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Heterogeneous nature

- **Part-time and full-time**
  - Many reasons for part-time faculty work: aspiring academics, freelancers, freeway flyers, retired, full-time professionals, different fields use part-timers differently.
  - Full-time – clinical, teaching, research, administration, service, fieldwork.

- **Teaching-only and research-only**

- **Multi-faceted appointments with a variety of responsibilities** – some customized – some on standard contracts.
Summary of changes

- Although a long-term trend, most of the change has occurred in last 15 years; NTTFs are now 70% of faculty nationally
- They are employed in large numbers across all institutional types and academic disciplines
- NTTFs are a very heterogeneous group making policymaking complex
- Academic departments overwhelmed to support NTTF given shift was so swift
- Few best practices are either widely known or circulated
The challenge!

- Few institutions have intentionally considered the composition of their faculty – it has devolved across the country.
- Few have considered the implications of changes in the composition of the faculty for meeting their mission and students and institutional needs.
- Few have made changes to policies and practices to support NTTFs or have institutional policies that are meant to address more than their tenure track faculty.
- If they consider NTTF, often not address all groups – very diverse set of faculty.
Connections to Student Learning

1. Diminished graduation and retention rates.
2. Decreased transfer rates from 2- to 4-year institutions.
3. Disproportionate impact on students early in undergraduate career; greater exposure to students in introductory and developmental or remedial courses.
4. Greater difficulty with major selection and persistence.
5. Lower grade point averages.

Conditions Affecting Student Outcomes

College Completion Goals + Student Learning Outcomes

- Greater Opportunities for Faculty-Student Interaction
- Greater Opportunities for Service Learning in Courses
- Greater Opportunities for Undergraduate Research
- Greater Opportunities for High-Impact Teaching Practices
- Greater Equity in Compensation, Academic Freedom, & Role on Campus
- Access to Office Space, Instructional Resources, & Support
- Role in Curriculum Design & Decision Making
- Better Defined Hiring Practices, Multi-Year Contracts, & Early Planning
- Contributions to Developing Core Curriculum
- Writing-Intensive Courses
- Role in Supporting Undergraduate Research
- Involvement with Learning Communities
- Integration of Service Learning in Courses
- Involvement with Learning Communities
- Proper Orientation & Professional Development
- Supportive Workplace & Climate for NTT Faculty
- External Communities & Stakeholders
Creating Conversations about Faculty Composition and New Faculty Models
For the most part, faculty roles have never been intentionally designed.

Faculty roles have shifted over the years but not thoughtfully, strategically, or in ways that are aligned with the changing nature of the higher education enterprise.

Higher education has shifted from a research focused to a teaching focused enterprise in the last 50 years, but faculty roles did not shift.
Critiques of Traditional Tenure-Track Model

- Disproportionate emphasis on conducting research and publishing downplay the importance of teaching

- Creates lack of flexibility to hire in new fields or to account for market fluctuations

- Limits emphasis on teaching and learning and incentives to improve and innovate teaching
Critiques of Traditional Tenure-Track Model

- Neglects important other roles faculty can play in service, civic engagement, and local leadership

- Some alternative models suggest that academic freedom can be protected without tenure, at least as it is conceived of today

- Faculty who are not yet tenured, but are on the tenure track (i.e., probationary faculty) often feel constrained in academic freedom or autonomy
Critiques of Adjunct Faculty Model

- Inequitable compensation, access to benefits, working conditions, and involvement in the life of department and campus

- Constraints placed on adjunct faculty have an adverse effect on student success outcomes

- Faculty members viewed merely as tools for facilitating content delivery
Critiques of Adjunct Faculty Model

- Lack of professional development opportunities limits access to effective pedagogies, high-impact practices, and innovative strategies to promote student learning.

- Little constructive evaluation of adjunct faculty work to assess effectiveness and provide opportunities to improve.

