The Professoriate: To Be or Not To Be Tenured—That is the Question

Ellen Junn and Tom Klammer

Welcome to this Special Volume

We are pleased to introduce this special themed issue of the Senate Forum on the lecturer’s experience in the CSU setting. This issue gives voice to many of our valued colleagues who serve our campus and our students admirably in their important roles as full-time and part-time lecturers. Their articles each focus on various aspects of the lecturer experience on our campus and provide insight into their career paths, aspirations, and life experiences. In this introductory piece, we hope to highlight some of the historical context and national and campus data and trends regarding lecturers, and identify some of the key issues, challenges, and implications. Lest you wonder why two administrators were called upon to provide the introductory commentary on this topic, perhaps it was because as college administrators, we receive and approve department requests for hiring faculty (whether tenure-track or lecturers), and we attend to and keep track of faculty flow in our colleges. Perhaps it is also because one of us started her first job in the professoriate as a full-time visiting lecturer, and thus can speak from personal experience. In any case, we hope you find this issue thought-provoking as we try to gain a better understanding and appreciation of a bit of history, some of the data, and the ever evolving role of the professoriate.

Who Constitutes the Professoriate?

Stanley N. Katz, a Professor at Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and president emeritus of the American Council of Learned Societies, has described the professoriate as a “mansion of many rooms” (2006). With regard to the diverse needs and characteristics of the professoriate, Katz observed that the new worlds of professors are “multiple, complex, and conflicting” (p. B8).
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This issue of the Senate Forum speaks directly to Katz’s point in the quote above. Depending on your viewpoint, membership in higher education’s “professoriate” in the US could be viewed as a many splendored fabric or as a rigid caste society comprised of the privileged and the marginalized. The fact that our “professoriate” constitutes individuals in a wide variety of positions, ranks, and educational attainment indicates the complexity of this constituency. On the one hand, this permits greater flexibility in the variety of faculty roles and responsibilities, but on the other hand, it opens the door for inequities in terms of significantly differentiated compensation, benefits, and career pathways.

Some Historical Context: The Role of Academic Tenure

For most newly minted PhDs, the prototypical goal is to secure a tenure-track position at an institution of higher education, publish (not perish), and be promoted to join the venerated ranks of the tenured faculty, thereby ensuring a lifetime profession rich with academic freedom and intellectual promise working with students and colleagues within one’s scholarly discipline.

Indeed, the concept of a de facto academic tenure in the U.S. can be traced back to the 19th century, when in 1870 at Cornell and in 1894 at the University of Wisconsin, business interests in the first case and the state legislature in the second tried unsuccessfully to oust faculty from their respective universities. Then in 1900, the presidents of Harvard, Chicago, and Columbia publicly declared that no donor could dictate faculty appointment or tenure decisions. By 1915, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was established and the organization formally adopted and published a Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure in 1945. Today, virtually all American accredited institutions of higher education continue to honor a commitment to tenure—but not for all faculty.

National Data Trends

In recent years, there has been increasing interest and concern about what has been billed as an erosion in the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty in U.S. institutions as compared to non-tenure-track faculty, both full-time and part-time. Several recent reports document some of these trends.

For example, Gravois (2006) cited a U.S. Department of Education report this past December 2006 entitled, “Background Characteristics, Work Activities, and Compensation of Instructional Faculty and Staff: Fall 2003” that shows faculty data from 1987, 1992, 1998, and 2003 (see Table 1a). This report included statistics showing that while the percentage of part-time faculty was lower in 1987 (33%), a slightly higher proportion held relatively steady between 1992 and 2003 (1992=42%, 1998=43%, 2003=43%). Thus, after an increase in the 1980s, the percentage of part-time faculty seems to have stabilized in the 1990s. Whether this percentage is “too high,” “a cause for concern,” or “OK,” is a separate question.

However, the same report shows that the percentage of full-time faculty members not on the tenure-track has almost tripled since 1987 (1987=8%, 1992=11%, 1998=18%, 2003=21%). Other shifts in faculty demographics include diversification of the faculty along ethnic and
gender lines—the percentage of all non-white full-time faculty rose from 11% in 1987 to 19% in 2003; women faculty increased from 27% in 1987 to 38% in 2003.

While the Department of Education data is globally informative, it is presented in aggregate form and does not separate out or individually identify the many different types of institutions as recognized by, for example, the Carnegie classification system. Consequently, the AAUP has drawn on the U.S. Department of Education data and compiled the various proportions of tenured, tenure-track, part-time, and full-time non-tenure track faculty employed at specific institutions (based on data from 2,617 American colleges and universities) in a publication known as the Contingent Faculty Index released this January 2007.

The Index includes both individual campus data and aggregate figures. Overall, since the 1970s, the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the U.S. professoriate has shrunk from 57% to 35%, with part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty making up the balance.

Our Campus’ Comparison Data: Where Do We Stand and What Accounts for Past Trends?

We are indebted to the excellent research and analyses of faculty flow conducted by Dolores Vura, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, and her staff. Dolores has presented cogent reports to various campus audiences during the past year, and, with Dolores’ permission, we have drawn on her data and analyses. She has, in addition, been generous in her gentle corrections and excellent suggestions in response to earlier drafts of this article.

Table 1b allows an approximate comparison between national and CSUF data in terms of numbers of faculty members who were part-time and full-time lecturers and tenured and tenure-track faculty in 1992, 1998, and 2003. The pie charts in Figure 1 show the distribution of FTEF (Full Time Equivalent Faculty) for our campus in 1995-96 and 2005-06. These charts show that in 1995-96, tenured/tenure-track faculty constituted 74% of our FTEF; part-time faculty made up 17% of CSUF’s total; and full-time lecturers occupied 8% of our campus FTEF.

The data from Figure 1 also show that the overall percentage of tenured/tenure-track faculty has declined over a ten-year period from 74% in 1995 to 52% in 2005. Within this group, the percentage of tenured faculty on campus has dropped from 62% in 1995 to 32% in 2005, while the percentage of tenure-track faculty increased from 12% to 20%. Meanwhile, part-time faculty went from constituting 17% of the FTEF to accounting for 32% of the total, and full-time lecturers went from 8% to 12%.

