

Workload and Tenure Policies In an Era of Organizational Change

by Henry Lee Allen

Henry Lee Allen is an associate professor of sociology at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois. He is developing databases for scrutinizing organizational changes in higher education pursuant to completing a book on mathematical and computational models of academic systems.

Allen's research interests also include the sociology of science, the theoretical development of academic disciplines, and comparative higher education systems.

W^hither higher education? The public questions its premises. Educational credentials—keys to life chances—become more expensive.¹ State officials debate whether to spend more on higher education, prisons, or health care. Accreditors and foundation officials, questioning the quality of undergraduate education, advocate accountability measures and outcomes assessments. Faculty members debate the escalating demands for teaching, research, and service as distance education and smart classrooms proliferate and as knowledge increases exponentially.

Not all the policy changes resulting from these debates are salutary.² Critics, for example, question the viability of academic tenure in a global economy and in a virtual world. Acquiring tenure, note some detractors, leads to less industrious teaching and scholarship; others note increased costs. These critics, viewing professors as employees, not as professionals, call for normative, procedural, and remunerative changes to tenure.³

A view of faculty as employees—or even as instructors with job descriptions resembling the duties of elementary and secondary teachers—also affects workload policies. How hard do college and university professors work? Critics, assuming that hours in the classroom are the best measure of faculty effort, perpetuate a naïve stereotype of professors as “scammers” or “loafers.”

Viewing professors as employees may also affect the debate over the role of part-time faculty—now over half of faculty positions at some colleges. Institutional mission, size, and organizational culture may affect the distribution of full- and part-time positions. But, some observers claim, the proliferation of part-time and temporary faculty is a device to replace or undercut full-time faculty positions.

Other controversies include technology—distance education, technology transfer policies, and intellectual property rights—and the move to accountability measures and performance indicators.⁴ Taken together, the criticisms place the academic career and its traditional autonomy under siege.⁵

Are the critics correct in their view of faculty? Surveys of faculty workload and productivity refute many concerns:

- The mission and inputs of a particular college or university constrain faculty workload and productivity.
- Faculty across all types of academic institutions devote the majority of their time to instructional tasks.
- Tenured faculty rates have not changed appreciably in recent decades.
- Faculty workload has not changed in structure or scope; the statistics show only minor changes in student contact hours and teaching loads, except in universities.

But critics dismiss this empirical evidence, suggesting that more is involved concerning the occupational status of faculty and that the rapid pace of change demands “flexibility.”

This chapter suggests an organizational context for faculty workload and productivity studies. It links data in the Faculty Appointment Policy Archive (FAPA)—a compilation of the appointment and tenure policies of a sample of colleges and universities—to 1980-81 and 1996-97 data on operating budgets, size of enrollments, and faculty composition.⁶ The chapter also shows how this linkage helps to assess academic work.

FACULTY WORKLOAD AND PRODUCTIVITY: RESEARCH

Analysts of academic work are affected by the presuppositions of their disciplines and by organizational metaphors.⁷ Some scholars, reflecting managerial or administrative biases, favor accountability, board activism, distance education, alternatives to tenure, and post-tenure review. The academic professions, these analysts presume, must submit to the dictates of business or professional leaders. These writers selectively quote faculty who downplay the experiences of dissatisfied and departed faculty and embrace the proposed constraints. Some scholars explore contracts as an alternative to tenure and promotion procedures.⁸ The academic professions, suggests one analyst, should mimic employment practices used by law firms, accounting agencies, and medical practices.⁹

Other scholars, writing from pro-faculty or labor prerogatives, cite evidence substantiating their wish to maintain the rewards of an academic career.¹⁰ Most professors, they assume, are too busy keeping abreast of changes in their fields of expertise to be indolent, sinister, or subversive. Academics, these scholars note, invest too many years of intrinsic motivation, anticipatory socialization, and delayed gratification to afford incompetence.

Instead of comparing academic work to other professions, these analysts look for best practices among academic organizations. Why, they ask, can some academic organizations enhance the conditions of academic work or effectively retain tenure while similar institutions cannot? Their studies of workload and productivity—emphasizing the professional responsibilities that overburden faculty—scrutinize inputs and institutional support.¹¹

Most neoclassical management-oriented studies view higher education in terms of quantifiable costs and benefits. Labor advocates do not see the duties and rights of academic work as determined by economics alone.¹² They are reluctant to concede any right or benefit of academic life *a priori* by yielding to popular forces. Few scholars in either camp propose collaborative approaches to the study of workload and productivity.¹³ Rare are investigations of *legitimate* items from *both* camps or studies from the standpoint of the academic system—though systems thinking is germane to any enterprise.¹⁴

Influenced by administrative concerns, and lacking the sophistication of research on other organizations, most studies of workload and productivity target items under the immediate control of a professor. These studies aggregate the data on individual faculty without analyzing institutional forces affecting faculty decisions, priorities, or behaviors. Academic work is reduced to time allotted to teaching, research, and service. Contextual factors, including recruitment, search and selection patterns, and mentoring, sponsorship, and social networking are ignored.¹⁵ So are the effects of environmental and organizational influences on academic careers.¹⁶

