

1000 0002 0465

CHAPTER 9

TOMORROW'S PROFESSORIATE

As we move into the twenty-first century those working in American higher education have the possibility of fundamentally reshaping the nature and character of the professoriate and in so doing altering higher learning itself. The next twenty years represents a "window of opportunity," the likes of which we have not seen since the period of enormous expansion in the 1960s. There is widespread debate about the nature of the change: Who's in the "pipeline?" What will be the size of the enrollment increase in the late 1990s? What are the dominant retirement patterns? Will the Ph.D.'s who have failed to find employment in the academy return when the market shifts? *But*, there is no question about the significance of the change.

To attract the finest of a new generation into the professoriate we will need a vision of the role of the scholar that is more enticing, one that is broadly challenging and promises to make a difference, not only in the colleges and universities and in the lives of students, but in the larger society as well.

We have come through a difficult time in higher education in this country. The lack of mobility, the retrenchment in some institutions, and steady-state staffing in others have created a highly competitive environment among faculty and contributed to a narrowing of our conception of scholarship. Morale among faculty, particularly junior faculty, is not high. At the same time, other professions such as business, engineering, and law have become increasingly attractive to the most talented young people. One wonders if those with broad interests and the kind of probing intellectual curiosity required of the best teachers and researchers might have been turned away from the rigorous path leading to a faculty career.

In their recent study of faculty supply and demand, *Prospects for Faculty in the Arts and Sciences*, William Bowen and Julie Ann Sosa found that the greatest shortage are expected in the

humanities and social sciences—this was their most striking finding. But they went on to relate their projections of faculty shortages to institutional type, using the Carnegie Classification. The authors found that while demand increases for all sectors, the rates of increase vary substantially from sector to sector. Most importantly, they found the lowest rates of increase in faculty demand among those institutions most intensely committed to research—the Research I institutions. In contrast, comprehensive universities and liberal arts colleges are projected to have the greatest increase in demand, more than doubling from 1987-92 to 1997-2002.

The new faculty most needed in the years ahead are not those who are narrowly prepared to engage in cutting-edge research in the discipline. The scholarly talents in highest demand are going to be those required for meeting the needs of a practical world, synthesizing knowledge and teaching. The research universities will have little difficulty dealing with the modest increase in the projected demand for faculty. It is the other sectors, with other scholarly missions, that are going to require not only new faculty in large numbers, but appropriately prepared faculty.

Minority Faculty

The question of tomorrow's professoriate cannot be seriously raised without soon turning to the issue of minority faculty recruitment. The demographic shifts we hear so much about—the “browning of America”—promises to alter everything in society from politics and economics to values and culture. Colleges and universities will not be able to contribute constructively to this time of dramatic change unless minorities are better represented on the faculty. At present, blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans together make up 20 percent of the population and 28 percent of 18- to 24-year-old people in this country, but earn only 6 percent of all doctorates and comprises less than 6 percent of the faculty.

To adequately respond to the great challenges and opportunities confronting us in the days ahead, we need to identify, mobilize, recruit, and educate the full range of talent available in this

society. In higher education this will require the introduction of greater intellectual and human diversity into our faculties. Critical to this task is the enlargement of the pool of minority talent. In some academic fields the number of qualified minority applicants is so small they can be individually named.

Although a major effort needs to be made to recruit and support minority graduate students—and we commend what the foundations and graduate schools are already doing in this regard—a concerted recruitment endeavor permeating undergraduate programs and reaching down into the high schools will be necessary. The Ford Foundation's summer research fellowships for minority undergraduates who might become interested in faculty careers is a step in the right direction. These fellowships allow minority students to work closely with faculty mentors on a selected research topic. A similar strategy focusing on the teaching role might be even more enticing. Included in the University of Alabama at Birmingham's "Comprehensive Minority Faculty Development Program" is a pre-college summer internship program for minority high school students of unusual potential. Programs of this sort need to be replicated across the country.

