvement in institutional governance and professional and disciplinary associations, as well as engagement with the local community and broader society.

Some researchers who have studied faculty roles have found them to be mutually exclusive and fragmented (Jordon, 1994; Massey & Zemsky, 1994), while other researchers have identified significant integration among teaching, research, and in some cases service (Clark, B. R., 1987; Colbeck, 1998, 2002; Layzell, 1996). In the practice of all three roles, however, faculty members practice their fourth role of creating a bridge between their institutions and their external environments.

The conceptualization of faculty roles varies across academic disciplines. Biglan (1973) developed a classification scheme that categorizes differentiation of roles according to the theoretical frames or paradigms in different disciplines. This model can help our understanding of the effects that disciplinary culture has on the role of the faculty and the nature of faculty work. According to Biglan, there are two main categories of disciplines: high paradigm (disciplines organized by clearly articulated theories, namely, the hard sciences) and low paradigm (disciplines organized around perceptions and understandings, such as the arts, humanities, and social sciences). In high-paradigm disciplines, knowledge is cumulative, theoretical frameworks are highly structured, and there are clear boundaries between disciplines. At these boundaries where two or more disciplines overlap, new interdisciplinary fields have developed (e.g., biotechnology, bioengineering, astrophysics). In this paradigm, the nature of faculty work is clearly defined through rigid structuring of curricula and standardization of research methodologies. In contrast, in low-paradigm disciplines, a general understanding exists that

there are multiple ways of knowing, which causes these fields' boundaries to be fluid, curricula to be more flexible, and research methodologies to be more diverse. This lack of consensus results in more role ambiguity for faculty. (Biglan's classification scheme was discussed in chapter 12, p. 291 and note 2 on p. 307.)

Beyond disciplinary traditions, institutional mission influences the definition of faculty roles and the balance among teaching, research, and service activities. For example, at research universities, while teaching has taken on more importance in the faculty reward structure, research remains the coin of the realm. Research universities' change in emphasis toward teaching is the result of public pressure as the cost of higher education has escalated. The public demands students have more contact in the classroom with tenured faculty instead of graduate assistants and instructors. In addition, since the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities' (1999) report emerged, community outreach has taken on more importance at research universities. Still, at research universities in which the faculty-reward structure continues to emphasize research and external funding, faculty teaching loads are smaller, particularly in hard-paradigm disciplines.

In contrast, at institutions whose mission focuses on undergraduate teaching and learning (e.g., community colleges, baccalaureate institutions, and private liberal arts colleges), the faculty role includes all three traditional components—teaching, research, and service—although greater emphasis is placed on teaching and engagement. In these contexts, faculty research tends to include the scholarship of discovery, but much research activity is directly related to teaching and learning (Palmer, 2002). As Fairweather (1996, 2005) has shown, however, many teaching-oriented institutions' reward structures try to mirror those of research universities, ignoring their own missions to pursue the prestige associated with research productivity.

As faculty members navigate their teaching, research, and service roles, they are also functioning as boundary spanners in and beyond their institutions. Some faculty members span internal boundaries by bridging disciplines, centers, and academic units to foster collaboration and interdisciplinarity. Others participate in civic engagement activities that provide opportunities to interact directly with community, state, and federal entities as well as professional and disciplinary associations. These boundary-spanning functions provide faculty members with a certain level of autonomy within their institution, especially if they receive external funding for community action work or applied or theoretical research.

The Nature of Faculty Work

Conventional wisdom suggests that faculty work is a cushy job that involves spending a few hours teaching in the classroom and some time holding office hours, while the professors spend the rest of their time free to do as they please. However, the reality could not be more different for most faculty members. Faculty work is a balancing act among the roles of teaching, research, and service. As mentioned previously, faculty members place greater emphasis on their different roles depending on their institution's mission and type. Typically, however, faculty members spend 50 hours per week on their work (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

All faculty members with teaching responsibilities spend time on course preparation and delivery (O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2009). For example, to ensure that course offerings remain current in the field, professors should develop new course syllabi and revise existing course syllabi prior to the semester when the classes will be offered. Course development should capitalize on lessons learned from previous teaching experiences, including the use of such tools as course websites. Faculty members should make themselves available to meet with their students outside the classroom, exchange e-mails as appropriate, and participate in online discussions. In addition, they should share with colleagues what is working well and seek input where improvements might be needed. Ultimately, the time faculty members spend on each course will depend somewhat on their prior experience with teaching the course (such as how often they have taught it previously) and the level of the course (i.e., introductory, advanced, or graduate level), but all these tasks indicate that, in reality, effective teaching practices consume a significant portion of a faculty member's time. In addition, beyond course preparation, faculty members' teaching role includes student advising and mentoring responsibilities, which can continue even after students graduate.

As we have already discussed, research responsibilities vary by institution type and by discipline (O'Meara et al., 2009). For example, faculty members in hard-paradigm disciplines at a research university are expected to support a laboratory, graduate assistants, and postdoctoral researchers. Although there is an expectation of funded research in soft-paradigm disciplines, there is greater emphasis on the publication of books, book chapters, and articles in refereed journals. At comprehensive colleges and liberal arts colleges that have not reformed their rewards structures, faculty members are expected to have an extensive research agenda despite the high teaching load typical of these institutions. Pressure for prestige, reputation, and national rankings drives these expectations.

At comprehensive colleges and liberal arts colleges whose administrators understand their teaching mission and have reformed their rewards structure to reflect this focus, faculty research agendas tend to involve keeping current in disciplines and fields and focusing on the scholarship of teaching and the development of textbooks for college-level courses (Rice, 2002). In fact, Palmer (2002) found that tenured faculty in community colleges were in many cases involved in the scholarship of teaching and textbook authorship.

