Using Tenure:
Citizenship Within The New Academic Workforce

Dr. William Plater

1997 - 1

Supported by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts. The opinion expressed in this report are that of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Pew Charitable Trusts.

Author:

Dr. William Plater
Executive Vice-Chancellor/Dean of Faculties
Indiana University- Purdue University@Indianapolis
Indianapolis, IN 46202-2896

Ordering Information

Copies of this report may be obtained by contacting:
The Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis
School of Education
University of Southern California
Waite Phillips Hall Room 701
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0031
Fax: (213) 740-3889
Email: CHEPA@usc.edu

Using Tenure: Citizenship Within The New Academic Workforce

Dr. William Plater
Executive Vice-Chancellor/ Dean of Faculties

“The” faculty no longer exists. It has been subsumed in an academic workforce of which tenured professors, tenured associate professors, and probationary assistant professors are only a small part, perhaps less than a third.¹ If faculty are to preserve tenure, we should learn how to use it. Before that, we need to understand who has tenure and why. For this purpose, it may be helpful to regard tenure as the equivalent of citizenship in the academic community.

Those who are awarded tenure by a university inherently accept it. Tenure, like citizenship, is not a gift but a bond of shared responsibility linking individual and institution in a relationship of mutual dependence. Both parties must use tenure if it is to be vital, purposeful, and sustainable. It is thus the use of tenure which distinguishes universities from other institutions and tenured faculty from other employees.

This is a propitious time for faculty to reclaim tenure by exercising it, by asserting their responsibilities and not merely claiming their protections. Not only are external critics reaching a crescendo of complaint that may trivialize tenure, but the nature of our own work and the roles of those who perform it have changed so much in the past fifty years that we are obligated to reconsider whether tenure still offers the same basis of citizenship within the new academic workforce.

FOUR REASONS FOR CHANGING THE WORKFORCE

In reflecting on the nature of faculty work, we should begin with the mission of the institution (or the department or school in large universities). The statement of purpose--not vision or aspiration or strategic objective--should determine how we organize our time, how we are compensated and rewarded, and how we relate to others within the same institution. For most

universities, the statement of mission is as unchanging and certain as the marble in which it is chiseled. What has changed is our environment and context. To endure, we may need to change who we are if our mission is fixed and constant.

The traditional model of a tenured professor with an antecedent probationary period and one intervening promotion is not likely to make much sense in the future given the nature of the workforce which is creating a wholly new industry based on education but elaborated by information processing, knowledge management, and a somewhat sinister sounding “edutainment.” The complexity of education as an industry will require that we adapt if we hope to preserve our mission and our respective institutional viability. There is money to be made in postsecondary education as Microsoft, Motorola, Disney, and Phoenix University know. Museums, cable television systems, newspapers, and alumni organizations all offer programs, products, and promises that were once our exclusive domain, despite the fact that there have always been proprietary and specialized trade schools as well as a variety of corporate and not-for-profit research institutes. This latest change in the environment is very different because the competition for students and research funding is now very real.

We have no alternative but to recognize ourselves as part of an industry that will behave in response to market conditions. The marketplace may not determine what we do or how we do it, but it will have an influence. We have already learned that academic medicine is not immune to health care reform, and neither will the rest of higher education. We work in an industry, and we are part of a labor market. We are subject to economic as well as moral and social forces. Although the professoriate can surely retain its distinctive role as a profession, we can do so more effectively by considering our place within a much larger workforce, including the variety of ranks and roles of those who teach most of the student in our own institutions.

As we imagine the future of the tenured professoriate, four market factors--at least--should be kept in mind: (1) the globalization of educating, (2) the potential for collaborative relationships between units of a university and parallel industries, (3) the certification of competence, and (4) the evolution of professional careers along a track more complicated than the two or three advancements in rank now in place in most universities.

1. GLOBALIZATION

With breathtaking acceleration, more and more industries are finding that they exist in a global marketplace, and many nations are looking for cost-effective ways to prepare highly trained workforces to meet the demand of global corporations. Some governments see higher education as a business--or at least an economic development initiative--and thus subsidize the improvement of their educational institutions as a means to gain competitive advantage. At the moment, many domestic graduate programs in the sciences, engineering, and other professions are sustained, or at least stabilized, by international students who find it cost-effective to come to this country for their training. In the future, there may be more cost-effective alternatives, or employment may be directly tied to contract education provided via distance learning. Long recognized as the world's leader in higher education, the United States is now the world's target of opportunity. The best defense may be a good offense: a global strategy.

One possible consequence is for universities to form international consortia to collaborate across disciplines as well as boundaries and to differentiate roles so that expertise is concentrated in locations that maximize global positioning. Medical schools in France, Turkey, Indiana, and Japan, for example, might combine forces in differentiating clinical treatment programs for global patient referral while integrating efforts in scientific research directed at special areas, such as diseases related to aging. Similar opportunities existing in fields as divergent as art and law,

computer science and social work. Students might take “training” in several locations, while faculty interact across national boundaries in curriculum design and in establishing performance criteria for students to meet international workforce demands. Research, obviously, can be coordinated through a consortium to take advantage of localized funding sources whose cumulative impact would ordinarily be beyond a single institution or nation. Current government-sponsored collaborations in space exploration may entice some of the more entrepreneurial research universities to expand the concept to other big science, large scale, projects. The potential for changing faculty roles, especially in the context of global teamwork, is only a few years away. Globalization will affect teaching, research, and service.

Under these circumstances, what can tenure mean or contribute to institutional success? At present, all tenure is local but it is conceivable that tenure might obligate faculty to move among multiple sites or, more likely, to interact with others at a distance through electronic means. Now is the time to consider what tenure might mean if it were freed from location. Even without considering the silliness of “virtual tenure” for a virtual university, we should be able to imagine ways in which tenure might work in a distributed, world-wide learning environment. When the definition of community changes, so must the concept of citizenship.

2. COLLABORATION

Some departments, schools, or other university subunits may find that partnerships--even described as joint business ventures--may become attractive. It is not uncommon for medical schools and other health professions to have business relations with practice groups or laboratories where work is shared among university employees--including faculty--and non-university employees--including former faculty or graduate students. Changes in federal research funding and shifts in the concept of technology transfer within the defense industry may place a

premium on faculty sustaining their research through collaborative enterprises involving profit and not-for-profit groups. Global business arrangements, as already noted, may further alter both funding sources and the nature of relationships. Microsoft, Motorola, and IBM--all current university partners--have global aspirations for research as well as program delivery.

It is common for a large company or consortium of businesses in the same field to fund basic research at a university and to locate company scientists in university laboratories. Several states are actively promoting such collaborations, using universities as "the neutral," anchor partner. The differentiation of roles between university-funded faculty and industry-paid researchers may be hard to make, especially for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who learn from and work with both sets of experts without obligation to recognize the difference. While scientific, engineering, and health disciplines are most prepared for industry collaboration, other professions such as law, business, and media arts may find business partners not only interested in sharing expertise but in having project professionals play roles in teaching or research in return for the department's contributing some profits to the company. A school of social work might contract with a city or state agency to provide services as manager of a public housing facility, including student internships and teaching assignments for practicing professionals. As a business venture, a school of art might supply contract design services to a software company in return for a share of royalties on a product. A department of history might join in the appointment of an individual with a nearby museum, where the professor of early American history might be the curator of a Civil War collection. The possibilities are limited only by the expertise and will of the faculty because every commercial enterprise has an intellectual link with the creation and application of knowledge.

Under these circumstances, how can tenure--the rights as well as the responsibilities--be extended to non-university collaborators? The origins and importance of tenure grew out of concerns for academic freedom in the pursuit of ideas and knowledge; can the whole team flourish if only some members have tenure? Can tenure be viable if it only applies to the common ground of the collaboration, separate from the separate work of the institutional partners? Who owns, or even defines, intellectual property? Is it possible to suspend tenure for faculty collaborators for the duration of a project if tenure cannot be granted to industrial partners? As medical schools currently face the very real issue of forming practice groups drawn from faculties and hospital staff, what can tenure mean if some within the same group have it and others do not? Is it conceivable that emerging arrangements in health care might extend to other professions and disciplines? In the future will professions such as law, teacher education, business, or technology be able to prepare graduates separate from the practice community? Will universities develop separate standards of tenure for some parts of the same institution? What happens to the arts and sciences faculty if they insist on preserving twentieth-century forms and standards when other segments of the university wish to experiment?

As distance education becomes more feasible at the home or work site, many disciplines may find joint ventures with corporations or marketing concerns financially attractive and intellectually rewarding. In some nations, corporations are forming private universities, including mega-universities designed to serve 100,000 plus students. Many need an academic partner to supply content and organization as well as a workforce. A university in the United States might subcontract with a foreign government or a multinational corporation to provide faculty in certain disciplines, a range of student services, and information resources in addition to licensing course syllabi, video tapes, or other instructional materials designed for Internet or electronic media. The

contract faculty may or may not have formal affiliation with the tenured faculty of the parent university. Even within the United States, some universities are finding that they can provide library services, student learning assessment, and other services to educational companies, including for-profits. How does tenure facilitate or support such risk-taking? What responsibility do tenured faculty have to contract colleagues?

Under such conditions of institutional collaboration, the academic workforce must be flexible and adaptive while preserving core values and at least some personal prerogatives. Our current definitions of roles and rewards do not easily accommodate collaboration or fluctuations of roles in relatively brief periods of time or under conditions controlled at least partially by partners. While none of these projections may be widely implemented in American higher education, all of them will have an influence on the overall academic workforce and conditions of employment--through competition for talent if in no other way. Principles or practices which succeed in one marketplace or country may prove to be useful in another, and we need to be creative in our adaptations. More importantly, we need to understand how tenure can sustain citizenship under such changeable --even volatile--conditions.

