DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 285 HE 027 147

TITLE	Enhancing Quality and Productivity in Illinois Higher Education: Faculty Roles and Responsibilities.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	8 Sep 93
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Administration; College Curriculum; *College Faculty; College Instruction; Educational Quality; *Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; *Personnel Selection; *Productivity; *Professional Development; Public Colleges; Strategic Planning; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

In 1991, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, working with Illinois colleges and universities, began an initiative to improve productivity, enhance quality, and refine priorities for higher education in Illinois. This initiative, commonly known as PQP, has focused to date on instructional research, public service, and administrative programs and activities. This report presents an overview and analysis of faculty activities and responsibilities. It summarizes information from a variety of studies and national and state reports that is intended to help institutions refine their priorities related to faculty roles and responsibilities. Specific topics discuss faculty responsibility and faculty characteristics at Illinois public institutions and studies concerning faculty workload. The report examines faculty and PQP in terms of improving productivity and quality, the impact of the curriculum and instructional methodologies, establishing priorities, hiring of faculty, and faculty promotion and compensation. The report concludes that productivity and quality improvements can be realized by modifying the policies and practices that govern the hiring, promotion, and compensation of faculty. Tables provide data for 1982, 1987, and 1992 Illinois public university faculty by tenure status, by rank, by full-time or part-time status, by racial/ethnic and gender characteristics, by institution, by estimated median undergraduate instructional hours, and by difficulty of receiving tenure. Appendices include a policy statement on faculty excellence in teaching and a 23-item bibliography. (GLR)

September 8, 1993

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

ENHANCING QUALITY AND PRODUCTIVITY IN ILLINOIS HIGHER EDUCATION: FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In October 1991, the Board of Higher Education, working with Illinois colleges and universities, began an initiative to improve productivity, enhance quality, and refine priorities for higher education in Illinois. This initiative, commonly known as P•Q•P, has focused to date on instructional, research, public service, and administrative programs and activities. As P•Q•P proceeds, however, it will be important to address academic functions that cut across various programs. This report offers an overview and analysis of the activities and responsibilities of faculty within such a context. The report does not offer recommendations at this point, but rather presents information from a wide variety of studies and national and state reports that is intended to help institutions refine their priorities related to faculty roles and responsibilities.

The insights and judgments of faculty--the individuals most closely connected with institutional programs and who teach, evaluate, and administer these programs--are critical in making decisions about institutional productivity and quality. Indeed, the quality, productivity, and priorities of a college or university are best revealed in its faculty's activities. Thus, a college or university's faculty determines, to a considerable degree, the character and quality of that institution, and a faculty's explicit and implicit priorities shape institutional development and progress. Since faculty salaries and related personnel expenses constitute a significant portion of a higher education institution's budget and resources, even small changes in faculty roles and responsibilities can have significant campus-wide impact.

College and university faculty have many roles and responsibilities encompassing instruction, research, and public service activities, and in some cases administrative responsibilities. Faculty at different institutions have varying emphases within these areas of responsibilities depending upon the college or university's educational mission and the types of students and clientele that they serve. In recent years, the Board of Higher Education has stressed the importance of the faculty's role in undergraduate education. This was an issue addressed by the Committee on the Study of Undergraduate Education, a special committee convened by the Board of Higher Education in 1985, and reconvened by the Board in 1989. Appendix I reproduces the Board of Higher Education's policies on faculty and excellence in teaching adopted at the recommendation of this committee. The policies show that the instructional challenges facing undergraduate education have increased in recent years, in part due to changes in the composition of the faculty and student body. The policies also recognize that teaching is affected by how faculty allocate their time between undergraduate and graduate instruction, and among instruction, research, and public service activities, as well as by various institutional practices in the areas of curriculum, mode of instruction, and faculty development.

A Board of Higher Education report, *Undergraduate Education: Learning and Teaching*, (January 1992), analyzed the reviews that community colleges and public universities conducted during previous years on undergraduate programs and efforts to improve undergraduate education. The Board's report described how public universities have enhanced learning, for example, through curriculum modifications and the strengthening of academic and support staff. The report noted that while faculty members have initiated projects or activities to improve teaching in their courses and departments, these activities primarily reflected individual department or faculty member initiatives.

It concluded that "the improvement of undergraduate education needs to be strengthened as a campus-wide priority".

Faculty Responsibilities

Higher education faculty generally have a mixture of responsibilities, involving instruction, research and public service, as well as administrative assignments particularly at the academic unit level. While not all faculty participate in sponsored research or public service projects, they are expected to engage in scholarship, remain current in their field, and pursue service activities. It is a fundamental premise of the organization of higher education that the specialized expertise that faculty members acquire during their years of graduate education has a variety of applications and audiences among students, academic and nonacademic specialists, and members of the public. Faculty activities are viewed as mutually supportive and reinforcing. For example, a faculty member shares and applies the results of his or her research through instruction and public service while receiving, in turn, stimulation and feedback from students and the public for further research and service activities.

Faculty spend most of their time in teaching and related activities. While faculty teaching loads are often expressed in credit hours, their instructional responsibilities extend far beyond their time in the classroom. Faculty, thus, resemble other professionals such as lawyers much of whose work occurs in preparation outside the public eye. Faculty instructional activities include class preparation, grading, advising, and new course development, as well as working with students on individual or group projects, theses, and dissertations. Faculty members are also active in the work of their departments and institutions, participating, for example, in program reviews, personnel reviews, accreditation reviews, and governance activities through the faculty senate or other department, college, and campus committees.

As academic specialists, faculty members are also involved in various research and public service activities that enable them to further develop and apply their knowledge. Many faculty members are affiliated with professional journals or members of professional associations and participate in workshops and conferences that establish standards and address issues within their disciplines. In addition, the mix of faculty time allocated to formalized research and public service varies according to institutional type and discipline. For example, doctoral and research university faculty are more actively engaged in research than are community college and liberal arts college faculty who spend more time teaching.

Faculty Characteristics at Illinois Public Institutions

College and university faculty carry out their responsibilities within long-established practices. Tenure, which is intended to protect a faculty member's academic freedom, is a key and unique feature of faculty organization. As shown in Table 1, considerable variation exists among the public universities both in the percentage of faculty in tenure track positions and in the percentage of faculty that has received tenure. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and Illinois State University have the lowest percentage of their faculties with tenure (50 percent) and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale has the lowest percentage of faculty on the tenure track (71 percent). Northeastern Illinois University has the highest percentage of tenured faculty (74 percent) and the highest percentage of faculty on the tenure track (94 percent). In total, 59 percent of all public university faculty in Illinois have tenure, and 80 percent are on the tenure track. Over the past decade, the percentage of tenured faculty has declined from 66 percent to 59 percent of all university faculty, while the percentage of faculty on the tenure track decreased from 89 percent to 80 percent. Correspondingly, the percentage of faculty outside the tenure process has increased from 11 percent to 20 percent in the past decade.

