Dispelling the Myths:

Locating the Resources Needed to Support Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Adrianna Kezar and Daniel Maxey

One of the greatest challenges that academic leaders voice when they address calls to provide additional support for faculty members, particularly those individuals in non-tenure-track positions, is their inability to cover the added expense of providing new programs and services or expanding existing ones. However, many of the ways that colleges could provide additional support for these faculty members are potentially no-cost or low-cost measures that would benefit faculty, as well as the students they teach. So, although leaders in higher education do face budgetary constraints and uncertainty over future funding sources, it is a myth that resources are the sole reason that prevents us from ensuring that all our faculty members are adequately supported so they can provide the highest quality of instruction to their students.

In order to advance the case for how and why leaders on campuses can make these changes, we have created this resource document to outline potential changes that would be less expensive to implement, as well as others that would likely require the reallocation of funding or increased expenditures. We provide a set of strategies for developing services and resources to support the whole faculty, not just full-time or tenured and tenure-track faculty members. But, it is important for leaders on campuses to begin to dispel the myth that constrained resources are the primary reason they do not provide what would often be considered to be even basic forms of support or opportunities for the involvement of non-tenure-track faculty. By exercising leadership and being attentive to aligning decisions about how to support faculty with their institutions' values and goals, administrators, faculty, and staff can identify opportunities to make improvements – often with little additional cost – that will yield benefits for faculty, as well as the students they teach.

Key to Cost Summaries

Each of the items detailed in this resource document includes a description of the costs institutions are likely to incur. Although it is difficult to determine the precise expense for all campuses, we have indicated a general range for each item using the following guidelines.

$	**$$**	**$$$**	**$$$$**
Marginal or No Cost	**Some Additional Expense**	**Moderate Increases or Reallocation of Funding**	**More Substantial Expense**

The individual recommended changes that follow are organized by their potential cost. Those that are most likely to result in marginal, no cost, or only some additional expense appear in the first section. The changes in the second section range in cost, but have the potential to require moderate increases, reallocation of funding, or more substantial expense.

Changes Requiring Marginal to Some Additional Funding

The following are examples of ways that leaders can be attentive to addressing some of the challenges facing non-tenure-track faculty that may generate minimal, if any, additional expense.

Enhancing Existing Data Collection Efforts

Although most institutions have institutional research offices that collect, maintain, and interpret data about faculty and instruction, they often collect and report only a limited amount of data about NTTFs. By directing these offices to reach out to NTTFs, collect, and report data pertaining to their work, institutional leaders can identify and better understand ways that they can improve campus policies and practices, which will result in better informed, strategic planning. Engaging NTTFs in this way can also help faculty members to feel that their concerns and ideas are being heard by leaders.

COST: $
Marginal or No Cost

For institutions with existing institutional research offices, there would be minimal cost associated with additional data collection and/or reporting.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES: For help with determining how institutional research offices currently collect data about NTTFs and considering ways they can better support data collection and reporting, please see our Supplemental Focus Guide for Institutional Researchers (http://guides.thechangingfaculty.org). Additional details and recommendations are also available in Kezar and Maxey's (2012) chapter in *New Directions in Institutional Research*, titled "Missing from the institutional data picture: Non-tenure-track faculty."

Ensuring or Clarifying Protections for Academic Freedom

Since they often work on short-term or annual contracts and have little, if any, job security, non-tenure-track faculty often report feeling more vulnerable to retaliation for taking positions in the course of their work that would normally be covered under academic freedom. Institutions can clarify that NTTFs are covered and protected by amending academic freedom statements in their faculty handbook and determining appropriate procedures for them to file grievances or appeals.

COST: $
Marginal or No Cost

Ensuring NTTFs are included in academic freedom statements and protections would often incur no additional cost. At times, there may be some cost for supporting

grievance processes, if there is an influx of cases due to this protection. However, a strong, authentic process enhances institutional integrity and contributes to a culture of professionalism, which can contribute to a decrease in the number of cases over time.

