The Status of Non-Tenured Faculty of Color in the Governance Process

Yolanda T. Moses

Abstract

This article calls for a comprehensive look at research and policy issues affecting non-tenured faculty in general, and faculty of color in particular, and at governance issues in American colleges and universities with a special focus on metropolitan universities. The author argues that the confluence of three national trends: (1) changing faculty demographics, (2) increasing numbers of women and men of color in the doctoral pipeline at the same time that there are fewer faculty being hired on the tenure track, and (3) shifting student demographics that will bring 2.6 million new entrants into higher education make it imperative that institutions prepare themselves for these profound changes that will shape the academy for the rest of the 21st century.

This paper is an "essay" in keeping with the root sense of the word—a trial of some ideas. In doing so, I call for new thinking and action. Readers may find that the paper raises more questions than it answers. However, in academia, as in the "outside" world, we know that the *sine qua non* to finding the right answers is first to articulate the right questions. Given the lack of comprehensive, reliable research on many of the issues surrounding non-tenured faculty of color, my attempt here is to start the process of forming the right questions. The issue of hiring non-tenured faculty is especially relevant at metropolitan universities where the leadership is constantly looking for ways to stretch dollars, while at the same time promoting academic excellence.

The first part of the paper examines what I see as the confluence of three national trends that have tremendous governance implications for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty of color at metropolitan universities in particular. They are:

- changing faculty demographics and the changing of the "faculty guard";
- the dilemma posed by the increase in the number of women and men of color who are moving into the professorate, at the same time that more new faculty hires are being placed on non-tenure tracks; and
- shifting student demographics that will bring 2.6 million new entrants, of whom 80 percent will belong to racial or ethnic minorities, or both.

Although none of these developments is "new" news to people in the academy, especially in metropolitan universities, we have not yet fully analyzed how this confluence of trends could create campus environments and structures in which the same people who will have responsibility for teaching, mentoring, and advising the new entrants into higher education may lack sufficient voice or authority in the

departmental and campus governance processes to respond effectively to the challenges posed by the new student demographics.

I then consider how non-tenured faculty of color are faring in academia and offer suggestions for research and policy directions that would start us on the track toward enhancing the participation of non-tenured faculty in general, and particularly non-tenured faculty of color, in the governance process.

Part I: The Three Trends

For the past decade, demographers, higher education researchers, and others have been telling us that demographic shifts will have a critical impact on the nature and success of both the higher education student body and faculty. There are three key shifts underway: retirement of senior faculty; entry of a younger, more diverse cohort of faculty into academia; and increasing student diversity.

A New Academic Generation

In the next 10 or 15 years, the majority of America's professors will be eligible for retirement. While institutional policies as well as individual decisions on retirement age differ, U.S. Department of Education data (2002c) show that in 1998—the most recent data available—the average age of full-time instructional faculty and staff was 49.5. In the same year, 69 percent of these faculty and staff at all types of institutions were aged 45 or older. They were almost evenly divided into two age groups: approximately 36 percent age 45 to 54 and approximately 33 percent age 55 or older.

Table 1 Age of Full-Time Faculty and Staff Whose Principal Activity Is Teaching, By Institution Type and Program Area, Fall 1998

Age 45–54	35.9%
Age 55–64	26.9%
Age 65–70	4.8%
71 or older	1%
Total	68.6%

Note. From the *Supplemental Table Update,* US Department of Education, April 2002, p. 4.

Whether these senior faculty decide to retire at age 55, 60, 65, or even older, the significance of these numbers is the same: over the next decade, America's colleges and universities will be losing many faculty and staff to retirement, and absent a sharp decline in enrollment (which is not predicted), they will need to hire people to fill the gaps. And as these faculty members move off our campuses, they are being replaced by a cohort with vastly different demographics.

One of the most useful sources of information on changing faculty demographics is *New Entrants to the Full-Time Faculty of Higher Education Institutions* (1998), in which Finkelstein and Schuster use data from the 1993 *National Study of Post-Secondary Faculty* (NSOPF [US Department of Education 1993]) to document the emergence of a new academic generation that will face significant new challenges in the twenty-first century.

The NSOPF compared a cohort of new-generation, full-time faculty in the first seven years of their academic careers with a more senior cohort of full-time faculty on a wide variety of demographic and career variables. (The new cohort consisted of full-time faculty whose principal activity during Fall 1992 was teaching, research, or administration at the level of program director, department chairperson, or dean). The new cohorts differed significantly from their more senior counterparts in several key ways: by size of cohort, institutional type, and program area, as well as by demographic characteristics, work experience, type of appointment, and job satisfaction.