The very large share of FTEF devoted to tenured faculty in 1995-96 pointed to the large number of retirements that would soon follow—and predictable difficulty for the campus in keeping up with tenure-track hiring, with a resulting increase in the share of FTEF devoted to lecturers. Conversely, the large share of FTEF devoted to tenure-track faculty in 2005-06 (20%, compared with only 12% in 1995-96) suggests a healthy balance of tenured faculty in years to come, IF we are successful in retaining our new tenure-track hires.

What caused these changes? The question is significant, in that one often hears that universities hire part-time faculty to save money. The situation is, in reality, not that simple. In our own experience, the state budget crisis of the early 1990s did cause funding problems in the universities. But it also prompted a “Golden Handshake” retirement incentive in 1992 that led to an increase in the numbers of retirements of tenured, senior faculty. In addition to encouraging senior, relatively high paid faculty to retire, the campus increased its student-faculty ratio (SFR) to reduce the need for all types of faculty, not just lecturers.

When budgets are recovering, and the campus is growing, it can become impossible to hire tenure-track faculty fast enough to keep up with enrollment growth. The result is a rapid increase
Table 1a: U.S. Department of Education Faculty Headcount Data (Dec. 2006 Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Part-Time Lecturers</th>
<th>Full-Time Lecturers</th>
<th>Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1b: Cal State Fullerton Faculty Headcount Data (Institutional Research and Analytical Studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year *</th>
<th>Part-Time Lecturers</th>
<th>Full-Time Lecturers</th>
<th>Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No comparable Fullerton data is available for 1987

Figure 1

Distribution of FTEF

1995 -1996

- Part-Time Lecturers: 124 (17%)
- Full-Time Lecturers: 58 (8%)
- FERPs: 10 (1%)
- Tenure Track: 90 (12%)
- Tenured: 469 (62%)

FTEF = 751.0

2005 -2006

- Part-Time: 363.5 (32%)
- Lecturers: 139 (12%)
- FERPs: 45.5 (4%)
- Tenure Track: 223 (20%)
- Tenured: 366 (32%)

FTEF = 1,137.0

These data were provided by Dolores Vura, Analytical Studies, with graphic assistance by Kelly Donovan, Faculty Development Center.
in the number of part-time lecturers. This was the case in the late 1990s through the present, and is reflected in the growth in FTEF occupied by part-time lecturers (Figure 1).

The President’s commitment to conduct 100 new tenure-track faculty searches each year, with a goal of hiring at least 80, for five years (2006-07 = year 2) will have the impact of gradually shifting the balance of faculty in favor of the tenured and tenure-track. Figure 2 shows a year-by-year snapshot of the campus distribution of faculty and FTEF for the campus, clearly reflecting some of the budgetary and enrollment patterns that affect faculty hiring. The growing numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty are finally regaining the level they had reached in the early 1990s. But, largely because of rapid enrollment growth, the numbers of part-time faculty have also grown steadily from 460 in Fall 1992 to 1287 in Fall 2005 (Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, Trends in Selected Faculty Statistics Fall 1992 to Fall 2005). How much has enrollment grown? The University’s Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) grew from 15,414 in 1994-95 to 27,187 in 2005-06, an increase of 76.4% (Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, Trends in FTES Targets and Actual FTES Achieved by Department 1987-88 Through 2005-06).

Conclusion: Lean budgets and budget cuts mean fewer lecturers (and fewer faculty in general). Improving budgets and enrollment growth mean more lecturers (and more faculty in general). However, from our perspective, inevitable changes in budgets and student demographics are only two of the factors that influence our hiring of full- and part-time lecturers. In fact, we employ lecturers for many reasons that are only tangentially related to budgets and enrollments. For example, some of our programs seek to employ experienced professional practitioners who are essential for maintaining program quality—or to meet accreditation standards. This is precisely what occurs in Communication, Public Administration, Criminal Justice, Education, and elsewhere. In other areas, we need to add professionally trained masters of an art or craft in a highly specialized area in which it is unlikely that we could ever support a tenured faculty member. Clear instances of this need occur in Music, where teachers of instrumental performance are needed for literally dozens of different instruments, often to give private instruction to just a few students. In juxtaposition to instrumental music instructors, who may teach a few students, sometimes at a very high level, other areas require many lecturers to teach large numbers of entering students at introductory or remedial levels. In Mathematics, English, and quite a few other departments, the introductory-level sections that need to be taught do not require the research training of a PhD—nor could we interest candidates with a doctorate in a career of teaching four sections of freshman writing or intermediate algebra every semester. Whereas the need for significant numbers of instructors in entry-level classes may be long-term, another reason the University hires lecturers (sometimes full-time lecturers) is to replace tenured faculty on leave. Sabbaticals and other leaves are essential to support the work of productive scholars and artists, but such leaves are temporary. Lecturers hired as leave replacements must hold, as a matter of course, temporary appointments.

Thus, the view that lecturers are hired as a budget-balancing strategy is, in our view, not just too simple, but mostly wrong. There are many reasons that the University requires the professional services of lecturers. Lecturers are an essential component of the broad mix of teachers, scholars, and professionals required in a large university to meet the educational needs of a diverse student body.

Some Impacts of Collective Bargaining on Lecturers

Since the advent of collective bargaining for faculty in the California State University, the professional situation of lecturers has changed considerably. Two changes seem to us particularly significant. The first is the expanding series of “entitlements” that collective bargaining has won for lecturers. For example, after one academic year in the same department, if a lecturer is rehired, she or he must be given a year-
### Full-Time Instructional Faculty, FTEF, FTES, SFR (updated 11/30/06)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured/</th>
<th>Tenured/</th>
<th>Sabbaticals</th>
<th>FERPs (0.5)</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>FTEF Allocation</th>
<th>FTES Target</th>
<th>Budgeted SFR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track</td>
<td>Track</td>
<td>at 0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>804.5</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>784.5</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>755.6</td>
<td>14,310</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>784.1</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>803.7</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>810.7</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>808.9</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>825.4</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>829.6</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>832.6</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>868.4</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>912.4</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>18.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>953.4</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>968.2</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>827.1</td>
<td>16,790</td>
<td>20.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>727.8</td>
<td>15,425</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>719.0</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>728.8</td>
<td>15,609</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>751.0</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>800.0</td>
<td>16,929</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>845.1</td>
<td>17,801</td>
<td>21.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>873.3</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>20.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>943.1</td>
<td>19,885</td>
<td>20.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>984.7</td>
<td>20,770</td>
<td>21.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1,037.8</td>
<td>21,825</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1,044.2</td>
<td>22,035</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1,078.3</td>
<td>22,761</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1,127.5</td>
<td>23,808</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1,137.0</td>
<td>24,010</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1,171.8</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Up through 1990-91, sabbaticals were allocated in the State and CSU budget to the campus. From 1991-92 onward, sabbaticals are in departmental replacement usage.