Faculty on the tenure track are generally categorized by academic rank. Junior faculty hold assistant professorships, many awaiting tenure review. Middle-level and senior faculty hold ranks of associate and full professor. Because of the increase in the number of faculty outside the tenure track,

the number and percentage of faculty at each professorial rank has fallen slightly over the past decade, as shown in Table 2.

Among public institutions, community colleges have a higher percentage of part-time faculty than do state universities, as shown in Table 3. Community colleges' greater use of part-time staff reflects their wide range of undergraduate, vocational, and adult education courses, and the fact that these institutions often utilize staff that are employed full time in the occupation that they teach. Over the past ten years, the number and percentage of part-time faculty has fluctuated at community colleges and decreased at public universities.

Faculty in Illinois and across the United States exhibit less diversity than the general population. As shown in Table 4, community college faculties are 42 percent female, and public university faculties are 30 percent female. Also, Table 4 shows that Blacks comprise four percent and Hispanics two percent of all Illinois public university faculty, with a higher percentage of Black representation at community colleges (10 percent). While female faculty representation has increased during the past decade at public universities, the percentage of Black and Hispanic faculty has remained relatively unchanged. In recent years, a number of institutions have established programs and funds to recruit and retain minority professors. The *Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly on Underrepresented Groups in Higher Education* will report in January 1994 on special institutional efforts to improve minority and female faculty representation.

In Illinois, faculty constitute 39 percent of all full-time community college employees and 27 percent of full-time public university employees, as shown in Table 5. Over the past decade, faculty have come to represent a smaller percentage of full-time higher education employees. At community colleges, for instance, faculty represented 47 percent of full-time employees in 1982, but only 39 percent of full-time employees in 1992. The employee category showing the largest growth in representation was "other professional employees" at public universities and support staff at community colleges. In some cases, professional and support staff have assumed responsibilities, such as advising, that faculty previously performed in earlier years. Table 6 shows the institutional affiliation of all public university faculty in Illinois. Institutional faculty size varies because of differences in student enrollment, and because faculty at some universities have major responsibilities in the areas of research and public service.

Studies of Faculty Workload

Many studies of faculty workload have been conducted over the years. Typically, these studies focus on one or more of the following questions: (1) How much time do faculty spend carrying out their responsibilities? (2) How do faculty distribute their efforts across research, service, instruction, and administrative activities? (3) Has the distribution of faculty activities changed significantly over time?

Three recent papers sponsored by the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) provide analyses of what is known about faculty workload, and also identify key studies that have examined faculty workload issues. These SHEEO reports are: *A Case Study of Faculty Workload Issues in Arizona: Implications for State Higher Education Policy* by Stephen M. Jordan and Daniel T. Layzell; *An Agenda for Reshaping Faculty Productivity* by Richard B. Heydinger and Hasan Simsek; and *Faculty Work and the Cost/Quality/Access Collision* by James R. Mingle.

These studies confirm earlier research results based upon faculty surveys that faculty work between 50-60 hours per week. Variations in these studies are probably due largely to different definitions, survey questions, and the institutions included in the survey samples. Any perception that faculty do not work very hard are probably more a function of the flexibility and unevenness in their schedules than other factors. In any case, there does not appear to be a basis for policy concerns

about level of faculty effort. Further self-reported studies of the amount of time faculty spend "on the job" do not appear to hold much promise for providing additional insights.

Faculty workload studies also demonstrate that the distribution of faculty effort among instruction, research, and public service activities varies largely by type of institution, with faculty in comprehensive and doctoral programs reporting approximately 50 percent of their time in instruction, faculty in liberal arts institutions and two-year colleges reporting somewhat greater than 50 percent in instruction, and faculty in research universities reporting somewhat less than 50 percent time spent in instruction. Other related findings are: faculty in the humanities tend to devote more time to teaching than do faculty in the sciences; faculty of higher rank (e.g., full professors) have lighter teaching loads than faculty at lower ranks (e.g., instructors and assistant professors); faculty of higher rank teach fewer hours at the undergraduate level than do faculty at lower ranks; and faculty with the largest teaching loads teach predominately undergraduate students.

Definitive answers to the question of whether faculty have significantly redistributed their efforts over time are difficult to document, primarily because of the differences in definitions and survey samples that studies have utilized over the past 30 to 40 years. Further, demands placed upon higher education in such areas as adult education, economic development and serving older and part-time students have changed over time, and have affected faculty effort.

Evidence indicates, however, that faculty are placing more emphasis on research and less on instruction, particularly undergraduate education. For example, three studies reported by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, spanning a fifteen-year period, examined the hours that full-time faculty spent per week in undergraduate instruction. The findings, shown in Table 7, indicate some reduction in the amount of time that faculty have allocated to teaching undergraduate courses. Perhaps, more significantly, Table 8 clearly shows an increasing orientation towards research at the expense of instruction. Particularly telling is the heightened perceptions of the pressures to publish reported by faculty at all baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, shown in Table 9. For example, in 1969, 19 percent of faculty at comprehensive universities reported that it was difficult to receive tenure if he or she did not publish. In contrast, by 1989, 65 percent of faculty at comprehensive universities reported that publishing was a prerequisite for tenure. Doctoral-granting institutions also showed a similar change, with the percentage of faculty stating that it was necessary to publish in order to receive tenure increasing from 55 percent in 1969 to 88 percent in 1989.

In summary, the major concern arising from analytical studies of faculty workload is that faculty are shifting their efforts in the direction of research and graduate education, and that recognition and incentives are the underlying cause of this redistribution of effort. It is not at all clear, however, that faculty prefer this shift. Many, indeed, would appear to choose teaching as their primary interest if the reward systems, both internal as well as external to the campus, would recognize teaching as the highest priority.

Faculty and P•Q•P

Improving Productivity and Quality

Faculty Roles and Responsibilities. Colleges and universities rely on a variety of traditional academic staffing practices to enhance productivity and control instructional costs. For instance, by hiring instructors and faculty outside the tenure track, by limiting the number of faculty who receive tenure and advance to the associate and full professorial level, and by hiring support staff to assume traditional faculty responsibilities such as in the area of advising, institutions can reduce costs through the substitution of lower salaried staff for higher salaried professors. Judicious use of such staffing practices has provided institutional diversity and vitality by ensuring some staff turnover and enlarging the teaching pool. However, overuse of these practices can have negative consequences by reducing the number of faculty that are committed to the institution's long-term success and that offer continuity in the educational process.