3. CERTIFICATION

Universities have long taken for granted their special status in certifying graduates based on completion of course work and degrees, but today a higher premium is being placed on demonstrated mastery of concepts and skills. The Western Governors University--which recently has entered into collaborative partnerships with universities in Canada, Britain, and Japan--reflects less a desire to create a virtual university than a need to have a flexible form of postsecondary education that can certify competence independent of a particular institution or location.

Certification is the issue, not education. Moreover, it is a global concern being pushed hardest by corporations who are interested in contractual relations with educational suppliers.

Of course any predictions about the separation of certification from attendance must be tempered by the real as well as apparent value of college degrees. Degrees from certain universities will always be valued apart from any return on investment or value added by class attendance.

However, there is a growing demand for certification tied to individual student competence independent of degree. This has long been practiced in fields such as medicine, law, nursing, and accounting where standardized examinations provide a credential to complement the degree. The prestige of a law degree is moot when a graduate does not pass the bar exam, for example. At the same time, degrees in the arts and sciences augmented by certification of specific competence (e.g., writing skills documented by a portfolio) may have market advantage when certification is external to the university awarding the degree (as is currently possible in chemistry, some languages, and a few other disciplines).

In the next few years, faculty may be called upon to adopt the idea of certification in many disciplines, including those which recoil at the very idea. Faculty as certifiers of student competence may require an expertise that lies not only outside disciplinary competence in the arts and sciences but also outside the university. "Critical thinking," for example, is not the province of a single discipline nor is a professor of history typically prepared to assess macro-level competence in general education. Partnerships may be useful as universities team up with professional societies or companies to offer a credential of competence in addition to the degree. And certifying competence to an international standard may even be more valuable. Under these circumstances, tenure may be essential as the arbiter of quality if faculty are to have the courage

to deny certification to individual and also place the integrity of the whole institution above benefit to the department or school. It may be hard for faculty to say that the accumulation of four year's worth of courses is less than the sum of the parts--unless tenure and the concept of citizenship it sustains places a higher value on quality than duration or tuition. If tenure is not used to enact integrity, it may not be worth preserving and surely cannot serve as the basis of citizenship for any community based on values and an enduring mission.

For most faculty, student learning provides the compelling rationale for their institution's mission and continued existence. Even research universities could not long continue should that foundation collapse. As faculty, we are clearly competent to defend our work in teaching. We can point to changing practices that have improved our accountability. However, as faculty we have not yet come to terms with the fact that certification has to do with the coherent whole of a student's education, not the accumulation of assessments in separate courses. When seen from this perspective, student learning may well require adjustments in the form of new types of faculty ranks and appointments or of tenure extended to encompass those who do not yet have formal responsibility for student learning: clinical, part-time, and adjunct faculty, advisors, graduate assistants, and professionals by a variety of names and titles. Tenure, like the academic workforce, must be flexible and adaptable without losing its shape or purpose.

4. CAREER PATTERNS

Tenure offers such protection that until only recently few faculty have been willing to give up its security for less certain but potentially more rewarding career opportunities outside the university. Freedom to pursue a line of inquiry regardless of where it leads has been one of the most cherished protections, especially since it has given most faculty considerable latitude over the use of their own time. As universities necessarily become more directive about the assignment

of faculty work, this perquisite may be less compelling. Even if the protection of freedom of inquiry remains, the loss of control over time may dilute the value of academic freedom.

Because the changing external workplace can now use a wider range of faculty competence, there may be more faculty tempted to give up the safety net of tenure as the gap in research freedom narrows. Mathematicians, economists, scientists, lawyers, librarians, and linguists may find tempting offers in the corporate sector, but they may also seek extended leaves of absence or advance their careers by leaving one university for a corporate position only to return to another university. The pattern of a few senior government officials who have been called from academic life to public service only to return to the academy may be replicated with greater variety and numbers in the future.

A few universities--mostly new institutions--have developed alternatives to tenure and even to the conventional three-tiered professoriate. In such places, faculty have options which trade security or protections for potentially greater returns in salary, control of time, or priority of assignments. Most universities which have developed these options, or even replaced tenure completely, have done so to attract or retain faculty who otherwise would not be interested. While there is much to debate regarding the comparative advantages and disadvantages of institutions which do not offer tenure, it is important to note that none has based its rationale on a desire to recruit inferior faculty, to promote lower quality, or to replace community with anarchy. There clearly is a place for alternative career patterns. One model of tenure cannot possibly serve all of our diverse institutions.

Universities that accommodate alternative career paths--but do not necessarily abolish tenure--may not only attract better faculty but find they have a comparative advantage in attracting students, developing global perspectives, and forming partnerships with complementary

external parties. To the degree that the academic market in many fields remains tight, the pattern of alternating academic appointments may also be more attractive to graduate students who can foresee a career path that combines a dual or intertwining career. Why would the academic workplace discourage intermittent but mutually reinforcing appointments in different sectors? Most universities, for example, limit leaves of absence to a year or two. Why not allow particularly valued colleagues leaves of five years or even unlimited leaves? In these cases, the institution instead of the individual might use tenure to encourage flexibility. Most administrators are so used to thinking of faculty on leave as vacant budget lines to be protected that they do not consider the work which needs to be accomplished first and then seek creative solutions which exploit a temporary vacancy.

In most universities, due process procedures require a full year's notice before a tenure probationary faculty member can be dismissed, and most post-tenure review procedures require a two or three year notice before formal disciplinary action is taken. Because tenure is a reciprocal relationship, universities might reasonably require faculty who hold tenure to give a full year's notice before they resign or retire as a part of their personal tenure "contract." Or they might ask faculty to develop plans of work to cover multiple years, taking into account research and service as well as preferred teaching assignments. Institutions as well as individuals have protections but tenure must be used to have meaning and typically institutions do not exercise the protections of the collective body.

Assessing the scholarly credentials of such transient or intermittent colleagues will not be comfortable for many faculties. Evidence of achievement may have to be expanded to accommodate dual or interrupted careers. In many professions these adjustments can be made readily, but in the arts and sciences it may be hard to accept a government report or leadership of

a division as the equivalent of a scholarly publication or classroom teaching. Yet universities that expand their criteria and modify their procedures while retaining standards will be stronger and quite possibly better for their flexibility. The rediscovered role of “public scholars”--faculty who apply their experience and expertise to public commentary, service, and policy formulation--offers an opportunity to strengthen and renew the capacity of universities to be flexible and accommodating--but also the capacity to be essential and useful to a dubious public.

When viewed as a bond of mutual responsibility instead of a code of privilege, tenure establishes a framework for shared risk taking and affords the flexibility needed to accommodate an extraordinarily diverse workforce. Tenure can no more be monolithic in its practice than can be the work of faculty in its putative role derived from nineteenth century norms. We are being distracted from the fundamental issues by an unseemly squabble over privilege when the real issue is citizenship. If tenure can be construed as the basis of citizenship through its bonds of mutual responsibility and dependence, then it can be the vehicle for a richer and more extensive set of career patterns and roles within the academic workplace. Those universities which eschew tenure may well be deciding that they are institutions--instead of communities--and that the use of tenure is too cumbersome to be efficient.

We need to engage our critics, but we must first understand what is at stake. Change is inevitable, as the four marketplace factors just cited suggest. Yet, our reasons for change may not be the same as those advanced by our critics, and we are less likely to be unified in our response than our critics are in their assaults. The possible results of change in the academic workforce are surely even more divergent, and thus we need to be very clear about what tenure actually does--not only what it means. We need more conversation among ourselves and less with our critics until we are confident about the actual uses of tenure.

UNDERSTANDING THE QUESTION

One of America's important novelists, Thomas Pynchon, has given us a concept which may be useful in considering the fundamental issues confronting higher education generally and the future work of faculty more specifically. Pynchon's idea of "creative paranoia" suggests that for every "they" system there should be an equal and opposite "we" system. He even gives us proverbs for paranoids, including the idea that "if they can get you asking the wrong questions, then they don't have to worry about answers."²

In the current debate on the nature of faculty work, there is a paranoid-like tension between "them"--an amorphous but highly vocal range of critics--and "us"--the faculty and administrators who feel persecuted for not working hard enough. Trustees seem to be somewhat divided between them and us. While faculty should be suspicious of the persistence of a debate that threatens our core values, we may be missing the point because we are asking the wrong questions--of ourselves and the society we seek to serve.

The familiar "we-they" dichotomy is not as simple as it first appears and conceals a complex paranoia inside the academy. The faculty are not all faculty it seems. Some faculty are more faculty than others, and some highly skilled professionals who teach, conduct research, and provide public service are not faculty at all. The "we" system is a more exclusive club than the general public imagines, and our paranoia manifests itself in the subtleties of differentiating some faculty from all others. There are really only three categories of faculty: tenured, tenure eligible, and tenure ineligible. But there are growing numbers and classifications of people who are doing the work of the faculty as it was practiced in the 1950's when tenure took on its current form and function. We need a richer and more diverse approach to the concept of faculty, one which is centered both on the work we actually do now and on an appreciation for the contributions of

those who are not afforded the distinction of tenure. More to the point, we need to find the basis of citizenship in the academic community which is both built on the concept of tenure and yet includes those who do not enjoy its favored status.

Understanding the current debate with external critics requires acknowledging a chain of assumptions that goes something like this. Tenured professors are the best. If a tenured professor is not teaching the class, then the students are being shortchanged. If graduate instructors or part-time lecturers are teaching, then students are being further shortchanged. The solution is to have more tenured, full-time faculty.

At the very same time, there is another chain of assumptions that affects the awarding of tenure, and it has become the subject of intense internal debate. It goes something like this. Faculty who earn tenure must demonstrate their abilities in research, teaching, and service. Activities in all three areas are required, but one of these must be excellent and none can be obviously unsatisfactory. If research is excellent, however, the definition of “satisfactory” can be adjusted. Tenure--with its bond of mutual dependence and its life-time contract--is awarded on the basis of an artifact, a dossier, created solely for this purpose as the prediction of a life’s work.

