The innovative actions that faculty, and institutions on behalf of faculty, have taken to adjust to retrenchment and the changing academic profession are considered. It is suggested that faculty have three kinds of employment options to present conditions such as the scarcity of tenure-track positions and the failure of salaries to keep pace with rising prices. The options are remaining on campus, engaging in supplemental work on and off the campus, or leaving academe. Programs to retrain faculty in low and declining enrollment areas to teach in related disciplines or subdisciplines with growing or high enrollment are increasingly common. Some faculty are shifting to college administration, research, or support services. Overload teaching and consultation are sources of faculty supplemental income and may result in retraining and additional job contacts. Sabbatical leaves may be another option for faculty that permits employment for professional development or retraining or simply allows the individual time for career reassessment. One institutional response is a program at Hagerstown Junior College that enables faculty in occupational programs to take leaves to work in industry. Faculty who feel that leaving the academic community is their best option have several choices, including retiring early, changing careers without retraining, and retraining with campus support. Some institutions now offer campus counseling or career exploration specifically to aid faculty who are changing careers. The University City Science Center in Philadelphia is an example of support to academicians who wish to start businesses. Low-cost administrative support is provided for a variety of industries that are housed at the center. A resource (within the American Association for Higher Education) for additional information on programs to individual faculty and institutions is described and a bibliography is included. (SV)
faculty response to retrenchment

Margot Sanders Eddy

It has become apparent in the last few years that retrenchment—alias reduction-in-force, steady-state planning, and reallocation—will be a way of life in academe for the foreseeable future. Although this is little disputed, the reasons given vary: declining enrollments, reduced state, and new federal, funding, inflation and rising costs, the collective bargaining movement, and finally a recent legislative development, the raising of the mandatory retirement age to 70, effective for college and university faculty in mid-1980.

The situation is cause for concern in higher education. Response by faculty and institutions has been mixed in kind and intensity. Collective bargaining has gained favor among faculty.

It is the last of these responses that is the focus of this article—the innovative actions that faculty, and institutions on behalf of faculty, have taken to adjust to the changing academic profession. What is presented is simply an outline of some faculty options and a sampler of institutional programs designed to accommodate faculty needs. The possibilities for action are great, and the programs undertaken have much potential.

Where faculty are now

There has been concern that because of the rapid increase in academic jobs, there has been turnover in academic jobs. The average age of faculty would rise. At least two studies have disputed this claim.

Patton, Kell, and Zelan (1979) found that nearly one-half of U.S. faculty are under 30. Of the remainder, all but ten percent or less are in a tenure track. This implies that faculty are tenured and not retiring, jobs are not turning over. Some institutions now are offering only non-tenure-track positions, which terminate after two or three years (Ferrone, 1981). The Carnegie Council projects a chronic depression in the academic labor market in the next quarter-century (Ferrone, 1978).

On the purely economic side, faculty salaries since 1948 have not kept pace with rising prices, or with other professional salaries. When adjusted to constant dollars, a net decrease occurred in 1967-68 (Hansen, 1979). Abbott (1980) suggests that lower-ranking faculty will enter the ranks of the working poor in the 1980s if 1970-77 trends in salaries—and the income needed to keep people above the poverty level—continue. In 2000, Abbott projects, full professors will have salaries comparable to those of present assistant professors, when considered in relation to the poverty threshold. Overall, faculty are losing ground, and Abbott feels that in the future entry into the academic profession may be based on access to supplemental income.

In general, then, faculty have three kinds of employment options, remaining on campus somehow, engaging in supplemental on- or off-campus work, or leaving academe.

Staying on campus

An early response to retrenchment threats was redistribution of faculty effort within an institution on the basis of workload analysis. Maximizing faculty productivity has become a standard approach to retrenchment, especially in small, developing colleges, according to Brown (1979). Henard (1979), found that workload data influence appropriations to higher education institutions in more than half the states, since faculty salaries are a major portion of institutional costs.