Providing Access to Instructional Materials, Resources, and Support Services

In order to effectively provide instruction, faculty members should routinely be provided access to materials, resources, and support services that are provided to tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Still, on many campuses, NTTFs do not even have access to basic materials and resources such as copies of required textbooks, email addresses for communicating with students and receiving information from the institution or department, ID card for affiliation and discounts, library privileges, parking, computers and telephones, photocopiers, or basic office supplies. When campuses do not provide NTTFs with access to basic materials and resources that are used in providing instruction and are typically provided at no cost to other faculty, these individuals have to reach into their own pockets.

Institutions and departments might also provide services to support faculty members' course planning, such as maintaining a library of sample syllabi or employing personnel to help with integrating instructional technology in the classroom. These support services can enhance the quality of instruction and should also be routinely provided to all faculty members, regardless of their appointment or rank.

Another improvement that can be made on campuses, which would incur little, if any, additional cost would be to help make sure that NTTFs know about resources on campus that are available to them and their students. Because they are not always provided an orientation, may not be involved in meetings, and are included in campus life less than tenured and tenure-track faculty, NTTFs may not know about all of the human resources services, development opportunities, or other resources that are available to them. Similiarly, they may not be aware of academic and support programs that benefit their students. Some campuses have started to share this information through a campus office or staff member tasked with ensuring details are disseminated to NTTFs through email listservs, websites, or NTTF resource centers.

COST: $
Marginal or No Cost

Many of the materials, resources, and support services we note could be provided to NTTFs at virtually no additional cost to institutions and departments. Even when some additional expense would be incurred because additional resources such as office supplies or copies are consumed, institutional and departmental leaders should be mindful that the marginal expense of providing basic materials and resources to faculty so that they can do their jobs helps their departments and institutions to provide even a minimum standard of quality instruction to students. Those faculty members who are typically paid the least for their work should not be expected to pay

for basic materials and resources that are required to provide instruction to their students that are made available to other faculty members at no cost.

Providing Access to On-Campus Professional Development Opportunities

Various opportunities for professional development such as workshops about pedagogies, teaching strategies, or high-impact practices are typically offered at most institutions; these development programs are often provided on campuses through centers for teaching and learning. They help faculty members to continue to build upon their existing skills and knowledge about effective teaching and introduce them to new and innovative techniques that can assist with improving the quality of instruction they can provide for their students. It may also be important for faculty members to engage in research or other sorts of activities in order to stay abreast of changes and current methods as part of their responsibilities, as well. However, NTTFs are not always permitted to access professional development opportunities on their campuses, even though collectively they are a majority of faculty in higher education and are responsible for providing instruction to large numbers of students. Other times, programs may be available to NTTFs, but they are not encouraged to attend, programs are not designed to address some of the unique challenges faced by NTTFs, information about upcoming workshops does not reach them, or seminars are only offered at times when they are unable to attend because they are teaching or are not on campus. Some campuses have responded to these limitations by involving NTTFs in the same development opportunities offered to other faculty members, creating specialized professional development programming for NTTFs, or both.

In the second part of this document, we include information about providing off-campus professional development opportunities.

COST: $-$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Some Additional Expense

$ - NTTFs could be included in existing professional development opportunities with little additional expense. Where programs are offered, no-cost or low-cost measures could be taken to ensure that NTTFs are informed about opportunities and encouraged to attend. For example, creating a process for sharing development opportunities through an up-to-date email list or asking department chairs to encourage their faculty to attend could improve outreach efforts and increase NTTF participation.

$$ - Creating new or additional professional development programming for NTTFs would incur some additional expense. Often centers for teaching and learning rely upon full-time faculty to lead workshops, but some have increased participation and interest in workshops by identifying experienced part-time faculty to create and facilitate sessions, offering them a stipend for their time and work. Also, although centers may not have a budget to provide stipends to NTTFs who attend, some have reported additional success reaching out to adjuncts by providing meals with workshops, recognizing faculty completion of development and training programs in

their evaluation and consideration for promotion, and providing sessions at times that are convenient for NTTFs, as well as online.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES: Please see the Delphi Project's example practice cases from William Rainey Harper College in Illinois and Tallahassee Community College in Florida, which have had great success in improving NTTF access to and participation in professional development opportunities, leading to additional benefits for the institution, faculty, and students (http://examplepractices.thechangingfaculty.org).