Perhaps the most important characteristic is the sheer size of this new cohort; the new faculty entrants constituted one third (33.5%) of the total of 514,976 full-time faculty in the United States. A second major finding is the increasing racial, gender, and ethnic diversity of this new cohort. By 1992 white males had become a minority (43.2%) among the new faculty cohort, declining to 36.5 percent in 1998.

Table 2 New Entrants (Seven or Fewer Years of Experience)

	1992	1998
% of Native-born White Males Among All New Full-Time Faculty Members	43.2%	36.5%
% of Native-Born White Males in Liberal Arts Fields Among All New Full-Time Faculty Members	20.5%	18.6%

Note. From "Assessing the Silent Revolution: How Changing Demographics are Reshaping the Academic Profession" by M. J. Finkelstein and J. Schuster, 2001, *AAHE Bulletin, 54,* p. 4, based on their calculations from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, 1993, 1999.

The data also showed a steady increase in representation of women from 1969 to 1998. By 1998, women accounted for 35.8 percent for all full-timers and 43.8 percent among the new entrants.

The new entrants to teaching were also more ethnically diverse. Minorities made up 11.7 percent of the senior cohort, but rose to 16.9 percent of the new entrants. The representation for African Americans, American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and Hispanics remained unchanged from 1992 to 1998 for senior versus new faculty. Nearly half the newly hired minority faculty (45.6%) were Asian/Pacific Islanders. The

increase in minority representation among the faculty came more from non-native born—11.5 percent in 1992 and 17 percent in 1998—and from Asian/Pacific Islander men, followed by Asian women. African-American women outnumber African-American men in the new cohort (US Department of Education 1999). Overall, female minority faculty accounted for 31.2 percent of all minority faculty in the senior cohort and comprised 38.4 percent of all new-entry minority faculty.

In summary, the new entrants are more diverse ethnically and by gender than their predecessors. But as the following table illustrates, despite the gains cited here, the numerical representation of minorities and women continues to be low in absolute terms (US Department of Education 1999).

Table 3 Full-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff (All 2- and 4-year institutions)

	Gender (%)		Race/Ethnicity (%)	
	Male	Female	Minority	White non-Hispanic
1992	66.8	33.2	14.9	86.5
1998	63.7	36.3	13.5	85.1

Note. From the *Supplemental Table Update* by the U.S. Department of Education, 2002, pp. 11 and 19.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

One of the hallmarks of stability for faculty in American higher education is tenure, a right that has been won by faculty to protect their ability to speak their minds without fear of retaliation by those in power who may disagree with them. At this time, the future of tenure in colleges and universities is being influenced, if not determined, often in subtle ways by demographics. Finkelstein and Schuster (2001) call this shift "the silent revolution."

In 1992, 83.5 percent of full-time experienced faculty held tenured or tenure-track positions, but only 66.8 percent of new entrants held those positions (Finkelstein and Schuster 2001). Of course, some faculty worked in off-tenure positions in the 1970s and 1980s, but the authors show that the numbers increased significantly in the 1990s, to the point where these types of appointments became both the majority and the norm at institutions across the country.

Table 4 Percentage Distribution of Full-Time Faculty by Tenure Status

	Number Tenured	On Tenure Track	Not on Tenure Track	No Tenure for Faculty Status	No Tenure System at Institution
All Faculty	514,976	56.6	21.4	9.7	4.48.0
New Faculty	172,319	23.9	42.9	17.0	7.09.2
Senior Faculty	342,657	73.0	10.5	6.0	3.27.3

Note. From the *New Entrants to the Full-Time Faculty of Higher Education Institutions,* US Department of Education, 1998, p. 34.

A 1998 update of some data from the 1993 NSOPF shows that overall the percentage of faculty who have tenure or who are on a tenure track is declining. Full-time faculty with tenure declined from 56.6 percent to 54.8 percent from 1992 to 1998, and the percentage on a tenure track declined from 21.4 to 20.1 in the same period (US Department of Education 2002c).