Faculty members' service or engagement role varies somewhat by institutional type but can be divided into institutional, disciplinary, and community activities. At all institutions, faculty members are involved in the governance of their institution, including making decisions surrounding hiring and determination of rank. Most faculty members participate in their national or regional disciplinary associations, serving as officers or committee chairs or members and participating in conferences. The faculty's service role continues to evolve, and civic engagement has become an important aspect of the service mission of many institutions (Berberet, 2002). (For more information on civic engagement, see chapter 7.)

The Changing Nature of the Faculty Position

Lately, U.S. higher education has witnessed a shift in faculty employment practices, with more contingent (part-time and full-time fixed-term) faculty members being hired in colleges and universities. This hiring strategy has affected faculty demographics, which have also changed significantly because faculty members have become more diverse on the basis of race and gender. The consequences of an aging professoriate and looming retirements will have a profound impact on the makeup of U.S. colleges' and universities' faculties in the future.

Contingent Versus Tenure-Track Faculty

For the past couple of decades, higher education institutions have been moving toward a greater reliance on contingent, part-time, and fixed-term full-time contract faculty. This practice is said to give institutions the ability to adapt to environmental, programmatic, and technological changes, as well as societal needs and demands (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2009). Specifically, institutions have moved to a contingent faculty model to gain flexibility in staffing and adaptability in academic programs, as well as to reduce costs. Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) reported that in 2003 the

number of non-tenure-track positions increased to 58.6%, and the number of tenured and tenure-track positions declined to 41.4% for all faculty in U.S. higher education institutions. The AFT (2009) explored the growth of contingent faculty and the decline of tenure-track faculty in U.S. higher education and indicated that tenure-track faculty positions in all higher education institutions had declined to 27.3% of all faculty, although total faculty appointments increased by 31.8%.

The AFT (2009) report indicated that the distribution of contingent versus tenure-track faculty varies across institution types. Public community colleges, for example, rely heavily on contingent faculty (over 80% of the faculty), with 13.5% of faculty members hired on fixed-term full-time contracts and 68.6% hired on part-time contracts—meaning that the tenure-track faculty makes up only 17.5% of the faculty at these institutions. Public and private comprehensive institutions are hiring more contingent faculty members. Fixed-term full-time faculty has increased to 10.9% at public comprehensives while increasing to 17.2% at private comprehensive institutions. Part-time faculty members at public comprehensive institutions make up 43.9% of the total faculty and 52.2% of all faculty at private comprehensive institutions. This change in types of faculty appointments has reduced the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty members to 39% at the public comprehensives and 29% at the private comprehensives. However, public and private research universities have seen only a slight decline in full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty and a small increase in the percentage of part-time faculty to 15.8% at public institutions and 31.3% at private institutions. Other studies have found similar changes in faculty hiring patterns (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005a, 2005b; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).¹

The demographics, career aspirations, and job satisfaction of contingent faculty members are not widely understood. Overall, however, contingent faculty members have been found to be consistently high performers (Gappa, 2000, p. 78). According to a study by Gappa, 64% of part-time faculty members held full-time jobs elsewhere, with 45% employed at several different institutions in the same region (p. 79). Gappa and Leslie (1993) developed a classification system that sheds light on who these part-time faculty members are. It classified part-time faculty as “professional specialists or experts” (employed in business or industry), “career enders” (retired or in transition to retirement), and “aspiring academics” (pursuing a faculty career). Leslie and Gappa (2002) found that only 16% of the part-time faculty population consisted of aspiring academics, and these individuals were

concentrated in fine arts and the humanities and taught at several institutions simultaneously (p. 79). In this study, Leslie and Gappa reported that a majority of contingent faculty members (85%) expressed satisfaction with their academic positions. Fixed-term, full-time contingent faculty members were more involved in academic governance and had greater access to professional development programs than part-time faculty. Hired because of their strong teaching skills, 75% reported being satisfied with their workload, job security, and salary, but they expressed some dissatisfaction with the overall status of contingent faculty in their institutions (p. 84).

Moreover, Leslie and Gappa (2002) found that part-timers in community colleges look more like full-time faculty than is sometimes assumed. Their interests, attitudes, and motivations are relatively similar. They are experienced, stable professionals who find satisfaction in teaching. Contrary to popular images, only small fractions of part-timers are eagerly seeking full-time positions and subsisting on starvation wages while holding multiple part-time jobs—the prevalent stereotype so often profiled in the popular media. (p. 65)

Part-timers have been recognized for their teaching, but they tend to lack comfort in expressing their opinions, and they receive less institutional support than their full-time colleagues. Institutions should invest in these faculty members as a long-term asset by integrating them more effectively into the academic processes of the institution rather than isolating them as a “replaceable part” (Leslie & Gappa, 2002, p. 66).

Hiring more contingent faculty members may make an institution more adaptable, but it may negatively affect fulfillment of its teaching mission as well. In a study of a state system of public higher education, Jaeger and Eagan (2010) found that the use of high concentrations of contingent faculty in first-year students’ courses reduced retention rates to the second year of college at doctoral-extensive, master’s, and baccalaureate institutions. While the proportion of courses taught by graduate students at master’s and baccalaureate institutions increased a first-year student’s propensity to drop out, full-time contract faculty also had a negative impact on retention. Jaeger and Eagan identified an exception to these trends at doctoral-intensive institutions, where employment of part-time faculty positively influenced student retention (p. 22). In contrast to part-time faculty’s treatment at master’s and baccalaureate institutions, they noted that at these doctoral institutions, part-time faculty members were more frequently viewed as an important asset for

student retention, given more institutional support, and included in faculty orientation programs (p. 23).