Both external critics and faculty tend to accept the validity of such reasoning to a point, but finally they diverge. While faculty favor hiring more full-time faculty to replace those who are part time, most public commentators prefer that current faculty teach more, and a peevish few would also abolish tenure to level the field. Most institutions are content to live with the long-term consequences of a single tenure review while most public critics argue that tenure should be reviewed periodically and thus be subject to term limits. Most faculty are content with the way things used to be and do not think the concerns about tenure are productive. Freed from logic

and fact, all sides argue positions that can never succeed, and should not, including retaining tenure intact as now practiced--or used--at most universities.

In a recent nationally syndicated column, the conservative political and social commentator George Will echoed the public cry about faculty tenure, noting that "Conservatives will be forgiven for thinking that tenure serves not the protection of valuable diversity and dissent but rather the self-perpetuation of an intellectually homogenous class that considers conservatism inconvenient."³ Except that liberals and conservatives alike have found tenure to be a safe target, there is nothing remarkable about Will's observation, yet it serves as a gauge of the persistence of the theme in the public's consciousness for nearly a decade.

Why do we defend tenure as the central, critical issue in engaging the public in a debate on faculty work? In so doing, we inherently reduce the complexity and diversity of our own work--along with the multiplicity of roles we must perform as a whole body. Why do we continue to answer the wrong question? Why do we fail to take into account the economic factors which are reshaping the industry of which we are a part?

Most faculty understand that tenure is a comparatively minor condition of academic work in contrast to salary, benefits, workload, criteria for advancement, faculty development programs, contractual conditions of employment, financial health of the institution, systems of evaluation, forms and effectiveness of faculty participation in decision-making, institutional autonomy, accountability of administrators, and the like. Most faculty even understand that their tenured members account for only a diminishing portion of the academic work of their institution. Yet campus by campus, the line in the sand--the definitional fault line of faculty status--is tenure.

TENURE AND THE ENDS OF WORK

The twin freedoms of tenure, arguably, are essential. Academic freedom, which by now may even be less protective than court-derived First Amendment rights (at least at public institutions), is the cornerstone of academic excellence. Academic freedom, of course, protects more than free speech, but it does not grant faculty autonomy to do what they want or even when to do it. Lack of clarity on this point has been an ill wind which fans the flame of public debate. Similarly, economic security is important, but surely not as important as due process and a reasonable standard of pay, both of which can be assured without tenure. Despite elaborate justifications, the line in the sand is not about the freedoms provided by tenure.

Tenure has become a symbol for both its defenders and its critics, but ironically the symbol is not the same for both groups. Speaking as representative of the critics, George Will says: "Increasing criticism of the tenure system reflects current tensions and illustrates this fact: Academics' resistance to changes in fundamental arrangements and privileges is as intense as their advocacy of changes for the rest of society."⁴ Speaking for faculty, Mary Burgan, general secretary of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), suggests that everyone--not just faculty--should have job security. Arguing that "tenure should be changed simply because there is no job security anywhere else in America," is counter-intuitive in Burgan's view.⁵

The debate has the characteristics of political or religious zeal. Both sides are so concerned with advancing their articles of faith that they have hardly noticed more important--or at least equally important--issues. Worse, we have allowed the debate to structure our private conversations about how best to carry out our own work and to realize the mission of our particular campus. Because tenure is so important to our external critics, we have allowed it to

become overly important to us as a symbol instead of as a practice. We should learn how to use the full range of tenure or expect to lose it.

The recent debate about tenure at the University of Minnesota is illustrative. The perceived threat to tenure as a result of unilateral trustee action galvanized the nation--faculty and critics alike--and served as a mock battleground for nearly everyone. At the battle's end in the summer of 1997, however, the symbols were put back on the shelf and the combatants walked away with their positions largely intact and with most of the hard issues still unresolved. The basis of compromise involved using tenure, but the concessions won by each side required that the other practice what was already their tenure-given responsibilities. Faculty will participate in post-tenure review and the university (i.e., administration under trustee direction) will reassign and retrain faculty if a unit is eliminated. The economic issues which precipitated the debate--especially the differentiated roles of tenured and non-tenured faculty--have yet to be addressed: who has tenure and why? One important matter was resolved, however, in that the bond of tenure is between the individual and the whole university--not a single department or school.⁶ Other universities may learn from this experience that they should not wait for a crisis to define the bonds of mutual dependence. While loyalty may accrue to the department, the responsibilities of tenure are to the whole institution. Understanding the implications of this bond requires explication.

They--our critics--define faculty as those who are protected by tenure (or are about to be) and all others. In the fall of 1993, 40 percent of faculty were part time, whereas less than a third of professional staff were full-time faculty.⁷ In most large public universities, more than half of all undergraduate credit hours are taught by part-time faculty or graduate assistants. The easy

equivalency of tenure and full-time faculty status is rarely examined, either by them or us, when it comes to understanding the relationship of tenure with work and of work with community.

Both sides advocate increasing the number of full-time faculty and thus the number of people who are eligible for tenure in the shared assumption that full-time status means higher quality education. We, for example, never seem to make the point that tenure has little or nothing to do with whether a person is full or part time. Most academic administrators hold tenure and are no more than part-time faculty, but they typically enjoy the benefits of tenure and would not serve as chairs, deans, or provosts if they did not. Increasing numbers of full-time faculty in clinical or professional programs have contracts with most of the protections of tenure. The first line of segregation is full- or part-time status, but the second is the formal designation of being tenured or tenure-eligible.

Many critics of tenure are also chief advocates of new forms of postsecondary education. As noted, the actions of the western governors to form a virtual university is the most intriguing because it is also the most dramatic. We need to understand why the public's attack on tenure shares root causes with the emergence of new forms of post-secondary education, forms more intensely competitive than the familiar proprietary schools of the past. In stressing results--learning outcomes--the governors have set aside any traditional concerns about who teaches or how they teach. Their focus is on demonstrating competence--the student's competence, not the teacher's. There is an inherent complaint about the quality of our current work in this focus on new forms of certification. Neither the critics of tenure nor the champions of new models make note of the fact that faculty in these alternative forms of higher education are largely, if not exclusively, part time, but we should. One does not have to agree with the western governors to

understand that they are speaking for a very large segment of the public when they tell us that student learning is what matters, not the status of those who teach.

This point--on which critics and criticized almost certainly agree--may be the key to accommodation and reconciliation based on substantive change--unlike compromises which save face and preserve symbols. It may not matter who teaches or how students learn if we can confidently assess student learning and certify competence. Who does this assessing and certifying may be a more critical question than the viability of tenure. Put differently, tenure should perhaps be reserved for those who assess and certify student--and faculty--learning. Those individuals most responsible for the quality and integrity of the whole institution, not only its disciplines or subunits, are the colleagues most likely to actually use tenure in a practical and meaningful way. If the case for tenure can be based on its serving a clear and valuable function, both social and economic, then much of the energy of our critics would dissipate. Tenure must be a causal factor in achieving the desired results of our work. Tenure must mean quality.

TENURE AND CITIZENSHIP

The argument for tenure as a necessary condition for both quality and discovery (or inquiry) is so well established as to require no explanation within the academy, through the practical and functional aspects of tenure could be better presented to a skeptical public. As we understand the conditions which are changing and enlarging the academic workforce--such as the four mentioned at the outset--and as we deal with the formation of an education industry apart from traditional institutions, we surely must consider tenure in a new light. Our critics point to the emerging corporate forms of education with anticipation, and now with enthusiasm, because none of them offers tenure. If tenure is thus seen as a differentiating element, then we are obligated to make the distinction a positive factor in favor of universities which retain tenure.

The function of tenure in ensuring quality is actually more complex than we usually assume, and a full analysis is beyond the scope of this study. The basic point is simple and obvious. The protections of tenure enable those who have it to assess the ideas and the work of others freely and independently and obligates them to subject themselves and their ideas to similar review. The freedom of inquiry rests on this foundation of peer review.

With respect to student learning, faculty rely on the protections of tenure to hold student performance to levels of quality and to standards consistent with institutional mission; we also rely on tenure to permit us to insist on learning which is not immediately applicable or practical. In the emerging education industry, the quality of student learning they proffer may well suffer by comparison with universities if faculty can seize this issue now and take the steps necessary to certify the competence of graduates instead of merely granting degrees. By using tenure to set performance standards which ensure the quality of student learning, faculty can turn our critics' complaints into an asset. However, we have to be willing to review what each other is teaching. We have to make teaching--and service--results at least as public as research results.

Peer review seems to be the essential ingredient in using tenure across the range of academic work. Research has long depended on peer review, and a case for the primacy of research over teaching and service as modes of faculty work can be linked to the effectiveness of peer assessment. In recent years, peer review of teaching has been recognized as valuable and appears to be on the verge of becoming a wide-spread practice. Although less well developed, peer review of professional service also appears likely.⁸ Practicing peer review with respect to faculty work is perhaps the most meaningful way for individual faculty to use tenure. In helping to set and maintain standards of performance for colleagues--also consistent with institutional mission--faculty have the potential to reverse the public's skepticism about the protections of

tenure and transfer the symbol to an association with quality. From this perspective, post-tenure review is not only a means to preserve tenure; it is integral to the concept of tenure itself.

Without belaboring the point, assessment of student learning and peer review of colleagues' work constitute the most obvious practical uses of tenure. Although assessment and quality control are common to many other industries, tenure does, in fact, differentiate universities from all other similar organizations because of the explicit reciprocal relationship of responsibility between the individual and the community. Faculty earn tenure. The university awards tenure. Faculty accept tenure. The university recognizes tenure. This ritual dance of interaction and interdependence defines a relationship such that the tenured faculty literally are the university because they are the community of the university--the members responsible for its standards, its integrity, and its mission. Administrators and trustees may manage the assets of the university, including its faculty's time, but faculty exercise the privileges and the responsibilities of tenure individually and collectively. The practice of mutual dependence--the use of tenure--is what makes a university a community instead of a company, an organization, or even a profession. The strength of this bond is almost always in direct proportion to the quality and the reputation of the university.