Budget Crisis FTES/FTEF Reduced with SFR increase

1992 Golden Handshake

Low Points of FTES/FTEF, High Points for SFR

FTES Recovery to Point of 1991-92 FTES and FTES Baseline Growth Dollars Begin

2004 Golden Handshake

FTES Growth at Constant SFR
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long contract for at least the same total number of units as she taught in the previous year. After six years of teaching in the same department, a lecturer, if rehired, must be given a three-year appointment at the same number of units as she or he taught in the sixth year. Such three-year entitled lecturers “shall have the expectation of appointment to subsequent three-year appointments except in instances of documented unsatisfactory performance or serious conduct problems” (Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement, 12.13). Taken in combination with the provision that incumbent lecturers must be offered “new or additional work” with priority over any newly hired lecturers, which has been interpreted to mean up to and including full time appointment, these stipulations can result in a part-time lecturer becoming full-time and enjoying a series of three-year appointments as long as performance is satisfactory and work is available. Thus, collective bargaining has won for lecturers a stunning increase in job stability. Some have called it “virtual tenure.”

What will this mean if the campus continues to hire 80 or more new tenure-track faculty each year for several more years? We speculate that, especially if enrollment growth slows, as it seems to be doing, the number of part-time faculty will fall, with many of the remaining lecturers on long-term, full-time contracts. This has a benefit for the University if it results in the continued service of the most effective lecturers. But it also has an unintended consequence of substantially reducing the traditional qualifications of full-time faculty. Part-time lecturers who become full-time and entitled to continuing three-year appointments will, in most cases, have only a master’s degree, not a PhD. They will never have been reviewed for tenure. They are less likely to be engaged in serious research and peer-reviewed publication. The impact of these changes has only begun to be discussed.

**Redefining the New Professoriate: Millennial Faculty, Shifting Values, and “The Fullerton Way”**

There have been perhaps two prominent shifts in viewpoints about the work of the professoriate since the last decade of the 20th century. In 1990, the Past President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Ernest L. Boyer, created a stir by re-conceptualizing the work of the professoriate in his seminal book, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.*

In this landmark book, Boyer sought to chart the changing role of the faculty and to redefine and reformulate the work of the professoriate. He described several overlapping historical eras for professorial work, each with distinct emphases, beginning first with the earliest phase focusing primarily on teaching; moving next to a societal Zeitgeist that emphasized the goal of an educated citizenry to serve the greater community; and finally arriving at a more recent shift to an emphasis on conducting and generating research. This analysis helps to explain the formation of the tripartite definition of academic work upon which most faculty in this country are evaluated today: teaching, service, and research. However, Boyer rejected juxtaposing teaching and research. Instead, he advocated a new paradigm in which institutions recognize and empower faculty to have multiple seasons in their professional lives. Healthy institutions, according to Boyer, are those that honor diverse faculty strengths in various domains and support faculty engagement in varying aspects of teaching, thinking, applying, and creating. In light of Boyer’s integration of scholarship with teaching and multiple forms of community and campus service, will we be capable of similarly integrating scholarship into what, until now, has been the distinctly teaching-centered role of most lecturers?

More recently, data emerging from Harvard’s Collaborative On Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) led by Drs. Cathy Trower and Dick Chait has begun to paint a very interesting and complex portrait of the aspirations and goals of our newest faculty colleagues. Sometimes referred to as the “Gen X professors” (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002) or “Millennial Faculty,” these faculty are demarcated as having been born between 1965 and 1980.

Survey data from these younger faculty members
indicate that this new cohort shares a number of common values and attitudes that set them distinctly apart from their more senior colleagues in the academy (Jaschik, 2006). These values include strong interest in collaborative work; somewhat greater skepticism about institutions and traditions; greater interest in a job or profession that offers flexibility in determining their own work hours and settings; a strong commitment to seeking a balance between their work and family life regardless of gender; greater willingness to relocate geographically for better work conditions; and hence, less commitment to staying loyal to one institution for a lifetime. Table 2 shows some of these generational changes in attitudes.

Table 2: Generational Changes in Attitudes and Values of the Professoriate (Trower, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chain of command</td>
<td>Chain of command</td>
<td>Self-command; collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a legacy</td>
<td>Build a stellar career</td>
<td>Build a portable career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction of a job well-done</td>
<td>Money, title, recognition, corner office</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job changing carries a stigma.</td>
<td>Job changing puts you behind.</td>
<td>Job changing is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I’m not yelling at you, you’re doing fine.</td>
<td>Feedback once a year; well-documented</td>
<td>Sorry to interrupt again, but how am I doing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, like the generations before them, the new Gen X or Millennial Professor is a product of social, societal, economic, political, cultural and demographic change. While values and attitudes may be evolving, this new wave of faculty remains deeply committed, actively engaged, consciously reflective, and passionate about its work. As such, being cognizant of these values will assist our campus in recruiting, retaining and building a supportive and collegial environment learning on campus. To what extent do the Gen X/Millennial values and attitudes characterize our younger lecturers? This is a question awaiting research, but its answer will definitely have an impact on the nature of our campus over the next generation. For example, will the traditions of active faculty involvement in academic governance and of shared commitment to the ideals of teaching and scholarship, access and quality, be sustainable in the new social context that is emerging?

So what is the lesson? Clearly, one size does not fit all, but the challenge for the university is to create niches and opportunities that help to support faculty with differing needs and at different stages in their professional life cycles. This is no easy feat, but we hope this introduction to the special issue of the Senate Forum helps to further explore the concept and context of “the professoriate.”