Similarly, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005b) found that increases in part-time faculty reduced graduation rates at some institutional types. While noting questions about the reliability of the institutional data used in the study, the authors said that when making staffing decisions, institutions must weigh the negative aspects of reduced graduation rates against the savings accrued by hiring contingent faculty. They calculated that institutions saved on average \$6,596 per salary annually by replacing an assistant professor with a full-time contingent faculty member (p. 657).

Increasing dependence on contingent faculty may also have implications for the faculty’s research role. In a study of the impact of faculty employment patterns on research and development (R&D) expenditures, Zhang and Ehrenberg (2010) found that a 1% increase in the number of full-time faculty resulted in a 2% increase in R&D expenditures, while a 1% increase in the proportion of full-time contingent faculty as a share of the total full-time faculty resulted in a .6% decrease in R&D expenditures. However, increasing contingent faculty while holding full-time faculty constant resulted in a .44% increase in R&D expenditures. (Increasing the number of graduate students—many of whom teach undergraduate courses—also increased R&D expenditures.)

As these studies have shown, faculty staffing decisions have direct effects on an institution’s ability to achieve its mission and educational outcomes. To ease negative consequences for undergraduate education, institutions may want to concentrate part-time faculty members in upper-division courses and graduate programs. When full-time contingent faculty teach first- and second-year students, they should be included in curriculum development and faculty governance activities and be fully oriented to all the learning resources available to students. Out of class, contingent faculty members should be encouraged and rewarded for engaging with students since research has suggested that such contacts positively affect persistence (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). These practices will allow an institution to remain true to its mission while addressing its need to be adaptable in a rapidly changing environment.

Faculty Demographics

Since the 1960s the demographic makeup of faculty members at U.S. institutions of higher education has become much more diverse in terms of gender,

race, and ethnicity. In particular, since the 1970s colleges and universities have increased the percentage of female faculty members and African American and Hispanic faculty members (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). These changes occurred in response to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 but also because of national and state policies to promote affirmative action in employment in and admission to higher education institutions. Bowen and Bok's (1998) study gave credence to the assumed benefits of affirmative action policies, reporting that student and faculty diversity enhances learning.

In terms of changes in the gender distribution of faculty members since the 1960s, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) found that the percentage of female faculty had grown from 17.3% of the total faculty in U.S. colleges and universities to 35.9% in 1998 (p. 50). Wilson (2010) reported that as of 2005–2006, women in all U.S. higher education institutions held 39% of all full-time faculty positions and 48% of the part-time positions. Of tenured and tenure-track faculty members who are women, just 24% held full professor positions in 2006—a percentage that had declined from 29.2% in 1998 (Wilson). Women are concentrated at the instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor levels of faculty employment (p. 50). The concentration of women in the lower faculty ranks, along with instances of pay disparities, suggests that gender discrimination remains an issue in faculty employment. Such data are cited in legal cases to provide evidence of inequity and the existence of a glass ceiling for women in higher education.

In a different interpretation of the concentration of female faculty members in lower ranks, Hargens and Long (2002) suggested that this concentration is less about discrimination and more about the demographic (age) makeup of the faculty. While they acknowledged that although the percentage of female PhDs and the percentage of new female faculty hires were increasing, both trends were having little positive impact on the percentage of female faculty members in the senior level of their profession. Hargens and Long postulated, however, that as retirements increase in the next 10 to 15 years the number of women in senior faculty positions should increase dramatically.

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2011) reported that in 2003 female faculty members constituted 42.2% of all teaching faculty, but according to the data they tended to be employed at certain institution types. For example, women made up 48.2% of the faculty at public two-year colleges and 40% of the faculty at private four-year colleges and public four-year colleges. At research and doctorate-granting institutions, women made up just 28% and 33% of the faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein,

2006, p. 52). Female faculty members are also concentrated in some disciplines. For example, women hold 67% of the positions in education, 62% in health sciences, 45% in communications, and 48% in law and social service. The number of female faculty is lower in engineering (10%), agriculture and natural resources (22%), and business administration (30%; NCES, 2011).

The racial and ethnic makeup of faculties has also become more diverse over the last five decades. For example, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) reported that the percentage of non-White full-time faculty members increased from 3.8% in 1969 to 20% in 1998 (p. 54). Using 2007 data, the "Almanac of Higher Education" (2010) reported that the U.S. higher education faculty was 75% White, 8% Black, 4% Hispanic, 6% Asian, and 3% non-U.S. foreign. As these figures indicate, there is still a need for more diversification in the faculty based on race and ethnicity. Diversification of faculty by race and gender is more pronounced in the humanities and social sciences than in the hard sciences (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 54). Institutions should be in a better position to address barriers to diversification of faculty as positions open up when baby boomers begin to retire.

Faculty Retirements

The graying of the faculty is a phenomenon that will have a significant impact on higher education in the next 12 to 20 years. Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) reported that in 1998, 51.2% of the faculty was under 50 years of age, 35.6% was between 50 and 59, and 16.1% was 60 years old or over (p. 59). While the economic downturn has caused some older faculty members to delay their exit from the academy, the next 10 to 15 years will see an onslaught of faculty retirements from the 49.8% of faculty members who were 50 years and older in 1998. Their retirement should have a significant and positive effect on gender, racial, and ethnic diversity in faculties.

While at first, given the difficult economic times, institutions may eliminate some retirees' positions, in time they will have to replace them to maintain academic programs, advance knowledge, and educate citizens. The main question is whether colleges and universities will opt to replace tenured faculty members with contingent faculty members, or whether institutions will choose to recruit entry-level, tenure-track faculty candidates. Our three principles of mission, adaptability, and democratic partnerships should drive institutions' decision-making processes as they develop strategies for the composition of their faculties.

