

The Imperative for Change

**Fostering Understanding of the Necessity of Changing
Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Policies and Practices**

Adrianna Kezar, Daniel Maxey, and Lara Badke

A resource created by **The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student**
www.thechangingfaculty.org

Additional resources and tool kits from
The Delphi Project on The Changing Faculty and Student Success

are available online at
<http://resources.thechangingfaculty.org>
including:

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on Our Campus: A Guide for Campus Task Forces to Better Understand Faculty Working Conditions and Necessity of Change examines non-tenure-track faculty practices and issues at the campus level. It has been prepared to accompany this guide, but is focused more broadly on the whole campus and can be used as your efforts begin to expand to improve conditions throughout your institution.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Our Department: A Guide for Departments and Academic Programs to Better Understand Faculty Working Conditions and Necessity of Change examines non-tenure-track faculty practices and issues at the department level. It has been prepared to accompany this guide, but is focused more narrowly on individual academic programs and can be used to collect information from specific departments to produce a more clear understanding of how practices might affect faculty on campus in different ways.

The Path to Change: How Campus Communities Worked to Change Non-Tenure-Track Policies and Practices describes how several campuses have already initiated a dialogue about non-tenure-track faculty practices and how different groups on each campus worked together to implement changes. These examples can offer some ideas about how to pursue changes on your own campus.

The Delphi Project has received generous support from:
The Spencer Foundation, The Teagle Foundation,
and
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>.

The Imperative for Change:

Understanding the Necessity of Changing Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Policies and Practices

By Adrianna Kezar, Daniel Maxey, and Lara Badke

In this document, we outline the three major imperatives we see as framing the need to create changes to policies and practices for non-tenure-track faculty. They are:

1. **The Student Learning Imperative**
2. **The Equity Imperative**
3. **The Risk Management Imperative**

The Student Learning Imperative

Studies suggest rising numbers of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education are negatively affecting student success (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Gross & Goldhaber, 2009; Eagan & Jaegar, 2004; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Harrington & Schibik, 2001; Jacoby, 2006; Jaegar & Eagan, 2009). The committed educators comprising the non-tenure-track faculty ranks – sometimes referred to as adjuncts, clinical, or contingent faculty – are not to blame for these adverse effects on student learning. Rather, poor working conditions and a lack of support diminish their capacity to provide a high quality learning environment and experience for students. The cumulative effect of working conditions constrains individual instructor’s abilities to interact with students and apply their many talents, creativity, and subject knowledge to maximum effect inside and outside the classroom. Leaders in academic affairs should be particularly concerned with ameliorating non-tenure-track faculty policies and practices that have a deleterious effect on efforts to serve our central mission with regard to teaching and learning. There are several areas of critical concern that have been documented, which we have highlighted below.

Diminished Graduation and Retention Rates

Empirical research studies suggest increased reliance on non-tenure-track faculty has negatively affected retention and graduation rates. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2004) and Jaeger and Eagan (2009) found that graduation rates declined as proportions of non-tenure-track faculty increased. Increases in part-time faculty employment, in particular, have been found to have the greatest impact on graduation rates, as well as retention rates (Harrington and Schibik, 2001; Jacoby, 2006).

Reduced Faculty Student Interaction and Accessibility

Most studies highlight the substantial effects of diminished faculty-student interaction on student learning outcomes. Contact time and interaction between traditional faculty and students have been shown to foster greater student success (Benjamin, 2003). However, research suggests that the inaccessibility of part-time faculty to students due to time constraints, a lack of office space, and because many hold jobs at multiple locations has an inverse, negative effect on student outcomes (CCSSE, 2009; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Jacoby, 2006).