Some departments, colleges, and institutions have policies governing teaching loads that are intended to enhance productivity and maintain uniformity in teaching practices. Some accrediting agencies also have maximum workload standards. For example, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education states that "the teaching load of undergraduate faculty is no more than the equivalent of 12 semester hours; the teaching load of graduate faculty is no more than the equivalent of nine semester hours". Teaching load standards for faculty depend upon institutional mission, educational level, and academic discipline. Thus, faculty at research universities have lighter teaching loads in recognition of their additional research responsibilities than faculty at community colleges, whose mission is primarily instruction related. Teaching loads are also reduced when faculty take on significant, added responsibilities, such as administrative work within an academic department. Given that individual adjustments to faculty teaching loads are necessary because of the scope and complexity of higher education institutions, implementation of a faculty workload standard must be consistent with institutional efforts to prioritize faculty responsibilities. Ultimately, it is through individual decisions about faculty assignments and faculty release time at the departmental and college levels that institutional faculty workload standards are realized.

As discussed above, Illinois public institutions have made greater use of traditional academic staffing practices over the past decade in order to achieve greater cost efficiency. While staffing changes such as increased use of nontenured staff are part of normal campus management and vary according to institutional characteristics and needs, it would appear that budgetary cutbacks have increasingly constrained college and university's ability to continue to make such changes without seriously affecting instructional quality. Public concerns about instructional quality in higher education have already heightened in recent years. Critics have faulted the quality of education such as the rigor and coherence of the general education curriculum, the baccalaureate-level skills of undergraduates, and the limited exposure of undergraduates to faculty, especially in the freshman and sophomore years. Undoubtedly, tuition increases have intensified public criticism, as has the fact that students are paying more at the same time that graduates have encountered greater difficulty in finding suitable employment. Nevertheless, in this environment, it is imperative that higher education adopt productivity measures that support advancement in instructional quality and that college and universities develop strategies and P•Q•P initiatives that go beyond previous productivity improvement efforts. Making priority choices among instructional, research, and public service programs is one way to achieve both efficiency and quality objectives. Another way is to rethink fundamental functions and operations such as the allocation of faculty tasks and time and the wider curricular and instructional context in which faculty teach and work.

Shifting faculty responsibilities from graduate education and research to undergraduate education, particularly for public institutions that do not have a primary research mission, can improve both instructional productivity and quality at the undergraduate level. Faculty can allocate a greater proportion of their time to instruction through a reprioritization of their responsibilities or by productivity improvements in noninstructional areas. Many faculty apparently support such a shift. For example, Russell Edgerton in a paper recently published by the American Association for Higher Education, *The Reexamination of Faculty Priorities,* notes that at Syracuse University, faculty, department chairs, and deans were surveyed about their ideas on teaching and research. The results indicated "that each constituent group thought the university's priorities were tilted too heavily toward research. They also believed that their colleagues thought otherwise....The survey made the balance between teaching and research an issue for the entire campus. During the fall of 1990 and spring of 1991, 46 other research universities administered this survey. Every campus favored a reemphasis on teaching."

Improving productivity and quality can also result from more closely examining faculty work within instruction, research, and public service functions. For example, advising is one area that is often overlooked in reviewing instruction, perhaps because at many institutions faculty share advising duties with counselors and other support personnel. Nevertheless, effective advising can improve both student and institutional productivity by increasing retention and reducing the time needed to

complete academic programs. One campus-wide approach that reassesses faculty instructional roles and activities while implementing productivity and qualitative improvement involves use of the popular business management strategy, Total Quality Management, or TQM. TQM was conceived by W. Edwards Deming and followed by many Japanese corporations, and increasingly by American corporations, in the decades after the second world war. TQM emphasizes teamwork, serving the customer, and close examination and evaluation of basic organizational purposes and processes. Some institutions have applied TQM to their administrative operations. Other institutions are beginning to apply TQM in academic units.

As the experience of implementing TQM has shown, reassessing traditional roles and work can reenergize a faculty and yield productivity results. This also is the case in the area of research where institutional expectations may not reflect the primary teaching responsibilities and interests of most faculty members. For example, a national survey of college and university faculty by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found that 56 percent of all faculty had never published or edited a book, and 26 percent had never published an article. Only 28 percent had published 11 or more articles during their academic careers. Ernest Boyer's book, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, represents a successful and influential attempt to reconceptualize the diverse research roles and responsibilities of faculty in a way that supports greater faculty involvement in teaching, and helps shift somewhat the balance among faculty responsibilities. Boyer has replaced the term research with the broader notion of scholarship, which he divides into four parts: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of pedagogy. Boyer advocates that institutions should fully recognize and reward faculty scholarship of each kind. He also suggests that academic disciplines should more highly value scholarship of application and pedagogy in the publication of articles and books and the awarding of grant proposals. Many colleges and universities have incorporated or are reviewing Boyer's ideas for use at their campus.

Greater appreciation of the wide range of faculty scholarship and the relationship between research and instruction should have a qualitative emphasis. Concerns have arisen in recent years that pressures to publish were affecting research quality. An exponential growth in monographs and, especially, journal articles has produced criticism that quantity was overemphasized both in research production and in faculty tenure and other evaluations, resulting in what Donald Kennedy, former president of Stanford University, has called the "overproduction of routine scholarship". The tendency to measure research productivity through quantitative measures encourages faculty, and especially junior faculty preparing for tenure review, to allocate more time to research activities. Perhaps equally important, faculty may lack the time to devote to the "scholarship of integration" and the "scholarship of pedagogy" that are necessary to develop the broad-based and integrative concepts required for effective undergraduate teaching and learning. Institutional overemphasis on faculty publications encourages faculty to structure their teaching to conform to specialized research interests and, thus, to teach, for inappropriate reasons, on the margins of their discipline. It also discourages faculty from pursuing more imaginative and long-range research projects that do not yield immediate, publishable results. Many faculty share public concerns that institutions overemphasize research. A national survey of faculty by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching conducted in 1989 found that one-third of faculty believed that current emphasis on the pressure to publish "reduces the quality of teaching".

Faculty should be viewed as an asset which matures over time as opposed to a static resource; that is, as an asset that can yield higher productivity if properly supported and developed. When faculty are viewed in this context, it brings an enhanced perspective to various institutional programs, particularly those involving instructional training and staff development. For instance, Leo Lambert in *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach* advocates that institutions should establish coordinated programs for young instructional faculty, starting with teaching assistants. He writes: "typically the eight to ten years that encompass graduate (usually doctoral) preparation and the first years as an assistant professor should be regarded as a continuum of professional preparation for teaching and

that for each of its stages (e.g., new teaching assistant, experienced graduate student, new faculty member) institutions should have a program in place appropriate to that level. For example, at each stage faculty or graduate students should be assigned to teaching responsibilities appropriate to that level; be provided with a teaching mentor; participate in professional development seminars with peers; receive incentives and rewards for excellence; and, perhaps most basic, have regular opportunities to talk with colleagues, both inside and outside their discipline, about teaching." The purpose of these programs should be to make demonstrated capability in teaching as important a requirement for Ph.D. students and new faculty as demonstrated capability to carry out research.