Faculty work, of course, is conducted within a complex organizational context that is, in turn, affected by state policies, demographics, and technology.¹⁷ Individual

proclivities affect academic work; but so do the opportunities afforded and constraints imposed by departments—their organizational culture, development, and resources—and their location within disciplines or fields and within a college.¹⁸ Few studies examine the political, managerial, or labor policy assumptions influencing research on academic work.¹⁹

We are not alone in identifying the need to study organizations and markets in accounting for social behavior in the division of labor.²⁰ Organizations, including academic organizations, argues Herbert Simon, are the most ubiquitous feature of economies. Individualistic market assumptions do not fully explain collective activities and outcomes. Simon identifies, for example, the importance of authority relations within and across organizational contexts. Scholars, he suggests, must probe the individual, structural, organizational, and systemic contours of the academic system to make valid inferences about the social behaviors of groups or individuals functioning within it. Absent such systematic knowledge, major policy shifts—such as abolishing tenure—might prove wrongheaded.²¹ But relating organizational and contextual knowledge to faculty workload and productivity remains the chief task.

WORKLOAD AND PRODUCTIVITY: THE FAPA DATABASE

We may explore traditional workload and productivity themes by perusing the appointment policies contained in the Faculty Appointment and Policy Archive (FAPA), a stratified sample of 241 four-year institutions considered—by the compilers—representative of four-year colleges and universities.²² The database can be searched for selected words, concepts, vocabulary, and references, similar to a content analysis. Word frequencies and locations—called *hits*—become key analytical concerns. Presumably, the frequency, location, and distribution of hits suggests the presence or absence of certain items. Inferences are drawn by scrutinizing the distribution of hits—workload and tenure, in this case—within and across institutions.

WORKLOAD POLICIES

FAPA 2.1 registered 711 hits on “workload” in 109 files; the top 10 institutions accounted for 332 hits (47 percent). Table 1 presents the 10 colleges with the greatest number of hits on workload policies. Seven institutions used collective bargaining to adjudicate faculty workload; the detailed

Table 1

Institutions with Most Hits: Workload, FAPA 2.1

Institution	#Hits	Agent	Observations
1. Rider University	60	AAUP	workload reports/guidelines
2. Kent State University	41	AAUP	workload reports/guidelines
3. University of South Dakota	40	NEA	workload reports/guidelines
4. Western Michigan University	35	AAUP	workload reports/guidelines
5. University of San Francisco	31	*yes	workload reports/guidelines
6. Shawnee State University	32	NEA	workload reports/guidelines
7. University of Detroit	26	NEA/MEA	workload reports/guidelines
8. University of Alaska	24	AFT/AAUP	workload reports/guidelines
9. Aquinas College	23	none	workload reports/guidelines
10. Lesley College	20	none	workload reports/guidelines
Total Hits	332		

* Denotes independent collective bargaining agent as indicated in policy document.

provisions on the conditions of work often contained in contracts help to explain the predominance of hits at unionized campuses. The last column notes the main workload-related concern in each document.

Eight of ten schools listed in Table 1 are universities; Aquinas College and Lesley College are masters institutions. Three schools are in Michigan: Western Michigan University, the University of Detroit, and Aquinas; two are in Ohio: Kent State University and Shawnee State University; two others are in the east: Rider University in New Jersey and Lesley in Massachusetts, and three schools are west of the Mississippi: the University of South Dakota, the University of San Francisco, and the University of Alaska. Rider, San Francisco, Detroit, Aquinas, and Lesley are independent; Kent State, South Dakota, Western Michigan, Shawnee State, and Alaska are public.²³

The workload provisions of documents from Rider, represented by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), stress collegiality. Many hits involve course loads, overloads, release time, and leave of absence. Most regular faculty had a workload assignment of 18 classroom contact hours. Annual workload plans for each faculty member are formulated within departments—subject to the academic dean's approval. These plans must incorporate scholarly and professional activities; course offerings, sequencing, changes, and unassigned teaching must respond to enrollment data and institutional funding patterns. Professors with unassigned teaching must specify alternative projects. Faculty receive credit for teaching large classes. The provost settles disputes between deans and departments over workload policies and procedures.

The workload policies affecting the other institutions in Table 1 resemble Rider's; this section covers the key distinctions. Documents from Kent State, an AAUP affiliate, provide for course loads, release time, summer school policies, and grievance procedures. Tenured faculty must submit annual reports on their teaching, research, grant-seeking, and service activities. A 15 credit hours per semester workload is specified for each faculty member belonging to the bargaining unit, with variations subject to negotiation. The documents

provide for modifying workload policies, subject to the approval of appropriate administrative officials.

