FACULTY POLICIES, STRATEGIES AND TRENDS
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

A Report Submitted to
The Board of Trustees

January 1999

Report prepared by
Dr. Patrick Palermo
Associate Provost for
Faculty and Academic Affairs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report has four primary goals. It describes faculty employment strategies and trends across higher education that are pertinent to the University of Dayton. The report moves the discussion of faculty away from the issue of tenure and toward a comprehensive examination of faculty careers. Third, it evaluates the progress the University has made in developing its faculty strategies and achieving its faculty goals. Finally, this report suggests ways the University might strengthen its faculty policies.

In response to changing conditions, new economic realities, and stakeholders' demands, the employment policies, practices, and roles for faculty have changed, often dramatically, across higher education. While alternatives to the tenure system have not proven more flexible, the trend is clearly toward differential staffing which includes a lower percentage of tenure-track faculty. By one estimate, over 70% of the faculty no longer hold tenure-track appointments. Over a quarter of the faculty now serve in full-time positions without the possibility of tenure. Well over 40% of the faculty are part-time. In fact, the employment strategies used in higher education are similar to those practiced in business and industry. Too often the issue of tenure has obscured these developments and distorted the discussion of how universities, including the University of Dayton, are using a variety of strategies to meet common challenges and achieve institutional visions.

As integral to *Vision 2005*, the Board of Trustees, the administration, and the faculty have discussed the work and roles of faculty at the University of Dayton. While affirming the importance of academic freedom and tenure, this ongoing conversation has recognized the richness and variety of faculty careers as well as the need to look at instructional staff in new and flexible ways. During and even preceding these discussions, the University strengthened faculty recruitment and pre-tenure evaluation procedures and began to differentiate faculty roles.

The results are encouraging and improvements have been made, but much, as always, still needs to be done. Like the rest of higher education, differential staffing is an important trend at the University of Dayton. Over the past two years, nearly half the faculty hired have been in full-time, non tenure-track appointments. The quality of new faculty and the scholarly productivity of all faculty have improved over the past decade. While the efforts to recruit women and minority faculty have been strong, the results are mixed. Pre-tenure review guidelines are solid, while procedures within the divisions range from strong to needing improvement. Post-tenure review deserves much attention and will receive it over the next several years. The early retirement program for faculty has had success, but the University needs to define specific expectations for its retirement programs.

PREFACE

As integral to the development of *Vision 2005*, the Board of Trustees, the administration at all levels, and the faculty have engaged in an ongoing discussion of faculty work, tenure, and policies for an expanded instructional staff. Much of this conversation has been generated by the need to meet the challenges set forth in the "Demand for Change" part of "The Foundations" section of *Vision 2005*. The "Outstanding Faculty" chapter in *Vision 2005* and the document, "Questions and Answers: Tenure and *Vision 2005*," both prepared by John Geiger, frame the discussion and explicate the University's strategy. While recognizing the value and importance of academic freedom protected by tenure, these documents realize that faculty policies and employment practices must change and adjust to meet the expectations of stakeholders, the demands facing higher education, and the goals of *Vision 2005*.

This report has several purposes. First, the report provides a context for our discussion of faculty by showing that employment strategies in higher education are dynamic and not much different from practices in business or, for that matter, what is going on at the University of Dayton. Second, this report moves the discussion of faculty away from the issue of tenure and toward emphasizing the complexities of faculty employment and careers. Third, this report evaluates the progress the University has made in its efforts to diversify faculty, differentiate instructional staff, evaluate faculty both pre- and post-tenure, and support timely retirement. Finally, this report suggests a number of ways to strengthen its faculty strategies and policies.

This report relies heavily on internal research for analyzing the University's situation and a variety of external sources, especially the American Association for Higher Education's Working Paper Series, "New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century."

