

**Faculty Realities and Challenges: Perspectives of Those Who Teach in CSP Programs**

Marilyn Amey  
Cheryl Lovell  
Kacy Heinmiller King  
Kang Li  
Mike Dannells

Prepared for the  
“Shaping the Future of Graduate Education: Challenges and Best Practices” Pre-  
Conference Workshop  
ACPA-NASPA  
Orlando, Florida  
March 31, 2007

Contact Information: [amey@msu.edu](mailto:amey@msu.edu)

## **Faculty Realities and Challenges: Perspectives of Those Who Teach in CSP Programs**

Societal shifts including diversity, technology, and globalization are changing the nature of faculty work and how it compares with emerging institutional and societal needs, preparing new faculty for the new millennium, and understanding faculty communities and how they affect faculty work (Fairweather, 2002; Fairweather & Baird, 2002). There is research examining the experiences of new faculty (e.g., Boice, 1992; Menges & Associates, 1999), new faculty socialization (e.g., Tierney & Bensimon, 1992; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993), the preparation of future faculty (e.g., Trower, Austin, & Sorcinelli, 2001), and administrator perceptions of faculty work and eliciting greater faculty-student engagement (O'Meara & Braskamp, 2005). Large faculty data sets collected regularly by the National Center for Educational Statistics, the Higher Education Research Institute and organizations such as the AAUP present useful overviews of national trends including teaching and advising loads, research productivity, administrative experience, one's professional involvement in terms of presentations or offices held, and satisfaction measures on various institutional governance issues. The surveys have important demographic and employment status data that show diversity of the academic profession, part-time/full-time status, rank and tenure, and similar factors that indicate aspects of professorial "health", standing and satisfaction within the academy. Finally, these data have begun to include a set of measures looking at work-life issues for faculty that affect longevity in or decisions to join the profession (Rice, 1998; Trower, Austin, & Sorcinelli). Gross aggregate and broad disaggregated comparisons have been conducted

on all these data, showing how disciplinary distinctions, institution type, gender, and other factors differentiate faculty life.

At the same time, these studies are not useful for looking at discrete disciplinary areas within the academy and do not often look specifically at faculty in graduate or graduate-only programs (those who have no real undergraduate instructional responsibilities), including programs in applied and “professional” fields such as College Student Personnel or Student Affairs, hereafter used simultaneously. While these faculty still have responsibilities for teaching, research, and institutional service represented in other studies of faculty, they also carry with them a “professional service” component that may be significantly more demanding than that facing their counterparts in other disciplines such as the Humanities. The expectation for professional work experience in the hiring process of student affairs faculty (Cawthon, McClellan, Dunn and Grandpré, 2001), the extent to which these programs require or need assistantship and practicum placements for students and therefore, inherently carry a proportionately higher level of administrative responsibilities than non field-based degree programs (Newell and Kuh, 1989), and the direct tie between faculty connection to the field and employment of graduates often goes unexamined when we look at the mix of responsibilities and career issues for faculty in our disciplines. The level of involvement in the field directly relates to recruitment of prospective students, credibility with prospective employers for placements, and often has both an intra- and extra-institutional component (Evans and Williams, 1998). Yet, by and large, these activities are considered service for evaluation purposes, the same as sitting on a department committee or reviewing a journal article, in spite of the fact that the time involved in the former activities may far exceed that spent

by most faculty in the latter areas of work. For those at early career, in the promotion pipeline, or moving from administration to full-time faculty roles (Blimling, 2002), the weight of these activities can be detrimental to other forms of institutionally-valued productivity, including research, yet remain critical to program viability at the same time that they potentially provide sites for data collection and dissemination of faculty research; finding the skills and balance for doing the array of work expected of CSP faculty by their university academic peers and student affairs administrative colleagues is potentially quite challenging (Evans and Williams). This double-edged sword for professional preparation faculty is largely not catalogued in research on faculty (Allen, 2001); yet, as we look to well documented changing demographics of the faculty labor market (e.g., Austin, 2002; Fairweather, 2002, 2005), the circumstances may be exacerbated by new faculty with different career perspectives (Austin), by increased use of part-time or adjunct faculty (Allen, 2003; Baldwin & Chronister, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993), and by the increased hiring of faculty from administrator ranks (Carpenter, Patitu, and Cuyjet, 1999; Evans and Williams).