The normal faculty workload at South Dakota (USD) and Western Michigan (WMU) is 24 course credit hours per year. Both universities expect annual performance reviews, though jurisdiction over workloads is decentralized. USD recognizes departmental adjustments for faculty teaching telecommunication courses. Faculty at both universities bargain collectively, and equity considerations and grievance procedures accompany references to mandatory reports about course loads and professional duties.

The University of San Francisco (USF) also requires annual performance reviews. The USF Faculty Association acts as the collective bargaining agent for faculty. Professors at USF are expected to contribute 30 units of work per year, with 24 units assigned to teaching duties and the remainder to non-teaching activities. A 40-45 hour workweek is considered typical, as one work unit equals three hours of work per week per semester. Workload plans are centralized under the auspices of a university dean, but approved faculty members may be allowed to pursue a 9+3+3 workload pattern for two to four semesters if warranted by their research ability or probationary status.

Affiliated with the NEA, Shawnee State University (SSU) emerged from a period of hostile faculty-administration relations; a 1997 faculty survey found "no confidence" in its administrative leaders.²⁴ The document in FAPA, reflecting conditions in 1993-94, acknowledges the centrality of teaching in the institution's mission—SSU faculty were expected to average 38 credit hours yearly across four years, with a 36 to 40 credit hours range. But the document does not reveal the organizational dynamics that produced the hostility.

NEA and the Michigan Education Association represent faculty members at the University of Detroit (UD, 26 hits). Most hits depict instructional or procedural matters, including a required annual workload report and a maximum teaching load (24 credit hours). Regular course loads ought not to exceed three course preparations per term. Most hits associated with the appointment policies at UA cover annual reviews, reporting,

and guidelines for determining course loads. Tenured faculty members are subject to tri-annual reviews, using a bipartite (teaching and service) or a tripartite (teaching, research, and service) allocation model.

Aquinas requires faculty to submit workload reports to the academic vice president. The policy document, emphasizing the teaching mission of the college, details assessment procedures, but allows faculty to negotiate their workloads with administrators. The standard workload for faculty is 12 semester hours, but Aquinas permits a heavier teaching load for colleagues preferring classroom instruction. A steering committee at Lesley College (non-bargaining), established by the Faculty Assembly, monitors workload. Lesley requires annual workload reports and classroom observations, but the college minimizes rules by assigning credit hours on an aggregate basis, and by accepting flexible targets and procedures. The regular workload for faculty with nine-month contracts is eight three-credit courses per academic year (24 credit hours). Teaching is primary; overloads are negotiated. The organizational culture for faculty at Lesley *appears* collegial, but the documents take us no further.

These portraits suggest, first, that workload policies are similar at most colleges, controlling for differences in mission (higher teaching loads at teaching colleges, for example). Most hits denote procedures or reporting guidelines designed to monitor faculty work. Second, the more codified and decentralized workload policies appear at larger, complex, and unionized colleges. Third, it is difficult to codify any but the most obvious faculty duties.

Fourth, the documents do not capture the organizational texture or social dynamics of a college—its culture, politics, negotiation, authority, and power—that gave rise to these policies. Last, when using FAPA-type databases, analysts must assume that, at best, the sampled institutions may represent their particular strata. Similar institutions, note organizational theorists, can differ radically in formalization and centralization.²⁵ The actual unit of analysis is the distribution of hits within a policy document—not the range of institutions. Serious aggregation errors occur by drawing inferences from an unrepresentative sample of policy documents.

TENURE POLICIES

What does the FAPA database say about tenure provisions? FAPA 2.1 records 20,664 hits on “tenure,” in 239 files, but only 15 institutions showed at least 200 hits (total=3,428 hits or 17 percent). Table 2 details these 15 schools, their location, patterns of governance, and institutional types. The Midwest predominates in this list: Illinois State, Michigan State, St. Louis University, Ohio State, Kent State, Indiana University, and Illinois Wesleyan. Weber State, Santa Clara, Northern Arizona, Regis University, and the University of South Dakota are in the West; the University of New Hampshire, and Clarkson are in the East, and East Carolina University is the only southern representative. Public universities predominate (10 of 15); three independents are Catholic: St. Louis, Santa Clara, and Regis. The list includes five research universities; five doctorals; four masters institutions—Santa Clara, East Carolina, Regis, and Weber State—and one bachelors institution—Illinois Wesleyan. Table 2, like Table 1, does not represent U.S. academic institutions; inferences deduced from their appointment policies may be biased accordingly.

Universities and public institutions dominate Table 2. Table 2 includes fewer unionized institutions, though Kent State and South Dakota—two unionized campuses—reappear in this table. Colleges and universities with bargaining agents, a wider investigation of the FAPA database suggests, have more codified policies regarding tenure than their non-bargaining counterparts. But many observers also believe tenure to be more secure at long-established research and flagship institutions. In any case, hits on “tenure” in university documents often refer to AAUP statements and suggest limitations on administrative power to terminate faculty members without cause or due process.

