

Faculty Tenure: Myth and Reality 1974 to 1992

By Philo A. Hutcheson

The “conventional wisdom” maintains that U.S. colleges and universities have been overflowing with tenured faculty since the 1970s. These tenured professors, critics claim, are running scams that drain the public coffers and taking political postures antithetical to the public interest.¹ Tenure’s critics are quick to cite figures on the number of tenured professors, or even the proportion at institutions offering tenure. But what they fail to provide is important contextual information, such as the percentages of faculty with tenure.² In fact, despite the “conventional wisdom,” there has not been a thorough longitudinal examination of tenure and the United States professoriate.

This study provides a look at the contextual information that has been so sorely lacking. Presented here are comparable longitudinal information about faculty tenure and faculty rank, at different types of institutions. This task is not easy, since differences in survey methods, even among those done by the same agency at different points in time, complicate the data collection.

The earliest national surveys on the number of tenured professors appear to have occurred in the post-World War II period, and not until the early 1960s do any reports with national data appear. From the end of World War II until 1963, occasional reports on faculty tenure appeared, each built upon surveys of selected institutions. For example, Byse and Joughin found in a sample of 68 institutions in 1955 that 53 percent of the full-time faculty held tenure.³ In 1963-64, the U.S. Office of Education instituted a set of

Philo A. Hutcheson is assistant professor of educational policy studies at Georgia State University, where he has also served as faculty coordinator of the higher education doctoral program. He recently authored a chapter for an upcoming volume of *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* titled, “McCarthyism and the Professoriate: A Historiographic Nightmare.” Research for this Thought & Action article was partially funded by the NEA Office of Higher Education.

***This report presents
longitudinal data that can
more fully inform those
interested in tenure.***

detailed surveys of the nation's professors, and, irregularly since then, the federal education agency has examined the professoriate.⁴

Several important works based on national surveys have appeared over the last 30 years. Alan Bayer's 1969 survey for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching stands as a comprehensive review of the professoriate. Lipset and Lipset completed another thorough examination in the early 1970s, focusing their efforts on collective bargaining issues and, subsequently, on faculty political identities. More recently, in 1986, Bowen and Schuster issued a compelling critique of the condition of the professoriate, subtitled *A National Resource Imperiled*. Finally, Ernest Boyer offered an evaluation of the nation's professors in *Scholarship Reconsidered* and in *College*, his arguments derived in great part from a 1988 survey of the professoriate by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.⁵

All of these studies are important contributions to the literature on professors in the United States. There remains, however, a critical but unanswered question: How have proportions of faculty with tenure changed over time? Simply put, what are the numbers? How has the proportion of tenured faculty changed over time relative to faculty rank, institutional types, and full-time and part-time employment?

This report examines three groups of faculty, presenting longitudinal data that can more fully inform those interested in tenure. The first is composed of professors employed full-time whose teaching responsibilities account for at least 50 percent of their time. The second includes women in the profession. Regrettably, longitudinal data are not available for faculty members of color, although this article examines recent conditions for those professors. The third encompasses all professors, full-time and part-time.

The federal government surveys of 1974-75 (conducted by the Office of Education) and the 1987 and 1992 surveys (conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, NCES) provide the available longitudinal data on tenure. The primary concern of this report are the surveys of 1974-75 and 1992. The 1987 data clarify some of the changes in proportions of tenured professors, especially

in terms of the common knowledge about such proportions.

As Table 1 indicates, just over one half of the full-time faculty in the fall of 1974 (the term surveyed) held tenure. This proportion represents a slight increase from the late 1960s, when Martin Trow reported that 50 percent of all professors held tenure.⁶ The 1974 figures show a noticeable difference between the public and private sectors.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Full-Time Faculty with or Without Tenure, Fall 1974

	Public	Private	All
Tenured faculty	56	50	54
Untenured faculty	44	50	46

Source: Richard M. Beazley, *Salaries and Tenure of Instructional Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education 1974-75*, Section I, Tables 2, 2-A, Table 2-B.