Extending the Opportunity to Participate in Departmental Meetings, Curriculum Design, and Campus Life

Non-tenure-track faculty members are often a majority of the faculty at an institution and are responsible for providing instruction to a large share of the students enrolled, particularly first-year students and those enrolled in introductory and developmental courses—students who might be at greater risk of attrition. Yet these individuals are often not included in planning and curriculum decisions in ways that are similar to the involvement of tenured and tenure-track faculty; they may not be included or encouraged to participate at all. Including NTTFs in routine meetings and planning efforts at the department level would help departments to ensure these faculty are informed about important developments, have a voice in decision making that affects their work, and could enhance planning by drawing upon their expertise, ideas, and observations from teaching. At a minimum, it is important to invite and encourage NTTFs to participate. Beyond meetings, departments and institutions might identify other ways to involve NTTFs more fully in the life of the campus by including them in other sorts of events and occasions that are generally open to other faculty members such as convocations, student orientation, graduation, forums, and activities related to student groups.

COST: $-$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Some Additional Expense

$ - Inviting and encouraging NTTFs to participate in various activities alone would incur no additional expense for departments and institutions.
$$ - However, NTTFs, particularly part-time faculty, are often only paid for the time they spend providing instruction, whereas other faculty are compensated for a range of teaching, research, and service tasks. Since these are often activities that other faculty members are expected to participate in, leaders may not be accustomed to attaching a price to the time they spend on this work. So, we do recommend that NTTFs should be provided some additional compensation for their investment of time for some of these activities, such as when they have a leadership role (e.g., chairing a committee or task force; leading a curricular change effort) or must attend meetings to contribute to getting the work done. Paying NTTFs for their time spent on these activities not only contributes to more fair and equitable compensation, but also encourages their authentic commitment as members of the campus community by demonstrating that their involvement and time are valued the same as other faculty members.

Participation in Governance

Campus governance can also be enhanced if the faculty who teach the majority of students are included in campus governance in some form. At a minimum, campuses should invite non-tenure track faculty to open forums, campuswide planning discussions, and the like. But, more than just inviting them to these types of discussions, NTTFs should be considered for faculty senate positions; accordingly, restrictions on who can participate in the senate should be examined. There are also a variety of other campus governance entities that should be considered, including administrative task forces, joint faculty-administrative groups, campus committees, ad hoc groups, or governing boards and their subcommittees when faculty representatives are invited to participate. Departmental meetings and decisions were already noted above as an essential area for inclusion, but the degree to which non-tenure track faculty are including in other areas of governance depends on campus history, culture and structure. However, having the input from the group that is the largest faculty group on campus may help improve decision-making at various levels and should be a consideration as campuses rethink and adjust their governance approach.

COST: $-$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Some Additional Expense

Involvement in governance should be compensated as typically this would involve a moderate amount of additional uncompensated time from these faculty members. Naturally, the cost will be determined by the number of representatives and the amount of time for which they will be compensated.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES: For more information about including non-tenure-track faculty members in governance and example practice cases, please see Kezar and Sam, 2010. Additionally, example cases highlighting how institutions sought changes, including participation in governance, are available in our Path to Change series (http://path.thechangingfaculty.org; see Madison Area Technical College and San Francisco State University).

Facilitating Opportunities for Faculty Mentoring

Mentoring can be an important form of professional development for any faculty member. Certainly, not all NTTFs require or would be interested in participating in mentorships opportunities with full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members. However, many NTTFs, particularly part-time faculty who hold full-time jobs in their area of professional practice, may be new to teaching and might be unfamiliar with common pedagogies, teaching strategies, and practices for evaluating students' work. So, they may derive substantial benefits from being paired with another faculty member for a semester or year to learn from the experience and knowledge of a colleague and to receive answers to questions that come up in their work. Sometimes, institutions have even assigned mentors to team teach a course with an NTTF. Non-tenure-track faculty members should not only be considered for service as mentees, but can also offer their experience and skills to other instructors as mentors, themselves.