Tenure is thus the formal basis for our definitions of citizenship within the academic community. Others--students, alumni, and many types of employees--occupy the space of the university and participate in the activities of community, but faculty are the tax-payers, the electorate, the year-round residents, the citizens whose standards and ways of doing things define the quality of life. Analogies and metaphors aside, tenured faculty call the important shots having to do with the assessment of learning, research and public service, and they define the acceptable level of quality by the results of their own work.

We return, therefore, to the same central question of who has tenure and why since the results of faculty work have so intertwined with the work products of others. With rapid changes in the nature of the academic workforce, the existing overlap of responsibilities among many different job descriptions and titles will make even less sense to the public. Regardless, most of us are hard-pressed to make convincing arguments for why some parts of the workforce have tenure and not others. Until we can satisfactorily explain to ourselves and then to the public why part-time faculty (or any other similar group) who conduct research, see patients, teach, assign grades, and authorize course credit do not enjoy the responsibilities and benefits of tenure, we will have a difficult time defending tenure as valid. In the meantime, the other segment of the education industry which eschews tenure will rise in public estimation, in part precisely because we cannot explain our practices and the special privileges of tenure.

More critically, if tenure is the basis of academic citizenship, how can our community succeed when citizenship is reserved to a (privileged) few while others carry out the work of the community to a greater degree than professors? Conversely, how can so few members of the academic community hope to cope with all of the responsibilities of tenure without sharing them with colleagues who fill partially congruent roles?

Implicitly, if not literally, tenured faculty must themselves be engaged in the full range of academic work they are obligated to assess--teaching, research, professional service, and university service (or citizenship)--and they must accept responsibility for the quality and viability of the whole institution, not merely their department or school or subunit. These are the bonds of mutual dependence between the tenured individual and the tenured community. How can these bonds be extended to the full academic workforce and yet retain their integrity and utility?

DIVERSIFICATION OF THE FACULTY

Before addressing what the use of tenure may be as the basis of citizenship, we should understand what the actual work of the institution is and what diverse roles faculty play within it. In our internal discussions as well as our debates with the public, we too frequently blur distinctions among the roles of academic workers, inadvertently lending credence to critics who see tenure as privilege for a few and not as a responsibility for a whole community. There have been advantages to us in blurring the roles of colleagues, but the time may have come for an honest appraisal.

Indeed, it may be slightly risky and temporarily uncomfortable, but tenured faculty should consider accepting responsibility for an annual audit of the full range of the academic work of their institution. If tenured faculty demonstrate to trustees and other stewards of institutional resources their full range of work and that of those others who contribute to institutional mission and objectives, then the relative and distinctive value of tenured or tenure-eligible faculty could not only be assessed but likely be assured. While such an analysis might have an aura of public disclosure, security and the long-term viability of a special privilege (and responsibility) can derive only from real value being added to the organizational purpose. The results could be more satisfying to everyone.

The role of tenured faculty in preparing such an analysis even enacts the use of tenure and puts into practice the concept of mutual responsibility. Tenured faculty incur a liability other academic workers do not, and we can demonstrate this by helping to manage the human resources required to achieve shared goals. What would such an audit look like? Who are the academic workers who make up the faculty?

At a minimum, the following roles have to be recognized in addition to those of the tenure-eligible assistant, the associate, and the “full” professors rank, each of which is usually defined in an academic handbook. All of the roles (or at least the work associated with them) will seem familiar, necessary, and self-evident even if the position descriptions are vague or non-existent within most university communities. However, they must be considered, or reconsidered, in view of first how the specific role itself precludes or warrants the use of tenure and second how the work of these “others” relates to the work of tenured faculty. Is it the work performed or the credentials of the people who perform it which makes a class of people eligible or ineligible for tenure? How does the concept of mutual responsibility apply to the work of those who perform essential academic work. Do these academic workers, these tenure ineligible faculty, use tenure even if it has not been bestowed, and what are the implications of someone’s using tenure when they don’t really have it? (When part-time faculty act in a more responsible way than some tenured faculty with respect to the university’s well-being, by participating in committees or showing up for extra-curricular student events for example, they can make tenured faculty feel uncomfortable--precisely because they are borrowing tenure.)

All of these questions lead, inevitably, to our addressing the public outside the academy and to our explaining why tenure for some but not for all may itself be the best argument for retaining tenure as the differentiating element of higher education from other knowledge industries. Confidence and trust should presumably be greater for those institutions which are willing to assume the added burden of tenure. What follows is an incomplete list of tenure ineligible academic workers, or the beginnings of an audit which tenured faculty might conduct of their own community--including their own numbers. By making explicit both titles and focused aspects of academic work, this partial inventory is intended to help define how tenure can in fact

serve as the basis of academic citizenship for the whole community. It is not a comprehensive categorization of academic work nor can it serve as the basis for decision making. Moreover, the issues raised by confronting tenured faculty with such an inventory can be addressed, finally, only within the mission of each specific institution. The difference between tenured work and untenured work almost always depends on local conditions and traditions. Most universities have grown into their current relationships. Few have intentionally planned to have such a mix of roles, titles, and responsibilities.

The following thirteen titles could be expanded to twenty or reduced to five, and the work assigned to each title can be as varied as the number of universities which use them. They are listed without regard to hierarchy or affinity as a way to hint at the diversity and complexity of the full faculty, of the new academic workforce.

LIBRARIANS:

On many campuses, libraries have become the centers for a shift in the way we approach student learning because they have the potential to accommodate inquiry and to engage students in learning through discovery--in a manner intentionally imitative of faculty research. Librarians hold the keys to guiding students and faculty alike to meaningful results.

Libraries hold not only print materials and objects, which are the traditional vehicles of learning and inquiry, but they increasingly are the major public computer cluster on campus and the multimedia gateway to electronic resources and to networks of other learners. Full-text data bases give first-year undergraduates greater access to new knowledge than even the most sophisticated scholars of the last decade. If the full potential of the electronic communication revolution is to be realized in education, libraries--and librarians--will play a central role, at least in the transition.

Can faculty who expect to unleash the potential of expanding information resources hope to cope with navigational issues without the explicit aid of a librarian? Can faculty take for granted the collaborating role of librarians without defining respective roles and responsibilities, especially when electronic documentation and authentication are still so ambiguous? Who assesses the quality and validity of sources? Can researchers hope to keep abreast of global developments in their fields without the support of information experts who help find and sort information from all sectors--industry, government, and higher education? Automated programs can play a part in managing information, but creating, disseminating, and applying knowledge is surely going to require a partnership with someone who holds the role now most closely associated with librarians. Librarians are surely thus tenurable, according to institutional mission, when they both play a role in the full range of responsibilities of teaching, research, and service and when they accept a role in making the whole institution succeed by assuming responsibility for the quality and integrity of information resources.

FACULTY EMERITI:

With the end of mandatory retirement and the advent of post-tenure review, early retirement programs, and other financial incentives, faculty are finding new ways to adjust their professional careers. It is not rare for a faculty member to accept early retirement in one state and then take a tenured position (or even probationary position) in another state. More often, faculty accept reduced appointments for a few years before retiring, only to return as part-time faculty, administrators, advisors, or mentors. Despite the enormous intellectual resource represented by retired or retiring faculty, few universities have systematic plans or policies to use their talents, whether on a volunteer or compensated basis.

Although many institutions grant certain privileges along with emeritus status, retired faculty may have a voice but no vote in faculty meetings. With the prospect of courses being taught in modules and variable time frames, with the increase in collaborative or team teaching, with the need for highly skilled research expertise that does not have to be covered on a grant, faculty emeriti are likely to reenter the academy in larger numbers in the next two decades. Their roles, including work assignments, voting status, compensation, and periodic review, obviously need to be addressed explicitly, but do they retain tenure? If they do not share a responsibility for the success of the whole institution, because their work is narrowly defined, can they still be tenured? How do faculty emeriti stop using tenure anyway?

TECHNICIANS AND TECHNOLOGISTS:

On many campuses, the role of librarians and computer specialists has become intertwined; however, in some cases librarians have tenure, but technologists do not. Technicians in production studios in the arts or in computer-aided design laboratories perform roles directly related to teaching. Many research laboratories rely on technicians who are as fully involved in designing and conducting experiments as the faculty member who is the principal investigator. When they are performing roles easily confused with faculty, these colleagues tend to have the same credentials. These experts interact with students, faculty, and even the larger public in ways that are indistinguishable from faculty to the casual observer. In cases where universities collaborate with industry, university technicians may have roles more like industrial scientists whose actual partners are faculty; will title and tenure status impede such collaborations? Moreover, many technicians perform such valuable services in areas where private sector industries compete for expertise that non-faculty, untenured colleagues occasionally command salaries in excess of faculty because of temporary market factors. Research universities cannot

afford not to have such internal collaborators, whether they are titled technologists, post-doctoral fellows, or scientists. As technology permeates all aspects of teaching, research, and service, should colleagues versed in the application of technology to the full range of institutional mission not be retained and rewarded with tenure when they make a commitment to the institution equal to that of faculty? If librarians have tenure, why should not appropriately credentialed technologists?

LECTURERS AND INSTRUCTORS:

Most universities have a category of full-time faculty who bridge the tenured and tenure-ineligible ranks. Persons appointed to this rank, often titled lecturer or instructor, may begin their academic careers prior to completing their terminal degrees; typically, their title is converted to assistant professor when the degree is awarded. In some institutions, persons with terminal degrees are appointed to such a rank to provide a warm-up year prior to moving on to the tenure track and starting the probationary clock; frequently, these appointments are in the sciences and are used when an especially promising recent graduate has not had a post-doctoral fellowship. In all of these cases, the full-time position leads almost automatically to a tenure-eligible position without a new search.