The results of several 1999 surveys by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce, a group of twenty-five academic societies, and Roper Starch, an opinion survey organization, illustrate how the trend toward using non-tenured faculty plays out in a range of humanities and social science disciplines including anthropology, art, and political science. They found that "all but three of the disciplines reported that traditional full-time, tenure-track faculty members accounted for less than half of the instructional staff in the responding departments and programs. Part-time and adjunct faculty comprised 22 to 42 percent of the instructional staff in these departments and programs, depending on the discipline" (Coalition, http://www.theaha.org/caw/cawreport.htm). A 2002 study by the American Mathematical Society showed similar trends, concluding that "between 1995 and 2000, the number of tenured faculty in mathematics departments in four-year colleges and universities dropped by about 3%, the number of tenure-eligible faculty dropped by 6%, and the number of other full-time faculty, i.e., full-time faculty members who are neither tenured nor tenure-eligible, rose by 65%" (Lutzer et al. 2002).

Student Demographics

It is predicted that by 2015 the number of undergraduates will increase by 2.6 million students, and that 37.2 percent of these will be minorities, compared with 29.4 percent in 1995 (Carnevale and Fry 2000). Many of these students will be from immigrant families, and their concentration on campuses will vary dramatically by region. On campuses in California, Hawaii, New Mexico, and the District of Columbia, minority students will outnumber Euro-American students, and in Texas, enrollment will be evenly split between Euro-Americans and minority students.

The greater numbers of minority students will result in a changing profile of undergraduates, which will pose a new challenge to higher education—the challenge to serve not just more students, but an increasingly diverse group of students. To meet their needs, colleges and universities will need to hire more faculty. Students in the pipeline now and in coming years, who will be the source of that faculty, are increasingly diverse. These trends coincide with the already-pronounced trend toward an increasing proportion of faculty in off-tenure tracks.

For purposes of this analysis, the most significant finding of Finkelstein and Schuster's (1998) research and of other studies cited here is the intersection of the racial and gender data with the findings on faculty tenure. This confluence of trends raises a number of important questions about the future status of faculty of color in non-tenured positions, and about the potential of these faculty members to play a meaningful role in issues of campus governance that directly affect their students, including learning and excellence on the one hand, and programmatic direction and strategic planning for the future on the other.

Part II: The Status of Non-Tenured Faculty of Color

How Are They Faring?

It would be hard to exaggerate the importance of tenure in academia. In his book, *Questions of Tenure* (2002), Richard Chait concludes that tenure is "the coin of the realm," and will continue indefinitely to be the preferred career path for most faculty. Yet the meaning of the concept differs widely across institutional categories, and the practical effects of different tenure systems play out in very different ways with respect to institutional mission, structure, curricula, culture, and student characteristics, as well as institutional governance.

This part of the essay consists of reviews of two groups of research literature on non-tenured faculty. The first group of work describes the types of alternatives to tenure that have emerged around the country, and the attitudes of tenured and non-tenured faculty about the role and status of those who do not have tenure. The second body of research focuses on the barriers that impede the ability of non-tenured faculty to play a role in institutional governance.

Roles and Responsibilities

In their book *Teaching Without Tenure* (2001), Baldwin and Chronister analyzed several data sources to create a profile of how full-time, off-tenure faculty carry out their work. The data—which unfortunately is not disaggregated to provide insights into potential differences based on race, gender, or ethnic origin—showed that full-time faculty in positions off the tenure track performed in a wide variety of categories that tend to cluster in four groups:

- Faculty who are interchangeable with tenure-track faculty. They are responsible for teaching, research, and service, but are not eligible for tenure.
- Faculty with more specialized roles such as teaching introductory courses or skill development courses such as English composition, foreign languages, or science laboratory. These roles do not require research or participation in governance activities.
- Faculty who are considered hybrid and form a bridging function. They usually combine some form of teaching with an administrative or technical role.
- Faculty who come to higher education from another profession. They usually have specialized knowledge in a field where they can offer current, expert information for a fraction of the cost (Baldwin and Chronister 1999).

In her 1996 AAHE working paper on non-tenure track appointments, Judith M. Gappa identified six models that have evolved as alternatives to tenure: teaching appointments, professors of practice, research professors, distinguished senior lecturers, limited-tenure situations, and integrated tenurable and non-tenurable tracks in medical school.