We faculty—full-time and part-time, tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track, younger and older, female and male, ethnically diverse—represent a varied and dynamic constituency, and one that continues to evolve. We hope you enjoy this issue, which gives voice to the personal stories, attitudes, values, and reflections of a very valuable sector of our faculty—our lecturers. Sharing their experiences, joys and challenges helps to bring to life many of the complex issues facing faculty everywhere in higher education.
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Secundi Inter Pares: A Full-Time Temporary Lecturer’s Perspective

Dana Loewy

I would hesitate to refer to teaching as my calling, but I’m a third-generation teacher in a family of educators, on my mother’s side. After flirting with journalism and public relations for years, intent on following in my father’s oversized footsteps, I opted for a profession for which he held a certain contempt.

Perhaps he had high, somewhat unrealistic expectations of scholars and other mind workers because as an education-deprived Jewish child under the Nazis and later as an adolescent in communist Czechoslovakia, he was almost entirely self-taught. Yet he was erudite, his knowledge encyclopedic. The consummate intellectual and prize-winning journalist, he despised mental laziness.

I was raised among stacks of books, surrounded by politics and fierce, rigorous intellectual debate. Most significantly, however, both my parents and I shared a knack for and love of writing and languages. Each of us understood a half-dozen Indo-European tongues and spoke at least three of them so competently that we could publish in them, and publish we did. I became a translator of prose and poetry at seventeen. As a young student at Bonn University, Germany, I studied English and American Literature and Linguistics, Slavic Literatures and Languages (Russian, Czech, and Old Church Slavic), as well as Communication and Phonetics.

Awarded a fellowship by the German government, I arrived in Los Angeles with a Magister Artium degree eager to earn a PhD in English from the University of Southern California. My peers were inspiring and intriguing, coming from various regions and countries, age groups, and previous professional
incarnations. We learned pedagogy from the ground up, by independently teaching freshman writing classes at USC.

To supplement my income at the ABD stage, I became a “freeway flyer” or “road scholar” also working at Glendale Community College and Loyola Marymount College, Palos Verdes. Quite often, I would find myself heading east on the I-10 nearing downtown and wondering momentarily: What day is it today? Where am I going? I set up a small private translation business on the side. Money was often tight, but I’m proud to say that unlike many of my less fortunate college pals, I graduated without any consumer debt.

During the ensuing job search, I woke up to the politics of the hiring process—the bogus jobs that evaporate due to budget constraints and deliberate attrition as well as the pro-forma listings that satisfy the letter of the law while allowing the hiring of a favorite adjunct waiting in the wings. Like many of my peers in the humanities, I could paper my walls with rejections from my annual nationwide searches. Only about ten percent of us found a tenure-track job in English, according to the Modern Language Association (MLA).

Three years in a row, I mounted a massive self-advertising and mailing campaign starting with the annual MLA Job List and ending with scouring local ads and entering pools for adjuncts at community colleges. I snagged a few interviews with some of these institutions, but the lengthy, probing panel interviews were so inscrutable and claustrophobic that they conjured up memories of 1984 and The Trial. There were no jobs—or not enough of them. However, how could one live anywhere else, especially in a colder clime, after basking in the sun in Southern California? Therefore, I stayed and gladly became a temporary full-time lecturer in the Business Communication Program at Cal State Fullerton more than ten years ago.

So what do I love about my job? I’ve come to enjoy teaching my students a type of writing that is practical and instantly applicable. Writing for business is highly pragmatic, yet it can be elegant and incisive in its precision. I take the dictum in loco parentis very seriously. Our students need us to teach them all-important communication skills. They also need a good dose of business etiquette, something I incorporate into my courses as much as possible. Students will come to me with their projects in other courses, share their goals and aspirations with me, and seek my advice on anything from business plans to proper attire. I am grateful I can make a difference, one student at a time.

I am also devoted to my colleagues, many of whom have become close friends. Although morale is flagging for very specific reasons, we are a loyal and friendly bunch. We happily serve the university, our college, and the department. All of the full-time lecturers in my department have PhDs from distinguished universities and various writing- and communication-related disciplines. All but one have taught at Cal State Fullerton for more than six years, two of us for more than 20 years. We attend conferences each year and despite our high workload try to eke out an occasional peer-reviewed publication in business communication.

The full-time teaching load is four three-unit classes although some of us teach three, thanks to assigned time for special projects or publications. Writing is a skill; hence, it requires much practice and time to develop. My students write at least one business document every week. That’s a lot of grading, 36 times three (or four), each week. Add to this additional take-home projects and the semester grading load reaches into the thousands of pages.

When I started at Cal State Fullerton, lecturers were not required to publish. Later we were encouraged to publish in our respective fields of interest, and those scholarly, peer-reviewed articles were accepted during the inevitable annual review in mid-March, the infamous WPAF. These days, due to AACSB accreditation, we are held to the same publishing standards and requirements as tenured and tenure-track faculty. We now must publish in business communication and demonstrate our effort to stay current in our field—something that’s a matter of course to most of us.
I would venture to say that all differences between tenured faculty and us have evaporated, except for the glaring pay inequity. This is the greatest source of our discontent and low morale.

Right now our salaries are at least 25-30% behind those of tenured faculty. Even incoming tenure-track faculty members in the College of Business and Economics make 25% more than many of our long-serving instructors do. To illustrate, some full-time lecturers are so poorly paid that they do not qualify for low-income university housing. They are too poor for the assistance that they so urgently need in high-priced Orange County.

The current CFA negotiations worry me because I fear that lecturers will again be left behind. I’m afraid that the salary gap between tenured faculty and lecturers will only grow. While I understand the efforts of the CFA to achieve greater market equity for tenured faculty, I worry that those much-needed raises will pass the lecturers by. The most recent round of market-equity increases, for which tenured and tenure-track faculty were invited to apply, is a case in point. Lecturers were not eligible as a result of the last collective bargaining agreement. I am a union member, but most of my lecturer colleagues are not. I’m told only 10% of us join the CFA. If I ask my colleagues why, I hear that lecturers don’t feel represented. However, all lecturers must pay their “fair share” contribution and because they are so numerous, the union benefits from them although they don’t have much of a voice.