In addition to the service issues for faculty in professional fields, there is increasing debate about the credentials and preparation of these faculty, especially with the expected percentages of retirements forecast to begin in the late 1980s (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Newell & Kuh, 1989) and that are occurring in higher numbers today. Specifically for Student Affairs preparation programs, often not seen as essential as Teacher Education to the mission of Colleges of Education in which they are most likely located, how do demographic trends of the faculty impact program viability? Evans and Williams (1998) found that less than one-half of faculty in Student Affairs were full

professors, one-third of the faculty were assistant professors, and almost a quarter of all student affairs faculty received their degrees since 1990. While this number does not reveal the level of work experience prior to receiving the terminal degree, it does suggest that the professoriate in this field is somewhat bi-modal in distribution (quite senior and quite junior), which may increase the likelihood of generational differences in what is important in student preparation and faculty work. Other demographic questions that come immediately to mind include to what extent do these faculty come directly from graduate preparation programs themselves or from practice? Is there an increased use of part-time and adjunct faculty in these applied fields (Carpenter, Patitu, and Cuyjet, 1999; Evans & Williams, 1998) similar to that found more broadly in postsecondary education? Is this seen as a way of providing the link between theory and practice for students (Cawthon, McClellan, Dunn, & Grandpré, 2001) or as a sign of instability and weakened program credibility? While the field may value the presence of retired administrators among program faculty because of the professional experience they bring to the curriculum (NASPA, 2004; AACCC, 2004), to what extent do these faculty contribute to scholarship, dissertation and thesis advising, and institutional governance? Are faculty with very different backgrounds and preparations allowed to construct differential load equations, providing means by which they can contribute in their areas of strength, or are all faculty held to the same standards regardless of their ability to accomplish high levels of research, teaching, and service contributions?

These and other questions were the impetus for our exploration of the current status of faculty in Student Affairs. Since it is impossible to draw reputable conclusions about this and many other discrete fields from the larger national data bases, we have no

comparable understanding specifically of faculty profiles and issues for those involved in teaching in our preparation programs with the exception of a handful of studies conducted in the past. Apart from what we “know” anecdotally, often from challenging faculty searches conducted in the past few years, we have limited understandings of our own academic labor market including the ways in which it mirrors or is distinct from the pictures portrayed in studies of other disciplines (e.g., Diamond & Adams, 1995; Fairweather, 2002). This line of inquiry attempts to fill this void and present a contemporary perspective on the faculty (broadly defined) involved in higher education and student affairs preparation programs. Research questions driving our study included for this paper:

What is the demographic profile of faculty teaching in higher education and student affairs preparation programs?

To what extent are CSP faculty involved in teaching, research, and service? Are there differences between full-time faculty and administrators who teach?

To what extent are CSP faculty satisfied with or in agreement with a series of institutional and individual factors? Are there differences between full-time faculty and administrators who teach?

## **Methodology**

Data were drawn from a national study of student affairs preparation program faculty. A survey instrument was designed, modified from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty survey. We wanted to be able to compare this discrete subset of faculty to the national trend data emanating from the NSOPF studies, so our instrument

includes many of the same data points<sup>1</sup>. Yet, to capture differences associated with fields that often draw heavily from practitioners for their instructional ranks, that have a high service component expected (potentially) as part of faculty work, and that may have other distinctions, we added questions throughout the survey. We conducted focus groups at one regional and one national conference, and participated in a second focus group of another national organization in order to generate additional questions and test the validity of our evolving survey instrument. It was later pilot tested with part-time and full-time instructors, and appropriate revisions made. A national data base was constructed using the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the Association of Counseling and Personnel Administrators program membership data sets, and a field-specific directory of program faculty housed at one of the major Student Affairs programs to be as inclusive of different instructional configurations as possible. Hard copy surveys were mailed to all faculty in early Fall, 2004, with follow-ups conducted in later fall, and a second hard copy mailing distributed in January, 2005. Electronic surveys were also made available to faculty to increase response rates.

The initial sample generated from the combined data sets numbered 1065 full- and part-time faculty identified as teaching in student affairs/higher education programs. The first mailing resulted in many withdrawals from the sample of those who were no longer employed at the institution, those whose mailing addresses were undeliverable, and those who did not teach/have not taught in the programs during the study year or previously. This brought the potential respondent pool down to approximately 830. Given the number of non-respondents following several follow-ups, it is very possible that many more should have been removed from the original sample. One lesson learned was

---

<sup>1</sup> Cross-disciplinary comparisons are beyond the scope of this paper.

the challenge of accessing a “credible” mailing list from which to generate data. At the same time that these often self-reported “program lists” are over-inflated resulting in lists that include anyone who may ever have taught, those who supervise interns/practica students but do not have formal instructional responsibility, etc., participating in “fee-based” program lists may also limit participation for those in small programs with limited resources. The data presented represent 226 respondents, or a 27.2% response rate.