However, the same title and job is also available to full-time appointees who teach, conduct research, and engage in service but without any expectation of moving to a tenure-eligible appointment. These faculty may or may not have completed their terminal degree. They may have one-year or multiple-year appointments. In some institutions, individuals may serve as full-time lecturers for five, ten, or even twenty years without a change in status. In a small subset of institutions, lecturers and instructors are awarded tenure, but invariably there is no opportunity

for advancement in rank. As many as a fifth of all full time faculty may fall into such categories of appointment, though tenure is rare.

Lecturers and instructors typically have higher teaching loads and may account for a disproportionate share of teaching responsibilities. Faculty who hold such positions have become indispensable to higher education because of the volume of their teaching and the variety of service roles they perform. Among lecturers who have taught at the same institution for a number of years, their status raises fundamental questions about the meaning and purpose of tenure because of all tenure ineligible faculty they are most likely to exercise the responsibilities of tenure without any of the formal protections. Their ambiguous status is generally beneficial to the institution but in the absence of tenure for long-time service, faculty in this role may actually undermine the use of tenure for all faculty unless their responsibilities explicitly exclude research and thus preclude advancement in rank. Even then, the presence of significant numbers of long-term lecturers and instructors who are ineligible for tenure is hard to explain to the public and institutional stewards. In making tenure the basis of citizenship in the academic community, higher education must address and resolve the tenure eligibility of long-term lecturers and instructors. Not to do so leaves open the very real possibility of a class system among faculty ranks. But awarding tenure to individuals whose very position precludes advancement in rank runs counter to the inherent value of personal professional development implied by the assistant, associate and professor ranks. A very few institutions have addressed this conundrum by awarding tenure following a probationary period and by offering at least one advancement to senior lecturer or instructor.

ADJUNCT AND PART-TIME FACULTY:

Some emergent for-profit institutions by design employ only part-time professionals to preserve flexibility and ensure that instruction is related to current practice. Even in traditional institutions, few faculty argue against the selective employment of such colleagues in practice-based disciplines. Yet this amorphous and sizable group of tenure ineligible colleagues is also the most challenging to accommodate within the conventions of academic citizenship. Not only are they part-time, but they are usually appointed at the rank of lecturer or instructor.

When large numbers of part-time people are retained for basic courses in writing, communications, mathematics, and other subjects, questions about quality and other factors are raised. As early as 1976, the AAUP sponsored a national study of part-time faculty.¹⁰ Their data have led to careful studies of the taxonomy of this diverse group of people who are not employed full time, but who occasionally hold tenure. There are three primary groups: those who hold full-time jobs elsewhere and seek academic appointment only on a part-time basis; those who are not employed full-time (or at all) elsewhere, but also do not seek a position; and those who may or may not be employed elsewhere, but who want an academic appointment--usually full time--as their primary occupational identity. It is the aspiration of part-time faculty, therefore, that has tended to classify them.

Only recently has research focused on student learning outcomes, which might be the most useful way to determine the efficacy of hiring part-time faculty and to help institutions develop more structured policies and classifications. If these colleagues are as effective as full-time faculty in the same limited roles, then the issue shifts from quality to the employment status of the part-time faculty member and to economic--or total resource management--considerations. As long as

part-time faculty are engaged only in teaching, however, they do not participate in the comprehensive bond which necessarily involves service as well as research.

There is no single model for these colleagues any more than there is for faculty in general, but institutions that employ part-time faculty with records of scholarship who add luster to the institution may find that a permanent linkage--with a professorial title--would be advantageous. At a few universities, some of these colleagues may even be awarded tenure because they participate in all aspects of academic work, albeit on a limited basis. At the other end of the spectrum, many more part-time faculty are minimally qualified, interchangeable with hundreds of others, and lack sufficient distinction or accomplishment to contribute to the institution's reputation or play a role in service. In between are those whose accomplishments are not yet sufficiently well known to be clear cases.

It is surely in our best interest to find ways to secure a permanent, tenure-like agreement with individuals who add to the prestige and effectiveness of the institution because they contribute to the full range of academic work. Being able to offer "tenure" to a part-time person who teaches one course a year may seem trivial to most full-time faculty, however, and such an offer might even be insulting to the practicing professional who sees an engagement with the university as a way to disseminate and test ideas which may have practical value to the person's principal employer. But why should universities and individuals not enter into long-term commitments so that the regular offering of a special course or on individual's systematic participation in the intellectual life of the department or unit can be planned and used to mutual advantage? Such colleagues may uniquely offer even more to the overall success of the whole institution because they are a vital link between the university and the social and practice community. These colleagues, of course, should be given the benefit of peer reviews of teaching

and scholarship to ensure that the level of contribution remains high. The awarding of tenure to such individuals should be consummated by their formally accepting the responsibilities of academic citizenship, by their agreeing to use tenure and not merely to hold it.

In the 20 years since the AAUP study, dozens of books and policy statements have been produced which affirm the permanent and valuable role of part-time faculty, yet the vast majority of these colleagues remain nearly invisible on most campuses and are usually not afforded the benefit of clear, comprehensive policies. Moreover, their work is often not documented or recognized apart from the contributions of full-time faculty, to whom are attributed credit hours, public service and other work that would be noticed only in its absence. At its root, the use of part-time faculty is an economic issue. An honest audit of academic community would deal explicitly with this somewhat unseemly matter.

One reason for obscuring the role of part-time faculty is that they are inexpensive, yet the credit awarded in classes they teach appears on the transcript undifferentiated from more costly tenured full professors. Exploitation of part-time faculty and their comparative economy and efficiency pose a dilemma in the context of mission and values for universities who employ such colleagues in large numbers, especially to the extent that tenure is a symbol of quality. Some emerging universities and for-profit institutions have begun hiring only, or mostly, part-time people. Tenure is not an option. While they may seek persons who have full-time occupations and commensurate expertise, they are prone to use faculty for whom there are few other employment opportunities. The potential for exploitation is greatest in the areas of highest student demand: writing, mathematics, languages. The issue for full-time faculty is not whether there will be such part-time faculty, but the conditions of employment and the portion they represent of the total educational program. It is not enough merely to fix a ratio of full- to part-time people if that

ratio does not also reflect the mission of the institution and objectives for student learning.

Having 20 percent part-time faculty who account for 40 percent of the instruction may not be consistent with the mission of the institution or with truth in advertising the nature or quality of instruction.

Economic considerations tend to be the dominant factor in determining how many part-time faculty are used by most institutions. Those institutions that are not dependent on tuition to maintain their viability have the luxury of employing only part-time faculty who contribute expertise and luster. Most others are dependent on part-time faculty--or graduate assistants--to make their budget (or to meet student demand within their budget). Taking this as a condition, it should be possible for all but the most marginal colleges and universities to develop institutional policies--determined by mission and strategic objectives--which could openly set forth clear and defensible principles for the recruitment, development, and retention of part-time faculty so that these colleagues are viewed as an asset and not a liability, so that their work is acknowledged and not concealed.

Among the policy issues which should be considered in the context of tenure and citizenship is how much time is part-time. Most universities have numerically concrete definitions of part-time status (due to laws and issues affecting benefits), but few of these percentage equivalencies are based on a thoughtful analysis of how particular work equals a specific percentage of time. How can teaching one three-credit hour writing course in a term equal a 20% appointment when the comparable course load for a tenured professor is two such courses? The answer, of course, lies in the fact that tenured faculty are also responsible for research, professional service, and citizenship service. Policies should address these relationships instead of relying on estimates which appear arbitrary, even punitive, to an uniformed public.

Their role within the academic community should be made explicit, including an explanation of how citizenship--and the use of tenure--does or does not apply to them. There is no uniform way of addressing the citizenship of part-time faculty, and each institution must define its own rules and standards. The only obligation is that they be public, be consistent with mission, and respect the bond of mutual dependence which defines community for each particular university. One important differentiating criterion may be the institution-wide responsibilities of tenure. Part-time faculty are usually engaged only at the department or school level, where they may participate in governance. If their responsibilities do not extend to the whole institution, they may not be "full" citizens. Nonetheless, there may well be value in developing a nation-wide conversation which would raise public awareness of the particular limited role of part-time colleagues within the academy, both to secure the status of these faculty and to explain why tenure requires a full-time commitment even when the work is part-time.

GRADUATE TEACHING OR RESEARCH ASSISTANTS AND ASSOCIATES:

Many large public universities are as dependent on graduate assistants as metropolitan universities are on part-time lecturers, and their conditions of employment may not vary significantly despite the graduate students' enrollment in degree programs. Not infrequently, the same economic dependency has induced artificially large graduate enrollments despite poor post-graduation employment prospects. The production of graduates with master's and doctorates in excess of the capacity of higher education to absorb them, ironically, creates the pool which largely defines the exploited part-time market.

Until recently, many universities discouraged graduate students from teaching or assisting in faculty research. However, the need to incorporate pedagogy in the preparation of graduate

students and the economic necessity of using a comparatively inexpensive but highly trained supply has made graduate students a part of the academic workforce. In most respects, graduate students are not different from part-time faculty; even 20 years ago when the AAUP conducted its survey, graduate students teaching at institutions other than those where they were enrolled accounted for more than a fifth of the part-time workforce.¹¹

It is not possible, therefore, to set aside graduate students as a special case. While it is admirable that doctoral-granting institutions have now implemented programs to prepare prospective faculty to teach as well as conduct research, the driving force continues to be the need to teach very large numbers of undergraduates. More and more graduate departments, however, are analyzing their dependency on graduate assistants for teaching. They are assessing the long-term prospects for placing graduates in appropriate professional positions upon graduation. The consequence of reducing the size of graduate programs to a more realistic number, of course, is the need to develop an adequate faculty to meet instructional demand--either through hiring more full-time faculty, increasing the number of part-time and adjunct faculty, or developing new modes of teaching using technology, undergraduates, or academic professionals.