Diminished Use of High-Impact Teaching Practices

Studies comparing tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty have identified that non-tenure-track faculty, particularly those holding part-time positions, make less use of teaching practices that are associated with better student learning outcomes such as service learning, undergraduate research, active and collaborative learning, problem-based learning, and student centered or multicultural approaches to teaching (Baldwin, & Wawrzynski, 2011; Umbach, 2007). There are various explanations for why this is the case, ranging from fears that experimenting with innovative strategies will negatively affect teaching evaluations to a lack of professional development limiting instructors' exposure to high-impact practices and pedagogies. Since full-time non-tenure-track faculty work more closely resembles that of tenure-track faculty, they may be more likely than their part-time peers to utilize high-impact practices and innovative teaching strategies.

Decreased Transfers from Two-Year to Four-Year Institutions

Gross and Goldhaber (2009) found that students at two-year colleges who had greater exposure to full-time, tenured faculty were more likely to transfer to four-year institutions. Their research found a 4% increase in transfers to four-year institutions per each 10% increase in the proportion of tenured faculty members. Eagan and Jaeger (2008) similarly found increased proportions of part-time faculty were correlated with lower transfer rates. This issue of adverse effects on transfer rates to four-year institutions becomes particularly important in light of the fact that non-tenure-track faculty account for approximately 80% of the instructional faculty – although sometimes more – among community colleges in the United States.

Part-Time Faculty Have a More Pronounced Negative Effect on Outcomes

Full-time non-tenure-track faculty practices often parallel those of tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin and Wawrzynski, 2011). Most studies focusing on the differences in effects on student learning find that the more negative outcomes are tied to part-time faculty, who have limited opportunities for faculty-student interaction and for participation in curriculum design. They also have limited access to instructional resources, support staff, and professional development opportunities (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Harrington and Schibik, 2001; Jacoby, 2006).

Growing reliance on part-time faculty has a pronounced negative effect on first-year students, specifically. In a study of college freshmen, Harrington and Schibik (2001) found that increased exposure to part-time faculty was significantly associated with lower second semester retention rates, lower GPAs, and fewer attempted credit hours. Bettinger and Long (2010) found early exposure to part-time faculty also had a negative effect on students' major selection.

The Equity Imperative

While the impact on student learning should be an imperative for all educators, many campus leaders and faculty are also concerned about inequities in their profession and the far-reaching consequences of such unsustainable practices. Human resource professionals are tasked with examining issues of equity and fairness in employment practices. There are several key areas where equity issues need to be carefully examined on college campuses such as salary, benefits, governance, professional development, and rehiring.

Salary

Though part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty are both paid less than tenured and tenure-track faculty, part-time faculty are customarily paid significantly less than even full-time non-tenure-track faculty for the same work. One national study found that full-time non-tenure-track faculty typically make 26% less than tenured faculty, but that part-time faculty earn approximately 60% less than comparable full-time, tenure-track faculty when their salaries are expressed on an hourly basis (Curtis, 2005; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). Hollenshead and others (2007) found the low end of per-course compensation for full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty to be comparable (\$3,171 for part-time and \$3,523 for full-time), but called attention to the disparity on the high end. The highest paid part-time faculty in the study earned only \$5,564 per course, as compared to \$7,978 for their full-time non-tenure-track faculty peers (Hollenshead et al., 2007).

A more recent study conducted by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW, 2012) found the median per-course compensation for part-time faculty, \$2,700, to be far lower than what tenure-track faculty are paid when standardized to reflect compensation for instruction in a three-credit course. Also, although the CAW study did find there is a wage premium for part-time faculty who hold doctoral or other terminal degrees, their rate of pay still falls far below that of full-time non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty. Length of service to an institution, another factor that typically contributes to increases in compensation, was similarly found to not result in higher levels of compensation for part-time faculty or pay rates comparable to other faculty members. Part-time faculty are often ineligible for salary adjustments (which were available to them at only 50% of institutions in a national sample), promotion opportunities, or evaluation (Hollenshead et al., 2007). Having a formal evaluation process in place can create a means for determining that faculty should be considered for salary increases, rehired, or offered opportunities for promotion. But, without any record of their performance, such arguments are difficult to make.