Increasingly common are programs to retain faculty in low- and declining-enrollment areas to teach in related disciplines or subdisciplines with growing or high enrollment (Neff and Nyquist, 1979). Neff (1978) reviewed four such programs in state systems: the State University at Florida, the State University of New York, the University of Wisconsin System, and the state university and 14 state colleges in Pennsylvania. All of the programs provide salaries during the retaining period, plus tuition waivers, and some cover other expenses such as books and travel. The retaining is taken, variously, in state or out, and in private or public institutions, not always within the faculty member's own institution or system.

Neff concluded that: (1) retaining does work; (2) resistance occurs at first; (3) institutional commitment is essential to program success; (4) financial exigency is a strong motivation; (5) the program must approach academic fields, not individuals; (6) the program should not be used to do away with or even to improve poor teachers; (7) programs work best in a multi-institutional framework; and (8) retaining can be viewed as contradictory to affirmative action for minorities, because existing staff balances are retained. A later study of the SUNY program revealed that more than half its participants had partially or fully shifted disciplines. Most of the participants were associate professors with doctorates (Neff and Nyquist, 1979).

It may be that in an effort to stay on campus, some faculty are consciously moving into other areas of the institution such as academic administration, research, or support services. However, hard data on these moves are not readily available.

Supplemental or temporary employment

In the past faculty have often applied their skills in supplemental or temporary work, both on- and off-campus. However, now they are looking into this type of employment not only as a way to broaden themselves intellectually, but increasingly, for supplemental income, retaining, and making additional job contacts.

This supplemental employment has taken a number of forms, but the most common seem to be consulting, overload teaching, and employment on sabbaticals. Other forms of moonlighting, though sometimes less common, are not well documented.

Consulting is a time-honored way for faculty members to use their skills, maintain professional contacts and awareness, and
issues raised by proliferation of consulting by faculty. A number of authors have addressed the ethical questions (Dillon 1979; Linnell 1978; March 1976; Marsh, Dillon, and Linnell 1979; Patton 1978). Shulman 1978). Patton believes the central concern is whether or not faculty are diminishing their university responsibilities while they consult for fees. Linnell characterizes these activities mood strongly as an end to academic freedom for financial gain and proposes that if faculty want to consult, they do so without remuneration. Patton responds that comparisons of 1971 and 1975 data show no less on-campus productivity among faculty who consult for pay than among those who do not.

The financial issue in consulting activity is a sensitive one. Although Hansen 1979) estimates that the average income faculty numbers earn beyond their basic academic year (8-month) contract is probably not substantial, consulting and overload teaching provide the two largest sources of supplemental income (Marsh 1978). Golumb argues further, in a hypothetical case, that even a highly scrupulous faculty member consulting for going rates in which in-demand field could double an 11-month university salary in his or her spare time and allotted consulting time (1978). Therefore, he notes, consulting conceivably enables a university to attract and retain leaders in their professional fields on terms both can accept.

On the other hand, Dillon proposes the increase in consulting during the last two decades, and the presumed use of institutional resource in accomplishing it, may actually discourage public financial support for higher education (1979). Gillen 1977) and March, Dillon, and Linnell (1979) discuss the need to define more thoroughly institutional restrictions and allowances for faculty consulting, traditionally one day per week is allowed, but the parameters of a day or a week of faculty time usually are not specified. Clark suggests that faculty groups or professional associations go so far as to donate a portion of the members' supplemental income to a fund for professional or institutional development (1976).

Overload teaching, as noted earlier, is a substantial source of faculty supplemental income. Summer teaching in one's own institution has long been available in some faculty; more recent developments are additional teaching assignments within the same institution, often in continuing education programs, and part-time teaching jobs on other campuses, often community colleges. Freedman found that although income is the most common incentive for such overload teaching, compensation is often proportionately much less than the regular teaching scale (1979).

Again, both ethical and economic issues are raised. Linnell believes that overload is a "fallacious concept, inconsistent with the basic idea of the university" and proposes that outside faculty income from all sources revert to the member's college or university (1978). However, most faculty collective bargaining agreements require supplemental compensation for services beyond a "normal teaching load," which generally is defined very clearly (Georges 1977). Furthermore, many agreements now contain guarantees of summer employment, sometimes despite cancellation of classes for low enrollment. It is clear that the ideal of the university and the reality of its financial interests in this case have not yet been reconciled.