As recent, well-publicized votes and strikes among graduate students from Connecticut to California have suggested, this particular segment of the workforce is itself uneasy about the conditions of employment--currently and prospectively. Graduate students share a growing unease along with probationary faculty about the process of awarding tenure.¹² They are raising fundamental questions about academic citizenship and the practice of tenure, questions which tenured faculty are obligated to address.

Good and principled arguments can be made for several different definitions of graduate student employees. One consideration, however, will have to be a comparison within the same

institution of policies and conditions of employment for graduate assistants and other part-time people. It will be increasingly hard to differentiate pay and conditions of employment--including benefits--for comparable work. This near crisis offers the opportunity for universities to create a newly stratified but equitable system of employment for all part-time people. One key issue will be whether these employees are assistants or faculty; if they are under the direct supervision of faculty, then they may have a different employment status. Tenure for graduate assistants, however, should be untenable since by definition students do not have a responsibility for the mission of the institution; instead, the university is responsible for them and for their developing an adequate understanding of the responsibilities of academic citizenship.

UNDERGRADUATE MENTORS AND ASSISTANTS:

Although not new, the use of undergraduates in teaching, research, and service appears to be growing. Reliable data is difficult to obtain, but the emergence of associations to support undergraduate research and peer mentoring suggests expansion as well as formalization of the role. The advocacy of active learning has supported the employment of undergraduates because of the opportunity to apply learning in appropriate, supervised settings. While the academic workforce now must include consideration of undergraduates as partners with faculty and other academic employees in carrying out the work of faculty, the distinction between undergraduates and graduates may be increasingly difficult to make with respect to their work. At urban universities, the presence of significant numbers of mature undergraduates poses an even greater challenge in differentiating work roles because these individuals can present experience and expertise which demonstrably exceeds that of some graduate students. Although the rationale for both graduate and undergraduate students' being employed may originate in their learning, the practices of most universities tend to reflect an emphasis on the work performed instead of

learning. Nonetheless, there are important distinctions between the purposes and levels of learning at the baccalaureate and graduate levels which should be considered in determining citizenship and compensation.

Although premature to predict long-term trends, mounting evidence of effectiveness and anecdotal examples of success suggest that undergraduates will contribute to advising, teaching (especially peer mentoring and tutoring), and research in an ever-expanding array. These students will surely not displace faculty, but they will increase efficiency and productivity with the concomitant need for faculty to supervise and guide students. They may replace graduate assistants to some degree. Where they are used, undergraduate academic employees should have their work documented, recognized, and rewarded with a clear rationale for why comparable work by graduate and undergraduate students may be valued differently, and for why students may be treated differently than other part-time employees despite seeming similarities. Academic credit may be neither sufficient nor appropriate, and tenure is less viable for undergraduates than for graduate students, not because of their work but because of an even more diminished degree of mutual dependence and responsibility.

SCIENTISTS, SCHOLARS AND POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS:

Many research-oriented universities and colleges have developed a faculty rank to engage appropriately trained and credentialed colleagues in research or scholarship without an obligation to teach or provide service to the institution. However, many of these colleagues both teach and provide service, including professional service. Titles vary, but something like a research professor or a scientist classification (with appropriately named counterparts for the humanities, social sciences and arts, such as “scholar”) has emerged with promotion in rank available to recognize excellence in the single dimension of research, scholarship, or creative works. Institutions which have such titles and ranks typically have defined their roles and, at least implicitly, their citizenship. Tenure is not appropriate because their responsibilities are limited.

In recent years, the number of postdoctoral appointments has increased so that these faculty typically exceed in number those who hold formal research rank appointments, at least in large research universities. They are, in some cases, a shadow group to the formal research, scientist, or scholar ranks. Their work varies, but they tend to be brought into laboratories, studios, and clinics of senior faculty as a form of “finishing school” and as a way to defer finding a permanent faculty position. For host institutions, there is the dual benefit of comparatively less expensive but highly qualified labor and the opportunity to review individuals on location prior to considering them for a faculty appointment. Not all postdoctoral positions lead to a full-time faculty appointment; postdoctoral employees who do not obtain a full-time faculty position may leave academic life for industry or become part of the pool of part-time faculty.

Postdoctoral appointees who hold continuous employment in this ambiguous state for several years--perhaps as many as 10--without any institutional review or formal consideration of their contribution to the work of the institution pose a potential problem. When they become

engaged in the intellectual life of a department or school, they may be indistinguishable from probationary, full-time tenure track colleagues or visiting faculty, especially when they assume a mutual commitment to the institution and begin to use the tenure which they were never accorded. On the other hand, some postdoctoral fellows recede into the background and become indistinguishable from students, technicians or other professionals whose role is clearly supportive and whose work is merely a job. Because postdoctoral employees are frequently appointed on grants and other noninstitutional funds, many universities do not even have accurate statistics on these colleagues. In some institutions, the contributions are so significant that their exclusion would create serious disruptions in research and possibly other important faculty work. Accordingly, the status of those faculty may require more urgent attention than any other because it is the most ambiguous and poses a direct challenge to the moral use of tenure.

VISITING FACULTY:

Most universities and colleges employ full-time faculty on brief one- or two-year visiting appointments. Often these appointments are a form of courtship or preprobationary review intended to result in a full-time tenured or tenure track appointment. In other cases, visiting appointments are institutionalized, sometimes with prestigious titles, to ensure the benefit of rotating appointments on an annual or shorter basis. The potential for increasing the number of such appointments exists and might be attractive as a way to turn some part-time appointments into more substantive engagements. Rates of pay for visiting faculty are typically commensurate with the purpose. When intended as recruitment strategies, these appointments are nearly the same as the expected full-time pay rate; when intended as a replacement for part-time faculty or a full-time person on temporary leave, then the pay rates are occasionally below the norm. The expectations for visiting faculty are often less demanding than for full-time faculty. As the number

of visiting appointments increases, therefore, the demands on full-time faculty for service and institutional citizenship increases.

Visiting faculty may also contribute to technology-based instruction. Universities or colleges that may not be able to afford or even want full-time expertise in a subject may invite a visiting faculty member to record lectures or courses for a video or digitized archive. In some cases, universities creating very high quality, technology-based courses may hire luminaries to make cameo appearances or less known but camera-friendly faculty to deliver content in an engaging way. Still other visitors may create self-paced instructional materials that they leave behind as work for hire when their appointment expires. In all of these cases, visiting faculty may continue a long-term relationship as part-time or adjunct faculty. The principled use of such colleagues requires consideration within the context of institutional values as well as mission. In all of these cases, however, the definition of the appointment as short term obviates any possibility of mutual responsibility and surely precludes tenure unless there is a “permanent” part-time relationship.

CLINICAL FACULTY:

With changes in health care, the number of clinical appointments in health-related schools has mushroomed, but clinical faculty appointments have also expanded to schools of law, business, education, social work, and even engineering. Faculty who may teach and participate in research are hired primarily because of their ability to create learning opportunities for students in practice-based or clinical settings. Not coincidentally, they are usually able to help generate income by serving patients or clients for a fee. In some settings, the clinical faculty generate sufficient net income beyond expenses to constitute an indispensable part of the unit’s fiscal integrity. In few instances are the client or patient-based services so removed from teaching or

research as to be ancillary to mission, but there are certain to be increasing possibilities for conflict between the university's mission and its opportunities to exploit income.

In health-related institutions, the very survival of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, allied health sciences, or nursing may depend on clinical faculty, with or without tenure. In more rarefied settings, medical schools may be differentiated between those which are research intensive and those which are teaching intensive based on the degree to which these faculty roles can be managed. In all cases, clinical faculty will have to play a role in generating income, but control and authority may rest with a tenured, numerically minority, portion of the faculty. The issues of using tenure by taking into account the full range of institutional responsibility--teaching, research, and service--as well as responsibility for institutional success in carrying out mission will come into sharp focus. Higher paid clinical faculty, freed from the responsibilities of tenure, may create locally-significant status reversals which discomfort other parts of the same university. Uniform policies and rules based on assumptions of the past half century may no longer be effective without restatement and, perhaps, differentiation.

The role of clinical faculty is important because of the opportunity to engage students in the practice of their learning in properly supervised settings. Professional schools have relied on clinical settings for decades, and the expansion of practice environments for the arts, sciences, and other disciplines is gaining momentum through service learning, undergraduate research, cooperative education, and other forms of active learning. Land-Grant universities have adapted their cooperative extension services to meet urban needs as agrarian pursuits have become increasingly industrialized and urban in nature. The model of county agents has been appropriated by health schools, programs in public administration, and other service professions, such as education and social work. In some states, the county extension agent (whether rural or urban) is

viewed as a faculty appointment; in others, it is not. In all cases, however, the work of these colleagues is derived from the basic mission of the unit in providing public service and thus applying and disseminating knowledge. Their work is the work of faculty. They share a sense of mutual dependence. Like librarians, their work may span the full range of mission responsibilities, and they may be the sole arbiters of quality for services and products which bear the university's name.

As arts and sciences faculty become more familiar with service learning and use internships more extensively, they are likely to find as yet unknown clients who are willing not only to pay for services but to allow the services to be provided by supervised students in a practice setting. These include communication and applied writing programs for corporations, design of web pages and other electronic interfaces, application of market and survey research to a variety of clients, intercultural communication and language translation, environmental sciences, and dozens of other applications. Clinical faculty appointments are certain to extend into new areas where the concept of clients is far more inclusive than patients.