Descriptive statistics and early inferential statistics, including cross-tabs, are reported in this paper. Summary findings are presented addressing aspects of the three research questions and include demographics, academic/professional background, nature of work, attitudes, and job satisfaction. Given the perceived importance of differentiating administrators who teach from full-time faculty, comparisons between these two groups are also highlighted. Gender variation was also explored, though the response rates for race and ethnicity precluded analysis beyond demographic information.

## **Findings**

### ***Demographics***

Those responding to the survey identified predominately as white (86.9%), and slightly more identified as male than female (50.9% versus 48.9%). This distribution across race and ethnic categories does not change greatly when full-time faculty (134 or 59.1% of respondents) are separated from administrators who teach (81 or 35.8%), although gender was different (insert Table 1). When the two respondent groups were differentiated, there was a greater percentage of male administrator respondents (61.7%) and greater percentage of women faculty respondents (54.8%). The same percentage of women and men were tenured (60.3% versus 60%) but they were also more often on

tenure track and untenured than men (30.1% versus 26.7%), and at less senior rank than their male peers. Of male full-time faculty responding, 42.4% held the title of professor compared to 23.0% women; less than ¼ of male respondents were at each of associate and assistant ranks (22% and 23.7%, respectively) while 41.9% of female respondents were at associate rank and 28.4% were at assistant (insert Table 2). This may reflect either a kind of glass ceiling for women in promotion to full professor, women who delayed tenure track progress for raising a family or starting faculty careers later, or of a tendency to hire men at initially higher levels. These results may also reflect the movement from senior administrator to faculty where rank is negotiated in that move; a greater percentage of male senior administrators, in this case, could lead to a comparably higher percentage of full professors. A greater percentage of male than female respondents held an affiliate or adjunct professor title (22.4% and 15.5%, respectively).

Of those responding, 63.6% were married, 7% indicated they were partnered, and 17.4% were single/never married (insert Table 3). A greater percentage of men than women were married (82.5% versus 50.9%) while the reverse is true for those who were single/never married and partnered (28.3% single/never married women versus 9.6% men and 10% women who were partnered and 4.3% men). The survey did not ask a specific question about children.

Of those responding, 90.7% held the Ph.d. as their terminal degree, almost evenly distributed between men and women (91.4% men and 90.0% women); we did not distinguish between Ed.D. and Ph.d. And of that group, 43.9% had a focus in the doctorate of higher education, 13.1% in counseling, and 10.1% in CSP/Student Affairs. Of those who identified master's degree disciplines, whether or not they also held a

doctorate, 17% had degrees in student affairs, 16% in counseling-related fields, and 3% in higher education; the remainder (over 50%) were in other disciplines.

Although we asked years teaching in higher education, for analysis purposes, this continuous variable was collapsed into three categories: 0-9 years (37.4%), 10-19 years (31.9%) and 20+ years (29.0%). This does not reflect total years as a professional but years teaching in the field, which may have an impact on later findings particularly related to satisfaction because some faculty who currently teach in our programs may first have been administrators. This distinction is beyond the scope of this paper.

### *Nature of Work*

Workload was one of the primary reasons for looking at those who teach in CSP programs. While administrators who teach in these programs may do so off-load (50.0%), our particular focus was on work considered part of calendar year on-load assignments including teaching (31.7% of administrators and 92.0% of faculty teach on-load). Table 4 shows on-load work distributions, indicating reported actual percent time spent and preferred time spent (insert Table 4). Respondents indicated actual percent time spent on research/scholarship to be much less than percent time preferred (19.5% actual versus 25.5% preferred) and the reverse for administration (36.5% actual versus 26.5% preferred); time spent on service/non-teaching activities was closely aligned with preferred time (9.8% actual versus 9.9% preferred).