The studies above point out how faculty compensation is often inequitable when considered on a per course basis, but it is also important to consider that, even by this standardized measure

(e.g., per course, standardized to reflect a three-credit course), faculty workloads are often not balanced. The workloads of non-tenure-track faculty are usually defined by their teaching, but consideration is not always given to the time faculty must spend preparing for classes, holding office hours, giving feedback on assignments, and communicating with students (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Non-tenure-track faculty members working for the same institution may even have very different teaching loads or responsibilities, but receive the same rate of pay. While lesser course loads might make sense for teaching-intensive courses such as writing, there are also variations that have no such rationale or justification.

Benefits

Only 51% of part-time faculty are provided some form of benefits from their institution. Typically these are health benefits, although the packages offered to part-time faculty are not usually the same ones given to full-time faculty, which may also include life insurance, retirement, and access to paid sick leave (Hollenshead et al., 2007). Gappa and Leslie (1993) also discovered that institutions frequently do not rehire part-time faculty if or when they might become eligible for benefits, for example, when they have been working for the institution for a defined, continuous period of time. *Inside Higher Ed* has begun to report on cases where institutions are capping the teaching loads of part-time faculty in order to avoid providing them health care benefits that are required by the Affordable Care Act (Flaherty, 2012). As a result of these decisions, part-time faculty may not just have to pay out of their own pocket for health insurance, but they may also be paid less in upcoming terms because of the limits that are placed on the number of hours or courses they can teach.

Participation in Governance

Part-time faculty have consistently been shown to be excluded from shared governance at institutions and are often not allowed to attend departmental or institutional meetings open to other faculty (Hollenshead et al., 2007). Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found that full-time non-tenure-track faculty are more actively involved in governance. Approximately 50% of the institutions in Baldwin's and Chronister's sample allowed full-time non-tenure-track faculty to participate in the faculty senate and other forms of governance alongside their tenured and tenure-track colleagues. They found that about 75% of these faculty were allowed to participate in departmental meetings and decision making. Although the researchers note that there are restrictions the participation of non-tenure-track faculty in formal governance structures and processes, many report they are involved in less formal governance tasks. For example, they may be asked to contribute to more local decision making or be asked informally for their advice.

Generally, increased participation rights do not necessarily equate to having a voice in shared governance or power on campus. Even on many campuses where non-tenure-track faculty are allowed to participate in governance, they have no voting rights or are only afforded partial voting rights (Kezar & Sam, 2010). They may also not have proportional representation, as compared to their tenured and tenure-track colleagues. For example, non-tenure-track faculty might only be apportioned two representatives on a faculty senate with more than 90 members or one position on a committee with around 20 members, even when they comprise a significant majority among the full faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2010). So, they are typically given only a token

status – without equal voting rights or proportional representation. In all of these types of circumstances, non-tenure-track faculty have a limited or no voice to raise concerns within the governing structures and processes of the institution, not just about the inequities inherent in their own experience, but also about practices and policies related to teaching and learning.

Professional Development

Many institutions do not provide professional development for non-tenure-track faculty, which affects their performance and ability to stay current on knowledge in their disciplines, as well as emerging and innovative pedagogies and classroom strategies. This not only constrains their ability to offer the very best educational experience for their current students, a goal to which they are often very committed, but also shapes their ability to succeed when they apply for tenure-track positions. Professional development on campus is often limited, if it is offered at all, but it is even less common for non-tenure-track faculty to be eligible for or receive funds to travel off campus for conferences, workshops, or to conduct research (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). This aspect of their work experience differs from that of most tenure-track faculty, who can participate in conferences and professional development of their own choosing and can routinely allocate the necessary funding and time. Even when professional development is available to non-tenure-track faculty, it is typically offered at times when they are unable to participate or they are not paid for their time, so in order to participate they have to do so on their own time and at their own expense.