FACULTY STRATEGIES AND TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Too often the discussion of faculty focuses on tenure at the expense of understanding the actual conditions of faculty work and the changing nature of faculty employment. As a result, the discussion of faculty can be distorted in several critical ways. First, the careers of faculty are reduced to pre-tenure and post-tenure periods. We will try to take a more comprehensive look at faculty careers, especially the requirement for post-tenure review. Second, the focus on tenure misses the point that a growing proportion of faculty and instructional staff hold either full-time, non tenure-track positions or are part-time instructors. According to the American Association of University Professors, over 70% of college teachers no longer have full-time, tenure track positions.

In fact, the employment practices of higher education are strikingly similar to trends in business. Universities, for example, have a growing number of full-time faculty who are treated significantly differently than tenured and tenure-track faculty. This amounts to a tiered employment system with tenure-track faculty receiving higher pay, greater privileges, more security and different job responsibilities than their non tenure-track counterparts. In 1993, 26%

of the full-time faculty, some 110,000 people, held full-time, non tenure-track appointments, and there is every reason to believe that percentage continues to increase. A forthcoming study will show that fully one third of all full-time faculty with less than seven years of service hold non tenure-track contracts.

In addition, higher education has dramatically increased the use of part-time faculty, again a trend similar to employment trends in business and commerce. From 1972 to 1992, the percentage of faculty who taught part-time rose from 22% to 42% of the total instructional staff. Further, this trend is strengthening with half of the increase taking place between 1990 and 1992. Like their counterparts in private industry, part-time faculty are paid less, receive few benefits, and have almost no job security. As we shall see, the University of Dayton's hiring and employment practices have much in common with what is happening across higher education.

Finally, the complaints that the tenure system is too inflexible to safeguard against incompetence, complacency, and the need to respond to changing marketing conditions are not easily resolved through alternative employment policies. At this point, the two alternatives to tenure for faculty employment are collective bargaining agreements negotiated by a faculty union or a contract system of limited term appointments. Clearly, collective bargaining agreements do not give participating universities more flexibility than the tenure system. More surprisingly, contract systems quickly become almost indistinguishable from a tenure system. At Evergreen State College and Hampshire College, two of the more prominent schools with contract systems, the rate of faculty contracts not renewed during the first seven years of employment is below the percentage of faculty denied tenure nationwide. Further, long-term contracts tend to be renewed with the consequence that the faculty at these two institutions essentially enjoy the same economic security as tenured faculty. Finally, the long-term contracts are of such duration — often up to ten years — that universities with contract systems have little or no more flexibility to respond to changing economic and market conditions than do universities with a tenure system.

What has become popular over the past decade in response to demands for accountability and responsibility is post-tenure review. In one 1996 survey of 680 schools, 61% had provisions for post-tenure review, a dramatic increase over the previous ten years. These evaluations tend to be formative, summative, or a combination of both. Formative reviews focus on faculty development to remedy weakness and support continual growth. Summative reviews emphasize using the evaluation to make personnel decisions. Most post-tenure review plans end up having both formative and summative dimensions to them. To this point, post-tenure review has been much more effective as a vehicle for faculty development than as an instrument for making personnel decisions such as dismissal.

FACULTY HIRING

In hiring faculty, the University of Dayton pursues four goals. First, the University seeks to hire highly qualified, strongly motivated teachers and scholars. Second, the University wishes to attract faculty who are empathetic with its mission and committed to its values. Third, the University is making a significant effort to diversify the faculty by hiring and retaining minority and women scholars. Fourth, the University with its academic divisions and units are changing the composition of the faculty and instructional staff to meet the realities of higher education and the needs of today's students. The University has done well in achieving the first two goals, is making a strong effort with mixed results to achieve the third goal, and hiring patterns have changed significantly with the rapid increase in full-time, non tenure-track faculty and instructional staff appointments.

FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

The University, its divisions, and departments have become more and more sophisticated and mature in effectively recruiting qualified faculty. In *Vision 2005*, the "Faculty Today" section describes in detail the qualifications and accomplishments of the faculty. More faculty hold terminal degrees, publish widely, and receive grants for research than ever before. While less quantifiable, there is a consensus that today's faculty are more knowledgeable and more sophisticated teachers. The Learning Village with its emphasis on the University as a learning-centered community, its use of high speed communication and information networks and learning technologies, its support of integrated and experiential learning, and its linking of service and scholarship to leadership and service cannot hope to succeed without a talented, creative, responsive, cooperative, and committed faculty. The University is confident that the faculty can with the help of the University support programs meet the challenges of the Learning Village.

FACULTY DIVERSITY

The efforts of the University to diversify the faculty have met with mixed success. On one hand, the percentage of women faculty has increased from 20.85% of the faculty in 1994-95 to 24.29% in 1998-99 (see Chart I). At the same time, minority faculty remain at less than 10% of the faculty (see Chart II). While the Diversity Task Force has not made its final recommendations, the University has initiated an aggressive plan to recruit more women and minorities. Searches with a better chance of attracting a diverse pool of candidates are selected for special effort. This includes the development and approval of aggressive recruitment plans, careful oversight of the recruitment and selection process, intervention where appropriate, inclusion of minority faculty in the recruitment process, and reluctance to approve hires where diversity goals have not been met. This aggressive approach has had some success in alerting search committees to the importance of diversity and helping departments implement effective diversity recruitment strategies.

FACULTY COHORTS

To measure the success of diversity efforts as well as to track the careers of pre-tenure faculty and to understand the changes in defining and hiring faculty and instructional staff, the Office of the Provost has begun to chart faculty cohorts by year of hire. Beginning with the 1997-98 academic year, all new full-time faculty and instructional staff are listed with key information and then tracked through succeeding years. So, for example, thirty-three full-time faculty and instructional staff were hired at the beginning of the 1997-98 academic year. Seventeen of these hires are tenure-track positions. Fourteen of the hires were women, with eight holding tenure-track appointments. There were only two minority hires and both were in non tenure-track positions. By the beginning of the second year, five short-term appointments had been terminated, and one tenure-track person had left the University (see Chart III).

Similar trends are apparent with 1998-99 hires (see Chart IV). This year the University hired a total of forty-three full-time faculty and instructional staff. Again, just over half — twenty-two — hold tenure-track appointments. Twenty-seven of the forty-three are women, with fourteen women holding tenure-track appointments. Of the four minority hires, three hold tenure-track appointments. Clearly, the University is doing a good job hiring women faculty, especially in tenure-track positions. The University is doing less well with minorities, but the diversity plan apparently has had some success. By tracking each faculty cohort class through at least the pre-tenure period, the University will be able to find out much more about what happens to faculty than it can by tracking all faculty at the University level. If, for example, we find that tenure-track women faculty are leaving the University in disproportionally high numbers before the tenure decision, we can find the reasons and take steps to reverse that trend.

DIFFERENTIAL FACULTY STAFFING

The most striking trend evident in the cohort groups is the emergence of differential faculty staffing. In both cohort years, full-time, non tenure-track appointments make up nearly one half of the hires. For the 1998-99 academic year, non tenure-track appointments include lecturers (9), visiting professors (4), artists-in-residence (2), and coordinators (3). In total, the University has sixty (60) full-time, non tenure-track instructional positions this academic year, or 13% of the full-time faculty have non tenure-track appointments. In fact, the University has nearly twice as many lecturers as approved for in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Again, this is a trend common to all of higher education, and one that the University should be able to take advantage of in thoughtful, systematic, and productive ways. For example, the University, with its professional schools and its goals of connecting theory with practice and leadership with service, is an inviting place for clinical professors or professors of practice. With its strong general education programs and its focus on undergraduate learning, the University has the opportunity to create long-term teaching appointments that do not include tenure. The Research Institute in collaboration with the academic divisions, especially the School of

Engineering, seeks to develop research professorships that carry rank without tenure, a common practice at institutions such as Harvard. Other possibilities include senior professors with five-year appointments with rollover provisions, but no tenure.