Table 2 illustrates differences among institutions, by control and type, for faculty tenure proportions in the mid-1970s. Substantial differences among institutional types appear within both the public and private sectors. Most striking are the differences between public and private four-year colleges, as well as between public and private two-year colleges. (The 1974-75 report distinguished institutions by levels rather than degrees offered; this study adjusts the data for 1987 and 1992—when the NCES used a more specific institutional taxonomy—in order to provide comparable information.) The explanations for these differences vary according to institutional control and history.

TABLE 2

Percentage of Full-Time Faculty with Tenure
by Institutional Type and Control, Fall 1974

	Public	Private	All
Universities	58	57	58
Four-year institutions	57	48	53
Two-year institutions	52	24	50

Source: Richard M. Beazley, *Salaries and Tenure of Instructional Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education 1974-75*, Section I, Tables 2-C, 2-D, 2-E, 2-F, 2-G, 2-H, 2-I, 2-J, 2-K.

Among private four-year institutions, denominational affiliations often meant that tenure proportions were low, since these institutions either did not offer tenure or, as in the case of Roman Catholic institutions, relied heavily on orders within the church to provide college instructors. In contrast, public four-year institutions were much more likely to have collective bargaining units, an activity that typically resulted in securing tenure procedures for the faculty. Many public institutions also were part of a state system that provided tenure for faculty members at universities and four-year institutions. Much like the public four-year institutions, the public two-year institutions either had collective bargaining or were part of a state system offering tenure. Private two-year institutions often did not offer tenure.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Full-Time Faculty With or Without Tenure
Fall 1974, Fall 1987, Fall 1992

	Fall 1974	Fall 1987	Fall 1992
Tenured faculty	54	60	53
Untenured faculty	46	40	47

Source: Richard M. Beazley, *Salaries and Tenure of Instructional Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education 1974-75*, Section I, Table 2; *Profiles of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions*, 1988, Table 1.6; *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty*, National Center for Education Statistics.

What about the changes over the next twenty years? How accurate are the characterizations of “tenured-in” faculties? Table 3 provides remarkable information. The proportion of tenured faculty members did increase from 1974 to 1987, but, by 1992, the proportion had fallen. In fact, the 1992 proportion is slightly less than that of 1974.

An important note about longitudinal comparisons is appropriate here. The 1974 data are parallel with the data from 1987 and 1992, due to changes in categorizing faculty members and their instructional responsibilities. The 1974 survey detailed criteria for inclusion in the report that are different from the criteria of the 1987 and 1992 surveys. For 1974, “instructional faculty” was defined as full-time staff members devoting more than one-half of their time to teaching. The survey asked respondents to exclude administrators with teaching responsibilities as well as faculty in preclinical and clinical medicine (all other clinical faculty in the

Governing boards continue to believe that colleges and universities have too many tenured professors.

health professions were to be included). In the 1987 and 1992 surveys, respondents were to include administrators with teaching responsibilities and not to exclude clinical medical faculty. For this reason, the groups examined in this report are those full-time instructional faculty with teaching accounting for more than half of their responsibilities in the term surveyed. We cannot determine the actual differences without the raw data from all three surveys, a set of research issues yet to be addressed, but it appears that the numbers and percentages for 1974, 1987, and 1992 are indeed comparable because of the constant condition of teaching load.

What do these numbers mean to professors? They are, perhaps, most significant to two groups: full-time professors on the tenure track and professors not eligible for tenure. Despite the clear indication that the percentage of tenured professors has declined, members of governing boards continue to believe that colleges and universities have too many tenured professors. The standard response: reject tenure candidates, a process apparently underway. In 1971, 8.7 percent of those professors considered for tenure did not receive it, and in 1987, 21 percent did not receive it.

Many critics arguing against tenure also suggest that non-tenure track instructors, full-time or part-time, are the best choices that institutions can make to fill teaching positions. Instructors are, after all, easily dismissed. As one author has stated in the *Educational Record*, "nontenure track faculty . . . have been shown the door" in efforts to reduce costs.⁸ Code words such as "efficiency" or "institutional flexibility" hide the real meaning of the tenure problem for institutions: They cannot dismiss at will when short-term economic problems occur. Professors not on the tenure track, however, can be shunted aside.

Table 4 provides more specific data about the changes in faculty tenure proportions from 1974 to 1992. For the entire period, private universities are less likely to have faculty members with tenure than any other institutional type except for "other institutions," a cohort that includes private two-year colleges (see discussion above for tenure rate at those institutions) and specialized institutions such as nursing schools.