Institutions can also enhance productivity through faculty development and early retirement programs. For example, sabbatical leaves are typically structured as half-time leaves for an entire academic year or full-time leaves for a semester. However, such time patterns may not serve equally well diverse faculty interests encompassing, for example, a cognitive scientist, a faculty member researching superconductivity, and a professor of French literature. Some fields of study require sustained involvement with archives that are located at remote sites, while others require interdisciplinary interaction with colleagues, and still others place a premium on being aware of and involved in leading-edge developments over very compressed time frames. Faculty development must be tailored to the needs of individual faculty members, and colleges and universities should recognize that these differ widely.

The Impact of the Curriculum and Instructional Methodologies. In addition to issues directly related to faculty roles and responsibilities, institutions should also examine the wider instructional and curricular contexts in which faculty work and how this environment affects faculty quality and productivity. Although this constitutes a broad area of examination, a number of recent reports address this topic. For example, William F. Massy and Robert Zemsky in *Faculty Discretionary Time: Departments and the Academic Rachet,* a paper published by the Pew Higher Education Research Program, suggest that a tighter undergraduate curriculum that better reflects faculty consensus on the courses that undergraduates need would constitute an advancement for higher education, both academically and financially. The authors criticize what they call the "destructuring of the curriculum" which they claim has occurred over the past two decades and has "resulted in fewer required courses, less emphasis on taking courses in an ordered sequence, and greater reliance on students to develop their own sense of how the various bits and pieces of knowledge they acquire in the classroom fit together into a coherent picture... (M)oreover, the destructuring of the curriculum has had important economic consequences in terms of course proliferation and the need to hire a larger faculty."

The manner in which courses are organized and delivered also has fundamental implications for instructional productivity. Most courses in higher education are structured around some combination of lecture, laboratory, and/or discussion formats. Further, courses are typically scheduled for one to two hours per day, several times per week during a 15 to 20 week semester. Large lecture sections are most frequently offered at the lower-division level where large numbers of students enroll in courses meeting general education requirements. Faculty work is, of course, organized around these patterns and faculty and student productivity is to some degree determined by these course schedules. Thus, opportunities may exist to improve productivity by changing course patterns, and by varying faculty roles through the use of instructional technology.

As telecommunication and computer systems become simultaneously more sophisticated, cost-effective, and user-friendly, these technologies will be increasingly integrated into instructional delivery systems. These systems have the potential to make faculty more accessible to students, to open a wider range of teaching techniques, and to provide greater flexibility in the use of student and faculty time. Computer and telecommunication networks are also rapidly expanding access to information resources and creating links among students and faculty across the campus, nation, and world.

Students and faculty, of course, will have to learn how to use these technologies effectively. Teaching techniques and course content need to be adapted to these new technologies and it will be

important for colleges and universities to support faculty development programs in order to capitalize fully upon opportunities to improve instructional quality and productivity.

Establishing Priorities

There are a variety of strategies, programs, and policies from which higher education institutions can choose in order to enhance faculty productivity and quality. Different types of institutions will necessarily establish different priorities in this process. Because hiring, tenure, promotion, and compensation policies have a powerful influence on faculty behavior, all institutions should examine and reconsider how their policies and practices in these areas affect undergraduate teaching as well as instructional quality and productivity.

Institutions should restructure faculty rewards and incentives in ways that respond to faculty short-term and long-term needs. Faculty like other professionals seek to further their careers within the norms of a national market. The success of institutional efforts, therefore, in part will depend on the ability to develop promotion and compensation policies that enhance faculty advancement and mobility beyond campus boundaries. Over the past few decades, studies have shown that faculty loyalties to their discipline have strengthened while institutional ties have weakened, thereby, reinforcing faculty emphases on research. Recently, however, a number of academic associations, prodded by new notions of scholarship, have begun a reexamination of their research focus. At the same time, many colleges and universities have modified their tenure and compensation policies to place greater emphasis upon teaching. These changes have been possible, in large part, because of faculty dissatisfaction with current promotion and compensation practices. For example, the 1989 survey of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found that 68 percent of all faculty believed that their institutions needed "better ways, besides publications, to evaluate the scholarly performance of the faculty." Dissatisfaction was particularly high at comprehensive institutions, where faculty have primarily instructional responsibilities but have encountered increasing emphasis upon research in compensation and promotion decisions, as shown in Table 9.

Establishing effective priorities to enhance faculty quality and productivity requires a supportive institutional climate and mechanisms that facilitate implementation. Institutional leadership is essential to implement change, and some of the most far-reaching reforms that have occurred throughout the United State have developed from plans and strategies of institutional leaders and campus-wide committees. Within this reform process, national studies and many institutions are increasingly emphasizing the role played by academic departments. It is at the department level that final decisions are made on faculty responsibilities, rewards and evaluation mechanisms, and the allocation of instructional, research, and public service assignments. Some writers even have argued that institutions should allocate rewards and incentives based upon department performance standards, thereby enabling the department to set faculty responsibilities and work in accordance with institutional objectives. To support institutional change, as well to promote new and effective ways to help faculty and administrators address issues related to faculty priorities, the American Association of Higher Education has undertaken a three-year project on faculty roles and rewards. The association is interested, in particular, in developing ideas and proposals that seek to refocus "faculty work assignments and rewards on teams and academic units (such as departments) rather than on individual faculty members."

Hiring. The first indication of an institution's priorities for its faculty occurs at the point of employment, and hiring decisions, in the aggregate, have significant long-range implications for both the quality and the direction of the institution. In the immediate future, colleges and universities should experience greater faculty turnover due to the increasing number of faculty over fifty years of age. The current state of the academic job market suggests that many different types of institutions, including comprehensive universities, will be able to hire as assistant professors Ph.D. graduates from the most prestigious research universities. The prospect of the infusion of talented new faculty presents a tremendous opportunity. However, colleges and universities will need to carefully recruit, hire, and mentor assistant professors who are truly interested and prepared to teach and are

responsive to institutional mission. Hiring processes should be reexamined, and if necessary changed, to accomplish these objectives. For example, a committee at Northwestern University has proposed that each department that recommends a candidate for a faculty appointment must demonstrate that the prospective faculty member has the potential to become an excellent teacher. Public universities should incorporate similar criteria in their recruitment process, and reexamine the importance placed on teaching in hiring decisions.

Promotion and Compensation. The emphasis on research shown during tenure review and other faculty evaluation processes has contributed in recent decades to a shift away from instruction. Indeed, some claim that there is now a mismatch between what most faculty do (that is, teach) and how they are evaluated. It is claimed that the faculty reward system undervalues instruction since teaching is difficult to evaluate. In part, promotion and compensation processes reward research because criteria exist such as book publications and articles published in referred journals, to weigh its value. While evaluating teaching may be more subjective than evaluating research, institutions should work to improve their faculty evaluation processes. One way this can be accomplished is by establishing a portfolio for each faculty member that documents his or her instructional contributions and performance. These portfolios can incorporate a broad range of instructional activity. The University of Kentucky, for example, requires a "Teaching and Advising Portfolio" with specific guidelines for information about advising. To date, a number of institutions have reported that the use of portfolios has allowed them to make more informed decisions about the quality of faculty teaching, while at the same time sustaining progress and interest across the campus in improving undergraduate education.