The most immediate challenge to current faculty work will not occur because of a decision to limit clinical teaching, research, and service within the mission of the unit or institution. Instead, faculty should anticipate direct competition to the individual faculty member's opportunity for personal income enhancement through consulting or other currently "unrelated" work undertaken outside the department's purview. As universities discover that traditional income sources from tuition or state appropriation can be increased significantly through other revenue streams, they will follow the model of medical, dental, and business schools in developing client service operations based on departmental research and student education. This will place

many faculty in direct conflict with their own department or school as they compete for the same clients.

When opportunities to involve students in expanded learning opportunities and to disperse overhead costs over a greater numbers of clients arise, departments will have the competitive advantage over individual faculty consultants who, for the most part, draw clients from the reputation of the department or university of which they are a member. The tradition of "one day per week" being reserved for personal work and the conflict of commitment, if not conflict of interest, may require changes in the definition of faculty work. The basic choice will be between the collective needs of the unit and the opportunity for some individuals to enhance income. The mission of the unit must play the deciding role, and thus determine who accepts as well as who is awarded tenure since tenure obligates an individual to place the institution's well being above self interest. Can clinical faculty, whether tenured or not, be allowed to compete with the institution for consulting work, use students to support outside work, or permit a blurring of personal work and institutional work? Put differently, do untenured clinical faculty have a competitive personal economic advantage over tenured faculty if tenure imposes a responsibility to place the good of the institution above that of the individual? In this sense, the absence of tenure may afford greater personal freedom.

ADVISORS:

Many universities and colleges have responded to the increase in enrollments since the early 1950's by creating a corps of professional advisors, often augmented by graduate assistants or peer undergraduates. At many universities, advising has been turned over to professionals who hold terminal degrees, but not faculty appointments, or to a colleague whose departmental duties have been reduced to a single dimension. This has not relieved faculty entirely from advising, but

these advising experts have permitted faculty to assume responsibility for a form of advising that is more akin to mentoring and teaching.

Many institutions are looking at ways for faculty to retain responsibility for overall advising while working collaboratively with professional advisors and student assistants to manage the specialized information required to integrate academic, financial, social, legal, and career components of a degree objective. This approach requires thinking of advisors as part of the faculty to the extent that academic and career planning are aspects of student learning. Some full-time advisors teach as a part of their duties. Typically, they focus on an introduction to the field or an orientation seminar, but there are no practical limits. In some universities, advisors teach outside the department of their employment, thus becoming a part-time faculty member in another unit. It is difficult to tell where the work of teaching and advising diverges.

As students make abundantly clear, they see a direct connection between their education and employment. More than 77 percent of all entering first-year students in 1995 responded to the Astin survey that getting a better job is one of their most important reasons for going to college.¹³ Capitalizing on this fact, for-profit and more entrepreneurial universities have aggressively integrated education and work experiences. Student services in the form of highly skilled advising have become one of the competitive advantages of these emerging institutions. Increasingly, conventional universities are also connecting career advising, job placement, and student learning--drawing on internships and practice-based studies to engage students in more effective learning situations and give them a head start in securing a job. These advisors are more specialized than the typical academic advisor, but they may occasionally have concurrent dual roles within the university and within the industry associated with the learning opportunities. Alumni frequently play this role, with or without remuneration, with or without title.

As we become more cognizant that learning in such environments constitutes a vital part of students' education, we can establish new or expanded notions of the work of the advising and mentoring faculty. Their role may accelerate as universities compete with each other on effective job placement and academic reputation based on student success. Especially skilled advisors may be rewarded more generously than some faculty whose primary contributions are limited to teaching or research. These advisors may begin to conduct their work more as clinical faculty than as academic professionals. For them as well as the institution the question of tenure may rest on institutional mission and mutual commitment.

ADMINISTRATORS AND OTHER ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS:

The tension between faculty and administration belies the fact that many administrators hold faculty appointment and engage in the work of the faculty to some degree. Few full-time administrators maintain active research programs, but many teach regularly and engage in service, including professional service related to their disciplines. Faculty ordinarily choose not to include these administrators within their definition of faculty, yet all but the most intransigent will concede that administrative work needs to be done and that it is better done by persons who have faculty experience and perspective. That said, we need to play a role in defining administration as the work of the faculty, lest it goes the way of management common to most corporate organizations. The lessons from the entrepreneurial profit and not-for-profit postsecondary institutions suggest there are advantages to having professional managers with respect to efficiency, speed, and market sensitivity. Managers can succeed, however, only if they have control. In the conventions of shared governance, therefore, administrative work must remain faculty work. It may be time for the sporting distinction between administration and faculty to end in universities which elect to retain tenure as the basis of citizenship.

Regardless, there is another cadre of academic administrators who do not hold formal faculty appointment. Like academic advisors, they serve as part-time or adjunct faculty, but usually in units other than those where they are principally employed. A business manager in a large department may well teach in an accounting or management department, serving as an adjunct professor and not merely a part-time lecturer. To the individual, the distinction among roles may not be great since the service to the institution makes an integration of effort inherently meaningful and the bond of mutual dependence may be greater for a few of these colleagues than for “pure” faculty whose discipline commands a higher loyalty than the institution.. At the same time, the two employing units may not even be aware of the way in which they are connected. On occasion, the part-time faculty member may make linkages which are fortunate or unfortunate, but without the direct involvement of the employing units. As a part-time accounting professor, the business manager in a department of medicine may use case studies or examples drawn from the day job that compromise the presumed privacy of the department; in most cases no harm is done, but there may well be adverse consequences. When departments begin to think of the faculty in a more wholistic manner, they may discover meaningful interactions which advance the unit’s mission or, alternatively, reduce overall institutional success by creating divisiveness or compromising integrity.

There is also a possibility that more minority colleagues who receive terminal degrees are being directed into academic professional roles. Departments and schools, reluctant to hire appropriately credentialed minority candidates for tenured or tenure track positions, may offer them appointments as administrators or advisors or clinical faculty with an adjunct or “courtesy” appointment. Although they may teach an occasional course and otherwise be involved in the life of the department or unit, they may never have an opportunity to stand for advancement or

tenure. There is little reliable data available, but minority faculty have noted the seeming increase in doctorally prepared colleagues who are in the academy, but not really part of it because they do not have the privilege of tenure or even faculty appointment. In 1993, about 45 percent of the professional-level black employees were in faculty ranks in comparison with about half the Hispanics and 57 percent of the whites.¹⁴ This dimension of the academic workforce bears monitoring and the issue of tenure may take on an added dimension in the context of the diversity of the academic workforce.

PUBLIC SCHOLARS:

Although they are likely to constitute only a small numerical part of the workforce, the emerging role of the “public scholar” warrants consideration within the discussion of tenure and the academic workforce because these individuals have disproportionate influence within the larger social and political community. Many of the faculty who are most vocal and most widely cited as commentators on social, political, health, economic, and public policy issues of all types have earned tenure and emerged as spokespersons because of their research. Others, however, have succeeded less because of their research than their ability to communicate complex issues effectively to a general public. They often publish in newspapers or mass circulation magazines or appear on radio and television instead of (or in addition to) publishing in scholarly journals.

Under ideal circumstances, public scholars are the best scholars period. As the role of public scholars expands and their influence increases, however, more faculty will gravitate to this role because of the opportunity. Moreover, universities may well intentionally seek out individuals to speak on behalf of the academic community regarding complex issues, and some--perhaps most--of these colleagues will come from organizations, governmental agencies, think tanks, and other enterprises where their experience or expertise has not previously involved

tenure. There can be little doubt about the importance of public scholars, but the role they play within the university is less clear. When they speak with the university's reputation as a credential of their credibility, the whole academic community has something at stake. These representatives may also be most in need of tenure when they take on controversial and complex issues, but they should also be among the most accountable to their peers. The role of public scholar, whether recognized with rank and title or not, may be vitally important in helping universities decide what the meaning of tenure actually is as a bond of mutual responsibility.

THE FACULTY AS A COMPREHENSIVE, DIVERSE WORKFORCE

We may have no choice about considering the future of the academic workforce except through the perspective of current titles and positions, of which the preceding description is representative, though not exhaustive. Many named positions can be meaningfully subdivided; others who play a role in teaching and research are not mentioned because they are not compensated. These include volunteer, adjunct, and other "clinical" professors who teach medical, nursing, and dental students; adjunct faculty in social work, education, and journalism who supervise interns; and a variety of unnamed, untitled but very caring colleagues who mentor students engaged in service learning programs. We know best what we do everyday, and those who do it. We associate our work with the positions and titles we see every day in our own institution or hear about in others. We find it convenient, even comforting, to reduce the faculty to as simple a model as possible. But the old paradigm of a single faculty is quickly falling in the face of external pressures and growing complexity.

Colleges or universities without medical schools or health-related units may not fully appreciate the degree to which clinical faculty are essential to the workforce, but most faculty are sufficiently aware to know that the arts and sciences model does not transfer intact to the health

environment. Increasingly, schools of business, law, journalism, and engineering are finding that traditional faculty roles are too inflexible to accommodate changes within professional practice. At the same time, campuses dominated by professional schools may not understand the need for faculty trained as musicians or writers or artists without doctorates or comprehend how distinction depends on reputation preserved as oral tradition. There are often very different perspectives on the same rank--such as lecturer--within the same institution. We are learning more about each other and the multiple roles of faculty, and this is good.

However, it is only the beginning. Much of future faculty work is being shaped by factors beyond our control. It is often said that health care reform will presage the kind of change that higher education must undergo. If this is true, we should think about our work not from the perspective of faculty roles and rewards but from the outcomes and the results by which we will be held accountable. As with health care reform, changes do not have to be dramatic to have consequences. Predictions about distance learning and virtual universities or the apocryphal implications of unseemly competition with for-profit institutions do not have to come to pass in order to be catalysts for restructuring faculty work, even if we continue to use the familiar terminology and retain existing forms of work.