Faculty Employment Issues

As is the case with most organizations, colleges and universities must contend with staff issues. In this section, we address concerns specifically related to the employment of faculty members. With the retirement of substantial numbers of senior faculty members looming, higher education institutions should develop plans for the recruitment and hiring of new faculty members. As institutions replace faculty members, they must address diversity issues in ways that are consistent with laws prohibiting discrimination. In addition, administrators of institutions should identify ways to protect faculty members' academic freedom—an important concept in the advancement of knowledge. They also should consider how faculty members can engage in academic governance as a democratic partner with administrators and board members.

A Faculty Employment Plan

In the wake of the economic downturn of 2008, institutions began to downsize their faculties and staffs using attrition through retirement and resignations. While the crash of 2008 caused some faculty members to delay retirement, in the next decade retirements are expected to increase (American Council on Education, 2010). Institutions should not leave staffing decisions to fate. Rather, administrators should develop and define faculty hiring strategies for the next 10 to 15 years. Such strategic planning should be completed in light of the institution's mission and if done properly will positively affect its academic programs.

In a study commissioned by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association to investigate the changing demographics of higher education faculty, R. L. Clark (2004) made the following recommendation:

A faculty-planning model should be based on demographic models of population growth and employment records of individual institutions. Using the planning model, academic administrators would be able to observe the changing age structure of their faculty, expected turnover rates and retirement rates, and the need for new faculty. The model will also be able to address the changing composition of the faculty between full-time tenure track faculty and other types of faculty appointments. (p. 10)

Such a plan should take into account the themes of this book: institutional mission, adaptability to environmental change, and democratic partnerships. The plan should account for the faculty positions needed to deliver

quality programs, including the ratio of contingent to tenured and tenure-track faculty members and their hiring rank. In addition, no plan should ignore the quest for diversity within the faculty. With half of faculties expected to retire in the next decade, now is an excellent time for colleges and universities to plan for new faculty hires that will allow them to adapt to environmental changes in ways that are consistent with their mission and values. Here are some questions that should be posed in developing a faculty staffing plan:

- Based on institutional mission, what should be the ratio of tenure or tenure-track faculty to contingent faculty (fixed-term, full-time, and part-time faculty)?
- If hiring tenured faculty, what should be the rank of a faculty member to maintain the quality and reputation of the degree program?
- Can quality of academic programs be maintained where we only employ contingent faculty to deliver those programs?
- Will what we know about the relationship between faculty staffing patterns and student learning be used in developing the plan?

Discrimination in Employment

Just as colleges and universities must consider affirmative action issues as they develop new faculty positions in the coming decade and beyond, administrators must also be attentive to these concerns with current faculty members. A number of federal laws inform these matters, including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (amended by the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990), and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. The foci of each of these affirmative action and antidiscrimination laws are discussed in chapter 6, but here we emphasize the need to be mindful of these laws in hiring, salary, promotion, and tenure decisions, and in nonrenewal, layoff, and termination for cause actions.

In faculty employment decisions, institutions must uphold the relevant federal laws and any state statutes that mirror or expand upon federal laws. Today most institutions maintain affirmative action policy statements that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, gender, national origin, sexual orientation, and veteran's status, meeting or exceeding federal and state employment obligations. Discrimination against individuals with physical

Faculty Employment Issues

As is the case with most organizations, colleges and universities must contend with staff issues. In this section, we address concerns specifically related to the employment of faculty members. With the retirement of substantial numbers of senior faculty members looming, higher education institutions should develop plans for the recruitment and hiring of new faculty members. As institutions replace faculty members, they must address diversity issues in ways that are consistent with laws prohibiting discrimination. In addition, administrators of institutions should identify ways to protect faculty members' academic freedom—an important concept in the advancement of knowledge. They also should consider how faculty members can engage in academic governance as a democratic partner with administrators and board members.

A Faculty Employment Plan

In the wake of the economic downturn of 2008, institutions began to downsize their faculties and staffs using attrition through retirement and resignations. While the crash of 2008 caused some faculty members to delay retirement, in the next decade retirements are expected to increase (American Council on Education, 2010). Institutions should not leave staffing decisions to fate. Rather, administrators should develop and define faculty hiring strategies for the next 10 to 15 years. Such strategic planning should be completed in light of the institution's mission and if done properly will positively affect its academic programs.

In a study commissioned by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association to investigate the changing demographics of higher education faculty, R. L. Clark (2004) made the following recommendation:

A faculty-planning model should be based on demographic models of population growth and employment records of individual institutions. Using the planning model, academic administrators would be able to observe the changing age structure of their faculty, expected turnover rates and retirement rates, and the need for new faculty. The model will also be able to address the changing composition of the faculty between full-time tenure track faculty and other types of faculty appointments. (p. 10)

Such a plan should take into account the themes of this book: institutional mission, adaptability to environmental change, and democratic partnerships. The plan should account for the faculty positions needed to deliver

quality programs, including the ratio of contingent to tenured and tenure-track faculty members and their hiring rank. In addition, no plan should ignore the quest for diversity within the faculty. With half of faculties expected to retire in the next decade, now is an excellent time for colleges and universities to plan for new faculty hires that will allow them to adapt to environmental changes in ways that are consistent with their mission and values. Here are some questions that should be posed in developing a faculty staffing plan:

- Based on institutional mission, what should be the ratio of tenure or tenure-track faculty to contingent faculty (fixed-term, full-time, and part-time faculty)?
- If hiring tenured faculty, what should be the rank of a faculty member to maintain the quality and reputation of the degree program?
- Can quality of academic programs be maintained where we only employ contingent faculty to deliver those programs?
- Will what we know about the relationship between faculty staffing patterns and student learning be used in developing the plan?