Tenure, for example, is highly regulated at the University of New Hampshire (UNH, 263 hits), a public research university. Candidates must exhibit strength in teaching, scholarship, administration, and public service. Consideration for tenure begins in the department, and most hits relate to procedures, reports, and deadlines required of

Table 2

Top Fifteen Institutions with Frequency of Hits: Tenure, FAPA 2.1

Institution	#Hits	Agent	Observations
1. University of New Hampshire	263	AAUP	t/p procedures/reports
2. Regis University	256	AAUP	t/p procedures/reports
3. Illinois State University	255	none	t/p procedures/reports
4. Michigan State University	253	none	t/p procedures/reports
5. Weber State University	239	none	t/p procedures/reports
6. Santa Clara University	238	none	t/p procedures/reports
7. Clarkson University	229	none	t/p procedures/reports
8. St. Louis University	220	none	t/p procedures/reports
9. University of South Dakota	220	NEA	t/p procedures/reports
10. Ohio State University	219	none	t/p procedures/reports
11. Kent State University	213	AAUP	t/p procedures/reports
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	211	none	t/p procedures/reports
13. Northern Arizona University	209	none	t/p procedures/reports
14. East Carolina University	203	none	t/p procedures/reports
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	200	none	t/p procedures/reports
Total Hits	3,428		

* Note abbreviation: t/p = tenure and promotion

departments in presenting a candidate's case. Candidates must secure favorable recommendations from the department chair, the department, and college promotion and tenure committees, and the university's academic affairs committee, including the respective dean, the provost, and the president. The guidelines stress confidentiality, note eligibility criteria associated with each rank, and specify termination procedures under conditions of financial exigency or programmatic change. The document also codifies procedures for appeal, review, and due process when tenure is denied. UNH bargains collectively—AAUP is the bargaining agent—helping to assure professional consultation, due process, and equity for candidates, and to forestall arbitrary or capricious decisions.

The same pattern appears at other public universities where tenure is part of the culture. The 255 hits from Illinois State (ISU), a research university, tie tenure to economic security, organizational stability, and academic

freedom—the documents quote the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom. Tenure is deemed a protection against the arbitrary dismissal of a faculty member without just cause or due recourse. Some hits codify the procedures for coordinating, documenting, and evaluating tenure candidacy, including soliciting teaching evaluations and student concerns. The documents specify committee composition, procedures, and the obligations and privileges of tenured, probationary, and non-tenured faculty.

Similar policies appear at other institutions in Table 2, including the independents and the Catholic colleges. No document specifies a single standard for adjudicating tenure rights, perhaps because tenure is a function of organizational patterns, practices, and processes. Two institutions of the same "type" can vary appreciably in collegiality or bureaucracy. As with workload, the more complex the institution, the less centralized the tenure process, though the routines associated with tenure are similar for most Table 2 institutions.

Table 3

**Operating Revenues of FAPA Institutions with Most Frequent Hits:
Workload and Tenure Policies and ACE Database**

Institution	1980–1981	1996–1997
Workload		
1. Rider University	\$20,593,589	\$79,663,629
2. Kent State University	87,376,147	242,817,200
3. University of South Dakota	36,899,295	83,389,980
4. Western Michigan University	95,539,000	325,642,083
5. University of San Francisco	not reported	135,847,000
6. Shawnee State University	not reported	not reported
7. University of Detroit	33,521,415	not reported
8. University of Alaska	15,505,397	not reported
9. Aquinas College	7,482,861	23,580,949
10. Lesley College	11,272,334	53,065,837
Tenure		
1. University of New Hampshire	84,173,653	269,086,019
2. Regis University	7,579,204	39,969,551
3. Illinois State University	85,238,118	191,422,093
4. Michigan State University	357,401,545	946,049,947
5. Weber State University	33,473,121	95,467,886
6. Santa Clara University	30,257,903	not reported
7. Clarkson University	25,264,233	66,623,000
8. St. Louis University	113,753,169	535,780,485
9. University of South Dakota	36,899,295	83,389,980
10. Ohio State University	485,657,981	1,531,000,000
11. Kent State University	87,376,147	242,817,200
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	237,638,123	707,145,227
13. Northern Arizona University	45,824,700	213,332,197
14. East Carolina University	65,170,904	308,234,749
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	11,673,362	not reported

**FACTORS AFFECTING WORKLOAD
AND TENURE: 1980–98**

To see if organizational conditions affect the way workload and tenure are negotiated within an institution, we augmented the FAPA database with institutional databases for the 1980–81 and 1996–97 academic years that contain data on the institutions listed in FAPA.²⁶ We selected 17 variables for all 241 institutions, and compiled a preliminary demographic profile of all institutions in the FAPA database to

permit inferences across time.²⁷ Tables 3–9 compare 1980–81 and 1996–97 institutional data on three variables: operating budgets, enrollments, and faculty composition of colleges listed in Tables 1 and 2.