The intolerably small pool of qualified minority applicants for faculty appointments in most fields represents a serious weakness, if not an indictment, of American higher education. We have invested in and developed an educational delivery system second to none, but have failed to cultivate an appropriately diverse faculty to staff it. This issue extends well beyond the campus, but must be high on the agenda of those who care about the future professoriate.

Faculty as Mentors

Most of the discussion of tomorrow's professoriate focuses on the graduate school years, and so it should. Recruitment of a new generation of faculty, however, must begin much earlier. It is time that we take a fresh look at efforts to attract the most talented undergraduates into the

academic profession and what needs to be done to initiate their preparation during the college years.

Faculty in the humanities and social sciences have been reluctant over the past fifteen years to urge their best undergraduates to follow them into the academy. In fact, responsible faculty have felt morally obligated to warn their students of the perils of entering the profession during a time when jobs were scarce.

Faculty now have a very different outlook. After a long period of restraint they can once again recommend that their better students consider an academic career. The rewards of mentoring budding scholars in one's own field, again, becomes a live possibility.

In the Carnegie Faculty Survey, one of the most dramatic changes between 1984 and 1989 was in response to the statement: "This is a poor time for any young person to begin an academic career." In 1984, 50 percent of the faculty respondents agreed; in 1989, the percentage agreeing with this statement had dropped to 20 percent. Clearly, the American professoriate anticipates a major shift in career prospects in their profession. This optimistic response was found across the institutional sector, age, gender and field of specialization.

In the 1989 Faculty Survey, the question was asked: "How have job prospects in your field changed over the past five years?" Even in this retrospective view, 49 percent of all faculty said job prospects were "better" and only 12 percent felt they were "worse."

Faculty must, once again, take up the task of seeking out and encouraging those students with that special kind of intellectual curiosity and love of learning that makes the best scholars in the broadest sense. Commitment to a field is important and needs to be thoughtfully nurtured, but the faculty of the future are—more than ever—going to have to be intrigued with how students learn and excited about teaching. Faculty mentoring needs to extend beyond the sharing of one's research interests; the other forms of scholarship also need to be cultivated *and* honored.

Undergraduate Preparation

Tomorrow's professoriate will need a broad intellectual foundation on which to build a scholarly career. The Carnegie study, *College*, recommends an "integrated core" as a counterbalance to the fragmentation and specialization so characteristic of the academy. The ability to interpret knowledge, so important to the teacher and researcher alike, requires a more coherent program of study ensuring that the basic intellectual building blocks are provided, the connection between disciplines are being made, and bridges to the practical world of everyday are being built.

So often students with exceptional academic promise are recruited by a professor in a particular discipline and urged to focus on work in a specialization. Jules La Pidus, President of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, points out that:

... while this is seen as putting the student on the right track, that track can be so narrow, particularly through the construction of a kind of pre-graduate major, that the talented undergraduate can lose the valuable experience of general learning that could characterize undergraduate education. Instead, the student may become a clone of the teacher, and if the teacher's interests are narrow, the student will emulate that model. (AAHE Bulletin, May/June 1989, p. 6)

The admissions policies of many graduate programs encourage this narrowing of focus and, in the interest of preparing students for graduate school, the undergraduate major becomes, in some cases, a miniature graduate program. At the extreme, certain talented undergraduates are "preselected" very early on for particular Ph.D. programs, and their capacity to work across the disciplines and do the kind of integrative scholarship required for high quality undergraduate teaching is severely limited.

Jaroslav Pelikan, Dean of Yale's Graduate School, has questioned the appropriateness of the conventional undergraduate major as preparation for advanced study, arguing that much of scholarly research is increasingly interdisciplinary in character. The broader conception of scholarship being called for in this report would make a divisional or interdisciplinary major preferable. The "enriched major" recommended in *College* which encourages students not only to explore a field in depth, but helps them put their special area in perspective might also be considered as an alternative to the regular disciplinary major.