Discrimination in Employment

Just as colleges and universities must consider affirmative action issues as they develop new faculty positions in the coming decade and beyond, administrators must also be attentive to these concerns with current faculty members. A number of federal laws inform these matters, including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (amended by the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990), and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. The foci of each of these affirmative action and antidiscrimination laws are discussed in chapter 6, but here we emphasize the need to be mindful of these laws in hiring, salary, promotion, and tenure decisions, and in nonrenewal, layoff, and termination for cause actions.

In faculty employment decisions, institutions must uphold the relevant federal laws and any state statutes that mirror or expand upon federal laws. Today most institutions maintain affirmative action policy statements that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, gender, national origin, sexual orientation, and veteran's status, meeting or exceeding federal and state employment obligations. Discrimination against individuals with physical

handicaps is treated somewhat differently in that a person with a physical disability must be otherwise qualified to perform the requirements of the position.

Academic Freedom and the First Amendment

Academic freedom as a concept was established by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) around the turn of the 20th century, although it originated in the German university traditions of *Lehrfreiheit* (freedom to pursue truth) and *Lernfreiheit* (freedom to learn). The purpose of these freedoms was to protect faculty members from religious, political, and societal interference in the pursuit of truth, wherever that might lead (Toma, 2011, p. 95). The 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* (AAUP, n.d.) institutionalized the standards used to define academic freedom today. The statement identified the following freedoms:

1. The freedom to research issues to advance truth and to publish results without institutional retribution;
2. The freedom of teachers in the classroom to present knowledge and discuss matters pertaining to the subject matter of the class, but not to include unrelated controversial subject matter; and
3. The freedom to speak or write publicly as concerned citizens, without institutional retribution, although in public pronouncements faculty members should use only their academic titles when speaking within their area of technical expertise.

Traditionally, only tenure-track and tenured faculty are protected by academic freedom, and in some cases only tenured faculty enjoy this protection. Tenure is defined as a contract without term, but it is not a job for life, and the contract can be terminated for cause as long as due process is observed (see chapter 6, pp. 152–153).

The AAUP considers academic freedom to be a First Amendment right. Based on U.S. Supreme Court cases such as *Minnesota State Board for Community Colleges v. Knight* (1984) and *Waters v. Churchill* (1994), Hendrickson (1999) has maintained that while faculty members have rights under the U.S. Constitution, including free speech rights under the First Amendment, academic freedom is a contractual right granted by an institution (p. 82).² DeFattore (2011), based on the Supreme Court's decision in *Garrett v. Ceballos* (2006), has also argued that academic freedom becomes a profession standard guaranteed by the institution through a contract.

All public employees are protected by First Amendment speech rights when discussing matters of public concern (*Garrett v. Ceballos*, 2006; *Jeffries v. Harleston*, 1994; *Waters v. Churchill*, 1994). These matters include the quality of education, health, and safety that affect the public. Faculty pronouncements about matters of employee concern—such as teaching assignments, class schedules, and expectations of time in the office—are not covered by the First Amendment. While matters of employee concern may not be covered by the First Amendment, they may be covered by academic freedom guidelines, depending on the content of the speech. Such matters could include course content or pedagogical strategies.

These academic freedoms and First Amendment rights are fundamental values that go to the core of higher education's concept of democratic partnerships. Academic freedom is not, however, academic license. For example, the curriculum of an academic program—that is, course sequences and course content—should be determined by the collective faculty of that program. Academic freedom does not give individual faculty members the right to teach whatever they want whenever they want. It is, however, the prerogative of individual faculty members to determine how and with which resources (i.e., readings, problems, and case studies) to deliver the content. Issues surrounding how course content is taught are a matter of employee concern and are not covered by the First Amendment, although they are certainly covered by academic freedom.

As institutions hire more contingent faculty members, questions are emerging concerning academic freedom and First Amendment protections, and administrators of institutions need to rethink their academic freedom policies. Gappa, Austin, and Tice (2007) have argued that institutions need to expand their academic freedom policy to cover contingent and tenured and tenure-track faculty members alike. Specifically, they have asserted that contingent and pretenure faculty members should receive explanations of adverse personnel actions, such as decisions not to renew contracts. Such decisions should be based on written peer evaluations of performance using consistent appropriate evaluation criteria; renewals of contingent faculty members' contracts should be based on programmatic needs; grievance procedures should follow the tenets of fundamental fairness and due process commonly used in discrimination cases. Finally, decisions should be reviewed by an impartial body according to academic freedom policies, and review committee members should be protected from retribution resulting from their findings (p. 236). Developing an academic freedom policy that

protects all faculty members is consistent with higher education's core mission and reflects adaptability to change in the institutional environment and dedication to fostering democratic partnerships.

Faculty Governance

Some research on the effects of increases in contingent faculty has indicated that concurrent declines in learning outcomes may be the result of isolation of contingent faculty members from academic governance in their institutions (Jaeger & Eagan, 2010; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Involving contingent faculty members in academic governance including curriculum development provides them with a better understanding of institutional mission and curricular design. Contingent faculty members can serve students more effectively when they know how the courses they teach fit into general education and the undergraduate major. By bringing these faculty members into the academic governance and culture of the institution, they will become active contributing members instead of being kept on the sidelines as second-class citizens. (See chapter 11 for a more in-depth discussion of academic governance.)

Faculty Reward Structures

Designing an evaluation and reward structure for faculty that reflects the mission and goals of the institution is important in maintaining a strong and vibrant faculty. A number of evaluation processes important to faculty growth and development include annual reviews, promotion and tenure, and posttenure reviews.