Understanding organizational dynamics, many analysts believe, requires knowing how the organizations acquire and utilize resources.²⁸ Table 3 presents 1980–81 and 1996–97 operating revenues for the FAPA institutions in Tables 1 and 2. Operating revenues increased at colleges and universities

Table 4

**Operating Expenditures of FAPA Institutions with Most Frequent Hits:
Workload and Tenure Policies—ACE Database**

Institution	1980–1981	1996–1997
Workload		
1. Rider University	\$19,796,801	\$80,541,330*
2. Kent State University	85,389,970	243,704,680
3. University of South Dakota	37,363,605*	83,019,531
4. Western Michigan University	93,149,000	311,395,809
5. University of San Francisco	not reported	119,786,000
6. Shawnee State University	not reported	not reported
7. University of Detroit	33,521,415	not reported
8. University of Alaska	17,881,574*	not reported
9. Aquinas College	7,482,861	23,139,554
10. Lesley College	11,272,334	50,940,293
Tenure		
1. University of New Hampshire	83,705,369	267,932,677
2. Regis University	7,577,395	38,460,198
3. Illinois State University	82,394,094	180,513,700
4. Michigan State University	343,334,712	925,605,689
5. Weber State University	32,989,027	92,330,855
6. Santa Clara University	30,473,056	not reported
7. Clarkson University	23,404,821	67,028,000
8. St. Louis University	110,841,658	519,173,011
9. University of South Dakota	37,363,605	83,019,531
10. Ohio State University	463,750,708	1,513,000,000
11. Kent State University	85,389,970	243,704,680
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	223,416,078	853,012,882
13. Northern Arizona University	45,045,000	205,629,327
14. East Carolina University	64,594,798	292,833,426
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	11,638,260	not reported

* Indicates deficit.

with the most hits on workload, tripling at Rider, Western Michigan, Aquinas, and Lesley, and doubling at Kent State and South Dakota.²⁹ Many institutions with the highest number of hits on tenure also reported substantial increases in operating revenues, such as Northern Arizona and East Carolina. New Hampshire, Regis, and St. Louis nearly tripled their budgets; Illinois State, Weber State, Clarkson, South Dakota, Kent State, and Indiana doubled theirs. In 1996–97, Ohio

State exceeded \$1 billion in operating revenues, while Michigan State and Indiana approached that sum.

How might growth in operating revenues affect organizational contexts and tenure policies? Increased revenues *may* allow some colleges to reduce workload and maintain tenure to improve their competitive advantage. But these are only hypotheses. Researchers must ascertain whether the revenues of an institution exceed or fall below the median for operating

Table 5

**Fall Semester Enrollments of FAPA Institutions with Most Frequent Hits:
Workload and Tenure Policies—ACE Database**

Institution	1980–1981	1996–1997
Workload		
1. Rider University	5,729	4,760*
2. Kent State University	18,845	20,635
3. University of South Dakota	7,349	6,970*
4. Western Michigan University	22,641	25,699
5. University of San Francisco	6,599	7,885
6. Shawnee State University	not reported	3,505
7. University of Detroit	6,397	7,524
8. University of Alaska	3,250	13,010
9. Aquinas College	2,529	2,385*
10. Lesley College	2,185	6,166
Tenure		
1. University of New Hampshire	12,735	12,454*
2. Regis University	2,023	9,600
3. Illinois State University	20,610	19,409*
4. Michigan State University	47,316	41,545*
5. Weber State University	10,065	13,907
6. Santa Clara University	7,025	7,863
7. Clarkson University	3,830	2,760*
8. St. Louis University	10,712	10,572*
9. University of South Dakota	7,349	6,970*
10. Ohio State University	60,007	54,726*
11. Kent State University	18,845	20,635
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	31,877	34,700
13. Northern Arizona University	11,649	19,605
14. East Carolina University	13,165	17,479
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	1,692	1,841

* Indicates a lower student enrollment in 1996–97 data than in 1980–81 ACE data.

revenues and where it ranks across the range of revenues reported by similar institutions.

How effectively do academic institutions utilize resources? How are funds allocated across departments and why does such a distribution occur?³⁰ Table 4 depicts the operating expenditures of FAPA institutions.³¹ As with revenues, scholars must link the rate of growth in expenditures to changing faculty composition. Table 5 gives enrollment data for the sampled institutions. Student enroll-

ment at some colleges declined as operating revenues increased—perhaps prompting a mission shift affecting workload and tenure. Rider, South Dakota, and Aquinas experienced declining enrollments between 1980–81 and 1996–97. So did six universities in Table 2—New Hampshire, Illinois State, Michigan State, Clarkson, St. Louis, and Ohio State.