Job Security and Rehiring

There is often no process in place to ensure non-tenure-track faculty will be rehired or to notify them in advance, even when they perform in an excellent manner. One problem noted above is that they do not always receive a formal evaluation, leaving no official record of their performance (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). There are also no due process rights for non-tenure-track faculty in the rehiring process on many campuses. They can often be terminated or their appointments can be discontinued for no reason and with very little notice. During any given semester, a non-tenure-track faculty member may not know whether or not they will have work for the next semester and may forgo other offers of employment.

The Risk Management Imperative

Administrators and legal professionals on campuses are tasked with examining the potential risk management factors related to faculty and their working conditions. However, many administrators may not have examined legal issues that may arise from the current working conditions for non-tenure-track faculty. A tight academic job market, poor working conditions, significant inequities, power imbalances, and often adversarial relationships with colleagues and administrators leaves aggrieved non-tenure-track faculty with little recourse than to resort to litigation in efforts to protect their perceived rights (Barnett & Matthews, 1982, Gajda, 2009). As the number of non-tenure-track faculty grows, so does the amount of litigation on related issues (Euben, 2004).

Fair Employment and Affirmative Action

Perhaps the most significant issue is whether the practice of re-hiring non-tenure-track faculty continuously violates the spirit of the fair employment laws. If administrators have an ongoing, routine need to employ non-tenure-track faculty, but do not hire them on a full-time basis, they may be in violation of fair employment guidelines, placing them at greater risk of becoming involved in a class-action lawsuit related over their employment practices (Kaplin & Lee, 2008). Most institutions routinely rehire non-tenure-track faculty members on an annual basis, which many legal scholars suggest violates fair employment laws.

Additionally, since many non-tenure-track faculty are not hired through regular hiring procedures such as those used for filling tenure-track or professional staff positions, they often do not utilize affirmative action and other standards to ensure fair employment. Instead, it is more common for department chairs and faculty informally hiring people they know personally, without considering other candidates or advertising an open position (Hollenshead et al., 2007; Kezar & Sam, 2010).

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act Violations

Hiring practices are not the only area where there are potential threats for risk management. The working conditions of faculty also present many problems for institutions. For example, since most part-time faculty are not provided private office space, they may be routinely meeting with students in places that are not appropriate for conversations about student coursework or performance and violate requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Noncompliance with FERPA not only places institutions at risk of being sued, but can also result in a full withdrawal of all federal funds received. When faculty members do not receive any orientation to campus policies and procedures, as is often the case for non-tenure-track faculty, they may unintentionally violate important policies on campus (FERPA and otherwise), which places the campus at greater risk of facing legal action.

Misclassification of Workers

Increasingly, institutions are failing to demonstrate any differences in the work carried out by non-tenure-track faculty and tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty may be involved with conducting research, sharing administrative work, and carrying out service obligations. If there is no difference between the work of these two groups of faculty, why should one be designated non-tenure-track and the other tenure-track, especially considering the dramatic differences in the quality of support they receive and their working conditions? The lack of a distinction in the roles of faculty may result in lawsuits about misclassification of employees' contracts or status.

Such misclassification also exposes institutions to a greater threat of discriminatory practices on the basis of disparate impact. While there may be no intent on an institution's part to discriminate against a protected group of people – as evidenced by seemingly neutral employment practices – a pattern of unintentional discrimination could emerge. For example, salary or wage discrimination resulting from the misclassification of groups of non-tenure-track faculty on the basis of their gender, race or ethnicity, religion, or national origin could provide grounds for a successful disparate impact claim (Toma, 2011).

Academic Freedom

While institutional policies often promise to protect academic freedom, the ability of non-tenure-track faculty to assert their academic freedom rights in pursuing controversial work is typically unrealistic. Those who are perceived as being “troublemakers” are unlikely to receive contract renewals (Toma, 2011). Increasingly, non-tenure-track faculty who speak out about institutional issues, and sometimes those who make statements or actions unrelated to the institution, are being fired or are not rehired because they espoused certain views (Kaplin & Lee, 2008). *The Chronicle of Higher Education* has profiled dozens of cases where non-tenure-track faculty have taken legal action as a result of having their academic freedom rights violated in this manner. Academic leaders are often unaware of or are not attuned to the meaning of academic freedom as it relates to non-tenure-track faculty, specifically.