<div style="background-color: #d4dcb0; padding: 1em;">

COST: $-$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Some Additional Expense

$ - Depending on how a mentorship program is designed, it may cost very little. Tenure-track faculty members or, in some cases, department chairs, at some institutions volunteer their time to mentor NTTFs or their contributions are recognized as part of their service or administrative obligations, so providing mentoring may not incur additional expense.

$$ - Some institutions hire an experienced non-tenure-track faculty member to mentor other, new NTTFs. The cost of compensating faculty mentors would require some additional expense.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES: There are a variety of examples available that can be provided at no cost or at very little expense. For some examples of actual campuses that included mentoring in their improvements of NTTF practices, see Chapters 4 and 9 of Kezar's (2012) book, *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty*, which detail changes at Madison Area Technical College and the University of Southern California.

</div>

Ensuring Access to Orientation for New Hires

Providing an orientation that includes an introduction to the institution, employment policies, and information that is important for faculty members to be familiar with such as the types of academic support available to students and grading policies is a common practice for newly hired tenure-track faculty. Institutions should consider including newly-hired NTTFs in the orientation programs already provided for tenure-track faculty or providing a similar orientation. Increasingly, institutions are providing access to existing orientation programs to NTTFs. Other institutions have created orientation programming specifically designed to address the unique employment circumstances and needs of NTTFs. Departments are sometimes also encouraged to provide a similar orientation to newly hired NTTFs to share information about policies and student profiles for their academic programs. When possible, departments are encouraged to use this as an opportunity for new NTTF hires to meet and interact with existing faculty members and to be welcomed into the department.

<div style="background-color: #d4dcb0; padding: 1em;">

COST: $-$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Some Additional Expense

$ - Involving newly-hired NTTFs in existing orientation programs may cost very little, since those already exist.
$$ - The creation of a new program might cost more, but some institutions have reported that the cost incurred can be fairly low; space can often be secured at little, if any, cost, but creating new programming may require staff time and the cost of materials or food. However, other institutions have begun to offer orientation programs online, which can be an effective way to provide important information that is accessible any time; there would be some expense associated with creating and keeping an online program up-to-date, but it may be worth the relatively low cost to reach a large number of faculty with this more flexible format. Additional expense may

</div>

also be associated with fairly compensating newly-hired NTTFs for their time participating in their orientation.

Access to Administrative Staff for Support

Tenure-track faculty are often able to rely on the support provided by administrative staff and student workers. Having some assistance with tasks such as making copies, creating or retrieving records and materials, or just having someone to answer their questions can be a tremendous help for any faculty member, but would be particularly beneficial to NTTFs who may spend little time on campus or work multiple jobs off-campus.

COST: $-$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Some Additional Expense

$ - Providing access to existing staff would likely incur little cost, since these personnel are often already employed in colleges and departments.
$$ - In some cases, utilizing staff to help meet the needs of faculty members who are not currently supported in this way may necessitate the hiring of additional staff or student workers.

Changes With the Potential to Incur Moderate Increases in Funding or More Substantial Expense

Providing Some Form of Access to Office Space

Office space always comes at a premium on campuses and it may seem that space is already very limited. But by managing existing space more efficiently and considering how future space is allocated, some campuses have been able to identify and create spaces for NTTFs to work, meet with their students, engage with colleagues, find information, and access copiers, computers, and other resources at relatively little cost. It may not be feasible for everyone to have their own private space, but even shared office space can give NTTFs a place to work before and after their classes, engage in the types of activities described above, or to securely store materials and student files. Some institutions have even explored allowing NTTFs to share offices assigned to tenure-track faculty, who may not use their office space all the time. Others have identified ways to convert meeting spaces that are not used very frequently into shared office space, serving multiple faculty members. When creating shared spaces, institutional and departmental leaders should also consider whether some space can be made available for NTTFs to meet privately with their students, allowing them to discuss sensitive matters and facilitating faculty compliance with FERPA guidelines.