It is also important that undergraduate students interested in academic careers interact intellectually with peers across disciplinary boundaries. Honors programs can make a difference here. Capstone seminars relating theory and practice or addressing ethical issues in an interdisciplinary area can draw the student into the rich excitement of crossing traditional academic boundaries, synthesizing work in their own way, sharing it with other students, and, thus, experiencing the joy of at least one aspect of teaching.

Traditionally, when bright undergraduates are encouraged to consider academic careers the effort is field-related. They are urged to consider being an economist, physicist, electrical engineer, or psychologist. The faculty member draws the student into the intellectual excitement of research in the field. Often this is done by including the student in a specific research project. To adequately represent the primary work of most faculty, however, the intellectual pleasures and challenges of teaching need also to be shared. Talented juniors and seniors can be included in the collaborative teaching of entry level courses. Peer tutoring has been used constructively in a variety of settings. And, is there any reason why the new Academic Alliances—local, discipline-based collaborations between schools and colleges—should not include advanced undergraduates in the development of teaching within a field and, perhaps, even teaching in the high schools? The scholarship of teaching provides its own enticement.

Fellowships for Graduate Study

In the 1950s, when it was evident that the next decade would be marked by a significant surge in college enrollments and high demand for faculty in higher education, private foundations such as Danforth and Woodrow Wilson initiated highly selective fellowship programs aimed at attracting the most talented young people of that period into the professoriate. The Danforth Foundation sought to encourage value-centered college teaching and spoke explicitly of the teaching profession as a vocation.

The primary support for graduate education, however, came from the Federal Government and focused mainly on one form of scholarship—research. Between the mid-1950s and 1970, the number of government fellowships, research assistantships, and traineeships increased from just 7,500 in 1954 to over 80,000. Most of the support went to the sciences and engineering—the National Science Foundation, National Institute of Health, NASA and other mission agencies—but the social sciences and humanities also benefitted, particularly through the National Defense Education Act fellowships and the Title VI foreign language and area studies fellowships.

This period of dramatic increase in federal support of graduate education was followed by a period of sudden retrenchment. Between 1970 and 1975 funding for graduate student support was cut by more than 50 percent. Programs such as the NDEA fellowships were terminated and others were reduced sharply in scale.

In 1982, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation anticipated future needs with the creation of a new program of graduate fellowships in the humanities. The program had two purposes: to attract annually into fields of the humanities 100 to 125 of the most promising potential teacher-scholars (including a number whom discouraging conditions might otherwise deflect to law, business, or other callings) by providing three-year, competitive, portable fellowships; and to contribute thereby to the minimum flow of

talent and funding needed to sustain graduate programs on which future advanced scholarly research so heavily depends.

In announcing the fellowship program, the foundation stated candidly that it was interested in recruiting “young women and men who have a larger vision of both teaching and learning than has characterized many of the products of recent graduate education.” It is this “larger vision” that needs to be built into a new strategy for recruiting the faculty of the future; it also needs to inform the funding of their graduate preparation through both public and private sources. We are convinced that this “larger vision” should have at its core a broader conception of scholarship and that this in itself would serve to entice the broad range of talented candidates.

[Recommendation for funding of fellowships for graduate study?]

Graduate School

If an enlarged conception of scholarship is to take hold, changes must take place in the graduate school. This is where the values and commitments of the American professoriate are shaped. The dominance of research in our thinking about scholarship can be traced to the overwhelming influence of that uniquely American institution—the graduate school.

Kenneth Eble, in one of his early books, *Professor as Teacher*, registered an observation that is widely shared:

... and the narrowness of vision, the disdain for education, the reluctance to function as a teacher are ills attributable in large part to graduate training.

Upgrading the preparation of college teachers in graduate schools is therefore fundamentally important not only to improving teaching but to refashioning higher education.