Those who believe that lecturers are being paid fairly because the market for writing teachers, professional writers, and English teachers doesn’t offer any high-paying alternatives should think again. An acquaintance, a PhD-less elementary school teacher, brings home a salary that’s 20% higher than mine is. A former assistant with an M.A. makes 30% more money than I do at a local community college. Professional writers in the corporate environment earn about $120,000. Unlike us, most of them can count on annual cost-of-living increases.

Now, here are three modest proposals that would make me and my colleagues happy campers while rectifying grave injustice:

1. We understand accountability and measuring performance, but overworked instructors, the department personnel committees, the chairs, and the deans would save much time and trouble if the WPAF were due only every three years, before the renewal of the “temporary” lecturers’ contract.

2. We don’t mind the pressure to publish but would welcome it if we were rewarded equally. Whereas tenured and tenure-track faculty receive assigned time for two semesters when they publish an article, we lecturers are given only one semester of release time.

3. Pay equity is the most pressing need for us. To live better than hand to mouth, lecturers would need a raise of 20-30% in the next five years to even inch closer to market equity in our field.

Right now, we must rely on a higher-paid spouse or in the absence of one, take on freelance assignments that cover much-needed living expenses. I enjoy my consulting jobs, my translating and interpreting assignments, and my professional writing, but I wish I could just survive by being a lecturer. I would like to be able to devote myself fully to publishing and to improving my teaching technique instead of having to supplement my meager income. Yes, I would have left a long time ago if I didn’t enjoy teaching at Cal State Fullerton so much, and if I didn’t hope that perhaps one day this institution that I have faithfully served would match my commitment and dedication and reciprocate by rewarding me with a dignified salary.

Dr. Dana Loewy teaches undergraduate and graduate Business Communication courses. She is also a successful consultant and translator. Fluent in several languages, Dana has published critical articles and various poetry as well as prose translations, mostly notably the 1997 volume The Early Poetry of Jaraslav Seifert from Northwestern University Press.
Driving to campus this morning, I began to think how I would approach writing an article describing the role of a lecturer in the university. The role of lecturers in the university is one that is often misunderstood, not only by students and colleagues, but often by us as well. We are considered faculty, yet sometimes not included in all academic activities that interest us. We attend to a variety of tasks in positions that require responsibility and reliability.

I am a Lecturer in the Department of Secondary Education. This semester I have 9 units for teaching, 3 units for serving as Assistant Director of the Internship Program (for those students wishing to complete teaching credential requirements while simultaneously teaching in their credential preparation subject area/s in the public schools), and 3 units for Social Studies Program Advisement.

Today’s activities might serve as a good example of a day in the life of a lecturer. Although I have no classes to teach on this day, the diversity of meetings, projects, and preparations for future classes and events provide a sample of my responsibilities to my department, the university, and community.

A.M.

- Graded a set of fieldwork reports for EDSC 310, The Teaching Experience: Participation. These are reports students complete on their required 40 hours of classroom observations in public secondary schools.
- Arrived on campus—checked mailboxes and e-mail.
- Sent a request to a principal for a student teaching placement in Social Studies.
- Met briefly with a part-time faculty member, Mary Dalessi, who is organizing the Future Teachers Field Trip to campus next week for over 500 high school students. I will present two breakout sessions on learning styles as part of the one-day conference. I made copies of handouts for my presentation.
- Sent e-mail requests for confirmation of student placements for the fieldwork requirement to teachers in five districts.
- Recorded graded papers.
- Prepared a simulation activity for next Monday’s EDSC 440S, General Pedagogy of Secondary School Teaching class, in which students will serve as readers for a peer’s written response to the first of four tasks comprising the Teaching Performance Assessment.
- Met with Dr. Debra Ambrosetti regarding posting resource material on Blackboard for students taking General Pedagogy of Secondary School Teaching.

P.M.

- Met with Dr. Helen Taylor, Director, Intern Program, regarding a presentation we would give at the State Directors’ Meeting in Sacramento in two weeks.
- Attended a meeting of JSU Hillel, a student organization, to offer faculty support.
- Prepared material for next Wednesday’s EDSC 310 class.
- Met with Cynthia Gautreau at the FDC to create my faculty web page, a department project.
- Met with a new, emergency lecturer, Marilyn Leuer, whom I am mentoring to inform her of the nature of the late afternoon meeting we would be attending.
- Drove to the Fullerton Joint Union High School District Office for a meeting of the Secondary Education Community Internship Advisory Board. Members of this board are Secondary Education faculty, teachers (former interns), master teachers, union members, district BTSA/Induction coordinators, and school board members from participating districts in our Professional Track/Intern Program. My contributions included describing the composition of this
year’s current cohort and presenting the results of the 2006 Intern Retention Study of 329 interns from the last five years in over 50 school districts.

- Arrived home to find the first issue of Secrets to Success for Beginning Elementary School Teachers, a book I co-authored with a colleague.
- Checked e-mail one more time and cross-checked my calendar for the next department meeting.

Being a lecturer enables me to draw on my background and experience in the field as a former high school teacher and curriculum specialist and my advanced degree. On any given day you will likely find me engaged with members of my department, future teachers, credential candidates in the public schools, master teachers, principals, and district personnel through e-mail, office-hour visits, meetings, school visits, and in classes. My role ranges from recruitment, to program administration to writing letters of recommendation for students applying to our graduate program as well as teaching. There are many other lecturers with similar and different responsibilities for teaching, field placement, supervision, and program administration. You’ll find us on campus and in the community actively serving the university.

Ellen Kottler received degrees from the University of Michigan, Eastern Michigan University, and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. A former teacher and curriculum specialist, she has been a lecturer in the Department of Secondary Education since 2001. She is author or coauthor of journal articles and books for educators.
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**Life Within a Full-Time Lecturer Cohort**

*Susan G. Shipstead*

We all have our stories about the choices we made, the roads we traveled and the ones we passed by. Here’s my CSUF full-time lecturer story.