TABLE 4

Percentage of Tenured Full-Time Faculty by Institutional Type,
Fall 1974, Fall 1987, Fall 1992

	Fall 1974	Fall 1987	Fall 1992
Public university	58	65	58
Public comprehensive	57	66	59
Public two-year	52	60	52
Private university	57	52	47
Private comprehensive	48	48	49
Other	NA	38	36

Source: Richard M. Beazley, *Salaries and Tenure of Instructional Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education 1974-75*, Section I, Table 2-D, 2-E, 2-G, 2-H, 2-J, 2-K; *Profiles of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions*, 1988, Table 2.7; *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty*, National Center for Education Statistics.

What factors are changing tenure dynamics? Institutional policies offer one possible explanation. Tenure is not a universal characteristic of higher education. Until the late 1950s, in fact, institutional tenure limits were characteristic of United States higher education. Those limits appear to be returning. In 1971, 6 percent of all institutions had limits on the number of tenured faculty. In 1987, 13 percent of all institutions limited the percentage of tenured faculty. Also in 1987, 93 percent of all institutions reported that they had taken recent action—such as appointing full-time faculty members to nontenure tracks—that could have the effect of reducing the number of tenured faculty.⁹ According to a recent NEA report, only 64 percent of full-time faculty members appointed in the five years prior to 1992 held tenure or were on tenure track, compared to 74 percent of all full-time faculty members.¹⁰ Who gets tenure today? That question raises important questions, especially given the gender and ethnic composition of the academic profession, as will become evident in the next section of this report.

Despite the trends noted above, some institutions have recently developed tenure systems. In 1987, 9 percent of all institutions did not have a tenure system. As of 1991, 8.1 percent of the nation's colleges and universities did not offer a tenure system.¹¹ Individual professors are indeed finding tenure more difficult to earn, but faculties at some institutions are now finding that tenure is available.

Another reason for the recent decline in the proportion of

The net effect is that the number of faculty holding tenure has not changed over the past 20 years.

tenured faculty may be a shift in the professoriate itself. As many commentators have noted, the professoriate has been aging. Under a quarter of all faculty in 1969 were 51 years old or older, that is, ready to retire within the next 15 years, by 1983. Nearly half of professors in 1969 were aged 36 to 50, due to retire or likely to retire (given the removal of the mandatory retirement age) between 1984 and 1999.¹² Indications of faculty retirement plans in the 1980s, although varied and at times subtle, generally suggest that a large cohort of aging faculty has indeed moved into or near retirement.¹³ In 1987, about 10 percent of all professors holding tenure indicated that they were very likely to retire within the next three years.¹⁴ If those professors maintained their plans, the proportion of tenured faculty could have declined from 60 to 54 percent from 1987 to 1991 (since 10 percent of 60 is 6 percent), very nearly accounting for the decline reported in Table 3. Other professors did, of course, receive tenure in this period, and, as a result, retiring professors do not account for the entire decline of tenured professors from 1987 to 1992. But the aging professoriate appears to be having a continuing substantial impact on tenure proportions. Professors are tenuring out, not in.

Finally, tenure is not an ultimate assurance of job security, despite charges that it is nothing but a sinecure. According to the 1988 National Center for Educational Statistics report, 2 percent of all tenured faculty who left their institutions lost their positions because of removal for cause or retrenchment. In other words, 280 tenured professors lost their jobs in 1987.¹⁵ Nor is tenure an automatic system, and the increase in professors on the tenure track who do not receive tenure, noted earlier, indicates that the possibility of gaining tenure has diminished.

The net effect of all these changes is that, in the past 20 years, the number of faculty holding tenure has not changed, despite the increasing numbers of colleges and universities that have developed tenure systems. Institutional policies restricting tenure appointments and the retirement plans of tenured faculty suggest that, within a few years, there may be a further decrease in the percentage of tenured faculty members. Critics of the academy who

charge that higher education is collapsing under the weight of tenure have mismeasured the weight and its duration. Only from the mid-1970s to the late 1980s did the proportion of tenured faculty members grow substantially, and, over recent years, that growth has turned into a considerable decline.