Peer review of faculty teaching is another way to improve institutional evaluation processes. Lee Shulman of Stanford University offers perhaps the most persuasive and insightful case for peer review. Shulman argues that the inadequate reward system for instruction at many institutions is a consequence of the private context of teaching. Shulman advocates that teaching will receive the prestige now frequently reserved for research once it becomes the "public property" of a common group of scholars. Peer review also offers a needed counterweight to student course reviews. While students are capable of assessing faculty abilities in some areas, such as the clarity and impact of a presentation, they are not as qualified to judge other aspects of teaching, such as the appropriateness of material to a subject or course level. A number of institutions, including the University of California System, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Cornell University, and Northwestern University are considering incorporating peer reviews into faculty evaluation processes.

Institutions should also reexamine the criteria used for evaluating research in tenure reviews and other faculty evaluation processes. As noted above, the tremendous increase in the volume of new research has elicited concerns about whether research quantity now overshadows research quality in faculty work. These concerns are shared by many faculty members. The 1989 survey by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching found that more than one-third of all faculty believed that publications "are just counted and not qualitatively measured" during faculty evaluations. Institutional incentives that reward research quantity encourage faculty members to shift their efforts away from their teaching responsibilities and to conceptualize and arrange their research activities to maximize publication opportunities. To facilitate and support high quality research, Stanford University has instituted limits on the number of research products and publications that departments can consider during each tenure review.

In reviewing faculty research, institutions also should formally recognize a broad range of scholarship. All institutions, and in particular those that have mainly an undergraduate teaching mission, should encourage the development of criteria and quality standards for evaluating and rewarding scholarship in the areas of integration, application, and pedagogy. Defining and recognizing broader definitions of scholarship will necessarily require the active involvement of academic colleges and departments. Russell Edgerton in *The Reexamination of Faculty Priorities* concludes that departments are most likely to undertake such a far-reaching review when it occurs as part of a broad

institutional effort. Edgerton reports that colleges and universities that have committed themselves to such a process have achieved some success. "At Syracuse University, for example, faculty are generating department-specific definitions of scholarship and then discussing these across the university. The exchange, especially between faculty in disciplines and professions, is heightening sensitivity to the many definitions of excellence that are imbedded in various academic fields and heightening self-consciousness among faculty about the definitions of worth that operate in their own field."

In faculty review processes and in promotion and compensation decisions, institutions should adopt policies that encourage faculty professional growth and that coordinate faculty responsibilities with individual preferences and changes in preferences over a faculty member's career. Adapting individual assignments can take many forms. One widely discussed approach would establish separate tenure tracks with different emphases on instruction, research, and public service. A faculty member, in consultation with his or her campus/academic unit, determines which track he or she will pursue, and be evaluated on, at the point of recruitment and hiring (with provisions for changing tracks at appropriate points by mutual agreement). Policy limits can be placed upon the number of faculty in each track based upon institutional mission. Another version of this concept would establish post-tenure contracts through which individual faculty in combination with their academic units decide upon the mix of instruction, research, and public service activities that they will pursue, and be evaluated on, over a three to five-year period.

Finally, institutions are encouraged to reexamine their promotion and compensation decisions to ensure that high quality teaching is well rewarded. Institutions should also reevaluate their policies and incentives for faculty advising and for other instructional activities such as working with students from underrepresented groups. Good teachers should expect to receive higher increases in compensation and promotion, particularly at institutions that primarily have an instructional mission. Promotions to endowed chairs, as well as to senior positions, should also demonstrate the institutions' commitment to excellence in teaching. Good teachers are an important institutional resource, and colleges and universities can take advantage of their collective expertise in many ways. For example, institutions can organize faculty recognized for their teaching accomplishments in a campus-wide committee or a teaching center that leads or directs efforts to improve undergraduate education.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Higher education, like many other institutions, has become broader in scope and more complex in function over recent decades. However, it is still the case that the work and accomplishments of colleges and universities are identified with the activities of their faculties and that the contributions of other employees are seen as helping to support and sustain faculty success. In the prominence of this one professional group, higher education resembles perhaps medicine, but few other large institutions or industries. The activities and responsibilities of the faculty are essential to the functions of higher education and have implications for the productivity and quality of the enterprise.

This report has examined the role and work of faculty within a P•Q•P context. The report has emphasized, in particular, that significant productivity and qualitative improvements are possible if institutions closely examine and modify existing faculty roles and responsibilities. Institutional decisions should reflect the mission, strengths, and needs of individual campuses. However, all institutions should address faculty roles and responsibilities, examining activities both across and within instruction, research, and public service functions, the development of faculty as an asset to the institution, and the curricular and methodological environments in which faculty work. The report concludes that productivity and quality improvements can be realized by modifying the policies and practices that govern the hiring, promotion, and compensation of faculty. institutions should ensure that changes in policies and practices governing faculty rewards and incentives encourage and strengthen efforts to improve undergraduate education.

It is the Board of Higher Education's expectation that the issue of faculty roles and responsibilities will be given thorough attention by Illinois higher education in the coming year. In November 1993, the Board staff will present, as part of the P•Q•P process, recommendations for 1993-94 follow-up activities in this area to enhance the quality and productivity of higher education and improve undergraduate education in the state. Board staff will develop these recommendations in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee and Illinois colleges and universities.

The Board's plans for 1993-94 regarding faculty will be targeted at the statewide, system, and institutional levels and will address the following topics: faculty roles and responsibilities across and within instruction, research, and public service functions; faculty development; the relationship between the curriculum and instructional methodologies and faculty quality and productivity; and faculty hiring, evaluation, promotion, and compensation policies and practices. Recommendations are intended to be broad in scope and to encourage the development of multi-year statewide, system, and institutional plans to define and implement strategies and priorities to improve undergraduate education as well as instructional quality and productivity.

On the statewide level, for instance, recommendations might consider instituting pilot projects to test and demonstrate the opportunities discussed in this report. Such projects might include supporting faculty development of discipline-based standards in the areas of the scholarship of application and scholarship of pedagogy for use in evaluations, or efforts to demonstrate and enhance the interrelationship between undergraduate teaching excellence and research. Statewide recommendations might also consider establishing budget policies with differential salary increases for instruction, research, and public service activities performed by faculty with the highest priority placed on undergraduate instruction. On the system level, recommendations could consider how governing board personnel policies affect teaching excellence. On the institutional level, public colleges and universities might review and select the combination of alternatives presented in this report that are best suited to advancing undergraduate education at their institution, and develop a strategy for implementation over the next two to three years that identifies associated reallocation funding and requested budget support. Specific recommendations to carry out these and other activities identified through consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee and Illinois colleges and universities will be recommended to the Illinois Board of Higher Education at its November 1993 meeting.