> **COST: $-$$$**
> **RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Moderate Increases or Reallocation of Funding**
>
> **$ -** By identifying spaces that are underutilized and carrying out more careful planning of existing and future office space, spaces might be provided for NTTFs to use at little expense.
> **$$-$$$ -** Creating new shared office space or renovating spaces might require additional resources, depending on the specific needs of the project.

Reconsidering or Changing Hiring Practices

At most institutions, NTTFs are hired—and rehired—through fairly causal or informal processes, as compared to tenure-track faculty. Institutions and departments should consider how they might improve the search and recruitment process for vacant NTTF positions or the timeline for hiring NTTFs, particularly if it is found that NTTFs are hired within only a few days or weeks of the beginning of the term, which allows them very little time to prepare. It is important to continue a practice of notifying instructors about hiring decisions early to allow them the same time to prepare in each successive term, not just when they are first hired. Some campuses have also sought to improve rehiring of NTTFs by other means, such as creating promotion processes that allow

experienced instructors to earn seniority and additional pay or to be considered for full-time vacancies before external applicants.

COST: $-$$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to Moderate Increases or Reallocation of Funding

$ - It is likely that some positive changes to hiring practices could be identified and implemented for little, if any, additional expense.
$$-$$$ - Formalizing hiring processes would incur additional expense, particularly if they were to be expanded to include having a faculty committee conduct interviews and provide input or if more formal recruitment and search practices were utilized.

However, the costs to hire NTTFs more systematically may be offset if it results in decreased turnover resulting from more thoughtful recruitment and hiring decisions. Institutions and departments should also identify the expense associated with having to constantly rehire NTTFs term after term; they may discover that, even without a formal search process in place, it could be more prudent to offer multi-term or multi-year contracts to faculty who are routinely rehired. While empirical data does not exist about turnover costs or the expense of repeated rehiring, professionals in human resources predict this is an area where institutions are incurring additional expenses that go unnoticed, but might be substantial.

Providing Access to Off-Campus Professional Development Opportunities

In addition to the opportunities for on-campus development detailed in the preceding section, there are also various opportunities to involve faculty, including NTTFs, in off-campus professional development at conferences or through webinars. However, NTTFs are often unable to access funding for these sorts of activities or are at the end of the line behind tenured and tenure-track faculty. Campuses should consider allocating some funding for NTTF to participate in off-campus development opportunities, particularly when the skills or knowledge that are acquired could lead to enhanced instructional quality and improved learning outcomes, retention, and graduation rates for students.

COST: $$$
Moderate Increases or Reallocation of Funding

Providing funding for NTTFs to attend off-campus professional development comes at a higher cost than opportunities on campus, but institutional and departmental leaders should consider whether there is value in seeking out or applying for funding that can be allocated to help cover related expenses, given that improving the quality of teaching can lead to a better student learning experience and outcomes.

Extending Employment Contracts to Multi-Year Terms

Some institutions are beginning to move from hiring NTTFs on a term-by-term or annual basis to multi-year contracts. By being attentive to enrollment management, institutions can have a sense of how many and what sort of faculty members they will need for upcoming terms, enabling them to plan ahead. Often, NTTFs are hired and then rehired repeatedly, sometimes for many consecutive years. This may be particularly true for programs and courses, such as mandatory introductory classes, that have fairly stable enrollments over time. So, moving to multi-year contracts might provide some added stability and planning time for faculty that might routinely be rehired, but often are not informed of hiring decisions until the last minute. Accreditation agencies and others are beginning to closely examine the issue of last-minute hiring and institutional planning around enrollments; institutions should be proactive about examining and addressing those practices and consider whether multi-year contracts might make sense while they are at it.

COST: $-$$$$
RANGING FROM: Marginal or No Cost to More Substantial Expense

$ - As institutions are better able to plan to meet their enrollment needs, it may be found that there is little additional cost or risk incurred by providing multi-year contracts to NTTFs. However, institutions will likely need to consider differently the costs and risks of programs that are new or typically have unstable enrollments.
$$-$$$$ - In the meantime, though, moving to multi-year contracts may require institutions to plan for and commit to employing faculty for a longer period of time than they may be accustomed to and which might extend beyond their current budget cycle. Changing employment contracts may require the creation of new offices or hiring of additional staff to manage enrollment data or human resources work.