Women, People of Color, and Tenure

Any consideration of the professoriate must take into account its composition. For the past 20 years, higher education has claimed to be making efforts to bring women and people of color into the academy. This section examines longitudinal changes for female faculty members and current data for professors of color.

The gains women achieved as tenured faculty members appear to have slowed, and, in fact, women were losing ground as of the early 1990s. Table 5 indicates that the chilly climate appears to be growing even colder than recent reports have suggested. Differences in tenure proportions between men and women are expressed in ratios. The higher the ratio, the higher the proportion of women who have tenure in any of the years noted. Table 5 suggests that an increasing proportion of women have tenure—if the timeline considered is 1974 to 1991-92—except at public and private four-year institutions. Yet the results are not so encouraging if the span of years considered dates from 1985-86.

Longitudinal data on professors of color are not available for this report, but recent federal surveys present data relevant to this discussion. Table 6 suggests a contemporary picture similar to the

TABLE 5

Ratio of Tenured Full-Time Faculty to Male Faculty
by Institutional Type and Control, 1974, 1985-86, 1991-92

	1974	1985-86	1991-92
Public universities	.60	.62	.62
Public four-year	.78	.71	.67
Public two-year	.82	.86	.85
Private universities	.59	.63	.61
Private four-year	.71	.65	.61

Source: Richard M. Beazley, *Salaries and Tenure of Instructional Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education 1974-75*, Section I, Tables 2-D, 2-E, 2-G, 2-H, 2-J, 2-K; *Digest of Educational Statistics, 1993*, Table 2.7.

TABLE 6

Percentage of Faculty Tenure Status by Ethnicity, Fall 1992

	Tenured	Tenure Track	Other*
White	54	19	26
Asian	44	26	32
Hispanic	44	33	24
Black	43	27	30
American Indian	42	26	32

Source: *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update*, "Tenure," Table 6..

* There are three groups in this category; faculty not on the tenure track, faculty in positions that do not have tenure, and faculty at institutions that do not offer tenure.

longitudinal story for women: little if any progress. A higher proportion of whites hold tenure than do people of color, and, except for Hispanic professors, higher proportions of professors of color hold positions that do not offer tenure.

Some 33 percent of all full-time faculty members in 1992 were women, and 14 percent were people of color.¹⁶ Women and people of color are numerically minorities in the professoriate and, in more troubling terms, also minorities in tenure positions. The calls to reform tenure rarely address the issue of the gender and ethnic composition of the professoriate. Policymakers in either public or private higher education have given little indication that they plan to do much to increase participation rates for women and people of color.

All Faculty and Tenure

This report has focused so far on full-time faculty who devote at least half of their time to teaching. These, of course, make up almost all of the professors most likely to hold tenure (full-time professors with course releases for the term surveyed would be the remainder of this cohort). If we look at all faculty, as Table 7 does, we see a different, more revealing and disturbing portrait of tenure. We see only a minimal increase in the percentage of tenured professors—indicating, in view of the data on full-time faculty members, the likelihood of a slight increase in the percentage of tenured part-time professors.

What does this mean? Arguments about tenure revolve around

TABLE 7Percentage of All Faculty With or Without Tenure
1974 and 1992: All Institutions

	1974	1992
Tenured faculty	35	36
Untenured faculty	65	64

Source: Richard M. Beazley, *Salaries and Tenure of Instructional Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education 1974-75*, Section I, Tables 2, Table 217; *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update*, "Tenure," Table 1..

several points. Tenure, typically described as "part of a wider contractual system that relates to academic freedom and to the participation of peers in personnel practices involving faculty," establishes an institutional pledge to keep professors for the duration of their careers. As Bowen and Schuster note, there are many who argue that tenure protects sloth and radicals, conserves departments against the press of changing demands, and impedes entrance to the professoriate, especially for women and people of color.¹⁷ There is, however, a more fundamental problem with tenure. In a mid-1970s work on academic freedom, a philosophy professor concluded that tenure is *not* a necessary or sufficient condition for the protection of the professoriate, given that a large proportion of professors do not hold tenure.¹⁸ Critics who scold academics for their cherished grasp on tenure fail to recognize that its power lies more in symbol than in political or social conditions.