Annual reviews and merit pay. While the process of annual evaluations of faculty performance and the award of merit pay is discussed in chapter 12, p. 301, it is relevant to discuss faculty work and productivity criteria briefly here. Diamond and colleagues have studied these issues since the 1990s (Diamond, 1993, 1995, 1999, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c; Diamond & Adam, 1993, 2004). A key recommendation that has emerged from their scholarship is that institutions need to ensure that criteria for annual reviews and rewards are consistent with their mission and their promotion and tenure process. What faculty members reported to Diamond (2002c), however, is that their institutions' rhetoric does not reflect what is actually rewarded, nor are personnel reward policies consistent with their institutions' stated mission. In addition, they found that applied research, teaching, course and curriculum design, and community service do not receive much in the way of rewards or

recognition (Diamond, 2002c, p. 31). Beyond connecting to the institutional mission, Diamond and his colleagues have also argued that reward structures need to be discipline specific so they will more accurately reflect the realities of faculty work.

Promotion and tenure. Scholars have asserted there is no longer a need for contracts without term, commonly known as tenure, because it stifles institutional adaptability (Breneman, 1997; Chait, 1997). Others have suggested that while the inability to adapt was one of the main arguments for eliminating tenure, the transition to a mix of tenured and tenure-track and contingent faculty has provided institutions with more flexibility to adapt to change (Allen, 2000; Finkin, 1998). Tenure advocates also argue that while contingent faculty members are protected by academic freedom at many institutions, they lack the job security of tenured faculty members. Moreover, they lack the freedom to set their own research agendas and pursue truth wherever it leads, free from intimidation and threats.

While this debate will continue, we propose that institutions need to maintain a ratio of different types of faculty positions based on their mission. This ratio will vary by institutional type and geographic location, but a cadre of tenure and tenure-track faculty should be maintained at all institutions. While the promotion and tenure process is discussed in chapter 12, current trends in faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure are considered here (see, for example, Green, 2008; Huber, 2002; Shapiro, 2006).

In his 1990 book on the professoriate, Boyer proposed revisions to the criteria used to evaluate faculty performance in awarding promotion and tenure. Specifically, he advocated for diversification of the criteria to move away from a primary focus on research and publication productivity, a secondary concern for teaching, and a tertiary interest in service. Instead, Boyer recommended that promotion and tenure criteria include balanced consideration of the four areas of scholarship: discovery, teaching, integration (interdisciplinary), and application (engagement). Moreover, Boyer maintained that faculty members' productivity should be based on four mandates: doing original research, staying current in their fields, maintaining high standards of performance in teaching and discovery, and improving assessment tools of faculty performance (p. 27).

A number of scholars have subsequently studied the impact of Boyer's (1990) recommendations on faculty reward criteria in higher education institutions (Braskamp, 1994; Braxton, Luckey, & Holland, 2002; Diamond &

Adam, 1993). More recently O'Meara (2005) surveyed a national sample of college and university chief academic officers (CAOs) to determine whether their faculty reward structures had changed in light of Boyer's proposals. The findings of O'Meara's study were that 68% of CAOs indicated that changes had been made to their institutional mission and policies and faculty evaluation criteria, and that they developed incentive grants, established policies for flexibility in workloads, and expanded the definition of scholarship (p. 488). Since O'Meara's findings came from CAOs' responses to a survey, we lack specific information about the scope of change at their institutions, but the study certainly indicates that some reform is taking place in U.S. higher education.

The most prominent reform in promotion and tenure has involved the tenure clock. Traditionally, a probationary faculty member (pretenured, tenure-track faculty member) has six years to be awarded tenure. During that period, the faculty member would be evaluated annually and given some indication of his or her progress toward the award of tenure. In recent years, many institutions have established a process to stop the tenure clock so that young women on the tenure track can have children. Even with such policies in place, however, research shows that female probationary faculty of child-bearing age avoid having children because of concern that it could jeopardize their chances of being awarded tenure (Bellas & Toukoushian, 1999; Finkel, 1994; Harper, Baldwin, Gansmeyer, & Chronister, 2001; Johnrud & Des Jarlais, 1994).

Any institutional reform that changes the faculty evaluation and reward structure for promotion and tenure should be based on the institution's mission and the work its faculty members actually perform. Too often changes in faculty reward structures have sought to mirror those of major research universities—a trend that contributes to the phenomenon of “mission creep” (Lane, 2005). For example, institutions whose primary mission is baccalaureate education should resist the temptation to adopt research universities' traditional standards for research and publication. Calabrese and Roberts (2004) noted that the quest to publish or perish forces faculty members to prepare articles for publication that are often inconsequential and are submitted to achieve the designated number of publications required for tenure and not to contribute to the advancement of knowledge. Indeed, it is incomprehensible how an institution that requires its professors to teach six to eight courses per academic year can also expect its faculty members to produce research and publications of a quality comparable to that of faculty members at research universities where they may teach two to four courses

each year. Rather, an institution with an undergraduate teaching mission should make teaching and the scholarship of teaching the top criteria for faculty evaluation and awards.

To avoid the trap of mission creep and the negative ramifications it can have for institutions and their faculty members' work, Diamond (2002c) has outlined the following principles for determining faculty reward criteria:

- Individual academic units can be given the responsibility of determining if a specific activity falls within the work of the discipline and the priorities of the institution, school, college, and department.
- The criteria that are used can be clear, easy to understand, and consistent across all disciplines, thus reducing problems for administrators, committees, and the faculty members being reviewed.
- The system is fair and the criteria are clearly understood, with no one discipline or group of disciplines determining what scholarship should be for another discipline or group of disciplines.
- The process is cost-effective, in that faculty members up for review know what is required of them and faculty members serving on review committees can focus their attention on the quality of the product and process rather than on whether or not the activity should be considered scholarly. (p. 77)

Using these principles, colleges and universities can develop faculty reward structures that are consistent with their mission and more accurately reflect faculty work and institutional expectations for faculty performance.