In consultation with the Academic Senate, the University needs to develop a strategy for the use of full-time, non tenure-track faculty or instructional staff. This strategy should include types of appointments, terms of appointments with provisions for renewal, and number of positions. For the latter, a good point to start might be to limit such appointments to no more than 20% of the total number of full-time faculty and instructional staff. At 450 positions, 20% of the total would be 90 full-time, non tenure-track positions. This compares with our present totals of 446 positions with 60 full-time, non tenure-track appointments. Such an approach would provide flexibility for the University while alleviating faculty concerns about a differential staffing strategy being an attack on tenure. Besides the number of non tenure-track instructional staff, the other critical issue is the length of appointment. Here the University should not be limited to a total of seven years, but should have the flexibility of total consecutive years of service beyond that limit without automatically granting tenure.

PART-TIME FACULTY

Part-time faculty have long been a staple of the teaching staff at the University of Dayton and will remain so in the future. For reasons of fairness and quality and in response to complaints from part-time faculty, the University and the Academic Senate have taken steps to recognize the importance of part-time faculty and the legitimacy of their concerns. The University has developed an orientation program for part-time faculty and they are invited to participate in any number of faculty development workshops and programs. The academic divisions have made efforts to raise the minimum level of compensation for part-time faculty. The Provost's Office, the academic divisions and units, and the Academic Senate all recognize that the academic support system — availability of computers, access to the network, office space, supplies — for part-time faculty should be strengthened as resources permit. Finally, part-time faculty now have elected representation on the Academic Senate.

With all these changes, the University needs a coherent strategy for part-time faculty. While the University already has adjunct appointments for part-time faculty — ranks most used by the School of Engineering — the University should make much fuller and systematic use of such ranks to recognize and reward valued, long-term, part-time faculty. Based on rank and length of service, adjunct appointments could include higher rates of pay, eligibility for selected benefits, access to computers and the information and communication network, participation in the life of the department, and limited guarantees to the right to teach selected courses. Preliminary to such initiatives, the University must begin to do a much better job of tracking the use of part-time faculty.

PRE-TENURE REVIEW

The pre-tenure review process has improved significantly over the past decade, but the University guidelines still need strengthening, and implementation remains uneven. Presently, University guidelines call for annual review by the chair of untenured faculty and peer review at least once during the usual six-year probationary period. The School of Business Administration has a model plan which has been fully implemented. The College of Arts and Sciences has an excellent plan which has been implemented unevenly. The School of Education and the School of Engineering are both in the process of revising their plans. These plans should be approved and in operation by the beginning of the 1999-2000 academic year. In addition, the University should strengthen its guidelines in two ways. First, peer review should take place at least twice during the probationary period, a goal that is being achieved in all the divisional plans. Second, the guidelines for evaluating faculty should be clear and the feedback explicit so that probationary faculty fully understand their situation. Here again, the procedures and practices of the School of Business Administration can serve as examples and models.

Good hiring practices, systematic evaluation of probationary faculty, strong faculty development programs and, something that should not be underestimated, the Marianist tradition of collegial and community support have combined to make the tenure review process fairly positive for faculty who complete their probationary period. At this point, we estimate that three in ten tenure-track faculty leave the University before tenure review. Nevertheless, the percentage of faculty holding tenure-track appointments who have tenure has risen steadily during the 1990s. What, if anything, should be done about that? As discussed earlier in this report, differential staffing is and should be used as part of the response to this trend. In fact, the percentage of full-time faculty and instructional staff with tenure is fairly low and is falling. Second, the University must continue to monitor tenure decisions carefully to make sure of quality. The University should not resort to a quota system for several reasons. The evaluation for tenure process is strong in a number of divisions and is improving in others. Second, any quota system would cause unnecessary friction with the faculty. Third, a quota system could close the door to tenure for women and minorities. Fourth, a quota would adversely affect recruiting. Finally, quotas would lead to endless requests for exceptions to the limits set by a quota.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