Acknowledging and Compensating NTTFs for Time Spent Meeting with Students in Office Hours

In other parts of this document, we have advocated for compensating faculty members for time spent attending to responsibilities outside the classroom; NTTFs' pay is often determined by the number of credit hours or actual time they spend teaching, so it may not account for all of the time they spend doing important work outside the classroom. Often, faculty members are expected – if not by their department chair, by their students – to be accessible to students during office hours. This time should be compensated, particularly when it is a requirement of NTTFs.

COST: $$-$$$$
RANGING FROM: Moderate Increases or Reallocation of Funding to More Substantial Expense

To pay NTTFs for their time spent in office hours, particularly when this time is not already factored into their compensation, would often incur significant additional expense for institutions or departments. However, there are examples of institutions that have found ways to shift or reallocate resources to cover these costs, recognizing

how important faculty-student interaction outside the classroom can be in facilitating student learning. Still, this may require extensive planning and additional resources.

Increasing Compensation

Increasing the pay for NTTFs would likely be one of the most costly changes an institution could make, particularly on campuses with large numbers of NTTFs. These faculty members are often paid significantly less – often for the same work – as compared to their tenure-track peers; often they are even paid less than what would be considered market rates for NTTF work. However, we describe below some ways that institutions can be strategic about redirecting funds recuperated from faculty retirements and other sources to identify funding to provide more equitable compensation and support for NTTFs.

COST: $$$-$$$$
RANGING FROM: Moderate Increases or Reallocation of Funding to More Substantial Expense

Although increasing compensation certainly creates an additional expense, through strategic planning and shifting resources, it may be possible to provide more equitable pay.

Benefits

Some institutions have been able to identify relatively low-cost ways to provide basic health care or life insurance plans to NTTFs. Larger campus systems, in particular, can use their purchasing power either to provide some benefits or to create a group insurance plan that could be offered to NTTFs at a lower cost to the faculty member than purchasing his or her own plan.   Unfortunately, in response to the Affordable Care Act, many institutions have decided to cap the number of hours NTTFs can teach at for an individual institution or system, regardless of their individual circumstances, to avoid requirements to provide access to health care benefits. These decisions not only deny faculty members access to benefits, but also can substantially reduce the take-home pay of NTTFs, who are already paid the least and may often need to accumulate multiple teaching positions to earn a living.

COST: $$$-$$$$
RANGING FROM: Moderate Increases or Reallocation of Funding to More Substantial Expense

Institutions might find that only a fraction of NTTFs will make use of benefits plans because they are covered by a spouse's plan or one provided by another employer, so the costs may not be as high as expected. One way to ascertain those costs would be to conduct a survey of faculty members to find out how many would enroll in a health care option if it were to be provided.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES: See New Faculty Majority website on Health Insurance for Adjuncts at http://www.newfacultymajority.info/equity/joomla-stuff-mainmenu-

26/health-insurance-for-adjuncts for additional information about some alternative ways to provide benefits for NTTFs.

Ways to Fund Support for <u>All</u> Faculty

In this section, we review some strategies that might be used to help campuses to generate the resources necessary to provide the support that faculty need. The Delta Cost Project (http://www.deltacostproject.org/) has consistently demonstrated that expenditures on the academic mission and instruction have mostly remained flat or declined, while expenses in other categories are increasing, sometimes dramatically. This trend needs to be examined closely. Decisions about funding are essentially a reflection of our institutions' priorities. If we want to invest in student success, then we need to invest more heavily in the faculty. Through strategic investment and realignment of funds, campuses can begin to move toward providing better support for faculty, which will enhance the quality of teaching, learning, and student success outcomes.