Our graduate schools do not prepare professors. They turn out members of academic professions and disciplines prepared primarily for specialized research. Certainly, our new Ph.D.s do not think of themselves as members of the teaching profession. In fact, for many, the

characterization "teacher" would be an insult. Rather, they consider themselves to be chemists, botanists, and historians, and if pressed, would identify most closely with a more specialized sub-field.

Given the broader scholarly needs of the colleges and universities in which most of the newly-minted Ph.D.s are going to work throughout their professional lives, a different kind of preparation is required. Future faculty need more than mastery of a narrowly defined specialty in order to carry out their diverse and extended responsibilities in the contemporary college or university.

Ernest Lynton is right when he points out that "of all professions it is the academic one that needs a truly liberal career preparation" (p. 139). As we have indicated, the foundation for this enlarged approach to knowing must be laid during the undergraduate years, but it is essential that during the graduate period of specialization future faculty continue to cultivate a broader perspective on their work. We believe that the enlarged view of scholarship presented in this report could serve as a general guide for the redirection of graduate school preparation.

Discovery. We are not calling for radical change. The graduate school needs to continue to be the place where future faculty experience the exhilaration that comes with being on the cutting edge of a field. The preparing of a dissertation or project that at least makes a modest contribution to the field should continue to be the center piece of that effort. The graduate student, however, should be given wide latitude in the choice of that project, so that there is a sense of ownership—that the project and the accomplishment is theirs. Too often the thesis is an extension of a senior professors established research agenda. The capacity to mentor in ways that value independence and honors the individuality of the student is all too rare.

While affirming the centrality of study in depth—focused specialization—and the importance of the scholarly process involved in producing a dissertation, we need to acknowledge that in some fields, and in the arts particularly, creativity is manifest in more

expressive ways. This difference needs to be accommodated in the requirements for a doctorate. And although the preparation of all faculty should include the opportunity to gain a firm grounding in the methodology utilized in basic research, the final scholarly product—in an applied area, for instance—might take a form different from the traditional research dissertation.

Integration. So often graduate preparation is so narrowly restricted to the department and discipline that the fact that it is intentionally located in a university is lost. In his classic statement, *The Idea of a University*, John Henry Newman set forth the essential argument for locating professional preparation in a university:

There will be this distinction as regards a Professor of Law, or of Medicine, or of Geology, or of Political Economy, in a University and out of it, that out of a University he is in danger of being absorbed and narrowed by his pursuit, and of giving Lectures which are the Lectures of nothing more than a lawyer, physician, geologist, or political economist; whereas in a University he will just know where he and his science stand, he has come to it, as it were, from a height, he has taken a survey of all knowledge, he is kept from extravagance by the very rivalry of other studies, he has gained from them a special illumination and largeness of mind and freedom and self-possession, and he treats his own in consequence with a philosophy and a resource, which belongs not to the study itself, but to his liberal education.

The advantage of being in a university needs to be reflected in the graduate curriculum. The specialization needs to be contextually located, intellectually, socially, and historically. The relationship to adjacent disciplines need to be explored in some depth. Ethical issues impinging

on the specialization—both personal and public— need addressing. And a thorough knowledge of the intellectual history of, not just the specialization, but the larger field, ought to be required.

This capacity for making connections and synthesizing related matters is essential for both quality research and good undergraduate teaching. It is also required for informed participation in the structuring of curricula. The scholarship of integration, as we have called it, might be built into one or more courses in the graduate program itself. Perhaps a better way of ensuring that this kind of knowledge is given attention is to restructure, or, as the case may be, merely resuscitate the dissertation defense. If the formal defense of one's specialized work required placing it in a larger context, relating it to historical developments in other disciplines, and being able to intelligently examine its ethical implications, and if representatives from adjacent fields and those utilizing the specialized knowledge outside the university were invited to the defense, the student's ability to integrate could be reasonably assured.