Table 1

FULL–TIME PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY
BY TENURE STATUS

Institution	1982		1987		1992	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Chicago State Univ.						
Tenure Track Faculty	233	84.4 %	257	86.0 %	240	80.3 %
Tenured	145	52.5	173	57.9	173	57.9
Awaiting Review	88	31.9	84	28.1	67	22.4
Other Faculty	43	15.6	42	14.0	59	19.7
Total	276	100.0	299	100.0	299	100.0
Eastern Illinois Univ.*						
Tenure Track Faculty	453	100.0	446	100.0	458	84.8
Tenured	329	72.6	291	65.2	304	56.3
Awaiting Review	124	27.4	155	34.8	154	28.5
Other Faculty	0	0.0	0	0.0	82	15.2
Total	453	100.0	446	100.0	540	100.0
Governors State Univ.						
Tenure Track Faculty	131	87.3	125	94.0	123	91.1
Tenured	76	50.7	91	68.4	95	70.4
Awaiting Review	55	36.7	34	25.6	28	20.7
Other Faculty	19	12.7	8	6.0	12	8.9
Total	150	100.0	133	100.0	135	100.0
Northeastern Illinois Univ.						
Tenure Track Faculty	314	97.5	328	93.2	300	93.8
Tenured	254	78.9	252	71.6	236	73.8
Awaiting Review	60	18.6	76	21.6	64	20.0
Other Faculty	8	2.5	24	6.8	20	6.3
Total	322	100.0	352	100.0	320	100.0
Western Illinois Univ.						
Tenure Track Faculty	565	86.4	527	80.6	525	80.2
Tenured	434	66.4	406	62.1	384	58.6
Awaiting Review	131	20.0	121	18.5	141	21.5
Other Faculty	89	13.6	127	19.4	130	19.8
Total	654	100.0	654	100.0	655	100.0
Illinois State Univ.						
Tenure Track Faculty	713	72.3	743	78.3	703	73.8
Tenured	546	55.4	567	59.7	479	50.3
Awaiting Review	167	16.9	176	18.5	224	23.5
Other Faculty	273	27.7	206	21.7	250	26.2
Total	986	100.0	949	100.0	953	100.0
Northern Illinois Univ.						
Tenure Track Faculty	879	84.5	832	80.7	819	79.7
Tenured	668	64.2	584	56.6	583	56.8
Awaiting Review	211	20.3	248	24.1	236	23.0
Other Faculty	161	15.5	199	19.3	208	20.3
Total	1,040	100.0	1,031	100.0	1,027	100.0
Sangamon State Univ.						
Tenure Track Faculty	170	93.4	140	95.9	154	92.2
Tenured	89	48.9	100	68.5	106	63.5
Awaiting Review	81	44.5	40	27.4	48	28.7
Other Faculty	12	6.6	6	4.1	13	7.8
Total	182	100.0	146	100.0	167	100.0

Table 1 (Continued)

FULL–TIME PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY
BY TENURE STATUS

Institution	1982		1987		1992	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
SIU at Carbondale						
Tenure Track Faculty	1,059	81.3 %	935	77.6 %	964	70.6 %
Tenured	706	54.2	662	54.9	679	49.7
Awaiting Review	353	27.1	273	22.7	285	20.9
Other Faculty	243	18.7	270	22.4	401	29.4
Total	1,302	100.0	1,205	100.0	1,365	100.0
SIU at Edwardsville						
Tenure Track Faculty	451	87.7	393	88.9	388	89.0
Tenured	385	74.9	302	68.3	282	64.7
Awaiting Review	66	12.8	91	20.6	106	24.3
Other Faculty	63	12.3	49	11.1	48	11.0
Total	514	100.0	442	100.0	436	100.0
Univ. of Illinois–Chicago						
Tenure Track Faculty	1,469	93.6	1,437	79.8	1,320	74.8
Tenured	994	63.4	1,024	56.9	971	55.0
Awaiting Review	475	30.3	413	22.9	349	19.8
Other Faculty	100	6.4	364	20.2	445	25.2
Total	1,569	100.0	1,801	100.0	1,765	100.0
Univ. of Illinois–Urbana						
Tenure Track Faculty	2,256	98.7	2,178	83.7	2,098	84.3
Tenured	1,766	77.3	1,702	65.4	1,620	65.1
Awaiting Review	490	21.4	476	18.3	478	19.2
Other Faculty	30	1.3	425	16.3	391	15.7
Total	2,286	100.0	2,603	100.0	2,489	100.0
ALL UNIVERSITY TOTAL						
Tenure Track Faculty	8,693	89.3	8,341	82.9	8,092	80.4
Tenured	6,392	65.7	6,154	61.2	5,912	58.7
Awaiting Review	2,301	23.6	2,187	21.7	2,180	21.6
Other Faculty	1,041	10.7	1,720	17.1	1,978	19.6
Total	9,734	100.0	10,061	100.0	10,070	100.0

• New reporting methodology instituted in 1992

Source: Board of Higher Education, EEO–6 Survey

Table 2

FULL-TIME PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY
BY RANK

Institution	1982		1987		1992	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Chicago State Univ.						
Professor	85	30.8 %	109	36.5 %	120	40.1 %
Associate Professor	71	25.7	70	23.4	61	20.4
Assistant Professor	63	22.8	65	21.7	74	24.7
Instructor/Lecturer	28	10.1	55	18.4	0	0.0
Other	29	10.5	0	0.0	44	14.7
Total	276	100.0	299	100.0	299	100.0
Eastern Illinois Univ.*						
Professor	184	40.6	164	36.8	164	30.4
Associate Professor	116	25.6	139	31.2	158	29.3
Assistant Professor	126	27.8	121	27.1	139	25.7
Instructor/Lecturer	27	6.0	22	4.9	79	14.6
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	453	100.0	446	100.0	540	100.0
Governors State Univ.						
Professor	133	88.7	126	94.7	135	100.0
Associate Professor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Assistant Professor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Instructor/Lecturer	16	10.7	7	5.3	0	0.0
Other	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	150	100.0	133	100.0	135	100.0
Northeastern Illinois Univ.						
Professor	132	41.0	151	42.9	133	41.6
Associate Professor	81	25.2	71	20.2	80	25.0
Assistant Professor	91	28.3	103	29.3	86	26.9
Instructor/Lecturer	18	5.6	27	7.7	21	6.6
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	322	100.0	352	100.0	320	100.0
Western Illinois Univ.						
Professor	213	32.6	227	34.7	239	36.5
Associate Professor	194	29.7	166	25.4	157	24.0
Assistant Professor	155	23.7	136	20.8	131	20.0
Instructor/Lecturer	75	11.5	88	13.5	93	14.2
Other	17	2.6	37	5.7	35	5.3
Total	654	100.0	654	100.0	655	100.0
Illinois State Univ.						
Professor	261	26.5	268	28.2	274	28.8
Associate Professor	230	23.3	225	23.7	198	20.8
Assistant Professor	314	31.8	240	25.3	273	28.6
Instructor/Lecturer	100	10.1	5	0.5	11	1.2
Other	81	8.2	211	22.2	197	20.7
Total	986	100.0	949	100.0	953	100.0