- Adjunct faculty members may not possess important information about academic policies and practices, student support programs, curriculum, or learning goals.
Critiques of Adjunct Faculty Model

- Lack of job security contributes to higher rates of turnover, lack of stability

- Adjunct faculty distanced from their disciplinary roots and content knowledge by not receiving support to participate in conferences or scholarly life

- Dependence on adjunct model makes it more difficult for institutions to meet their broader goals related to service, community engagement, leadership, and public good
Calls for an intentional, collaborative, and inclusive discussion about shifting faculty roles and consideration of new faculty models. The backward design process—which involves identifying the desired outcomes, examining the current faculty model(s), and developing a plan for redesigning the faculty and its composition of different types—it presents a method for considering what the faculty ought to look like in order for an institution to address its various stakeholder priorities and the important aspects of its mission.
Backwards Design Process

1. Identify the Desired Outcomes
2. Examine the Current Faculty Model
3. Develop a Plan for Redesigning the Faculty
Layers to Consider in Redesign Process

- **Landscape**: Consideration of Environmental Factors and Context
- **Stakeholder**: Stakeholder Needs and Goals for Institution
- **Institutional**: Institutional Needs, Mission, Goals, and Values
- **Core**
Core Features of Professionalism in All Faculty Roles

1. Promoting equity among academic appointments
2. Vigorously protecting academic freedom
3. Ensuring flexibility in appointments
4. Fostering professional growth
5. Promoting collegiality or a greater sense of community

- All features predicated on respect
Institutional factors that play into redesign of the faculty model and role:
- Mission and vision statements
- Values
- Culture
- Size and composition of faculty and enrollments
- Budgets
Multiple stakeholders, both internal and external, should be involved in redesigning faculty role.

Students, faculty members, administrators, policymakers, community leaders, accreditors, and trustees should all have a role in the process.

Input from a broad range of stakeholders will help keep institutions accountable for outcomes.
Considerations from the Higher Education Landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Retirements</th>
<th>New Generation of Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Faculty Development</td>
<td>New Knowledge about Learning</td>
<td>Accountability for Public Expectations and Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Uncertainty</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Increasing Competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Model: Scholarly Educator

Scholarly Educator

Essential Emphasis on Student Learning

Key Values

- Reprofessionalization
- Shared Governance
- Flexibility
- Diverse/Equally Valued Roles
- Alignment to Mission
- Greater Customization

Mission Goals, Roles, and Rewards

- Responsibility to External Forces
- Accountability for Student Learning
- Institutional
- Internationalization
- Changing Student Demographics

Emphasis on Student Learning

- Technology Integration
- Collaborative/Collective Orientation
- Collegiality
- Assessment, Evaluation, and Ongoing Peer Review

Recommitment to Public Good

- Professional Development
- Equal Compensation
- Commitment to the Public Good
- Academic Freedom

Appreciation for Diverse Roles

- Diverse Learning Needs
## Shifting Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching-only tenure-track model</strong></td>
<td>- faculty hired for teaching positions with no research requirements, eligible for tenure based on review of their teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical school model</strong></td>
<td>- research, education, and clinical tracks with equal status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity contracts</strong></td>
<td>- faculty work with department chairs to set professional goals for 3-5 year time periods, can shift over the course of their careers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching-Only Tenure-Track Model

- Faculty hired full-time to focus on teaching, with no expectation of research responsibilities (though typically some expectation of service)

- Experiments with this model at UC through their Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) model
  - Eligible for tenure (or “security of employment” at UC) after a certain period of years
  - Tenure eligibility based on evaluation of teaching effectiveness
  - Participation in governance activities
Multiple complex missions of medical schools and volatility in the health care market led medical schools to rethink their faculty roles and structures.

Three tracks: research, education, and clinical
- Contracts specify primary responsibilities in one of the three tracks
- Tracks afforded equal status and equitable working conditions, access to governance and voting rights

Mostly non-tenure-track, the few tenure-track positions typically reserved for research faculty to preserve academic freedom
Creativity Contracts

• Based on Boyer (1990)

• Faculty typically hired on 3-5 year contracts, which are developed in consultation with department chairs and specify expectations and goals for faculty work during that period

• Allows for a broad and flexible range of scholarly activities over the course of faculty careers
  ○ For example, a contract could specify 3 years of traditional research activity, 1 year of broad literature review and textbook writing, and 1 year of focus on teaching
Questions

- What do we think should be the composition of the faculty to meet our mission and goals?
- How many tenure track? Should tenure roles be tweaked? Of NTTF, How many part-time and fulltime?
- How many contracts that are research or teaching only or multiple roles? What are the best type of contracts for our mission? Multi-year vs. annual vs semesterly?
How might we obtain input from key groups to structure a discussion about faculty roles – faculty across groups, administrators, students, and board members views about faculty and best way their role can be structured to meet USC’s mission?
Thank you!

For more details visit the Delphi Project online at
http://www.thechangingfaculty.org