Sabbatical leaves, another valued tradition in higher education, also have been subject to change to suit new faculty needs. Traditionally, such leaves have been a year or less in length, taken at reduced salary, and devoted to scholarly research or off campus. Several new and proposed programs extend that purpose by permitting employment for professional development or retraining by allowing younger scholars to enter academe.

An example of leave taken for professional development through employment is the "Return to Industry" program at Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland. Funded by the Appalachian Regional Commission, the program is designed to encourage career faculty who are teaching in occupational programs to return to an industrial setting for a short time to "validate theory, study current practice, or apply problem-solving techniques." In two cases, faculty members went to different industries during separate leaves, to develop new skills (Parsons 1979a). Although the program is intended to strengthen faculty skills, it also provides an opportunity for teachers to learn new skills marketable in other higher education or industry.

Loyola University of Chicago has instituted a program (described in more detail later) that provides not only the opportunity, but also the contacts and some of the planning, for faculty wishing to take leave to work in industry.

Radner and Kuh, in addressing the larger issues of presenting the flow of teachers and scholars in higher education, propose a Junior Scholars program to provide research employment for new Ph.D. recipients until teaching jobs are available (1978). In this context they also suggest a system of government-funded leaves for established faculty. They stipulate that the leaves be granted in addition to those the institution ordinarily would offer and that the institution be required to hire new junior faculty for temporary replacement.

It appears, then, that sabbaticals and extended leaves can provide opportunities for responding to retraining threats without leaving academe completely. These leaves also can be viewed, as they are by Small (1978), as ways of loosening institutional ties to ease the transition to a new career.

Leaving academe

Faculty who feel that moving out of the academic community is their best option have several choices, including retiring early, changing careers without retraining, and retraining with campus support. Some institutions now offer campus counseling or career exploration specifically to aid faculty who are changing careers.

Early retirement is a traditional option, and one increasingly encouraged by institutions. Novotny (1981) reviews this option and the literature pertaining to it in the context of the higher mandatory retirement age. Patton, Kell, and Zelen now, however, that this movement is unlikely to affect the quantities of available academic positions, but would permit only a few important relocations (1977).

Changing careers without campus-based retraining has always been available to faculty, but only recently have observers begun to examine this option and the group of academics choosing it. Individuals may use their subject-area skills in a different setting in industry or government, or may use other, nonacademic skills (whether avocational, such as carpentry or computer work, or other talents, such as organizational ability) in an entirely new field.

An example of the use of subject-area skills outside the academic community is the University City Science Center in Philadelphia, which houses 63 young businesses that started within academic disciplines. Helyar (1981) describes the Center as a "railway house for academicians trying to make it in the business world." It provides low-cost administrative support and a college-community environment for a variety of industries, among them cell-culturing for refined antibody production, nuclear accident management (planning and recovery services), cancer detection research, and commercial data processing. The center has seen few failures in recent years and is felt to have even greater demand and potential than now realized.
At least two recent projects have focused on the individuals who leave academic mid-life. Clara M. Lovett has undertaken a limited study of former senior faculty who already have turned to nonacademic careers (1981). The reasons for these career changes are familiar lack of career mobility in academe, income erosion or job threats, and frustration with various aspects of academic life. Most regret the move as permanent, but have stayed in careers close to their academic specialties. However, quite aside from the mechanics of the changes they made are some interesting insights into the psychological aspects of such a major career decision. Many felt that the college community offered little support for their decisions, and some felt outright hostility. Others had faced suspension within their institutions and families, among career colleagues, and even among job interviewers. The study’s findings suggest that academe can be an isolated and isolating career environment. Lovett anticipates that further results will be forthcoming (1981).