Tables 6–9—presenting data on faculty composition—show organizational disparities

Table 6

**Faculty Composition of FAPA Institutions with Most Frequent Hits:
Workload and Tenure Policies (Percentage of Doctorates)—ACE Database**

Institution	1980–1981	1996–1997
Workload		
1. Rider University	52	88
2. Kent State University	not reported	83
3. University of South Dakota	not reported	58
4. Western Michigan University	51	83
5. University of San Francisco	29	15*
6. Shawnee State University	not reported	39
7. University of Detroit	33	not reported
8. University of Alaska	not reported	40
9. Aquinas College	15	57
10. Lesley College	not reported	not reported
Tenure		
1. University of New Hampshire	61	84
2. Regis University	51	not reported
3. Illinois State University	not reported	70
4. Michigan State University	75	80
5. Weber State University	40	64
6. Santa Clara University	53	78
7. Clarkson University	73	88
8. St. Louis University	60	52
9. University of South Dakota	not reported	58
10. Ohio State University	not reported	not reported
11. Kent State University	not reported	83
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	62	83
13. Northern Arizona University	66	77
14. East Carolina University	48	56
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	44	not reported

* A decrease.

within an academic year and across time.³² Note the decreases over time for some institutions. Might disparities in the percentage of faculty possessing doctorates affect the culture and policies of some institutions (Table 6)? Might a decline in total size of the faculty, accompanied by increased operating revenues, affect some policies (Table 7)? We might ask the same question for the total number of full-time faculty (Table 8). Table 9 displays variable patterns for tenure rates.

Contexts matter. These tabulations improve on the short-term, individualistic focus of most workload, productivity, and tenure studies and help to redirect research about academic work toward understanding organizational change.³³ Other variables and ratios must be analyzed—for instance, the ratio of administrators to total faculty or full-time faculty, proportion of tenured professors, or proportion of faculty with doctoral degrees.³⁴ Researchers must also become organizational

Table 7**Faculty Composition of FAPA Institutions with Most Frequent Hits: Workload and Tenure Policies (Total Number of Faculty)—ACE Database**

Institution	1980–1981	1996–1997
Workload		
1. Rider University	305	238*
2. Kent State University	932	1,719
3. University of South Dakota	937	413
4. Western Michigan University	995	1,057
5. University of San Francisco	542	447*
6. Shawnee State University	not reported	266
7. University of Detroit	476	566
8. University of Alaska	192	not reported
9. Aquinas College	206	116*
10. Lesley College	193	150*
Tenure		
1. University of New Hampshire	592	974
2. Regis University	94	425
3. Illinois State University	1,092	944*
4. Michigan State University	2,619	2,578*
5. Weber State University	435	440
6. Santa Clara University	402	592
7. Clarkson University	213	160*
8. St. Louis University	984	not reported
9. University of South Dakota	937	413*
10. Ohio State University	2,707	2,748
11. Kent State University	932	1,719
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	1,271	1,766
13. Northern Arizona University	538	637
14. East Carolina University	700	1,181
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	160	160

* A decrease.

demographers to show how markets and competitors affect institutions and departments.³⁵

These studies must precede substantial policy changes.³⁶ Intelligent policymaking occurs when organizational analysis is applied to the study of academic work.

CONCLUSION

Why the concern about the dynamics of academic institutions? During the 21st century,

faculty must develop an organizational mindset regarding workload, productivity, and tenure policies. Senior faculty members—the chief actors within academic organizations—must think systemically to encourage their departments to become learning organizations and to discern unintended consequences of policies.³⁷ Associations must arm faculty leaders with the appropriate expertise. Faculty must enlarge the debate on productivity and accountability to include

Table 8

**Faculty Composition of FAPA Institutions with Most Frequent Hits:
Workload and Tenure Policies (Total Number of Full-Time Faculty)—ACE Database**

Institution	1980–1981	1996–1997
Workload		
1. Rider University	203	195*
2. Kent State University	677	742
3. University of South Dakota	429	413*
4. Western Michigan University	810	777*
5. University of San Francisco	237	290
6. Shawnee State University	not reported	not reported
7. University of Detroit	255	283
8. University of Alaska	127	380
9. Aquinas College	74	83
10. Lesley College	52	20*
Tenure		
1. University of New Hampshire	514	not reported
2. Regis University	53	128
3. Illinois State University	918	944
4. Michigan State University	2,517	2,022*
5. Weber State University	344	344
6. Santa Clara University	253	367
7. Clarkson University	172	188
8. St. Louis University	749	479*
9. University of South Dakota	429	413*
10. Ohio State University	2,368	2,748
11. Kent State University	677	742
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	1,271	1,546
13. Northern Arizona University	500	637
14. East Carolina University	649	1,037
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	118	115*

* A decrease.

review of academic administrators and governing boards for leadership and effectiveness. Criticisms of tenure and academic work, the onslaught of performance indicators, and post-tenure reviews surprised us because of our preoccupation with our teaching, research, and service. Understanding the policy changes affecting higher education requires organizational expertise. Too often in this era of organizations, ideologies, politics, pundits, consumerism, media, markets, and

electronic technologies, our knowledge has not been enough.

NOTES

¹ Blau and Duncan, 1967; Collins, 1979.

² Gladwell, 2000.