Bullying and Harassment

In recent years, there has been a rise in academic literature highlighting bullying and harassment in the academy. While occurrences of bullying and harassment are often difficult to prove, the uncivil way that many non-tenure-track faculty are treated is often well known and has been documented through earlier research. So, this may emerge as an greater source of harassment claims in the future (Lester, 2013). Several studies of the workplace experiences of part-time faculty suggest that tenure-track faculty often express antagonism toward these contingent faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Leslie, Samuels, & Gunne, 1982). Evidence from case studies of campuses suggests that tenure-track faculty perceive part-time faculty as posing a threat to the sustainability of the institution of tenure, having lesser qualifications and being poor teachers, having a negative impact on the collegial environment of departments, and lowering the overall educational quality of their institution (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Even full-time non-tenure-track faculty have been found to treat their part-time colleagues with animosity, largely because they feel they compete with them for courses and that their job security is threatened (Kezar & Sam, 2009). These feelings espoused by tenured and tenure-track faculty, but sometimes also full-time non-tenure-track faculty, have led some individuals to lash out at non-tenure-track colleagues. As the numbers of non-tenure-track faculty on campuses continue to rise, this growing antagonism may result in greater instances of bullying and harassment. Such a hostile work environment, retaliation, and failure to accommodate may expose the university to additional lawsuits.

Rehiring and Due Process

Because non-tenure-track faculty do not routinely receive evaluations, contracts that do not specify the criteria for rehire or do not exclude the possibility of being rehired may increase the threat of legal action (Kezar & Sam, 2010). While due process is usually not designated for non-tenure-track faculty, the lack of clear processes around hiring and rehiring do expose institutions up to increased scrutiny of legal concerns and potential legal action (Toma, 1999).

Opportunity for an Equal Education

Students may also reasonably claim that their opportunities for receiving a high-quality education are being violated by institutions that rely heavily on non-tenure-track faculty.

Research in recent years has shown that non-tenure-track faculty are constrained by institutional policies and practices, preventing them from providing the same quality education experience students might expect to receive in a course taught by a tenure-track or tenured faculty member (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Minority students, who are more likely to be enrolled in introductory and remedial courses, may be taught almost exclusively by non-tenure-track faculty. Many of the ways that working conditions can impact a faculty member's ability to teach were presented above in *The Student Learning Imperative*. Students who could be adversely affected in this way could potentially form a class action lawsuit on the basis of disparate impact if they could establish a pattern of (even unintentional) discrimination by the university and document the adverse effects of over-exposure to non-tenure-track faculty instruction for their academic progress and success.

Policy Implementation

Across a variety of studies, a major concern raised by non-tenure track faculty is the inconsistency in the application of policies (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar & Sam, 2010). Gappa and Leslie (1993) describe a multitude of policies for part-time faculty that are inconsistently applied within institutions. They include hiring processes, orientation, participation in governance, contract terms, salary, evaluation, promotion, and a host of other working conditions, policies, and practices that vary from one department to another and sometimes even from person-to-person, which raises questions about risk management.

With the overlapping of different institutional policies, which are being applied in an inconsistent manner, and with institutions creating rules that may be either too broad or too narrow, the ability to standardize policies across an institution becomes jeopardized. Such inconsistency diminishes the expert subjective and qualitative judgments of peers, exposing the institution to increases in discrimination, litigation, and reputational risk. It is becoming increasingly difficult to interpret employment contracts as the faculty workforce is reconfigured. Institutional norms – often relics of an earlier era when there was a mostly tenure-track faculty workforce – provide less practical guidance for resolving disputes internally under today's circumstances. Externally, the application of judicial precedent to cases regarding non-tenure-track employment becomes even less clear, state statutes are more ambiguous, and institutional provisions appear all the more inconsistent (Toma, 2011).