Breakdowns in workload preferences between faculty and administrators show similar patterns, but others as well (see Table 4). Full-time faculty spent more time with teaching and administration than they preferred (48.3% actual time spent teaching versus 44.2% preferred, and 17.5% actual times spent with administration versus 9.8%

preferred) and less time with research/scholarship than preferred (23.9% actual versus 30.8% preferred time spent). By comparison, administrators spent less time on all activities than preferred with the exception of administration (17.1% actual time spent teaching versus 23.7%; 8.2% actual time spent on research/scholarship versus 13.6% preferred; 7.3% professional development versus 11.9% preferred). One observation from these findings is that full-time faculty in graduate preparation programs at research (intensive and extensive) and master's comprehensive universities spend almost 50% of their actual time on teaching, with not quite a reported 25% time on research/scholarship and almost 10% time spent on service/non-teaching. The rhetoric of a 40-40-20 split among work categories seems not to apply for faculty in our field.

We also looked at comparisons between tenured and non-tenured faculty that yielded interesting results (insert Table 5). Tenured faculty spend more time teaching than their non-tenured colleagues (50.4% versus 45.3%) and both groups prefer to spend less time on this work (45.5% versus 42.6%). Both groups of faculty spend roughly the same amount of actual time on research/scholarship, although tenured faculty prefer to spend more time, and there was comparable actual and preferred time identified for service among tenured and non-tenured faculty. Tenured faculty report less actual time spent on administration (15.5%) than their non-tenured colleagues (20.2%) and both groups prefer to spend much less time in this area. That non-tenured faculty spend 1/5 of their actual time on administrative work could suggest program leadership responsibilities, student recruitment activities, or work associated with assistantship/practica placements. This may be attributable also to recent hires in small academic units who are left with considerable administrative duties because of the nature

of our preparation programs. Add to this percent time actually spent on service/non-teaching activities, even while comparable to time spent on this by their tenured colleagues, and it appears that non-tenured faculty are spending approximately 30% of their on-load work in responsibilities less likely to be highly valued in tenure review.

Comparisons by gender (not broken out by position) show that men overall spend more time on administration than women (41.7% versus 31.0%), and less on research/scholarship (17.7% versus 21.1%) and teaching (34.2% versus 40.2%). Men prefer to spend more time on research/scholarship and professional growth, and less on administration, while women preferred to spend less time on teaching and administration and more time on research/scholarship and consulting. (insert Table 6). Some of this variation in actual percent time spent can be attributed to administrators more frequently being men, and women more frequently being early career faculty. One could have assumed, however, because of the percentage of men who are also full professors that time spent on research among men might have been greater. Men and women indicate roughly the same percent time for actual and preferred time spent on service (approximately 10%).

More than 51% of all respondents, full-time faculty and administrators, taught four, five or more courses during the academic year in question; 19.4% taught only one course. For most respondents, courses fell at both the master's and doctoral level. Respondents identified their courses as core, elective, practica/field experience, and independent study. Administrators who teach delivered courses across this range, and were not just instructors of record for practica, field experiences, or elective courses. Full-time faculty were actually responsible for teaching more practicum classes than

administrators who teach. These findings suggest that administrators may be more central to curriculum delivery and that faculty may be taking on a greater theory-to-practice translation role in teaching field experience courses than we think. The aggregate median hours spent advising per week was 2 (62.5% reported spending 3 or more hours per week), and spent in office hours was 4 (52.7% reported spending 3 or more hours per week).<sup>2</sup>

### **Satisfaction**

A series of questions related to job satisfaction were included in the survey. Participants rated on a four-point scale the extent to which they were satisfied with a specific item from “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied.” The results are presented first, for all respondents and then reported by position group, gender, and faculty-only.

Overall, respondents were satisfied, with the exception of effectiveness of faculty leadership and time to keep current in which they were somewhat dissatisfied. Respondents were very satisfied with job security and opportunity for advancement, and 88.5% of respondents were somewhat or very satisfied with their job overall. To determine whether job satisfaction was affected by certain demographic factors, independent T-tests were conducted to compare the overall satisfaction scores when the sample was grouped by sex, faculty or administrator, and rank. The significance level used for this study was .05. All three groups were found to have statistically significant differences (see Table 7 for means and standard deviations). Men in the sample were significantly more satisfied than women. The difference in scores by position category show the administrators in the sample were significantly more satisfied than the faculty

---

<sup>2</sup> Respondents were also asked to indicate scholarly productivity during the last two years and over their total career. The parameters of this paper preclude inclusion of this full array of self-reported data.

members.<sup>3</sup> Lastly, the tenured faculty were significantly more satisfied with their jobs than the untenured faculty; administrators were not included in this rank analysis.