³ At a professional conference I attended in November 2000, a senior academic official posited that a tenured faculty member represents a \$2 million

Table 9**Faculty Composition of FAPA Institutions with Most Frequent Hits:
Workload and Tenure Policies (Percentage of Tenured Faculty)—ACE Database**

Institution	1980–1981	1996–1997
Workload		
1. Rider University	40	56
2. Kent State University	59	34*
3. University of South Dakota	16	50
4. Western Michigan University	63	47*
5. University of San Francisco	27	33
6. Shawnee State University	not reported	not reported
7. University of Detroit	36	not reported
8. University of Alaska	19	65
9. Aquinas College	19	50
10. Lesley College	4	not reported
Tenure		
1. University of New Hampshire	not reported	76
2. Regis University	58	38*
3. Illinois State University	50	72
4. Michigan State University	59	68
5. Weber State University	49	not reported
6. Santa Clara University	not reported	38
7. Clarkson University	38	60
8. St. Louis University	45	41*
9. University of South Dakota	16	50
10. Ohio State University	50	71
11. Kent State University	59	34*
12. Indiana University (Bloomington)	67	56*
13. Northern Arizona University	49	48*
14. East Carolina University	59	49*
15. Illinois Wesleyan University	48	48

* A decrease.

investment for an academic institution estimated across a 30-year career.

⁴ Allen, 1999, Kezar, 1999, King, 1998.

⁵ Cole, Barber, and Graubard, 1993.

⁶ Richard Chait of the Harvard Graduate School of Education directed the compilation of this database.

⁷ Keller, 1982, Carley and Newell, 1994, Morgan, 1997.

⁸ Chait and Trower, 1996.

⁹ Trower, 1998.

¹⁰ Rhoades, 1998; Slaughter and Leslie, 1998; Cotter, 1996; Allen, 1997.

¹¹ Allen, 1996.

¹² Rosenberg, 1992.

¹³ Bensimon and O'Neil, 1998.

¹⁴ Senge, 1990.

¹⁵ Nohria, 1992; Krackhardt, 1992; Burt, 1992.

¹⁶ Hickman, 1998, Brass and Burkhardt, 1992.

¹⁷ Gross, 1968, Gornitzka and Maasen, 2000.

¹⁸ Schein, 1987; Morgan, 1992, 1997.

- ¹⁹ Keller, 1980; Slaughter and Leslie, 1993.
- ²⁰ Carroll and Hannan, 1999.
- ²¹ Gray and Seeber, 1996.
- ²² The database was released in two versions: FAPA 1.1 in 1998; FAPA 2.1 in 1999; the second version included a few additional institutions. This chapter integrates both versions.
- ²³ These institutions do not represent all types of institutions of higher education in the United States; missing, for example, are southern colleges and colleges that award only the bachelor's degree. Our analysis may therefore reflect regional and institutional skews.
- ²⁴ Forrey, 1999.
- ²⁵ Hall, 1999; Burton and Obel, 1998.
- ²⁶ American Council on Education, 1983, 1997.
- ²⁷ State location; regional location; control (public vs. independent); age of institution; institutional expenditures; fall enrollment; proportion of doctorates 1996-97/number of doctorates 1980-81; total instructional faculty; total full-time faculty; total tenured faculty; institutional revenues; student test scores; total administrators; affiliation (religious or nonsectarian); ratio of administrators to total full-time faculty; total degrees conferred (baccalaureate, masters, doctorate), and total library volumes.
- ²⁸ Hall, 1999.
- ²⁹ The other four institutions in the workload category failed to report consistent data.
- ³⁰ Kalleberg, 2000 advocates using a resource-dependency framework to analyze postsecondary schools.
- ³¹ Asterisked institutions failed to report budget data or reported a deficit.
- ³² One might also be suspicious about institutions that do report data infrequently; what organizational dynamics might influence this outcome?
- ³³ A previous generation of sociologists suggested the importance of these organizational dynamics: Gross, 1968, Blau, 1973, and Ben-David, 1972.
- ³⁴ Namboodiri, 1984; Skienna, 1998. A complex analysis of data using matrix algebra or algorithmic modeling techniques is being developed to link the number of hits from the FAPA database, both ACE databases, and the variables listed earlier.
- ³⁵ Carroll and Hannan, 2000; Bourdieu, 1988.
- ³⁶ Future reports will depict similar organizational changes for all 241 FAPA institutions. Systematic, longitudinal site visits and studies of organizational culture in two- and four-year colleges could augment this research.
- ³⁷ Senge, 1990.