Application. In a recent statement on the central challenges facing the graduate schools, the Ford Foundation's Peter Stanley focused on the relationship between scholarship and public discourse. He questioned the tendency of scholars to frame their inquiry along lines that are either too specialized or too abstract to address the normal range of concerns that plague the lay public. He sees it this way:

. . . that this society, with its cheapened discourse and banal politics, suffers terribly from the separation that is opening between it and its most thoughtful members. When scholars address that need by framing their questions somewhat more broadly and writing so as to make enormously complicated issues and evidence understandable to serious lay readers, they perform a service not only to the community of scholars, but to society at large. This is an ideal that I wish

graduate education in America more typically recognized and more vigorously espoused.

Future faculty are going to need experience in, and understanding of, the world beyond the campus. As we have argued in Chapter 5, knowledge is generated from the complexity and demands of practice itself. Experience is, itself, a source of learning and understanding. Much of what is done in graduate school assumes a hierarchical relationship between theory and practice; theoretical constructs are developed in the university and then applied to practice. The “wisdom of practice” needs to inform and enrich theory. For instance, in schools of education faculty and students need to be out in the schools working with teachers and relating to children; their academic work needs to benefit from that experience. Theory and practice need to be mutually interactive, each building on the other.

For this interchange to take place, internships, cooperative education placements, or provision for other forms of practical experience needs to be included in the preparation for the professoriate. Some M.B.A. programs require a minimum of two years of pertinent practical experience. Perhaps a similar stipulation, especially in applied programs, might be formally incorporated into doctoral study. A practical interlude in the preparation of future faculty might serve to reconnect the academy to the larger society.

Teaching. Because the overwhelming majority of the Ph.D.s produced by our graduate schools will devote most of their professional careers to teaching, the lack of attention to teaching in graduate schools has been a point of contention for decades. Back in 1930, G. J. Laing, Dean of the Graduate School at the University of Chicago, raised the same questions that are being raised today:

What are we doing in the way of equipping them [the graduate students] for their chosen work? Have the departments of the various graduate schools kept the teaching career sufficiently in mind in the organization of their program[s] of studies? Or have they arranged their courses with an eye to the production of research workers only, thinking of the teacher's duties merely as a means of livelihood that will furnish the young instructor or professor with enough money to buy food, drink, clothes, and shelter for himself and his family, and enable him to pay insurance premiums and contribute to the portrait funds of retiring colleagues, while he carries on his research? And finally comes the question: What sort of college teachers do our Doctors of Philosophy make? [1930, p. 51].

The standard response, since the founding of the graduate school back in the 1870s, has been that in-depth study of a field and specialized research on the cutting edge of a discipline is the best preparation for teaching. This argument is most persuasive where faculty are working with advanced graduate students, or, better, with post-doctoral appointees; there teaching is, essentially, the sharing of research. In teaching undergraduates, however, another form of scholarship is required, and it is this that we would like to see built into the graduate preparation of future faculty.

Especially important in whatever is done is to move beyond the usual split between the intellectual substance of the field and teaching as technique. Wherever this dichotomy is allowed to persist, teaching will be devalued and the serious scholarship that is a part of good teaching will be neglected. The old hierarchy giving preference to research over teaching will be reinforced rather than negated.

We would like to see all graduate students interested in pursuing academic careers required to take at least one course focused on teaching. In most cases, the courses would be discipline or field specific and could deal with both intellectual content and teaching process. Ideally, the course would be taught collaboratively by a leading scholar in the field who had excelled in both research and teaching and someone thoroughly knowledgeable about how students learn and the more generic aspects of teaching. Being able to draw on the resources of an institution-wide center for teaching effectiveness—the kind being developed at research universities across the

country—would greatly strengthen the course. Hopefully, this work would be granted full credit in the student's discipline or division; anything less would convey the wrong message.