For centuries, faculty have enjoyed a special privilege as individuals who think, teach, write, and conduct research in private. So ingrained is this aspect of our work that many faculty mistakenly confuse autonomy with academic freedom. While extremes are greater in the humanistic disciplines, most faculty have enjoyed an autonomy and independence rarely experienced in other professions. In several fields, this independence has been ameliorated by interaction with others. Faculty in fields such as medicine and the laboratory sciences develop teams to address issues, adapt their disciplinary expertise to a problem-based curriculum to

advance student learning, or share facilities. Business, engineering, law, and other professional programs find that teams or collaborative arrangements offer distinct advantages in some settings. More slowly, the humanities, social sciences and emerging fields based on interdisciplinary protocols are also finding that teamwork has promise. Whether for teaching, research, or professional service, individuals are learning how to work in tandem with a colleague elsewhere at a distance or with faculty or professionals in other fields within the same institution.

Faculty who collaborate with technicians, technologists, librarians, or postdoctoral fellows are so common as to elicit little commentary, even in promotion and tenure reviews, despite the fact that there is only a casual reward structure for non-faculty contributors. More and more schools are discussing the positive aspects of joint publications and raising questions about how to account for individual effort as part of a team. Trustees and other institutional stewards are asking departments or schools--not individual faculty--to report on collective efforts in teaching. Administrators are finding that the unit of accountability is better correlated with results when they can be defined at the aggregate rather than individual level. Under these circumstances, then, the work of the faculty needs to be reassessed. We cannot assume that the apex of faculty hierarchy--the tenured, or perhaps distinguished, full professor--is necessarily the most important person in any particular activity when the work of the group as a whole is being assessed or rewarded.

The role of faculty--especially tenured faculty--in directing and guiding teams of students, professionals, or other faculty not only requires new skills but also new means of assessing effectiveness and results. If the team achieves its results and the results are not directly attributable to the tenured professor, to whom should the rewards and recognition go? The

system must be sufficiently complex and flexible to reward true effort, not merely position and title.

Over the past four decades, the number of full-time academic and professional appointees has increased dramatically because of increasing student enrollments and the expanded research mission of many universities. Within this expansion, the last decade has seen a marked increase in the number of professional employees--technicians, scientists, technologists, programmers, administrators, and the like. It is not uncommon for large universities to have professional ranks (often coded by a number instead of a descriptive title), which are much more sophisticated than the three typical faculty ranks. Moreover, the pay scales for these professional appointments often exceed faculty pay scales, yet the procedures for advancement have few of the features associated with faculty advancement. There is rarely peer review of any kind. Academic review is even more rare except by the person responsible for the account, who may or may not be a faculty member. Advancement and pay increases can come at any time instead of following the annual ritual for faculty that usually begins in September and concludes in May. A professional appointee might advance from a rank of "6" to a rank of "10" with a \$10,000 pay increase--often tied to market conditions--without anyone in the academic side of the house ever seeing or knowing about the change. Among faculty, an increase of one rank--from assistant to associate--might entail seven separate and distinct reviews, involve 75 faculty peers, a dozen external peers, and result in a \$2,000-\$5,000 raise twice in one's life. There is something wrong with a workplace where there is an inverse relationship between the elaborateness of the reviews and the substance of the rewards. Can tenure possibly be worth so much in economic return or status to sustain the dual systems for tenure eligible faculty and everyone else? The value of tenure rests on something more ephemeral but surely more important: the quality and reputation of the

community of which one is a formal member. Community depends on principles of equitable participation for all its members.

CONCLUSION

Other factors too will have an impact on redefining the academic workforce. Financing is surely one, especially as federal and state roles change and tuition pricing policies affect student participation. Some smaller colleges will survive intact with the single, three-rank, tenure track model, but some may not. Most institutions--large and small, public and independent--will need part-time faculty and graduate instructors, and all will need people engaged in creating, disseminating, and applying knowledge in collaboration with the professoriate. Role differentiation will continue, but universities that accept the importance of the many roles will be those best prepared to succeed. The issues remains, however: what value will tenure have in this changing environment, what should privilege the faculty who hold tenure over those who do not, and what are the principles of involvement for professionals who are ineligible for tenure?

As suggested at the outset, the mission of the institution and unit is the most important factor in deciding the fate of future faculty roles. The work derived from mission should suggest the kinds, numbers, and types of faculty roles required to achieve the desired results at a level of quality and cost consistent with mission. Whether some or all academic appointees are tenured should be determined by these considerations and not the reverse. It is not likely that a university can succeed if it makes tenure a condition of its continuation without also explicitly and actively using tenure as the basis of academic citizenship. Making certain that we have an appropriate workforce for the mission of our institution requires that we use tenure intentionally as a strategy to attain shared objectives and to maintain a level of quality consistent with mission. Critics who equate tenure with privilege have simply failed to understand what a university is. To the extent

that we keep trying to answer the wrong question, we have failed to understand just how serious the threat to academic community really is.

The academic workforce will not become any less complex in the foreseeable future. While tenure may change, it is likely to change incrementally and to vary significantly among status and types of institutions. The key local questions are what part of the academic workforce will have tenure and how will their having it enhance an institution's ability to achieve its particular mission. All tenure is local for now, and there must be inherent value in awarding some faculty tenure and not others. But that value must be manifest to the whole community, especially those who do not have it.

The only claim for the special responsibility and protection of tenure is that those who seek and hold it are representative of both the entire academic workforce and the institution itself. When we say that faculty are a university's greatest resource or, more profoundly, that faculty are the university, then we are acknowledging the symbolic as well as practical role faculty play. Those who hold tenure are invested in all aspects of academic life. They are engaged in the discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge; they are accountable for their contributions in all aspects of this work; and they are accountable for the work of other members of the academic community. Tenured faculty represent the coherence, integrity, and unity of the institution they serve. When one of its members commits fraud, the whole community is shamed; when one of its members is recognized, the whole community is elevated.

Given the new education marketplace, the only institutional benefit to retaining tenure rests in the faculty's sense of responsibility, which reciprocates the institution's offering that protection. While market forces will require some level of academic freedom and economic security for most of the academic workforce, the added value of tenure must include additional

responsibility beyond ordinary accountability--including post-tenure review. Faculty should make clear to trustees that when tenure is awarded, it is also accepted, which is an affirmative action and not the receipt of a gift. We should consider establishing a formal exchange of commitment when tenure is awarded and accepted, and those universities which make explicit the relationship of mutual dependence may have the most solid foundation for sustaining quality in the face of competition. In many places, the awarding of tenure has become not only bureaucratic but impersonal. The official letter confirming tenure seldom reciprocates the effort put in to earning tenure. The lasting nature of the relationship between individual and community is thus often defined by the unintended symbolism of indifference. Faculty themselves can change this relationship by their first act of using tenure. They can accept it.

Using tenure may be the only way to preserve it. Tenured faculty can ensure academic freedom and economic security for all by setting standards for performance, holding all members of the academic workforce accountable, and taking actions to improve those who are not meeting their responsibilities. If any member of the workforce cannot advance the institution's mission and will not take the steps necessary to meet conditions of performance, then the tenured faculty must act for the welfare of all. Under these conditions, tenure is a necessity, not a luxury. As a matter of mutual dependence, tenure is also a commitment to renew faculty constantly through continuous professional development. Tenured faculty are renewed, not replaced, as institutional needs change.

In asking faculty to defend tenure's privileges, the enemies of higher education have directed us to questions that take society away from the fundamental issues--so they do not have to worry about answers. The fundamental questions confronting the public have more to do with how the nation will sustain its commitment to access to levels of education required for economic

and social stability, how it will sustain research that will fuel the next generation of prosperity, and how it will apply the experience, wisdom, and perspective of its most committed servants to advance society. The important questions confronting higher education have nothing to do with tenure or how many sections of undergraduates a professor teaches. By focusing on the right questions, both we and they can find the answers and, in so doing, sustain and advance higher education.

The author is grateful for the comments and suggestions of several colleagues who read drafts of this essay, especially Pat Hutchings, Carl Rothe, and Richard Turner.

¹Estimates abound. Depending on definitions and sample groups, almost any estimate can be defended. Perception, therefore, is at least as important as reality when discussing the national academic workforce; see, for example, the editorial comment in the June 29, 1997, New York Times.

²Thomas Pynchon, Gravity's Rainbow, New York: Viking, 1973, p. 251.

³George Will, "A Reliance on Insecure Educators," The Indianapolis Star, April 20, 1997.

⁴Will, "A Reliance on Insecure Educators."

⁵Mary Burgan, "More Faculty Members Question the Value of Tenure," The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 25, 1996, p. A13.

⁶Denise Magner, "A Fierce Battle Over Tenure at the University of Minnesota Comes to a Quiet Close," The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 20, 1997, p. A14.

⁷"The Nation: Faculty and Staff," The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue, September 2, 1996, p. 24.

⁸Several national professional organizations and disciplinary societies have collaborated to advance the concept of peer review of teaching, most notably the American Association of Higher Education's project, "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching." Similarly, AAHE with assistance from Kellogg and other foundations has encouraged a parallel study of evaluating and documenting professional service.

⁹"The Nation: Nine Issues Affecting Colleges," The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue, September 2, 1996, p. 12.

¹⁰Howard Tuckman, Jaime Caldwell, and William Vogler, "Part-Timers and the Academic Labor Market of the Eighties," in Part-Time Faculties Series, Washington D.C.: AAUP, 1978.

¹¹George Biles and Howard Tuckman, Part-Time Faculty Personnel Management Policies, New York: Macmillan, 1986, p. 11.

¹²See, for example, the chapter in this volume by Ann E. Austin and R. Eugene Rice, "Heading the New Voices: Views of the Tenure System and the Academic Workplace."

¹³"Attitudes and Characteristics of Freshmen, Fall 1995," The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue, September 2, 1996, p. 19.

¹⁴"The Nation: Faculty and Staff," The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue, September 2, 1996, p. 24. A new study completed in 1995-96 by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute further substantiates the basis for concern regarding the academic status of minorities.