REFERENCES

- Allen, H.L. "Workload and Productivity in an Era of Performance Measures." In *NEA 1999 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1999, 27-44.
- _____. "Tenure: Why Faculty, and the Nation, Need It," *Thought and Action* 13 (2) (Fall 1997): 75-88.
- _____. "Faculty Workload and Productivity: Preliminary Findings." In *NEA 1996 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1996, 21-33.
- American Council on Education, *American Colleges and Universities, 12th edition*. Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1983.
- _____. *American Universities and Colleges, 15th edition*. Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1997.
- Ben-David, J. *American Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Bensimon, E.M. and H.F. O'Neil, Jr. "Collaborative Effort to Measure Faculty Work," *Liberal Education* 84 (Fall 1998): 23-31.
- Blau, P.M. and O.D. Duncan. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Blau, P.M. *The Organization of Academic Work*. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Bourdieu, P. *Homo Academicus*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University, 1988.
- Brass, D.J. and M.E. Burkhardt. "Centrality and Power in Organizations." In *Networks and Organizations*, edited by N. Nohria and R. G. Eccles. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School, 1992, 191-215.
- Burrell, G. and G. Morgan. *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London: Heinemann, 1980.
- Burt, R.S. *Structural Holes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Burton, R.M. and B. Obel. *Strategic Organizational Diagnosis and Design, 2nd ed.* Boston, Mass.: Kluwer, 1998.
- Carley, K. and A. Newell. "The Nature of the Social Agent," *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 19 (1994): 221-262.
- Carroll, G. and M.T. Hannan. *The Demography of Corporations and Industries*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Chait, R. "Ideas in Incubation: Three Possible Modifications to Traditional Tenure Policies," AAHE Working Paper Series, *New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C. AAHE Working Paper Series, 1998, 1-27.

- Chait, R. and C.A. Trower. "Where Tenure Does Not Reign: Colleges With Contract Systems," AAHE Working Paper Series, *New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C.: 1997, 1-26.
- Chait, R. "The New Activism of Corporate Boards and Implications for Campus Governance," *AGB Occasional Paper Series 26* (1996): 1-23.
- Chait, R., T.P. Holland, and B.E. Taylor. *Improving the Performance of Governing Boards*. Phoenix, Ariz: Oryx, 1996.
- Cole, J.R., E.G. Barber, and S.R. Graubard (eds.). *The Research University in a Time of Discontent*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Collins, R. *The Credential Society*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Cotter, W.R. "Why Tenure Works," *Academe* (January-February 1996), 26-29.
- Forrey, R. "New Unionism Replaces the Old at Shawnee State," *Thought and Action* 15 (Spring 1999): 139-144.
- Gross, E. "Universities As Organizations: A Research Approach." In *Reader on the Sociology of the Academic Profession*, edited by W. P. Metzger. New York: Arno, 1977, 518-544.
- Gladwell, M. *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown, and Company, 2000.
- Gornitzka, A. and P. Maasen. "Analyzing Organizational Change in Higher Education." In *Comparative Perspectives on Universities*, edited by R. Kalleberg, et al., Stamford, Conn.: Jai, 2000, 83-99.
- Gray, L.S. and R.L. Seeber, eds., *Under the Stars: Essays on Labor Relations in Arts and Entertainment*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Hall, R.H. *Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes, 7th. ed.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1999.
- Harrison, M. *Diagnosing Organizations: Methods, Models, and Processes*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1987.
- Hickman, G.R., ed. *Leading Organizations: Perspectives for a New Era*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1998.
- Kalleberg, R. et al., eds., *Comparative Perspectives on Universities*. Stamford, Conn.: Jai Press, 2000.
- Keller, G. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins, 1983.
- Kezar, A. "Higher Education Trends (1997-1999) Faculty." Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1999, 3-7.
- King, A.F. "The Endless Pursuit of Efficiency: The International Movement to Increase Accountability and Performance in Higher Education," Association for the Study of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: ERIC, 1998, 1-15.
- Krackhardt, D. "The Strength of Strong Ties: The Importance of *Philos* in Organizations," in *Networks and Organizations*, edited by N. Nohria and R.G. Eccles. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School, 1992: 216-239.
- Massy, W.F. and A.K. Wilger. "Improving Productivity," *Change* 27 (July 1995): 10-20.
- Morgan, G. *Images of Organizations, 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1997.
- _____. *Imaginization*. San Francisco, Calif.: Berrett-Koehler/Sage, 1997.
- _____. *Riding the Waves of Change: Developing Managerial Competencies for a Turbulent World*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1988.
- Namboodiri, K. *Matrix Algebra: An Introduction*. Beverly Hills: Sage 1984.
- Nohria, N. and R.G. Eccles, eds. *Networks and Organizations*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School, 1992.
- Rhoades, G. *Managed Professionals*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press: 1998.
- Rosenberg, A. *Economics—Mathematical Politics or Science of Diminishing Returns?* Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Schein, E.H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Scott, J. *Social Network Analysis*. London: Sage, 1991.
- Scott, R. *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, 4th ed.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1997.
- Senge, P.M. *The Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday/Currency, 1990.
- Simon, H. "Organizations and Markets," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 5 (July 1995): 273-294.
- Skienna, S. *The Algorithm Design Manual*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- Slaughter, S. and L.L. Leslie. *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins, 1997.
- Trower, C. "Employment Practices in the Professions: Fresh Ideas from Inside and Outside the Academy," *New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE Working Paper Series, 1998, 1-63.