Aspects of what is being proposed here are already being tried. The Physiology Department at State University of New York at Buffalo offers a course with the title "Introduction to Teaching of Biological Science." At Indiana University teaching assistants in the French department are required to take a course on problems and methods of college French teaching. In addition to general sessions on teaching and testing, the course includes an overview of approaches to foreign language teaching and an examination of the theoretical bases underlying current practice in the field. The fine teaching resource centers at universities such as Syracuse, University of Washington, and University of California, Davis, offer a wide variety of workshops, seminars and other activities that are drawn on by disciplinary departments in tailoring their own approaches to the preparation of graduate students for teaching.

Included in the graduate course work of future faculty should be the opportunity to study the academic profession, its history, and the diverse institutional contexts in which it is actually practiced. New faculty need to know what they will be called upon to do—what they are getting into. As Burton Clark has pointed out, the academic profession on the whole is astonishingly ignorant of "the province of [its] own commitment" (Clark, 1983, p. 1).

John Kijinsky, a Ph.D. candidate in English at The University of Wisconsin-Madison, writes perceptively about the limited purview of graduate students. In English, he says, they have clearly aligned themselves with one specialized area (i.e., the eighteenth century, critical theory, or the modern period). They are concerned with the state of English studies after structuralism and the future of deconstruction; and worry about the national rankings of the department and the scholarly reputation of individual faculty members. Kijinski goes on to warn that the majority of graduate students are "courting disappointment" and will have a very difficult time making the transition from the research university to institutions where other professional responsibilities, particularly teaching, will be given priority.

In graduate school, such people develop the notion that if they fail to achieve the type of academic life lived by their professors, they have somehow betrayed or wasted the years of work it takes to become a specialist. . . . They continue to think of themselves exclusively as specialists—Miltonists or Kantians rather than college teachers—who are simply not adequately appreciated by what they begin to think of as a mediocre student body, faculty, and administration. These specialists are obviously not suited to the academic environment in which they find themselves, and their unhappiness with this predicament has a negative effect on both students and colleagues. (*College Teaching*, v. 33, n. 1, p. 6)

The faculty of the future need to be prepared for the diversity of choices and the difficult challenges to be confronted across the various sectors of American higher education. And, if faculty are going to continue to insist on collegial governance—full faculty participation in academic decision-making—they need to be informed about the complex history of our decentralized system and the patterns and rapidity of institutional change. We concur with the recommendation of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education that “graduate deans and department chairs should help prospective faculty in all disciplines . . . to learn about the history, organization, and culture of American higher education” (1984, p. 65).

Teaching Apprenticeships. Key to the adequate preparation of faculty for their careers as teachers is a carefully monitored teaching apprenticeship. Opportunities to experience teaching are already built into most graduate programs. In fact, a large percentage of undergraduate classes are taught by, what are most commonly referred to, teaching assistants. Syracuse’s Robert Diamond estimates that somewhere between 30 and 50 percent of undergraduate contact hours in research universities are taught by TAs (p. 59).

Although the opportunity to focus on teaching already exists, the question is: "Is the best being made of it?" The situation has been much improved over the past several years with the fine work that has been done on the training of teaching assistants; especially helpful were the National TA Training conferences of 1986 and 1989. We believe, however, that the whole approach to the use of graduate students for undergraduate instruction needs reassessing.

The overarching purpose for involving graduate students in teaching ought to be to prepare them for the scholarly work that, for most, will dominate their professional lives. Here is an opportunity to honor the teaching role and provide the chance for future faculty to experience teaching at its best.

Unfortunately, teaching in most graduate programs is not viewed as a significant scholarly undertaking. As a graduate student in the humanities put it:

Teaching is considered secondary, at best, with the implication being that those who aspire to teach or who enjoy it are not good scholars or intellectuals. The department gives double messages about teaching. It does not want to short the undergrads, but it is suspicious of those of us who care deeply about teaching (p. 69).

Or, as a teaching assistant in geology reported:

Very little to no credit is given at this institution for proficiency in teaching. As with any university that sees itself as a research institution, teaching is purely a chore. I enjoy teaching and hope to continue, but our young faculty are anything but inspirational (p. 70)!