Collective Bargaining and Unionization

Collective bargaining is typically most developed among employees with the least influence, such as non-tenure-track faculty. While academic unions have been slow to organize non-tenure-track faculty, they are now organizing them on campuses much more actively. Also, non-academic unions are also unionizing faculty. With universities becoming more managed and hiring greater numbers of non-tenure-track faculty, the institution risks the introduction of, or increase in, collective bargaining units. Collective bargaining has been shown to transform relations, reducing collegiality among colleagues and increasing adversarial and heated relationships between faculty and administrators, which often leads to lawsuits (Burnett & Matthews, 1982; Rhoades, 1996; Toma, 2011).

Practicing Preventative Law

Campus preventative law represents one of the most pressing imperatives for higher education (Algers, 2008; Gajda, 2009; LaNoue & Lee, 1987; Santora, 2004). Comprehensive training and guidebooks are typically provided for new tenure-track faculty when they are hired to explain complex academic legal issues and provide tips for minimizing liability (Gunsalas, 2006; Lucas & Murray, 2007; Toma & Palm, 1999). Non-tenure-track faculty, like other faculty, often encounter situations in the course of their daily work that carry legal implications for their institutions and them, personally. Yet, they are not provided the same, if any, preventative training to be able to recognize and avoid violating the law or turning up in the center of contentious legal battles. The exclusion of non-tenure-track faculty from orientations or training on this topic exposes them and their institutions to greater risk and potential for litigation.

Increased Judicial Scrutiny

Traditional deference to academic decision-making is threatened when universities increasingly assume more characteristics and activities of corporations, losing the customary features of an educational social institution. As the faculty employed on campuses becomes less traditional and more contingent, universities may open themselves up to greater judicial scrutiny and more legally actionable rights. Courts may become more prone to imposing opinions that contradict the more traditional values of higher education institutions, upsetting seemingly reasonable academic decisions that were arrived at through appropriate internal processes (Burnett & Matthews, 1982; Gajda, 2009; Toma, 2011).

While many of these legal issues are just now emerging, they represent a wide range of difficult challenges that campuses may encounter, but can address by systematically examining their policies and practices. Campuses should reconsider their policies and practices – including their inconsistent application to different types of faculty – related to hiring, rehiring, due process, affirmative action, evaluation, academic freedom, basic working conditions, and protection from a hostile work environment.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there are a variety of reasons to be concerned about the policies and practices related to non-tenure-track faculty. There is a great need for institutions to systematically review their policies and procedures to better understand their impact on student learning, equity, and risk management. Whenever possible, the review of policies and practices and planning for their revision or replacement should be part of a collaborative process, where non-tenure-track faculty and other stakeholders can voice their concerns and contribute to efforts to resolve them.

Resources

- Alger, J. A. (2008). Legal issues for academic leaders. *Effective Practices for Academic Leaders*, 3(2), 1-14.
- Burnett, C. W., & Matthews, W. L. (1982). The legalistic culture in American higher education. *College and University* 57(2), 197-207.
- Euben, D. R. (2004). Legal watch: Contingent faculty and the courts. *Academe*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/JF/Col/lw.htm>
- Gajda, A. (2009). *The trials of academe: the new era of campus litigation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gunsalas, C. K. (2006). *The college administrator's survival guide*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hobbs, W. C. (1974). The "defective pressure cooker" syndrome: Dispute process in the university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 45(8), 569-581.
- Kaplin, W. A. (1995). *The law of higher education: A comprehensive guide to legal implications of administrative decision making* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- LaNoue, G. R., & Lee, B. A. (1987). *Academics in court: the consequences of faculty discrimination litigation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Lucas, C. J., & Murray, J. W. (2007). *New faculty: A practical guide for academic beginners* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Pelgrave.
- Munn, R. L. (1998). The attorney-administrator relationship: A perspective on institutional decision making and power. *NASPA Journal*, 36(1), 35-47.
- Rhoades, G. (1996). Reorganizing the faculty workforce for flexibility: Part-time professional labor. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(6), 636-670.
- Santora, K. C. (2004, June 25). Pressing legal issues: 10 views of the next 5 years. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 4.
- Toma, J. D. (2011). *Managing the entrepreneurial university: Legal issues and commercial realities*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Toma, J. D., & Palm, R. L. (1999). The academic administrator and the law: What every dean and department chair needs to know. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* 26(5).