Streamlining Expenses

One option available to institutions is to streamline expenses to identify and capture funding that can be re-invested to improve instruction and faculty support. In a 2007 article in Change magazine, University of Maryland Chancellor Britt Kirwan outlined steps his system took for evaluating its expenses in order to make changes that would result in greater cost savings. Their Effectiveness and Efficiency Initiative audits identified areas where academic and administrative processes could be reworked to lower cost, as well as improve quality. Some of the changes targeted in academic processes included reducing the time required for students to complete degrees, increasing faculty teaching commitments, and utilizing educational technology more effectively; administrative savings were realized by consolidating procurement processes and auditing functions across the system. The effort was a collaboration of stakeholders across the system – the administration, Board of Regents, presidents, faculty, staff, and students – to determine how resources could be used more effectively and has been reported to have yielded more than $175 million in cost-containment, cost-avoidance, and reallocation over a two-year period.

The University of Maryland system mostly used these savings to hold down the cost of attendance, which earned the system newfound trust in the legislature and contributed to increased budget allocations from the state in the following years. Institutions conducting a similar streamlining process could decide to use some portion of the funds they recuperate to cover the expense generated by some of the recommendations we have made in this document, as well.

Targeted Reinvestment into Academic Programs

The State University of New York (SUNY) undertook a similar effort to reduce administrative costs in order to redirect spending on instruction and student services. The initial plan calls upon all SUNY campuses to cut a minimum of 5% from their administrative spending; shifting that funding is anticipated to free an additional

$100,000,000 that can be reinvested in academic programs to enhance student success. This system-wide initiative brings together presidents, provosts, vice presidents for administration and finance, heads of faculty senates, trustees, and other stakeholders through a Shared Services Committee, which has sought out and evaluated opportunities for cost savings and coordinated efforts across the system's 12 shared service alliances and 64 campuses.

The Shared Services Committee identified several key areas for cost savings across the system, including strategic sourcing to combine the buying power of its campuses, streamlining information technology management, and centralizing some administrative and human resources functions such as payroll, benefits, accounts payable, and travel in regional administrative centers. The committee's plans also encourage SUNY campuses to partner with one another to exploit additional opportunities for producing cost savings. Although these changes are anticipated to generate savings that will be redirected to bolstering the strength of SUNY's academic and student support services, the streamlining of key information technology and administrative assets and services is expected to have the added benefit of streamlining students', faculty and staff members', and administrators' access to pertinent records and data.

Explore High Growth Expenses and Connection to Mission

The Delta Cost Project has identified that certain expenses on campuses have risen much more than others in the last 20-30 years, even as instructional spending has remained mostly stagnant. For example, athletics funding has gone up exponentially—twice as much as spending on academic functions; multi-million dollar coaching contracts, new facilities, and increases in scholarship funding for student-athletes have contributed to these growing expenditures. Institutions are spending three to six times as much on student-athletes than they do to provide instruction for the average student on campus. This is an area where campuses could seek to cut costs to support instruction (Jan, 2013).

Additionally, the Delta Cost Project and others have found that research and auxiliary services are growing on most campuses. The share of institutional budgets allocated to expenditures for research and development funded through internal funding sources, for examples, increased from 11% in the 1970s to more than 20% today. In a 2013 article in *Change*, Ron Ehrenberg notes how increases in institutional research funding were often accompanied by higher student-faculty ratios, increased reliance on NTTFs, and increases in undergraduate tuition. So, while tuitions are rising, money is increasingly being diverted to research, rather than instruction and efforts that would contribute to improving student learning outcomes. The Chronicle of Higher Education also profiled teaching institutions that pursued more research growth and prestige, finding that many did so with little success in terms of increasing their research functions given all the additional expense. The Delta Project also documents increases in the number of staff and administrators on campuses, which contribute to rising costs in this category over time. Expenses for fundraising have also gone up on campuses and this needs to be weighed against actual revenues the increase in expense brings in.

A key role for leaders is examining expenses over time and ensuring that instructional costs do not decline while other areas expand that are less mission central.