Finkelstein and Schuster's (2001) work illustrates how structural differences between tenured and non-tenured faculty translate into functional differences. Their analysis shows that off-tenure faculty devote about five hours less per week to institutional responsibilities (as much as 10 hours less at research universities) than their counterparts do; spend more time teaching and less time in service activities (governance and committee work); and are about twice as likely as tenure-track faculty to spend no time at all in "informal interaction" with students. The disparity is even greater in professional fields.

Effects of Non-Tenured Appointments

Researchers who have studied the implications of full-time, non-tenured appointments have found largely positive effects for the institutions that hire non-tenured faculty and staff and largely negative effects for the individuals who work in these positions. The positive effects that Baldwin and Chronister (2001) identified were that by hiring non-tenured faculty an institution can benefit from flexibility in the use of its workforce, cost savings, and short-term contracts.

On the other hand, the same researchers identified several negative impacts. First, faculty may become bored from teaching the same classes, usually lower division, creating the risk that they will pay less attention to how students are learning than they should. Second, non-tenured faculty may become generally dissatisfied with their work situation, due to their lack of participation in scholarship and governance. Third, Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found that a two-tier faculty status system had developed on many campuses, in which the non-tenured faculty on term appointments were disadvantaged on several variables, including teaching assignments, salary compensation, professional development support, and opportunities for career advancement. Many of these faculty felt that they were second-class citizens, and

because they lacked job security, they were often actively job-hunting, which resulted in diminished commitment to the institution and its students (Baldwin and Chronister 1999). This two-tiered system impedes the development of trust, loyalty, and a sense of community among the faculty, which in turn sends a signal to students, who also see the schism.

Gappa's work also sheds light on the attitudes of and about non-tenurable faculty. She found that the integration of these faculty members into their department varied from one institution to another for a variety of reasons, including the attitudes of tenured faculty. For example, non-tenurable faculty with credentials similar to those of tenure-track faculty were seen as equals, but non-tenurable faculty who were more junior and still building their academic careers felt more vulnerable because they depended on tenured faculty for professional approval.

Consistent with Baldwin and Chronister's findings, Gappa reports that status differentials between tenured and non-tenured faculty are often tied to course assignments, location in special programs that give non-tenured faculty a feeling of marginalization, inability to participate in or vote at special department meetings, lack of sabbaticals, lack of career mobility, lack of rules and regulations around their employment, and lack of job security (1996).

My own experience as president of The City College/CUNY also offers insight into the campus dynamics that may occur as the numbers of non-tenured faculty increase. Specifically, I observed that when political issues arose on campus, the non-tenure-track faculty—who were often faculty of color and Euro-American women—often identified with students. The posture they were taking was not only anti-administration, but was also in opposition to that of the tenured faculty, which was really an anti-status-quo position. When I asked faculty union leaders about this, they explained that the non-tenured faculty felt invisible and helpless to influence the administration and traditional faculty culture. They believed that joining the student protests was a way to draw attention to their own concerns.

In sum, researchers have identified a range of job qualifications, titles, and responsibilities that accrue to non-tenurable faculty, but the research shows that faculty in this situation generally have highly circumscribed, specialized roles on campus, mostly around teaching. Furthermore, there is considerable evidence that such faculty are at risk of becoming marginalized and of feeling that in comparison to their tenured colleagues they are treated as second-class citizens. One arena in which this two-tier faculty structure becomes evident is in campus governance.[12]

---

[12] *Teaching Without Tenure* by Baldwin and Chronister and other work by the same authors provide a comprehensive look at data collected from several sources, and are the basis of the discussion and analysis in the previous section. Specific sources include the US Department of Education's 1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-88) and the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPSF-93). In addition, the authors completed a survey of 88 four-year institutions representing a cross-section of US colleges and universities, and interviews with 385 faculty and administrators based on site visits to twelve geographically diverse institutions.

Barriers to Participation in Governance

On any campus, the governance process is embedded in the cultural history of the institution. It is the sum of interactions among a diverse group that comprises the executive team and both permanent and ad hoc structures such as boards and committees, at the institutional and departmental levels.

The policies and decisions established by these structures and processes affect non-tenured faculty and their students as much as tenured faculty and their students. Yet by being employed in a non-tenurable track almost by definition serves as a barrier to a faculty member's meaningful participation in governance.

The first part of this paper documented that more than half the professorate is likely to retire in the next 10 or 15 years; that the "new entrants" into the profession increasingly are members of minorities; and that there is a trend toward hiring more and more faculty in non-tenurable positions. This situation poses a serious question about the potential of the new faculty entrants to gain influence, let alone representation, in campus governance.