Posttenure review. With the rising cost of higher education and increasing calls for accountability in colleges and universities, tenure has been targeted as an expensive and enigmatic practice, particularly at public higher education institutions. As the critique of tenure stiffened, institutions began to adopt posttenure review processes as a way to address the public's concern about the value and performance of tenured faculty members.

As is the case with other evaluation and reward systems, posttenure review criteria and objectives must be a realistic representation of an institution's mission. Posttenure reviews usually take place every five to seven years after a faculty member receives tenure. They can be either formative or summative, and they can require faculty peer review or be the sole responsibility of the department chair. Formative and summative reviews require presentation of an updated curriculum vitae; compilation of prior annual reviews;

evidence of student and peer evaluations of teaching; evidence of publications, research, and creative work; and a letter of evaluation from the chair of the primary academic unit (Alstere, 2000). A summative review typically includes a professional development plan that addresses any performance weaknesses identified during the review, while in a formative review a faculty development strategy would be voluntary. In the formative review process, however, the faculty member usually develops a five-year plan to define his or her future areas of productivity, growth, and improvement (Alstere; Licata & Morreale, 2002). These plans are revisited during subsequent reviews.

Licata and Morreale (2002) have investigated the consequences of implementing posttenure review processes at higher education institutions. They explored how posttenure reviews can enhance the importance of good teaching, define tenured faculty work and expectations, and redefine the types of appointments and work expectations for some senior faculty. Out of these enhancements should come continual improvement and the elimination of deadweight, development of individual faculty members as good academic citizens, and reinforcement of the institution's values and mission (Licata & Morreale).

Faculty Development

In line with calls for posttenure review, the professional growth and development of faculty members has become a pressing issue in the past several decades. Gappa et al. (2007) and O'Meara et al. (2009) have discussed the need to approach faculty growth and development individually, taking into account the faculty member's career stage and other issues specific to that person. For example, the needs of midcareer faculty members differ greatly from those of new faculty members (Austin, 2002; Baldwin, Dezure, Shaw, & Moretto, 2008; Gappa et al. 2007). Zahorski (2002) advocates a holistic approach to faculty development to achieve this individualization, including a variety of programs such as a resource center, mentoring and orientation programs, minigrants, sabbaticals, funding for annual conference attendance and participation, topical workshops, faculty exchange programs, newsletters, faculty development networks, phased retirement, awards programs, and individual counseling for faculty members.

Faculty and Civic Engagement

Expectations for faculty members to engage in development activities come from several sources, including rising calls for colleges and universities to be

civically engaged. The old stereotype of solitary faculty members holed up in the ivory tower to engage in their individual research agendas is rapidly disappearing, particularly at institutions where the primary mission is teaching and civic engagement but also in some disciplinary units at research universities (O'Meara et al., 2009). Faculty members may need assistance, though, to learn how to participate in civic activities effectively.

In thinking about ways to foster faculty development and academic growth O'Meara et al. (2009) suggested the following:

Identify ways to foster, in faculty, the desire and will to craft themselves as teachers, researchers, and partners in service and community engagement who have actively chosen—and continue actively to choose—the academic career as a way to lead their lives. (p. 19)

Enhancing Teaching and Learning Through Technology

Rapid changes in technology, computers, the Internet, and gaming are revolutionizing teaching and learning (Dede, 2004). Dede has written about changes in the learning style of the members of the Internet generation, who frequently are more independent learners, intellectually open-minded, innovative, curious, and self-reliant (p. 4). Other generational age groups are adopting this learning style as well. New technologies have resulted in the development of new media tools, such as groupware for virtual collaboration, asynchronous threaded discussion, multuser virtual environments, videoconferencing, and mobile wireless devices, all of which have changed teaching and learning (p. 5).

As we discuss in chapter 14, numerous theories of learning have been developed over time. Dede (2004) distinguished among the behaviorist theory of learning; or presentational instruction; the cognitive theory of learning, with tutorials and guided learning by doing; and the situational theory of learning, which uses mentoring and apprenticeships in communities of practice (p. 12). Dede asserted that new technologies are having the most impact in these situational contexts. Technological innovations are allowing the creation of new types of student-faculty learning communities that are changing significantly the ways professors and students learn and grow.

Others have also written about these issues, advocating that faculty members should acquire skills and knowledge about teaching and learning in online and distance education environments (Howell, Saba, Lindsay, & Williams, 2004), while still others have argued that faculty members and graduate students can learn how to use new and evolving technologies by