Explore Instructional Expenses

Many institutions allocate money for items beyond faculty salaries under the category of instruction. Increasingly money for technology support, assessment, and other areas are included under this category in their budgets. Instead of increasing the budget for instruction as new programs or services are added, the share of the overall budget spent on instruction at many institutions has remained flat for years. Campuses should consider what they are categorizing as instructional expenses and determine whether they are committing adequate resources to functions that are necessary for ensuring the quality of instruction and educational experience provided to students, including providing the types of support for NTTFs that are described in this document.

Examine Ways to Reallocate Funding Recuperated Through Faculty Retirements

As faculty retire, institutions should determine how they can reallocate the funding that is recuperated from their salaries to better support NTTFs. Strategic reallocation of money from faculty turn over to support instructional improvements would likely require moving faculty lines and funding to a more centralized model, taking this function away from individuals colleges or departments. Campuses often hire an expensive star faculty member; instead, they could choose to hire two or three lecturers that are paid fairly and provided a stable and supported role with the access to materials, professional development, mentoring and benefits. While this section focuses on faculty, it is important to note that administrator salaries are also rising significantly and should be examined for equity.

Conclusion

While each campus has unique challenges and contexts, each can better support non-tenure track faculty and often at minimal cost. Leadership can prioritize changes in policies and practices that can support faculty who can improve student outcomes (see Delphi resources on impact of changing faculty on student outcomes). This publication also addresses how to strategically realign campus revenues and control and rethink expenses to provide needed polices and practices to support non-tenure track faculty.

Bibliography

Desrochers, D.M. (2013). *Academic spending versus athletic spending: Who wins?* Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research. http://www.deltacostproject.org/pdfs/DeltaCostAIR_AthleticAcademic_Spending_Issue Brief.pdf

Ehrenberg, R. (2013). Is the golden age of the private research university over? *Change, 45*(3), 16-23.

Hurlburt, S. & Kirshstein, R. (2012). *Spending: Where does the money go?* Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research. http://www.deltacostproject.org/resources/pdf/Delta-Spending-Trends-Production.pdf

Kezar, A. & Sam, C. (2010). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experiences, and plans of action. *ASHE Higher Education Series, 36*(4), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kirwan, W.E. (2007). Higher education's "accountability" imperative: How the University System of Maryland responded. *Change, 39*(2), 21-25.

National Education Association. (2004). *The NEA and Contingent Academic Workers in Higher Education: NBI 2004-60 Action Plan*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Union, C. (2013). *Shared Services Steering Committee governance and funding*. http://www.suny.edu/powerofsuny/framework/goals_ideas_teams/files/SSSC%201-30-2013%20%20FINAL2.pptx

State University of New York. (2013). *Shared Services Steering Committee.* http://www.suny.edu/powerofsuny/framework/goals_ideas_teams/GettingDowntoBusiness1_Team.cfm

The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success

Project Description

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

Project Team and Partner Organizations

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

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

In partnership with the Association of American College and Universities

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

USCRossier
School of Education

Project Funding

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

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

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

The Carnegie Corporation of New York, founded by Andrew Carnegie, was envisioned as a foundation that would "promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding." In keeping with this mandate, our work incorporates an affirmation of our historic role as an education foundation but also honors Andrew Carnegie's passion for international peace and the health of our democracy. Mr. Carnegie dedicated his foundation to the goal of doing "real and permanent good in this world" and deemed that its efforts should create "ladders on which the aspiring can rise." In our current-day grantmaking we continue to carry out this mission through programs and initiatives that address today's problems by drawing on the best ideas and cutting-edge strategies that draw strength from deep knowledge and scholarship. History guides us and the present informs us, but our work looks always toward the future.

Pullias Center for Higher Education

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

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

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

Mission

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

Goal

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

Association of American Colleges and Universities

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

AAC&U organizes its work around five broad goals:
- A Guiding Vision for Liberal Education
- Inclusive Excellence
- Intentional and Integrative Learning
- Civic, Diversity, and Global Engagement
- Authentic Evidence

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

Mission

The mission of the Association of American Colleges and Universities is to make the aims of liberal learning a vigorous and constant influence on institutional purpose and educational practice in higher education.
(Approved by the Board of Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1997).