This section has examined specific barriers that impede the ability of non-tenure track faculty to participate in governance. The foregoing descriptions of the different types of non-tenure-track appointments, the status of faculty in these appointments, and the barriers to their participation in campus governance raise serious questions about the ability of non-tenured faculty to play a meaningful role in campus decisions that affect both their own status and the learning experiences of their students. All of us who care about the quality of the education we offer our students should be deeply concerned about these issues, especially the evolution of a two-tier faculty system in which those who do not have tenure may be professionally marginalized and isolated by their colleagues and their institutions, and the persistence of biases and stereotypes in the process of hiring and assigning teaching and other responsibilities.

In short, this emerging phenomenon of a larger cohort of non-tenured faculty of color calls out, both for more focused research and for new paradigms of the tenure process and of campus governance.

Part III: Enhancing Participation in Campus Governance

Soon the most diverse group of students in American history will be heading to our colleges and universities—over roughly the same time period in which a major transformation is occurring in the professorate. Research shows that the growing cohort of non-tenured faculty are likely to be the ones to engage head-on with these new students, because they tend to teach the undergraduate, lower-division courses that many of these first-generation, racially and ethnically diverse students are required to take.

We cannot respond effectively to the challenge of providing a quality education for these students unless we also address the issues posed by the advent of a new, largely untenured, wave of faculty of color.

What We Don't Know

Currently a disconnect exists between the increasing importance of the new cohort of faculty and their ability to teach an increasingly diverse student body, because these faculty still lack sufficient status in their institutions and an adequate voice in campus governance.

To what extent does the growing corps of faculty of color have an opportunity for meaningful involvement in the issues of curriculum policy and autonomy, or for serving on key policy-making committees (both inside and outside the departments)? To what extent do they have the opportunity to influence or participate in departmental academic program planning and review? What do we know about how faculty of color are faring within the existing academic structure and governance systems?

The research to date offers few answers. Most of what we know comes by deduction from studies that address a part of the issue—such as the structure of the various types of non-tenure arrangements or the barriers that deter faculty of color from full participation in campus affairs. While I advocate a full research agenda in the next section of this paper to investigate what is actually happening and not happening on college and university campuses across the nation, I would like to offer my own suggestions of what should be done to include non-tenured faculty of color in the campus governance process right now.

Departmental Level
- Leadership at the departmental level should look at policies and practices that exclude this group of faculty. Does the rhetoric of inclusion match the realities of the policies? If not, the policies should be changed.
- New non-tenured faculty should be included in the formal orientation for new tenure-track faculty. Attention should be paid to orienting this faculty to the history and traditions of the department.
- Every non-tenured faculty of color should be provided with a senior faculty mentor from the department into which the faculty is hired, or from another department if that is more appropriate. The bottom line is that new faculty members need to be given a personal perspective of what is expected from them. They also need to have someone who they can talk to one-on-one, who will be honest with them, and who can be their advocate if need be.
- Every non-tenured faculty of color should be provided with the same or comparable professional development and training opportunities as tenure-track faculty.
- Non-tenure track faculty should be invited to sit on key departmental committees that set policy for and oversee the quality of academic programs.

Dean/Provost Level
- Change campus-wide policies and procedures to allow non-tenured faculty of color to serve on college/school or university-wide committees such as curriculum committees and educational policies committees, or on committees focused on teaching and learning issues.
- Extend eligibility for teaching awards and other similar recognition awards to non-tenured faculty of color.
- Provide non-tenured faculty of color with funds to attend professional meetings and conferences. If there are scarce resources and complaints from tenured faculty, the dean or the provost should raise special funds or obtain funds through grants for this activity.
- The provost should make sure that non-tenured faculty of color are made aware of any research funds or grant opportunities that for which they may be eligible to apply.

President/Chancellor
- The president should acknowledge non-tenured faculty of color in public speeches, and when the president makes visits to academic departments.
- The president should appoint non-tenured faculty of color to presidential and Blue Ribbon committees, where appropriate.
- The president should be made aware of the significant contributions that non-tenured faculty of color are making to the institution in an annual report.

Academic Senate
- Academic senates should extend membership to non-tenured faculty of color.
- Non-tenured faculty of color should be eligible to serve on key policy-making committees of the senate, including the educational policies committee.