The University has a post-tenure review process that calls for the department chair to evaluate tenured faculty at least every two years and for peers in a department to evaluate tenured colleagues at least once every six years. In most instances, chairs and program directors evaluate tenured faculty every year as part of the distribution of merit raises. Peers are not evaluating tenured colleagues every six years in most departments or are doing it in a cursory fashion. The University should require the implementation of a post-tenure review process that is clearly separate from the routine reviews done by chairs and does not duplicate reviews for promotion.

Post-tenure review should have clearly stated formative and summative purposes, something that is not at all clear in the present description. Studies indicate that post-tenure review should have the following characteristics to be successful. They are: protection of academic freedom; respect for the academic traditions of shared governance, collegiality, and due process for appeals; clear articulation of purposes and consequences; accurate, defensible, and useful information; decentralized control and peer review; well defined feedback loop; flexibility to respond to individual situations; and institutional support for faculty development plans. The University should have well developed guidelines for post-tenure review approved with the beginning of systematic implementation by the beginning of the 2001-02 academic year.

FACULTY VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Recently, the University renewed, with minor revisions, both the "Faculty Voluntary Early Severance Program" and the "Faculty Phased Retirement Program" through June 2000. With few exceptions, faculty have chosen to participate in the "Severance Program." At the request of the President, the Office of the Provost calculated the impact and cost of the "Faculty Voluntary Early Severance Program" by looking at the 1997-98 academic year. During that year, 16 faculty members (12 in the College, 2 from Engineering, and 1 each from Business Administration and Education) took advantage of this program. They received a total of $941,036 in severance for an average of $55,814 per person. The last full-time faculty salary for these retirees averaged $54,728 for a total of $875,655. When benefits are added at the rate of 33%, the total compensation for these faculty came to $1,164,621. They averaged a little over 63 years in age at retirement. While the correspondence between retirements and replacements is not always clear, there appears to have been 9 new faculty hires, either temporary or tenure-track, as replacements at an average salary of $42,444. The salary of these replacements totals $382,000 and when benefits are added at 33%, the amount of compensation totals $508,060. The divisions are ultimately responsible for paying the severance for its retirees, and there are essentially two ways for them to recover this cost. A division can leave a position open for a year and use the salary and benefits of that line to cover its cost or it can use the difference in salary in benefits between the retiree and the replacement to recover at least part of the severance amount. By calculating severance payments plus full-time replacement costs, but not the costs of any part-time replacements, the divisions are in debt $284,475 for the 1997-98 academic year. Finally, the decline in full-time, tenure-track faculty from 397 last year to 387 for this year was, in good part, a direct result of these retirements.

Another way to look at these retirement programs is to examine their impact on faculty eligible to take advantage of them. As of the end of June 1997, a total of 65 faculty had reached 60 years of age and, therefore, would have been eligible to participate in the "Faculty Voluntary Early Severance Program." Of these 65 faculty members, 1 died, 1 is ineligible, 4 are Marianists, and 25 have taken advantage of the severance program. In all likelihood, one or two more will

decide to participate by the end of the academic year. Two faculty members have reached age 70 and technically are not eligible for the program. Clearly, the severance program has proven attractive to about one half of the eligible faculty at a manageable cost, but the University needs to better define and benchmark the success of these programs.

CONCLUSION

Observers and commentators from both inside and outside of higher education often make the mistake of defining faculty and their careers in static terms. As a result, there is a tendency to see a single change or reform as a way of correcting the system. What this report has tried to show is the dynamic nature of faculty roles and employment practices. The situation is in flux, will remain so, and there can be no single or final response or solution. Instead, the University of Dayton, its faculty and administrators, must continually collaborate to assure that its recruitment strategies, employment policies, and evaluation procedures respond to the demands for change while fulfilling its mission and achieving its vision.