Descriptive statistics were also run to allow us to meaningfully describe the data (see Tables 8-10). Although overall, faculty and administrators are relatively satisfied, there are some interesting distinctions to note. As a group, untenured faculty were reported being somewhat or very dissatisfied in greater frequency than their tenured colleagues regarding authority to make decisions over courses they teach and other non-instructional aspects of the job, which may relate back to time spent on administration. They are more dissatisfied with their workload than tenured peers, and almost equally dissatisfied with the opportunity for advancement in rank (30.2% untenured faculty indicating very or somewhat dissatisfied and 29.1% administrators, compared to 16.9% of tenured faculty). Faculty were generally more dissatisfied with faculty leadership at their institution than their administrative counterparts, with 52.6% faculty responding very or somewhat dissatisfied compared to 34.6% administrators. Tenured faculty are more dissatisfied than their untenured colleagues (55.6% versus 49%), which is an interesting finding considering that tenured faculty tend to assume more campus leadership roles in governance than pre-tenure faculty. Women tend to be more dissatisfied than men with faculty leadership on campus, with almost ½ indicating they were very or somewhat dissatisfied (49.5%) compared to 41.2% of men. Yet, overall, survey respondents indicate being somewhat to very satisfied with their jobs, with the exception of slightly over ¼ of women who indicated they were very or somewhat dissatisfied (25.7%). This finding may be tied to campus climate issues discussed later in the paper.

---

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that the sample sizes were unequal for position and rank.

**Criteria for Promotion.** Participants were also asked a series of questions about various aspects of academic life including criteria for promotion and aspects of institutional climate. Participants rated on a four-point scale the extent to which they agreed with a specific statement from “disagree strongly” to “agree strongly” (see Tables 11-13). When asked about factors that should be taken into account when awarding promotion in rank, 67.2% of all respondents either somewhat or strongly agreed that teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion<sup>4</sup>. Surprisingly, 80.5% of administrators agreed or strongly agreed that teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion compared to 59.3% of faculty. Interestingly, among untenured faculty in the sample, 50.9% disagree that teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion; at the same time, more than 60% of the tenured faculty agree that teaching should be the primary criterion for promotion. In addition, more men than women agreed that teaching should be the primary criterion for promotion (73.0% men versus 62.7% women). When looking at time spent on teaching, it is not surprising that faculty would want teaching effectiveness to play a central part of promotion. It is a bit surprising that slightly over ½ the non-tenured faculty disagree with its use as a primary criterion when their preferred workload distribution indicates only a slightly smaller percentage time on teaching than they actually report spending.

Beliefs about whether research (publications) should be the primary criterion for promotion were almost equal for those who agreed and disagreed. Almost 52% percent of faculty disagreed that research should be the primary criterion for promotion, and women

---

<sup>4</sup> Respondents were not asked to prioritize or select only one factor for use in promotion but were asked of each factor to identify whether they agreed or disagreed with its use as *the* primary criterion for promotion. The survey questions for outreach and service asked whether each should be *a* strong consideration for promotion.

across positions tended to disagree at the same percentage. Untenured faculty disagreed (64%) that research should be the primary criterion more so than tenured faculty (44%). However, 64% of faculty and 73 % of administrators believe that research is rewarded more than teaching. Among faculty, tenured faculty agreed that research is rewarded more than teaching at a higher percentage (68%) than the untenured faculty (57%). Overall, it seems faculty believe that promotion should be based on teaching effectiveness, even at the same time that they believe research is actually rewarded more.

Just over 66 of respondents somewhat or strongly agreed that outreach should be a strong consideration for promotion, and this held for both faculty (61.4%) and administrators (65.9%). Service to the field was also acknowledged as an important criterion in promotion with 68% of respondents indicating somewhat or strong agreement. Here, too, faculty and administrators largely concurred (65.7% and 71.8%, respectively), although administrators agreed with the criterion more frequently. The survey did not ask respondents to differentiate activities falling within these two broad categories, which might help clarify how this work connects directly to the practice of student affairs. Yet, a greater percentage of respondents somewhat or strongly agreed that outreach and service to the field should be of strong consideration in promotion than they did that teaching effectiveness or research should be the primary criterion. That CSP programs are often located at institutions with outreach missions such as land-grant universities or master's granting (the former "comprehensive state") universities with a state service mission may account for some of the perceived emphasis in this area though it seems unlikely to be the cause of such a high percentage. We have not yet compared this finding to faculty in other applied fields, but it seems apparent that there is a tension

between the work of those who teach in CSP programs and what may be priorities of the tenure and reward structures of their institutions.