These suggestions, while not exhaustive, should be thought of in terms of creating an environment in which faculty of color can do their job. Although they will not be on a tenure-track line, they will have the authority and power to influence what happens in their department, school, or division, or even college- or university-wide as it relates to student learning, student achievement, and student learning outcomes. In the next section, I make more specific research and policy recommendations.

Research Agenda

In light of the above findings, I propose here a research agenda to examine more deeply the status of off-tenure-track faculty of color, their needs, their interaction with students and with their colleagues, and their role in the shared governance process. The research should document the experiences of tenured and non-tenured faculty of color at all different types of academic institutions, and should assess the professional factors that enable productive, successful, and satisfying careers. Among the themes that merit further research are:

- The demographics of full-time, non-tenured faculty of color. What do we know about the distribution of non-tenured faculty of color across institutional types? Are they clustered in one type? Under what conditions are they hired? How long do they tend to stay in the institution? Under what kinds of conditions do they leave? Do they readily move from non-tenure positions to tenure-track positions over time, or is it a dead end job?

- The relationship between tenured- and non-tenured faculty on campus. What is the relationship between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty on different kinds of campuses? Is there a difference among research and non-research institutions, or among unionized and non-unionized institutions? On a given campus, what are the structural barriers—policies, procedures, and practices—that mitigate or enhance this relationship?

- The degree to which non-tenured faculty play a role in governance or are marginalized within their departments or institutions. Both survey and ethnographic research will reveal to what extent faculty of color in non-tenure positions are involved in the governance structures of their institutions. It would be interesting to measure this against the actual courses that they teach. Research is needed to show what kind, if any, informal processes exist in which these faculty can be influential in the governance process.

- The ways in which these faculty members can overcome institutional barriers to participation in governance. Research is needed to show how institutions have in fact managed to include non-tenured faculty of color in the governance process and how the institution has fared as a result. This research could then be shared widely in publications and at conferences that leaders of metropolitan and other kinds of universities will attend. Dissemination of this kind of research will allow institutions to get out in front of the curve on this higher education issue.

As we search for answers to these types of questions, we must be alert to promising practices that can be shared with, and possibly replicated by, a range of institutions, but especially metropolitan universities that teach the lion's share of America's students in postsecondary education.

Policy Agenda

The other challenge we face is to determine to what extent individual faculty, departments, and programs want the new faculty to be better integrated, and what we can do to make it happen. The key to making changes is having the will as an institution to change the culture of the two-tier system in which tenured and non-tenured faculty operate. We need a new paradigm that values what each faculty member brings to the students, the department, and the institution as a whole. The challenge is to create opportunities within governance structures and processes to hear

the new voices of more diverse faculty, and to channel their ideas into creating a new governance structure that is based not on tenure and seniority, but on the expertise that all faculty bring to the institution.

A number of researchers, including some of those cited here, have offered proposals that would move us toward this ultimate goal. Their work provides a basis on which to build, but much more must be done if we are to change the academic culture to ensure that full-time, non-tenurable faculty of color are full-fledged members of the academic community. To make progress, we need to have a better understanding of who—the board of trustees, president, or academic senate—is making policy decisions on a particular campus, and we need to know their degree of commitment to making the types of changes that I believe are absolutely imperative to ensure the access of all American students to a quality education.

In our fast-changing social, economic, and technological environment, higher education faculty and administrators already face a full agenda of challenges just to keep their doors open and their students graduating (Tierney 2003). Yet we must find a way to grapple with the issues raised in this paper. Our institutions cannot be considered successful unless we find ways to continue to increase the numbers of faculty of color and to ensure their effectiveness by breaking down the caste-like environment that currently divides tenured and non-tenured faculty on many of our campuses. If we do not engage in this work, faculty of color in full-time, non-tenured positions face the threat of greater marginalization, and of becoming more isolated from participating in governance processes and structures such as decisions on curriculum, service on key policy committees, and input into departmental or program review processes.

If we allow this marginalization to occur, those who suffer most will be those for whom the entire academic enterprise exists—our students.

As I warned at the beginning of this paper, I have raised more questions than I have answered. But I have done so because I believe the twenty-first century university and college in America can be the place where shared governance provides the vehicle that allows the quality of our work to reach a new and better level—a level that links our values to open and free inquiry, and to engagement in shared governance for all faculty.

References

Aguirre, A. Jr., *Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace: Recruitment, Retention and Academic Culture,* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Vol. 27, No.6. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000).