Recent pressures on graduate schools have accentuated a peculiar contradiction related to the graduate student's teaching experience. While graduate students are being called upon to

increase their involvement in teaching, the activity itself is being devalued. As government and foundation fellowships and other kinds of support for graduate study have diminished, graduate students have been compelled to rely more heavily on teaching assistantships for basic financial sustenance. This has contributed to a serious problem with the time it takes to complete a graduate degree. For instance, in the humanities, the average student takes more than twelve years to finish his or her graduate program. Students find it necessary to teach and neglect what is seen as their “real work” in order to remain in school; and, when teaching receives little recognition, the activity itself becomes a source of resentment. The situation is exacerbated when the most accomplished students are given research assistantships and rewarded by not having to teach. A pattern of priorities is cultivated that can persist throughout one’s academic career.

The pressure for established faculty to increase their research productivity and their commitment to it often leads to a corresponding reduction in the teaching load and the call for more teaching assistants. Recently, in order to find funding for faculty research and graduate programs, undergraduate course offerings have been enlarged and “course plans” increased, calling again for more teaching assistants. Teaching, as a part of the student’s graduate program, has become, in many graduate schools, a secondary means to more important ends.

It is during these graduate years that future faculty are socialized into the basic value structure of the profession. If teaching is consistently devalued and not seen as one important part of the scholarly enterprise, new faculty will assume their first appointments already biased against this important professional responsibility. We are concerned about preparation in the scholarship of teaching, but regard as equally important the value placed on undergraduate teaching. Both concerns need to be addressed.

A major shortcoming of the present efforts to prepare future faculty for teaching, in even the most effective TA programs, is their location; they are, for obvious reasons, all located in major research universities. And as we know, most new doctorates will find themselves teaching in

very different contexts—in comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges. As an alternative, we would like to see “teaching residencies” established linking research universities to, for instance, selected liberal arts colleges known for the quality of their teaching. As an example, the chemistry department of the University of Michigan might work out an alliance with Hope College, a school recognized nationally for its excellent undergraduate program in chemistry.

A graduate student interested in exploring career options within higher education could not only teach under the guidance of a group of chemistry professors deeply committed to teaching, but could also learn—from the inside—how a small liberal arts college works. While this could be an enormously rich experience for an inquisitive graduate student, it could also contribute to the renewal of faculty at the host institution. Knowledge of the most recent work in graduate research would be immediately accessible, and the connection between advanced disciplinary content and the teaching process would be insured.

Similar alliances could be arranged for other students with comprehensive institutions and community colleges. New faculty could make informal choices—based on experience—and match more directly their own scholarly strengths and commitments with the educational challenges of a specific kind of institution. It is this “fit” that motivates, nurtures the appropriate kind of productivity, and sustains morale.

Graduate schools need to see their work within the larger context of American higher education. Some students—those most successful in their research—will stay in the research university, but most will pursue their scholarly courses in settings that require academic talents and capabilities of a broader sort. The quality of graduate schools need to be judged on the adequacy of the preparation provided for these larger scholarly responsibilities. It is critically important that the graduate school take seriously the central thesis of this report.

Faculty Renewal

Building an enlarged view of the role of the scholar into the preparation of tomorrow's faculty has the potential for dramatically improving American higher education as we enter the new century. In the meantime, however, a broader conception of scholarship would open new opportunities for the renewal of the present faculty and contribute to the maintaining the vitality of faculty throughout their careers.

Over the past decade and a half much has been learned about faculty lives and academic careers. Faculty development as a primary concern within higher education emerged from the struggles with steady state staffing and, in many places, with retrenchment. In its initial phases, efforts at faculty renewal focused on the individual. The primary concern was with teaching improvement and private—usually confidential—consultation. Priority was placed on maintaining distance from the sources of academic decision-making, particularly those related to tenure and promotion. The approach was intentionally peripheral.