The real issue is not how many professors have tenure but rather the weak protection tenure offers. In 1992, 47 percent of all full-time instructional faculty did not hold tenure and 63 percent of all faculty did not hold tenure.¹⁹ Tenure does not provide protection, even as due process, for the majority of the nation's faculty.

Conclusion: The Meaning of Tenure

This article has focused on the quantitative nature of tenure—who has it, who gives it. It is appropriate that the conclusion address the two fundamental meanings of tenure: its assurance that professors may teach and conduct research in an atmosphere of freedom of thought and speech and the institution's lifetime commitment to the professor.

Many events in the post-World War II period show that society is not willing to tolerate diverse and at times controversial views in

Schrecker documents about 100 instances of outright dismissal of professors dur- ing the McCarthy period.

higher education. This intolerance ranges from outright suppression and condemnation to subtle faculty inhibitions. The McCarthy era was an extraordinary example. Ellen Schrecker has documented the instances of outright dismissal during the McCarthy period, estimating that approximately 100 professors lost their positions.²² Lazarsfeld and Thielens documented just as thoroughly the general apprehension experienced by social science professors during McCarthyism. Overall, their investigation found substantial evidence of “patterns of caution” in teaching, research, and professional obligations.

In 1965, American Association of University Professors General Secretary Fidler presented a report on academic freedom in the South that noted how meager faculty condemnation of segregation had been.²⁴ Despite academic freedom and tenure, constraints on faculty clearly existed.

Sheila Slaughter has reviewed several decades of alleged violations of academic freedom and tenure, her most recent work focusing on the 1980s. Her conclusion speaks to shifts in problems in the academy, as the anti-Communist, anti-American concerns of the 1950s and the segregationist views of the 1960s have given way to new social concerns. Her analysis of those academic freedom cases taken up by AAUP leads her to conclude: “Gender ran like a thread through all the academic freedom cases other than the anti-administration category, testifying to the difficulty that the academy has had in incorporating women.”

Finally, Slaughter’s examination of the AAUP cases in the 1980s reveals another disturbing characteristic of tenure. Of the cases she examined, accounting for 191 dismissals, 82 percent resulted from administrative decisions concerning program changes. In her examples of those dismissals, she indicates that administrations dismissed tenured professors as well as untenured professors.²⁶ Financial considerations can be part of a tenured faculty member’s release from contract.

The lessons of the post-World War II period are clear, if not widely accepted. Tenure is not an assurance that institutions will protect professors for social or political reasons, or from financial

***There are specific activities
that faculty unions can
pursue to clarify the faculty
tenure myth.***

troubles. Institutions have dismissed professors with tenure, and, just as troubling, professors with tenure have, upon occasion, restrained their inquiry due to social or political conditions.

The tenure debate will continue. Critics, despite the numbers evident in this article, will offer their age-old arguments that professors are too critical of tradition and too secure in the ivory tower. Those who ought to defend tenure, however, need to attend to some ominous realities of the tenure system. Tenure is neither characteristic of the nation's professoriate nor an automatic condition. Nor does it necessarily provide protection to those who hold it, much less those who do not.

There are specific activities that faculty unions and faculty senates can pursue to clarify the faculty tenure myth. First, no governing board or administrative statement on the number or percentage of tenured faculty members at an institution or in a system should go unexamined. What does a governing board member mean when he declares that over 5,000 faculty members in the system have tenure, as Florida's university system regent did in describing the Florida system? The faculty response needs to be precise and immediate. How many professors are full-time and do not have tenure? How many are part-time and do not have tenure? What are the actual percentages of each group as a part of the whole? University governance and the media should get the whole picture. Whichever office on campus completes the annual federal IPEDS report will have the applicable data, and the heads of faculty unions and senates should consider collecting the IPEDS summaries on an annual basis.

Second, unions and faculty senates should ensure that governing boards and administrations do not propose reforms in the tenure system without faculty participation and explicit language guarding such critical domains as access and academic freedom. Consider this description of the late 1970s. As institutions—often with only the most grudging of faculty approval—created tenure restrictions, increasing numbers of women and people of color, finally coming through the slightly wider pipeline resulting from the 1960s, encountered these new obstacles. Allowing administra-

***There is simply no reason
to deny substantial due
process rights to part-time
professors.***

tions to have flexibility (a code word) with such words as “may” is likely to create obstacles for new faculty members. Declarations that the administration “shall” engage a faculty review committee in consideration of changes in tenure guidelines have more force.