Baldwin, R. G. and J. Chronister, *Teaching Without Tenure* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

Baldwin, Roger G. and Jay Chronister, "Marginal or Mainstream? Full-Time Faculty Off the Tenure-Track," *Liberal Education 85* (4,1999): 16–23.

Carnevale, A. P. and R. A. Fry, *Crossing the Great Divide* (Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 2001).

Chait, R. P., *The Questions of Tenure* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002).

Chait, R. P., and C. H.Trower, "Faculty Diversity: Too Little for Too Long," Plenary Paper at *Keeping Our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color,* University of Minnesota, 2002: 2–12.

Coalition on the Academic Workforce, *Summary of Data from Surveys,* http://www.theaha.org/caw/cawreport.htm.

Day, J.C., *Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995–2050.* Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports (February): 25-1130. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1996).

Finkelstein, M. J., R. K. Seal, and J. H. Schuster, *The New Academic Generation: A Professorate in Transition* (Baltimore: John's Hopkins University Press, 1998).

Finkelstein, M. J. and J. Schuster, "Assessing the Silent Revolution: How Changing Demographics are Reshaping the Academic Profession," *AAHE Bulletin Volume 54* (2, October 2001): 3–7.

Gaff, J., A. Pruitt-Logan, and K.Weibel, *Building the Faculty We Need: Colleges and Universities Working Together* (Washington D.C. American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2002).

Gaff, J. "Toward a Strategic Plan for the Future of the Preparing Future Faculty Program," (Unpublished Report. American Association for Higher Education, March 2003).

Gappa, J. M., *Off the Tenure Track: Six Models for Full-Time, Non-Tenurable Appointments.* New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry #10. (Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1996).

Gappa, J. M. and D. W. Leslie, *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Time Faculty in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993).

Gappa, J. M. and D. W Leslie., *Two Faculties or One? The Conundrum of Part-Timers in a Bifurcated Work Force.* New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry # 6 (Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1997).

Gappa, J. M., "The New Faculty Majority: Somewhat Satisfied, But not Eligible for Tenure," In *New Directions for Institutional Research* (105, 2000): 77–86.

Lutzer, D. J, J.W. Maxwell, and S.B. Rodi, *Statistical Abstract of Undergraduate Programs in the Mathematical Sciences in the United States, 2002* (Washington, DC: American Mathematical Society).

Smith, D. G. et al., *Achieving Faculty Diversity: Debunking the Myths* (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1996).

Smith, D. G. "Hiring Faculty of Color: Research on the Search Committee Process and Implications for Practice." Symposium Proceedings. *Keeping Our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color,* University of Minnesota, 2002a: 29–34.

Tierney, W. G., "Challenges for Governance: A National Report," (Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California, 2003)

Turner, C. S. V., "Hiring of Faculty of Color: Research on the Search Committee Process and Implications for Practice." Symposium Proceedings: *Keeping Our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color,* University of Minnesota, 2002a: 34–40.

Turner, C. S. V., *Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees* (Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2002).

Turner, C. S. V. and S.L. Myers, *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success* (Des Moines: Longwood Division, Allyn and Bacon, 2000).

US Department of Education, *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93): Methodology Report.* NCES 97467 (1998).

US Department of Education, *New Entrants to the Full-Time Faculty of Higher Education Institutions,* Martin J. Finkelstein, Robert Seal, and Jack H. Schuster. NCES 98-252 (1998).

US Department of Education, *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 99): Methodology Report.* NCES 2002154 (2002a).

US Department of Education, *The Gender and Racial/Ethnic Composition of Postsecondary Instructional Faculty and Staff,* 1992-98. NCES 2002-160 (2002b).

US Department of Education, Supplemental Table Update, April 2002: Background Characteristics, Work Activities and Compensation of Instructional Staff in Postsecondary Institutions. Tracy Hunt-White. http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001152u.pdf (2002c).

Author Information

Dr. Yolanda T. Moses is former President of AAHE and Distinguished Visiting Scholar, Claremont Graduate University, School of Educational Studies.

Dr. Yolanda T. Moses
Special Assistant for Excellence and Diversity
Office of the Chancellor
University of California, Riverside
2119 Hinderaker Hall
Riverside, CA 92521
Telephone: 909-827-7741
Fax: 909-787-3866
E-mail: Yolanda.moses@ucr.edu