David Palmer at the University of Connecticut surveyed faculty in research and doctoral institutions, comprehensive colleges, and liberal arts colleges (1981). He found that a number of characteristics distinguished the group who both felt they would be satisfied with life outside academe and recently had seriously considered leaving academe; they tended to be younger (35-45), had less research, held affordable professor rank, and would not seek the same work elsewhere if their current job was up for renewal. More comprehensive results are forthcoming in the Journal of Higher Education (Palmer & Patton, in press).

A program mentioned earlier, the Career Development Program at Loyola University Chicago, spans all three of the faculty attrition categories outlined earlier. It extends beyond faculty to include spouses, administrators, and staff—in effect, the entire academic community. The program initially was funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, but gradually has moved toward full institutional funding.

Its aim is to provide opportunities for members of the university community to assess their careers and career directions, but it contains a variety of other notable elements. Workshops in setting goals to integrate personal and professional growth, in personnel, financial management, and in time management have been held. A month-long management workshop is upcoming. For a time, Loyola-conceived efforts to get faculty new employment in industry. Most of these faculty were in their 30’s, and many were tenured. Interestingly, of the 14 individuals “outplaced” in two years, about half decided to return to academe after the industry experience. Now the university puts job-seeking responsibility on the faculty members themselves, but does make contacts and alert the business community to its program (Naftzger 1981).

The program office is off campus, providing an environment of relative neutrality but retaining the institutional link. Robert Barry, the program director, stresses the family orientation of the program and its emphasis on enriching academic family relationships and helping to resolve conflicts in expectations (1981).

Conclusion

It is clear that changes are imminent, if not already apparent, in the character of academic careers in the United States. Shulman finds a “loom” in the academic profession due to dissonance between career expectations and actual career paths (1979).

Baldwin et al characterize faculty as “the demoralized profession” (1970, p. 1). Reduced funding and unpredictable employment have become immediate realities in the last few years. It appears that faculty and institutions acting on behalf of their faculty are using innovative as well as traditional ways to help themselves through the current redefinition period and process. Whether they choose to remain in the academic community in part-time or newly adapted ones, turn to temporary or supplemental employment or on or off campus to enhance or just make possible an academic career, or leave higher education entirely for new careers or early retirement, faculty are adjusting their sights to the new college and university environment. A number of programs support the ideas that faculty want to find ways to change careers, both within and outside academe.

Despite the great start made by these faculty members and their institutions, however, there is a need for counseling, career exploration, and retraining opportunities that are broader based, both geographically and in occupational scope. Colleges and universities, as well as institutions, need to respond creatively—and quickly—to a very difficult academic employment situation. Expansion of existing programs to new groups within higher education would serve to open up these opportunities. Even more effective might be development of regional or national networks, fostered by existing interinstitutional or professional ties, that would increase the options available to individual faculty members whose choices otherwise would be relatively limited. If a range of higher education is to expand horizons, this is an important occasion to do so for faculty, its most vital human resource.
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AAHE hopes to expand its efforts to include a clearinghouse for information and referral on academic career issues. The Association also plans to sponsor conferences on issues such as professional growth opportunities for academicians in the nonacademic sector and career transition services for college faculty. Likewise, it plans to convene a conference of professional association representatives to discuss the career development interests and problems of academicians in various disciplinary fields. Also proposed is a self-assessment guide to help colleges and universities to evaluate the career development opportunities available to their faculty. The project’s director, Roger Baldwin, emphasizes the need for higher education to think of institutions as workplaces and to recognize more fully that faculty are valuable resource people, skillful often beyond their areas of academic specialization (1981).

A further resource

The programs outlined here are just a sampling of the efforts of groups and individuals to adjust to the realities of the changing academic career. The American Association for Higher Education currently operates a program entitled Academic Careers Unlimited—AAHE—, which provides information about some of these and many other programs to individuals and institutions. One result of AAHE’s efforts is a “catalog” of programs in college and universities, Baldwin et al, 1981. Four basic categories of programs are listed: career planning, re-specialization or retraining; experimental internships and exchanges; and multidimensional or comprehensive. Special categories are devoted to transition to nonacademic careers and to formal initiatives in community colleges. A revised version of this catalog is scheduled for publication in fall of 1981.
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