Third, faculty unions and faculty senates need to consider, within faculty ranks, the meaning of tenure at their individual institutions. Throughout the 20th century, institutions and their faculties have increased tenure demands without providing releases in any areas.²⁷ One of the most direct complaints about tenure is that the reward system emphasizes research at the cost of teaching. Faculty unions and senates should examine their institutions’ tenure guidelines and ask how well they match institutional goals and mission. Should teaching institutions —numerically speaking, the majority of colleges and universities in this country—have research as the first condition of tenure? Even if research is the second condition, should a strong research record outweigh a mediocre teaching portfolio? Research universities also need to consider the problem of research versus teaching. On the way to a Washington, D.C., meeting to present the initial results of this article, I read an inflight magazine article about a professor at a Research I institution. The article synopsis states: “The campus’s most beloved professor put his students ahead of his scholarly tomes. That’s why he’s being dumped.” An ungraceful description in ungraceful language, but, the truth is, hundreds of thousands of anxious flyers read the article. For professors, the message should be: We all teach, and we all need to reward those who teach well. Determining the meaning of “teach well” is difficult but hardly overwhelming at the institutional level.

Finally, why not find ways to provide tenure for other than full-time white males? There is no reason to deny substantial due process to part-time professors. Why not provide tenure to part-time faculty members? There are also ways to address tenure issues for full-time professors. Women may come into the tenure track at the very time that they must come to a decision about family, in their thirties.²⁹ An unfriendly or indifferent environment may leave faculty of color with an uncomfortable choice of finding a

more welcoming place. Furthermore, women and professors of color are increasingly examining issues of gender and race, dishearteningly called “nonmainstream” research interests and published in “nonmainstream” journals. Having the freedom to teach in creative ways and to investigate the unusual or new should be central aspects of the professoriate. Why not find ways to provide appropriate faculty development for those who are just now finding their way into the academy in increasing numbers?

There is little to suggest that tenure will disappear completely. Institutions that have “done away” with tenure are isolated examples, not a national pattern. Even at these institutions that have eliminated tenure, tenure-like realities—especially long-term contracts and protections for academic freedom—re-emerge.³⁰ Nevertheless, governing boards and administrations continue to have the power to restrict tenure and define it in their own terms. The debate over tenure will continue. ■

Endnotes

- ¹ See, for example, Anderson, 1992; Kimball, 1990; and Sykes, 1988.
- ² Uhlfelder, 1995, 3.
- ³ Byse and Joughin, 1959, 170.
- ⁴ Dunham and Wright, 1966; Beazley, 1976; *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988*; *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty*, 1993.
- ⁵ Bayer, 1970; Lipset and Lipset, 1973; 1975; Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Boyer, 1987; Boyer, 1990.
- ⁶ Trow, 1973, Table 1.
- ⁷ Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, Table 4; *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education*, 1990, Table 4.3.
- ⁸ Harvey, 1992, 16. Harvey concludes that academic leaders need to explain tenure to a skeptical public (see pp. 16-17); nevertheless his harsh comments regarding untenured professors reflect their considerable vulnerability.
- ⁹ On the 1950s and 1971, see Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, pp. 2-7 on range of institutional practices, p. 49 on tenure limits until 1950s, p. 6 on 1971 limits. On 1987, see *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education*, 1990, Table 4.6, on institutional limits, Table 4.8, on recent limiting actions.
- ¹⁰ National Education Association, 1995, 2.
- ¹¹ For 1987 data, see *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions*, 1988, Table 2.7. On 1991 data, see National Education Association, Table 3.
- ¹² Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, 1973, Table 6.
- ¹³ Bowen and Schuster, 1986, 37-39 for a discussion of the aging professoriate.
- ¹⁴ *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions*, 1988, Table 6.3.
- ¹⁵ *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education*, 1990, Table 3.5.
- ¹⁶ National Education Association, 1995, Tables 5 and 6.
- ¹⁷ Bowen and Schuster, 1986, 235.