Five full-time lecturers were hired by the Child and Adolescent Studies department (CHAD) to begin in the fall of 2001. Although one left for a tenure-track job out of state after a year, the remaining four of us have soldiered on for nearly six productive years. We knew each other, and for the most part we knew the tenured and tenure-track faculty; I suspect our combined 32 years of part-time experience at CSUF eased our entry into the full-time ranks. Our cohort has been involved in writing course proposals, working on the CHAD curriculum, teaching new courses, participating in course-specific study groups, academically advising our majors, taking our turns as faculty advisors to our student organization, running our peer mentoring network, planning our spring achievement program, preparing our website, mentoring part-time faculty, representing our department at New Student Orientations and Welcome to Fullerton Days, and attending more meetings that prefaced more work than we ever could have anticipated on countless issues pertaining to our department, college, and university.

Having taught at CSUF for 15 years before my full-time lecturer appointment, I thought I knew what I was getting into. I was wrong. Most surprising to me was a deepened sense of inclusion and a heightened attachment to the department and its majors. The change was the swift result of participating in bi-weekly department meetings and delving into individual assignments. My major non-teaching assignment
was to advise the CHAD majors on the Irvine Campus. My chair and many advising colleagues gave me a crash course in the requirements of the CHAD major and General Education, and I update my knowledge frequently since, as we know, the University is not a stagnant place. I adore shepherding CHAD students through their college careers and helping them identify their own passions that will sustain their life’s work. These two new experiences, department meetings and academic advisement, bound me to my CAS colleagues, CHAD majors, and this university.

I was also dead wrong in my anticipation of the time requirements that would go along with my full-time status. How much could one additional course and advisement add to my previous part-time load? The answer turned out to be a lot because of the department’s non-teaching work that I neither knew about nor had been a part of. Now, six years down the full-time road with more work than I can handle, I fail to understand how faculty can do research on top of a full-time teaching load. I send kudos to them. Although I co-authored three editions of a textbook while I was part-time, I have found precious little time for writing as a full-time lecturer. All of us in the full-time lecturer cohort would like more than 24 hours in our days and struggle to balance our lives. How did I get to this point?

By the time I was in the midst of my Ph.D. dissertation at Stanford, I had graduated from the University of Michigan, worked in program development at the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, earned a master’s at Harvard, taught and consulted at High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, and trained early childhood teachers in Los Angeles. I was also in the midst of a pregnancy. When our first child was 6 months old, my husband and I moved from Minneapolis to Southern California, where his law office opened a regional branch. For the next several years, my dissertation progressed at a snail’s pace as I continued to consult to early childhood programs in the Los Angeles area, settled into a new home, and raised our young son. When my oral defense was finally scheduled, we planned our second child and I began teaching part-time at nearby Saddleback College.

Imagine my shock when I attended a Stanford Alumni Conference in 1985, found a random empty seat in a dining venue of 400 strangers next to Shirley Hill, then chair of Elementary Education at CSUF, and received a part-time job offer by the end of lunch. In the spring of 1986, I taught a statistics course for master’s students in education but found my true home in Child Development (now Child and Adolescent Studies), teaching a developmental course to undergraduates; thus my CSUF lecturer career was launched.

My decision to remain part-time was deliberately made to balance my home and work lives. With two young children and a husband with a demanding law practice, the prospect of a full-time position 33 miles from my home was not attractive. Each time a tenure-track position announcement was put in my box, I re-affirmed this decision; I felt fortunate that I could do without the additional income of an assistant professorship and abide the lack of prestige of my non-tenure track lectureship. Life was busy and full. I taught typically two courses a semester from my repertoire of six, co-authored three editions of an observation textbook for early childhood, and did a bit of consulting, but my priority was always my children. They thrived, and when my youngest went off to Harvard, I succumbed to some gentle arm-twisting from my chair and acting dean and applied for a full-time lectureship.

“Straddling life between the home and academia equipped me with eclectic strengths to bring to my department. Study of development at Harvard and Stanford continued to serve as the anchor of my knowledge base, but I added both depth and breadth as I raised my two children and taught and consulted in the field.”
I’m glad I did. Straddling life between the home and academia equipped me with eclectic strengths to bring to my department. Study of development at Harvard and Stanford continued to serve as the anchor of my knowledge base, but I added both depth and breadth as I raised my two children and taught and consulted in the field. My knowledge of writing became increasingly clear, specific, and detailed as I co-authored three editions of a textbook over 12 years so that I am confident I know what I’m doing when I teach CAS 300, our upper division writing course. I’m a better college teacher because I have had college students as children, and volunteerism in schools, school districts, sports groups, and parent organizations offered daily opportunities for cooperative endeavors. My own teaching and consulting experiences prepared me to share the faculty lead of the CSUF Jumpstart program in cooperation with the CAS department, the Center for Internships and Service Learning, National Jumpstart, and our community partner, Orange County Head Start. My life in the CAS department has been stimulating, varied, challenging, and rewarding.

What worked best for me as an individual also worked well for Cal State Fullerton. The university found a lecturer with a solid academic background and diverse practical experiences who was well prepared to teach students planning to work with children and families. I chose my meandering road and, with hindsight, would repeat my path because my varied life experiences have enriched my work. I am grateful that my department drew me into its heart and welcomed my contributions.

Susan Shipstead has taught in the Child and Adolescent Studies Department for 21 years, the last 6 as a full-time lecturer. Her course repertoire includes assessing and observing development, writing and communication skills, families and development, and practica for students participating in the Jumpstart program. She is the co-author of three editions of an observation textbook for early childhood educators.
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**Road Scholar**

David Freeman

I am a road scholar, also known as a Freeway Flyer. In short, I am one of the many thousands of collegiate instructors in the state of California who works at two or more schools in order to make a living. Our ranks now make up a majority of the faculty teaching at California community colleges, as well as the CSU and UC campuses. We teach more than half of all courses offered at these institutions, and we do this by commuting several hundred miles each week, from campus to campus. We teach year round, spring, summer, fall, winter with little or no job security and certainly no prospect of ever going on sabbatical. While nearly all of us start out in the belief that the situation is only temporary, the fact is that for most of us, this is the way it will be throughout our entire careers. Yet many of us have published more than our tenure-track colleagues, are active scholars and continuously receive outstanding evaluations for our performance. We have done what members of our profession traditionally are supposed to do to get a tenured position, but for many reasons will never secure one.