- Calabrese, R. L., & Roberts, B. (2004). Self-interest and scholarly publication: The dilemma of researchers, reviewers, and editors. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(6), 335-341.
- Chart, R. (1997, February 7). Thawing the cold war over tenure: Why academe needs more employment options. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 43(22), B4.
- Civil Rights Restoration Act, U.S. P.L. 100-259 (1987).
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, R. L. (2004). *Changing faculty demographics and the need for new policies*. Paper presented at the TIVA-CREF Institute Conference, New York, NY.
- Colbeck, C. L. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69(6), 647-671. doi:10.2307/2649212
- Colbeck, C. L. (2002). Integration: Evaluating faculty work as a whole. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 114, 43-52. doi:10.1002/ir.45
- Dede, C. (2004). Planning for neomillennial learning styles. *Educourse Quarterly*, 28(1), 7-12.
- DeFatore, J. (2011). Defending academic freedom in the age of Garcetti. *Academe Online*, 97(1). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AALUP/pubsres/academic/2011/F/Feat/delf.htm>
- Diamond, R. M. (1993). Changing priorities and the faculty reward system. In R. M. Diamond (Ed.), *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000* (pp. 5-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi:10.1002/he.36919938103
- Diamond, R. M. (1995). *Preparing for promotion and tenure review: A faculty guide*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Diamond, R. M. (1999). *Aligning faculty rewards with institutional mission: Statements, policies & guidelines*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Diamond, R. M. (2002a). Curricula and courses: Administrative issues. In R. M. Diamond (Ed.), *Field guide to academic leadership* (pp. 135-156). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Diamond, R. M. (2002b). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2002(90), 73-79. doi:10.1002/dtl.57
- Diamond, R. M. (2002c). The mission-driven faculty reward system. In R. M. Diamond (Ed.), *Field guide to academic leadership* (pp. 271-291). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (Eds.). (1993). *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (2004). Balancing institutional, disciplinary and faculty priorities with public and social needs: Defining scholarship for the 21st century. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 3(1), 29-40. doi:10.1177/147402204039643
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2003a). The changing nature of faculty employment. In R. L. Clark & J. Ma (Eds.), *Recruitment, retention and retirement in higher education: Building and managing the faculty of the future* (pp. 32-52). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2003b). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *Journal of Human Resources*, 40(3), 647-659.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, 42 U.S.C.a. 2000e et seq.
- Equal Pay Act, 29 U.S.C. 206(d) et seq. (1963).
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in America*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 401-422. doi:10.1353/jhe.2005.0027
- Finkel, S. K. (1994). Childbirth, tenure, and promotion for women faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(3), 259-270.
- Finkin, M. W. (1998). Tenure and the entrepreneurial academy: A reply. *Sociological Perspectives*, 41(4), 729-746. doi:10.2307/40252281
- Gappa, J. M. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 77-86. doi:10.1002/ir.10507
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Tice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Garcetti v. Ceballos, 547 U.S. 410 (2006).
- Green, R. (2008). Tenure and promotion decisions: The relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44(2), 117-127. doi:10.5175/JSW.E.2008.200700003
- Hagens, L., & Long, J. (2002). Demographic inertia and women's representation among faculty in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 494-518. doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.0037
- Harper, E. P., Baldwin, R. G., Gansneder, B. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). Full-time women faculty off the tenure track: Profile and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 237-258. doi:10.1353/rhe.2001.0003
- Hendrickson, R. M. (1999). *The colleges, their constituencies and the courts* (2nd ed.). Dayton, OH: Education Law Association.
- Howell, S. L., Saba, F., Lindsay, N. K., & Williams, P. B. (2004). Seven strategies for enabling faculty success in distance education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(1), 33-49. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.11.005
- Huber, M. T. (2002). Faculty evaluation and the development of academic careers. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 114, 73-83. doi:10.1002/ir.48
- Jager, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2010). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state system of public higher education. *Educational Policy*, 20(10), 1-31. doi:10.1177/0895904810361733

- Jeffries v. Harleston, 516 U.S. 862 (1994).
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Des Jarlais, C. D. (1994). Barriers to tenure for women and minorities: The case of a university's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(4), 335-353. doi:10.1080/0729436940130101
- Jordan, S. M. (1994). What we have learned about faculty workload: The best evidence. In J. F. Wergan (Ed.), *Analyzing faculty workload* (pp. 15-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution* (3rd report). Retrieved from <http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=183>
- Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., Hershhey, K., & Peruski, L. (2004). With a little help from your students: A new model for faculty development and online course design. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 12(1), 25-31.
- Lane, J. E. (2005, November). *Politics of mission creep: A framework for understanding the phenomena*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- Layzell, D. T. (1996). Faculty workload and productivity: Recurrent issues with new imperatives. *The Review of Higher Education*, 19(3), 267-282.
- Leslie, D. W., & Gappa, J. M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118, 59-67. doi:10.1002/cc.64
- Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. C. (2002). *Post-tenure faculty review and renewal: Experienced voices*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Massey, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1994). Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the "academic ratchet." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65, 1-22.
- Minnesota State Board for Community Colleges v. Knight, 465 U.S. 271 (1984).
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *Career/technical education (CTE) statistics*. Table P59. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ctes/tables/P59.asp>
- O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education*, 46(5), 479-510. doi:10.1007/s11162-005-3362-6
- O'Meara, K. A., Terosky, A. T., & Neumann, A. (2009). Faculty careers and work lives: Professional growth perspectives. *ASHE Higher Education Reports*, 34(3).
- Palmer, J. C. (2002). Disciplinary variation in the work of full-time faculty members. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2002(118), 9-19. doi:10.1002/cc.59
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rice, R. E. (2002). Beyond scholarship reconsidered: Toward an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 90, 7-17. doi:10.1002/lt.51
- Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 701 et seq. (1973).
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shapiro, H. N. (2006). Promotion & tenure & the scholarship of teaching & learning. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(2), 39-43.
- Title IX of the Education Amendments, 20 U.S.C. 1681(a) (1972).
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 2000d to 2000d-7 (1964).
- Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. 20001 et seq. (1964).
- Toma, J. D. (2011). *Managing the entrepreneurial university: Legal issues and commercial realities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Van Alstyne, W. (2011). Academic freedom and the first amendment in the Supreme Court of the United States: An unhurried historical review. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 53(3), 79-154.
- Waters v. Churchill, 511 U.S. 661 (1994).
- Wilson, R. (2010). AAUP report blames colleges for gender inequity among professors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(11), A11.
- Zahorski, K. J. (2002). Nurturing scholarship through holistic faculty development: A synergistic approach. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2002(90), 29-37. doi:10.1002/lt.53
- Zhang, L., & Ehrenberg, R. G. (2010). Faculty employment and R&D expenditures at research universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 29(3), 329-337. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.10.006