- ¹⁸ Sartorius, 1975, 133-158.
- ¹⁹ National Education Association, 1995, Table 1, on percent of all faculty with tenure.
- ²⁰ On the characterization of tenure as due process, a contractual right, see Bowen and Schuster, 1986
- ²¹ See, for example American Association of University Professors, 1990, 3-10.
- ²² Schrecker, 1986.
- ²³ Lazarsfeld and Thielens, 1958, 192-236.
- ²⁴ Fidler, 1965, 414.
- ²⁵ Slaughter, 1994, 96.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 76-79.
- ²⁷ For an early and intriguing argument about the problem, see James, "The Ph.D. Octopus," (1912) for a discussion of the first step in increased demands: requiring the doctorate.
- ²⁸ On the Research I institution, see Harper, 1995, pp. 22, 24, 26-27. On determining criteria for teaching well, see the Jossey-Bass *New Directions* series on teaching and learning as well as Centra, 1993; Cross, 1981; Eble, 1977; Eble and McKeachie, 1985.
- ²⁹ This is an awkward construct, since it apparently assumes continuation of the dilemma noted in parenting literature, that husbands expect wives to take care of infants. Even with equity in that regard, as an expectant father I am acutely aware that pregnancy is much more my wife's fatigue and pain, however sympathetic and supportive I may try to be.
- ³⁰ Chait, 1995: 90-91.

References

- 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1993).
- American Association of University Professors. *AAUP Policy Documents & Reports*. Washington, D.C.: AAUP.
- Anderson, Martin. *Imposters in the Temple*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.
- Bayer, Alan E. *College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970).
- Beazley, Richard M. *Salaries and Tenure of Instructional Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education 1974-75*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Bowen, Howard R. and Jack H. Schuster. *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Boyer, Ernest L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- _____. *Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Byse, Clark, and Louis Joughin. *Tenure in American Higher Education: Plans, Practices and the Law*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1959.
- Centra, John A. *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1993.
- Chait, Richard P. "The Future of Academic Tenure," *Priorities* 3 (Spring 1995): 81-91.
- Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, *Faculty Tenure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.
- Cross, K. Patricia. *Adults as Learners: Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.

- Digest of Educational Statistics, 1993*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1993.
- Dunham, Ralph E., and Patricia S. Wright. *Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education: First Term 1963-64*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Eble, Kenneth E. *The Craft of Teaching: A Guide to Mastering the Professor's Art*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.
- Eble, Kenneth E., and Wilbert J. McKeachie. *Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development: An Analysis of Effective Programs and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.
- Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1990.
- Fidler, William P. "Academic Freedom in the South Today," *AAUP Bulletin* 51 (December 1965): 413-421.
- Harper, Timoth. "Publish or Perish." *Sky* (October 1995): 22, 24, 26-27.
- Harvey, James. "Footing the Bill: Financial Prospects for Higher Education," *Educational Record* 73 (Fall 1992): 11-17.
- Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1990.
- James, William. "The Ph.D. Octopus." In *Memories and Studies*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912.
- Kimball, Roger. *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education*. New York: Harper & Row, 1990.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul, and Thielens, Jr., Wagner. *The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958
- Lipset, Jr., Everett Carll, and Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education*. Berkeley: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1973.
- Lipset, Jr., Everett Carll, and Seymour Martin Lipset. *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- National Education Association. "Tenure," *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update* (September 1995).
- National Study of Postsecondary Faculty*, National Center for Education Statistics, 1993.
- Sartorius, Rolf. "Tenure and Academic Freedom." In *The Concept of Academic Freedom*, edited by Edmund L. Pincoffs, 133-158. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.
- Schrecker, Ellen. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Slaughter, Sheila. "Academic Freedom at the End of the Century: Professional Labor, Gender, and Professionalization." In *Higher Education in American Society*, 3rd edition, edited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumpert, 73-100. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1994.
- Sykes, Charles J. *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway, 1988.
- Taylor, Barbara E. "Talking About Tenure," *Priorities* 3 (Spring 1995): 82.
- Trow, Martin. "The Distribution of Academic Tenure in American Higher Education." In *The Tenure Debate*, edited by Bardwell L. Smith and Associates, 223-250. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.
- Uhlfelder, Steven J. "Reform Tenure Now: Addressing Florida's Failed System," *Outside the Lines*. Coral Gables, Florida: Foundation for Florida's Future, 1 August 1995.