The growing number of road scholars represents part of the ongoing assault on tenure. Employers seeking absolute control of their workforce try to end any and all forms of job security in order to minimize costs by dismissing higher-paid personnel without just cause and intimidating workers who do not toe the line. This, of course, is an old story, but what makes it so shocking in our case is that the employer in question is the State of California, supposedly a labor-friendly Red State. Private employers do not make the rules mandating the benefits they must provide their employees. They do what they need to stay profitable.

We, however, work for the people who DO make the rules but are unwilling themselves to live by them. Consequently, California has become perhaps the largest, and certainly one of the
worst, exploiters of labor in the country. State universities and colleges have become totally dependent upon part-time employees who are entitled to few benefits and can be dismissed at any time without reason. Fear of losing one’s job completely sabotages the concept of academic freedom. Creating a two-tier labor system, tenure-track and non tenure-track faculty, also gives administrators the ability to drive a wedge between their employees and try to play the two groups off against one another to the disadvantage of both.

Just as important, though, is the fact that the current system works against students. Most of their courses are taught by part-time faculty. These same instructors are constantly moving from one class to the next, which normally means getting in a car and driving ten, twenty, thirty miles or more. Theses instructors do not have time to spend with their students outside of their required office hours even if they desire to do so. Community colleges do not even provide office hours or office space for their part-time faculty. The quality of education suffers even as the student fees increase.

In my experience, I have seen and heard many stories illustrating my points first hand. I have known: an instructor who drove 100 miles each day, one who taught at CSU Channel Islands and CSU Fullerton during the SAME semester, one who taught 19 classes—not units, classes—in one semester, faculty ordered by their Dean NOT to be in their office outside of office hours and faculty told by a department chair NOT to hold office hours at all; this last a violation of state requirements.

We need to communicate that the present situation hurts not only ALL faculty and students but undermines the very purpose of the state-supported higher education system. The costs are not costs at all but investments in the future. The results are not quantifiable in any traditional sense. Rather, they are manifested in the long-term health and increasing prosperity of our society. We all need to unite so that everybody wins.

David Freeman earned his Ph.D. in history from Texas A&M University. He has been teaching at California State University, Fullerton since 1999. Additionally, he teaches at Saddleback College in Mission Viejo, CA, where he has created Internet courses in world history for the Department of Defense. His recently published articles include “Winston Churchill and the Invention of Iraq” and “Voices from the Deep: Life and Culture Aboard US Navy Submarines During the Cold War.”

A Positive Transition from the Corporate World to Academia

JoAnne Andre

Although I would be the first to admit that some of the tradeoffs are difficult, leaving corporate America for Cal State Fullerton has been an extremely positive change for me. I have worked for many years in both the for-profit and the nonprofit sectors of health care and both pale in comparison to the pleasures of campus life.

For-profit employment frequently included the following scenarios which, I confess, I do not miss at all:

- Frequent conversations about whether the company would meet Wall Street’s quarterly and yearly earning projections
- Discussions as to what percentage of my staff would need to be laid off if Wall Street’s expectations were not met and how we would “reengineer “ delivery of services based upon this scenario
- The value of services being based largely on their profit margin
• Decisions made on whether to institute new services based upon exceeding "hurdle rates"
• Work related travel that frequently meant long hours at the airport and periods of time away from home

I can happily say that, since coming to Cal State Fullerton, none of these situations have been a part of my professional experience. Nonprofit health care offered a different set of problems including:

• Cash flow issues and ongoing juggling of accounts payable and accounts receivable in order to meet payroll every two weeks
• Ongoing fund raising appeals to cover the cost of unfunded services

Although I know financial staff here at CSUF deal with these issues, thankfully I no longer need to do so.

Academia also offers pleasures I can say were infrequent or nonexistent in my corporate life. Since coming to CSUF, I have been blessed to be awarded a Fulbright scholarship to experience another culture first-hand in Thailand. The support of colleagues versus the competition for scarce promotions is also welcome. And very little can compare to the gratification I experience in seeing students grow and develop as they begin to grasp previously unknown concepts and ideas.

So while it may not be true for all lecturers, the transition to academia for me has been welcome and deeply appreciated.

JoAnne Andre is the Director of Distance Nursing Education. She graduated with a B.S. from Columbia University and an MSN from UCLA. She has held national, regional, and local administrative positions in Home Health and Hospice, as well as consulting nationally in managed care.

What do Lecturer’s Need?

Curtis Williams

Lecturers deserve access to University-provided resources to achieve their maximum possible teaching effectiveness. Providing lecturers with the tools to enhance student learning will increase the value of a Cal State Fullerton education. Temporary faculty members should be equipped equally as well as permanent faculty for their instructional duties.

The title of “Lecturer” is the official designation given to all temporary faculty members in the CSU. Lecturers don’t have permanent contracts but are appointed for a limited period of time. As the name suggests, lecturers have the primary responsibility of teaching classes for credit. Temporary faculty members usually don’t have the same research requirements as do permanent faculty subject to the RTP (Retention, Tenure, and Promotion) process.

The hiring of tenure-track faculty is often done after a nationwide (or international) search. Lecturer hiring usually takes place only at the department level with candidates subject to minimum qualification standards, usually only a master’s degree in the subject. Lecturers often teach larger classes at the lower division level (usually GE) or upper division courses in areas in which they have special experience or expertise. Our lecturer faculty teach as little as a single lab and as many as 15 units. Lecturers who have taught in the same department for more than six years become eligible for a three-year contract.

After talking with a number of temporary faculty here at CSUF, I have assembled a list of specific unmet lecturer needs. The highest priority issue (not surprisingly) is pay. The University faces the combined challenges of increasing enrollment, dwindling financial support, and the loss of general public sympathy for the role that education plays in our society. Low pay affects
all faculty to some extent, but lecturers usually begin at the lowest step and advance slowly through the salary schedule.

Faculty members often teach in a traditional classroom environment by presenting a formal lecture. In spite of the prevalence of the lecture format in American higher education, other methods of teaching must be included as a part of the learning experience. Two-way communication is crucial for our students to learn the skills necessary to be fully engaged in their own learning, both now and in the future.