Table 2 (Continued)

FULL-TIME PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY
BY RANK

Institution	1982		1987		1992	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Northern Illinois Univ.						
Professor	324	31.2 %	301	29.2 %	306	29.8 %
Associate Professor	288	27.7	268	26.0	254	24.7
Assistant Professor	274	26.3	278	27.0	287	27.9
Instructor/Lecturer	140	13.5	158	15.3	147	14.3
Other	14	1.3	26	2.5	33	3.2
Total	1,040	100.0	1,031	100.0	1,027	100.0
Sangamon State Univ.						
Professor	36	19.8	39	26.7	55	32.9
Associate Professor	75	41.2	69	47.3	63	37.7
Assistant Professor	62	34.1	33	22.6	43	25.7
Instructor/Lecturer	9	4.9	1	0.7	3	1.8
Other	0	0.0	4	2.7	3	1.8
Total	182	100.0	146	100.0	167	100.0
SIU at Carbondale						
Professor	263	20.2	273	22.7	295	21.6
Associate Professor	309	23.7	310	25.7	319	23.4
Assistant Professor	520	39.9	450	37.3	493	36.1
Instructor/Lecturer	195	15.0	172	14.3	257	18.8
Other	15	1.2	0	0.0	1	0.1
Total	1,302	100.0	1,205	100.0	1,365	100.0
SIU at Edwardsville						
Professor	181	35.2	156	35.3	151	34.6
Associate Professor	152	29.6	119	26.9	106	24.3
Assistant Professor	100	19.5	97	21.9	110	25.2
Instructor/Lecturer	76	14.8	65	14.7	60	13.8
Other	5	1.0	5	1.1	9	2.1
Total	514	100.0	442	100.0	436	100.0
Univ. of Illinois-Chicago						
Professor	437	27.9	482	26.8	506	28.7
Associate Professor	479	30.5	533	29.6	477	27.0
Assistant Professor	552	35.2	554	30.8	516	29.2
Instructor/Lecturer	101	6.4	163	9.1	51	2.9
Other	0	0.0	69	3.8	215	12.2
Total	1,569	100.0	1,801	100.0	1,765	100.0
Univ. of Illinois-Urbana						
Professor	1,035	45.3	1,068	41.0	1,028	41.3
Associate Professor	648	28.3	647	24.9	618	24.8
Assistant Professor	587	25.7	633	24.3	581	23.3
Instructor/Lecturer	16	0.7	73	2.8	14	0.6
Other	0	0.0	182	7.0	248	10.0
Total	2,286	100.0	2,603	100.0	2,489	100.0
ALL UNIVERSITY TOTAL						
Professor	3,284	33.7	3,364	33.4	3,271	32.5
Associate Professor	2,643	27.2	2,617	26.0	2,491	24.7
Assistant Professor	2,844	29.2	2,710	26.9	2,720	27.0
Instructor/Lecturer	801	8.2	836	8.3	668	6.6
Other	162	1.7	534	5.3	920	9.1
Total	9,734	100.0	10,061	100.0	10,070	100.0

* New reporting methodology instituted in 1992

Source: Board of Higher Education, EE0-6 Survey

Table 3

PUBLIC UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY
FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME

	1982		1987		1992	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Public University						
Full Time	9,734	76.0 %	10,061	77.0 %	10,070	78.1 %
Part Time	3,082	24.0	3,001	23.0	2,824	21.9
Total	12,816	100.0	13,062	100.0	12,894	100.0
Community College						
Full Time	5,592	30.7	5,160	33.7	4,985	27.3
Part Time	12,620	69.3	10,139	66.3	13,285	72.7
Total	18,212	100.0	15,299	100.0	18,270	100.0

Source: Board of Higher Education, EEO-5 Survey

Table 4

CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL–TIME PUBLIC INSTITUTION FACULTY, 1992

	Public Universities		Community Colleges	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Racial/Ethnic				
White	8,734	86.7 %	4,326	86.8 %
Black	373	3.7	485	9.7
Hispanic	193	1.9	47	0.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	740	7.3	119	2.4
Native American	30	0.3	8	0.2
Total	10,070	100.0	4,985	100.0
Gender				
Male	7,048	70.0 %	2,916	58.5 %
Female	3,022	30.0	2,069	41.5
Total	10,070	100.0	4,985	100.0

Source: Board of Higher Education, EEO–6 Survey

Table 5

FULL–TIME PERSONNEL
AT ILLINOIS PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Sector	1982		1987		1992	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Public Universities						
Faculty	9,734	28.2 %	10,061	28.3 %	10,070	26.9 %
Executive/Administrative	2,287	6.6	2,606	7.3	2,875	7.7
Other Professional	5,427	15.7	6,557	18.5	7,444	19.9
Clerical	7,550	21.9	7,521	21.2	7,829	20.9
Support	9,494	27.5	8,768	24.7	9,187	24.6
Total	34,492	100.0	35,513	100.0	37,405	100.0
Community Colleges						
Faculty	5,592	47.2	5,160	41.7	4,985	39.1
Executive/Administrative	1,093	9.2	1,197	9.7	1,273	10.0
Other Professional	901	7.6	1,224	9.9	1,278	10.0
Clerical	2,442	20.6	2,532	20.5	2,824	22.2
Support	1,809	15.3	2,247	18.2	2,387	18.7
Total	11,837	100.0	12,360	100.0	12,747	100.0

Source: Board of Higher Education, EEO–6 Survey

Table 6

FULL–TIME PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY
BY INSTITUTION

Institution	1982		1987		1992	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Board of Governors						
Chicago State University	276	2.8 %	299	3.0 %	299	3.0 %
Eastern Illinois University	453	4.7	446	4.4	459	4.6
Governors State University	150	1.5	133	1.3	135	1.3
Northeastern Illinois University	322	3.3	352	3.5	320	3.2
Western Illinois University	654	6.7	654	6.5	655	6.5
Total	1,855	19.1	1,884	18.7	1,868	18.6
Board of Regents						
Illinois State University	986	10.1	949	9.4	953	9.5
Northern Illinois University	1,040	10.7	1,031	10.2	1,027	10.2
Sangamon State University	182	1.9	146	1.5	167	1.7
Total	2,208	22.7	2,126	21.1	2,147	21.3
Southern Illinois University						
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	1,302	13.4	1,205	12.0	1,365	13.6
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	514	5.3	442	4.4	436	4.3
Total	1,816	18.7	1,647	16.4	1,801	17.9
University of Illinois						
University of Illinois at Chicago	1,569	16.1	1,801	17.9	1,765	17.5
University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana*	2,286	23.5	2,603	25.9	2,489	24.7
Total	3,855	39.6	4,404	43.8	4,254	42.2
All University Total	9,734	100.0	10,061	100.0	10,070	100.0

*Includes faculty of the University of Illinois without a campus designation--35 in 1982, 37 in 1988, and 38 in 1992.