This resource was created by
The Delphi Project on The Changing Faculty and Student Success

Additional resources are available online at
<http://resources.thechangingfaculty.org>

Project Description

The nature of the American academic workforce has fundamentally shifted over the past several decades. Whereas full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty were once the norm, more than two-thirds of the professoriate in non-profit postsecondary education is now comprised of non-tenure-track faculty. New hires across all institutional types are now largely contingent and this number will continue to grow unless trends change. The purpose of this project is to examine and develop solutions to change the nature of the professoriate, the causes of the rise of non-tenure-track faculty, and the impact of this change on the teaching and learning environment.

Project Team and Partner Organizations

Adrianna Kezar, Ph.D.
Director and Principal Investigator
University of Southern California

Daniel Maxey, M.Ed.
Co-Investigator
University of Southern California

Hannah Yang, M.Ed.
Project Associate

In partnership with the Association of American College and Universities

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,250 member institutions - including accredited public and private colleges, community colleges, and universities of every type and size.

USC Rossier
School of Education

Pullias Center for Higher Education
701 Waite Philips Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90089-4038 Phone: (213) 740-7218 Online @ pullias.usc.edu

Project Funding

The research for the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success is funded through generous support from The Spencer Foundation, The Teagle Foundation, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The Spencer Foundation was established in 1962 by Lyle M. Spencer. The Foundation is committed to investigating ways in which education, broadly conceived, can be improved around the world. From the first, the Foundation has been dedicated to the belief that research is necessary to the improvement in education. The Foundation is thus committed to supporting high-quality investigation of education through its research programs and to strengthening and renewing the educational research community through its fellowship and training programs and related activities.

The Teagle Foundation intends to be an influential national voice and a catalyst for change in higher education to improve undergraduate student learning in the arts and sciences. The Foundation provides leadership by mobilizing the intellectual and financial resources that are necessary if today's students are to have access to a challenging and transformative liberal education. The benefits of such learning last for a lifetime and are best achieved when colleges set clear goals for liberal learning and systematically evaluate progress toward them. In carrying out its work, the Foundation is committed to disseminating its findings widely, believing that the knowledge generated by our grantees— rather than the funding that enabled their work—is at the heart of our philanthropy.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1905 and chartered in 1906 by an act of Congress, is an independent policy and research center. Improving teaching and learning has always been Carnegie's motivation and heritage. The Carnegie Foundation's current improvement research approach builds on the scholarship of teaching and learning, where we learn from each other, improve on what we know works, continuously create new knowledge, and take what we learn and make it usable by others.

Pullias Center for Higher Education

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

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

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

Mission

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

Goal

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

Association of American Colleges and Universities

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,250 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges, community colleges, and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U organizes its work around five broad goals:

- A Guiding Vision for Liberal Education
- Inclusive Excellence
- Intentional and Integrative Learning
- Civic, Diversity, and Global Engagement
- Authentic Evidence

Through its publications, meetings, public advocacy, and programs, AAC&U provides a powerful voice for liberal education. AAC&U works to reinforce the commitment to liberal education at both the national and the local level and to help individual colleges and universities keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges. With a nearly one-hundred year history and national stature, AAC&U is an influential catalyst for educational improvement and reform.

Mission

The mission of the Association of American Colleges and Universities is to make the aims of liberal learning a vigorous and constant influence on institutional purpose and educational practice in higher education.

(Approved by the Board of Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1997).

The Delphi Project on
The Changing Faculty
and
Student Success