Students deserve faculty members who are available both in and out of classes. Office hours represent an invaluable opportunity for faculty to meet with individual students. Temporary faculty have cited numerous examples of substandard office situations. Many departments have more than 10 persons assigned to an office space equipped for two. The highest density I found was one department with 14 temporary faculty (down from more than 20) sharing two desks, one very old computer and no printer. A properly prepared office allows students to get extra help with class work, papers, projects, or the chance to discuss their assignments without the interruption of other office occupants. One faculty member told me that he is asked to leave his desk the moment his scheduled office time is over.

The campus has taken the lead in providing desktop computers to all full-time faculty members (including lecturers). Full-time faculty can also arrange for a University-provided laptop computer to effectively extend their office functions to other areas. The Academic Senate passed a resolution in February 2007 that gives some long-term part-time temporary faculty the same benefit. This includes lecturers who have been with the University for many years and treat CSUF as their primary work location. This new policy should be implemented for its stated effective date of fall semester 2007.

Once a temporary faculty member is hired, a Fullerton email account is immediately created to handle the communication between the employer and employee. The marginal cost is quite low for the email and portal services because the computer servers are already established and the data space requirements are really quite small. Each course is now assigned a Blackboard.com course site as a part of the preparation for each new semester.

Offices and computers have a much higher unit cost, but the return on the investment is still significant because better teaching result from the investments made on behalf of the students. If learning is pre-eminent at Cal State Fullerton, then building more offices should be a stated goal of the administration. Providing the part-time faculty laptop computers will be a prudent use of limited resources.

The last thing to recognize is that CSUF is in competition with other local colleges and universities for the best temporary faculty. In the same way that low salaries hurt our ability to attract and retain tenure-track faculty, temporary faculty also look for the best teaching situation available to them. Making CSUF a desirable employer of temporary faculty will increase the number of students who go on to take upper division course and earn degrees. A professional cadre of properly equipped temporary faculty will change lives.

Curtis Williams is a Lecturer in the Department of Geological Sciences and represents part-time faculty on the Academic Senate. He has been with CSUF since 2000, but taught his first class in the CSU in 1989. He also serves as a database administrator in the College of Business & Economics.
A Message from the Chair

Diana Guerin

I had the pleasure of sitting next to Professor Charles Tumlinson from the Department of Music at a recent lunch event in the TSU, but I must admit that at first he seemed to fit the stereotype of the absent-minded professor quite well. Not only was he late sitting down to lunch, but he also seemed quite distracted when he joined the table and then almost immediately left the table to take a call on his cell phone.

When Chuck finally had a chance to settle into lunch, however, all became clear. Chuck is the director of our Jazz Program. His students were playing the music for the event (they were excellent), hence his delayed seating. And the cell phone call? Chuck was finalizing a visit to campus that afternoon by saxophonist Branford Marsalis. “If you’re free, come to Meng Hall at 3:00,” he offered. I did, and what a treat. For about 40 minutes, Marsalis took questions from the intimate audience. Then, Chuck’s students joined Marsalis on the stage. As I sat there in the beautiful Meng Hall on that Friday afternoon watching our students playing with Branford Marsalis and listening to great jazz, I couldn’t help but think about what a great learning opportunity Chuck had created for his students and those of us lucky enough to hear about the Marsalis visit.

Now for an update on the Academic Senate. Clearly, the audit investigation dominated the Senate’s attention in the fall. In October, the CSU Auditor Larry Mandel released a special investigation audit report over 50 pages long. This report was in response to numerous allegations made by members of our campus, including “improper governmental activities, disregard for regulations and CSU policy, allowance of abuse of authority, continuous improper suppression of irregularities, and acts of retaliation.” The investigation spanned two years, and many of the allegations were supported. The report culminated with over 50 recommendations for action, which are being addressed by the campus.

As a result of the audit, Senate actions focused on strengthening policies pertaining to review of administrative units/personnel, reviewing the function and structure of the Planning, Resource, and Budget Committee (PRBC), and increasing access to campus budget information. Based on information included in the audit report, a resolution on the expenditure of lottery funds was passed; this is on PRBC’s agenda this week. Another resolution called for dissemination of more information on steps taken to address the issues raised by the audit. A final resolution on restoring pay to faculty who taught in summer 2004 is still under debate.

This spring, agenda items will include revisions to several policies being reviewed by the Senate’s standing committees. Last semester, UPS 210.000 was amended to reduce the materials submitted for periodic reviews; additional revision on the size of the Portfolio will be considered soon, as well as the document as a whole. The Senate has been informed that work on the campus institutional proposal for re-accreditation is underway, with a draft proposal for campus review expected in August. Additionally, the CSU Board of Trustees has initiated a strategic planning process called Access to Excellence (successor to Cornerstones from the 1990s), and our campus conversation to provide input will be on March 21st.

No doubt, it will be a busy and challenging semester for all of us. While I have a moment, I want to thank Chuck and his jazz students for a pleasant respite and reminder of the great things that happen here at CSUF.

Diana Wright Guerin, Professor of Child and Adolescent Studies, joined the faculty in 1988. She is one of three campus senators in the CSU Academic Senate and also an elected delegate to the CFA Assembly. Dr. Guerin is the current chair of the Academic Senate.
Poetry Corner

Winter in High Latitudes

For my Grandfather at 90

We drift from breath
through consciousness, towards death.
And as we’ve praised the early sun,
admired how the apple grows
from flower buds to fruit
we’ve come to shortened days,
to shadows stretching out,
sketching lines of dark across
the nests of birds flown south.
We wait those shadows out

Remember, now that ends come on
in small towns feathered out in frost,
that after birds fly south
and apple trees have dropped their fruit,
and time has near run out
that as the bustling birds returned
to raise another hungry brood
of chitterings and mouths
the winter of high latitudes
must sing their fledglings south.

Mark Grinyer
Business Writing Program

Call for Papers

The first issue of the Senate Forum in fall 2007 will
focus on the “First-Year Faculty Experience.” Faculty
members who were hired in fall 2006 are encouraged
to write an article of 1500 to 2000 words on their first
year at Cal State Fullerton. Deadline for submissions
is June 1, 2007. Please indicate your interest by
emailing the editor at lrandall@fullerton.edu.