Source: Board of Higher Education, EEO–6 Survey

Table 7

ESTIMATED MEDIAN FACULTY UNDERGRADUATE
INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS PER WEEK*

Institutional Type	1975	1984	1989
Research	3.4-3.8	3.4-3.6	2.6-3.8
Doctorate-granting	5.6-6.0	5.5-5.7	4.6-6.4
Comprehensive	9.6-9.8	9.2-9.3	8.4-8.4
Liberal Arts	9.7-9.9	9.5-9.6	9.2-9.6
Two-year	13.8-13.9	14.2-14.3	13.7-14.6
All Respondents	8.9-9.3	7.7-9.0	8.4-9.2

* Full-Time Faculty

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Table 8

PERCENT OF FULL-TIME SURVEYED FACULTY REPORTING
THAT THEIR INTEREST LEANED TOWARD TEACHING

Institutional Type	1969	1975	1984	1989
Research	57%	49%	39%	36%
Doctorate-granting	71	66	63	57
Comprehensive	86	84	75	78
Liberal Arts	90	85	85	84
Two-Year	95	94	92	93
All Respondents	76	75	70	72

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Table 9

PERCENT OF FULL-TIME SURVEYED FACULTY REPORTING THAT IT IS DIFFICULT FOR A PERSON TO RECEIVE TENURE IF HE/WHE DOES NOT PUBLISH

Institutional Type	1969	1975	1984	1989
Research	74%	86%	92%	94%
Doctorate-granting	55	67	85	88
Comprehensive	19	33	54	65
Liberal Arts	18	22	35	39
Two-Year	6	9	8	7
All Respondents	41	46	55	59

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

APPENDIX I

POLICIES ON FACULTY EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

1. Colleges and universities should give increased attention to the emerging challenges to faculty and excellence in teaching: the changing composition of the faculty, new roles for faculty members, the changing characteristics of the student body, and new methods for the delivery of instruction. Each college and university should also give increased attention to keeping the public informed about its mission and priorities and its commitment to excellence in teaching and to undergraduate education.

2. Each college and university should assure that faculty members are well prepared to teach. Doctoral degree-granting institutions should provide supervised teaching opportunities to develop the teaching skills of graduate students who plan academic careers. Colleges and universities should also make special efforts to emphasize the importance of instruction in orientation programs for new faculty members, to assist classroom instructors in developing their teaching skills, and to integrate part-time faculty members into the academic processes of the institution.

3. Proficient scholar-teachers are essential to the improvement of undergraduate education. Each faculty member should engage in scholarship and keep abreast of developments in the discipline through such activities as continuing study in the discipline and related disciplines, designing new courses, authoring works that synthesize and clarify developments in the field, or participating in professional activities, as well as through research and creative activity. Each faculty member should also keep abreast of developments in teaching techniques and in the teaching and learning process.

4. Faculties and their institutions should jointly develop the means to support continuous opportunities for faculty members to grow and develop in their instructional and scholarly roles. Opportunities should be provided not only for course and curriculum development, but also for the improvement of instructional strategies and the incorporation of baccalaureate-level skills (i.e., communication, mathematical, and critical and analytical thinking skills) into baccalaureate coursework. Faculty members should also be assisted in seeking formal and informal feedback from peers and students on teaching effectiveness.

5. Colleges and universities should assure that the importance of undergraduate teaching and advising is recognized through formal acknowledgement of outstanding contributions and through criteria used in faculty appointment, salary, promotion, and tenure decisions.

6. Colleges and universities should assure that faculty assignments reflect the importance of undergraduate instruction by maintaining an appropriate balance between undergraduate instruction and graduate instruction, research, and public service. This balance should include the assignment of the institution's most effective teachers to undergraduate courses, particularly lower-division courses.

7. Because faculty members play a key role in program improvement, an evaluation of the policies and practices that provide the conditions for faculty members to enhance undergraduate instruction shall be incorporated into the program review process at both the state and institutional levels.

APPENDIX II

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton, 1990.

Carothers, Robert. "Translating Quality for the Academy," *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin.* (November, 1992).

Edgerton, Russell. *The Reexamination of Faculty Priorities.* Discussion Paper of the American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1993.

Finkelstein, Martin J. *The American Academic Profession: A Synthesis of Social Scientific Inquiry Since World War II.* Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1984.

Heydinger, Richard B. and Simsek, Hasan. *An Agenda for Reshaping Faculty Productivity.* Joint Report of the State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States, Washington, D.C., 1992.

Illinois Board of Higher Education Committee on the Study of Undergraduate Education. *Undergraduate Education.* Springfield, IL, September 1990.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *Undergraduate Education: Learning and Teaching.* Springfield, IL, January 1992.

Illinois Board of Regents, *Faculty Workload and Professional Responsibilities.* Chancellor's Report No. 75, Springfield, IL, 1992.

Jordan, Stephen M. and Layzell, Daniel T. *A Case Study of Faculty Workload Issues in Arizona: Implications for State Higher Education Policy.* Joint Report of the State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States, Washington, D.C., 1992.

Lambert, Leo M. and Tice, Stacey Lane. *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: A Guide to Programs That Improve Undergraduate Education and Develop Tomorrow's Faculty.* American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1993.

Levin, Henry M. *Raising Productivity in Higher Education.* Pew Higher Education Research Program, Philadelphia, 1989.

Massy, William F. and Wilger, Andrea K. "Productivity in Postsecondary Education: A New Approach," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.* (Winter, 1992).

Massy, William F. and Zemsky, Robert. *Faculty Discretionary Time: Departments and the Academic Ratchet.* The Pew Higher Education Research Program, Philadelphia, 1992.

Mingle, James. *Faculty Work and the Cost/Quality/Access Collision.* Joint Report of the State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States, Washington, D.C., 1992.

1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty. 3 vols. United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1990.

Otten, Kim. *How Do Universities in the UNC System Identify and Reward Excellent Teaching?* Report by the North Carolina Center For Public Policy Research, 1992.

Russell, Alene Bycer. *Faculty Workload: State and System Perspectives.* Joint Report of the State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States, Washington, D.C., 1992.

Smith, Page. *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America.* Viking, New York, 1990.

University of Wisconsin System. *Trends in Faculty Teaching Assignments.* Madison, Wis., 1992.

University of Wisconsin System. *Activities and Opinions of the University of Wisconsin Faculty.* Madison, Wis., 1992.

Virginia Council of Higher Education. *Preliminary Report of the Virginia Faculty Survey.* Richmond, Va., 1991.

Winkler, Allan M. "The Faculty Workload Question," *Change.* (July/August, 1992).

Yuker, Harold. *Faculty Workload: Research, Theory, and Interpretation.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research, No. 10, Washington, D.C., 1984.