More recently, faculty development has shifted from the margins of institutions to the center. No longer is faculty development conceived of as an independent entity or separate enterprise; it has moved to the heart of efforts to maintain institutional vitality. There is an emerging recognition that faculty growth and development need to be linked directly to institutional mission, academic decision-making, curriculum development, and—most critical—the reward system.

Especially important is the congruence between institutional expectations and the day-to-day work of individual faculty. Motivation and effectiveness, we have learned, are often directly related to the relationship between performance, evaluation, and reward. It is the direct connection between these elements that adds meaning to academic work, sustains morale, and cultivates commitment. The key faculty development officers are no longer the directors of centers of teaching and learning, but deans and department chairpersons.

A broader conception of scholarship will complement and greatly enhance this emphasis. It will make it possible for an individual faculty member to both build on his or her scholarly strengths and respond to the primary challenges of the institution. It will also make it more likely that the direct connection will be made between the performance of work, its evaluation, and how it is rewarded.

An enlarged view of scholarship opens the way for the individual faculty member to continue to grow and change as a scholar. Present institutional policies related to faculty career development will have to be significantly revised to make this possible. Most policies now assume that faculty develop best by building on and accentuating what they have already done well, by continuing to narrow their specialization. Many of the existing policies that monitor and reward faculty activity have hardened into rules which stifle rather than enhance faculty growth. Future faculty development will need to be linked to a basic reassessment of these institutional policies.

In Chapter 8 we argued that the faculty evaluation processes need to be individualized and made more flexible to accommodate a broader range of scholarly activities and allow for changes in the focus of the faculty member's scholarship. Faculty development for tomorrow's professoriate will need to concentrate on assisting faculty in making informal choices among the new opportunities and options that will be available and helping faculty match their scholarly strengths and interests with the changing needs and commitments of the institution. Career planning will be much more important and faculty will need an array of resources to draw upon in order to take full advantage of the scholarly options that will be available. The move from a narrower view of scholarship to one that is more heterogeneous will strengthen faculty vitality and commitment, but making choices and adapting effectively to change has never been easy.

To assist faculty, as well as deans, and department chairpersons, in taking full advantage of the opportunities introduced by an enlarged conception of scholarship, professional development centers will become even more important than they are now. Preparing department chairpersons

for their enlarged faculty development responsibilities will be a key function of such centers. Working with departments in advancing the scholarship of teaching in the discipline will take on new importance. Helping to make connections between individual faculty talents and the professional service needs of a community or region will become a priority. Giving grant writing workshops to assist the research effort and supporting new interdisciplinary endeavors will also be important. In short, providing a full range of resources that can be drawn upon in helping faculty realize their full potential as scholars—understood in this larger sense—will be the primary work of these centers. The establishment and strong support of such a multifaceted professional development endeavor would provide tangible evidence of an institution's firm commitment to a broader vision of faculty scholarship and its relationship to the mission of the institution.

A key professional development resource is the sabbatical leave. We urge that the faculty leave be systematically maintained, but redefined as a professional development leave where, in addition to meeting the individual needs of faculty for renewal and concentrated research, the goals of the institution are considered. The professional development leave—say, one term, every five years—would be the focal point for career and organizational planning. The leave would be used by individual faculty to prepare to address his or her own scholarly priorities, as well as the shifting needs of the department, college or university. For instance, a faculty member previously committed to specialized research and the teaching of advanced courses in the discipline could use the leave to engage in the kind of integrative scholarship required to teach in a new undergraduate core curriculum. The scholarly capacities of the individual would be enhanced and the faculty member would continue to grow intellectually, while the academic needs of the students and the institution would also be served.

A broader conception of scholarship promises to enrich the graduate school preparation of new faculty and make the work of the scholar more challenging and enticing to a new generation. It also has the potential for encouraging faculty in mid-career to be more

intellectually vibrant and adaptive in their scholarship. Finally, this enlarged scholarly vision, if taken seriously, also promises to make tomorrow's professoriate more responsive to the shifting scholarly needs of society.