*Institutional Climate Issues.* As expected, women were less inclined than their male counterparts to perceive that women faculty were treated fairly at their institution (56.9% versus 87.8%). Concerning fair treatment of faculty of color at their institution, 53 % of female respondents agreed that racial and ethnic minority faculty were treated fairly while almost 84 % of male respondents agreed. In a profession historically considered welcoming to white women and people of color, even to the point of being characterized as “feminized,” these findings suggest that women who teach in CSP programs still see a greater difference in fair treatment than their male colleagues. This may contribute to a greater lack of satisfaction for women with their jobs overall.

Most respondents do not think research quality has declined at the same time that most believe that faculty workload expectations and actual workload have increased. More than half of the faculty, both tenured and untenured, believe that it has become more difficult to obtain external funding. In addition, over 70% of faculty believe that too many full-time faculty have been replaced by part-time instructors. These findings mirror sentiment on these issues nationally across disciplines (Baldwin & Chronister, 2000; Carpenter, Patitu, and Cuyjet, 1999). What is not clear from the data in our study is whether full-time faculty consider their colleague administrators who teach to be part of the increase in part-time instructors or if their referent is the larger university context in which they work.

Most respondents believed that the quality of graduate students they teach has not declined (78%). Almost 80% also think that the professional competence of individuals

entering their academic field has not declined; the question did not provide a specific referent for respondents such as college student personnel or higher education faculty versus administrators. Overall, 94 % of all respondents would choose an academic career again.

### **Implications and Conclusions**

This paper provided descriptive data on those who teach in our CSP preparation programs, not all of which are surprising and some of which suggest both additional lines of inquiry and potential areas of concern for the future of our instructor labor market.

Not surprising, the overall demographics of the field as represented by those who responded to the survey indicate vestiges of a profession still quite dominated by white men at senior levels of both full-time faculty and administrator ranks. Progress to diversify the labor market is being made, but professionals of color are still sorely under-represented among respondents in either position category. White women are well represented overall, but within the more distinct categories of rank, for example, their promotion towards senior leadership as faculty or administrators is slow. These features of our demographic profile are not unlike the landscape nationally in higher education, but seem a bit more concerning in a field that values diversity and inclusion among our students. Further inquiry seems warranted into hiring and tenure/promotion policies and practices, as well as more discrete analysis of factors like time in rank, years to promotion, differences afforded or negotiated at hiring, etc. in order to better understand the nuances of the internal and external labor markets for those intending to assume careers teaching or as administrators in student affairs.

It also seems that, for full-time faculty particularly, time spent and time preferred on various aspects of work is not in sync and perhaps ties back to promotion in rank. Again, it is likely that faculty in all fields report some degree of disconnect between their actual time spent in areas of work and their preferred time. Yet, the teaching-intensive responsibilities of faculty in predominately research-intensive environments along with high administrative responsibilities associated with programs requiring close ties to practice may exacerbate the issues for CSP faculty. Given the percentage that report overall satisfaction and a desire to choose an academic career were they to start again, the apparent discrepancies may be written off to faculty complaining when given the chance to do so. But particularly for those faculty still untenured, the pressures appear great and the percentage time spent on activities less likely to be highly valued in upper levels of promotion review should be a concern to the stability of the academic profession. Effective mentoring, creative job sharing, strong connections between divisions of student affairs and faculty, and other ways of creating needed slack to accommodate these responsibilities are necessary – much on the order of conversations typically taking place among Emerging Scholars and New Faculty groups on campus and in national associations. Rather than relegating the task of navigating the processes to junior colleagues and those administrators who recently assumed full-time faculty responsibilities, however, we take more proactive roles in helping colleagues professional advance and find ways of establishing better integration of work and life.

New paradigms for constructing the role of instructors in CSP programs may be warranted as we continue to situate our programs within Colleges faced with multiple and competing priorities. How to connect with unit and institutional priorities, integrate our

expertise into the classroom and the fabric of our universities, and establish a more significant role for our programs are real challenges facing us in the academic side of the profession, quite similar to the challenges faced by our senior administrative colleagues for the last 15 years. Those who teach in CSP programs appear quite engaged in their practice, whether as full-time faculty or administrators who teach. We are productive, teaching-intensive, active on campus and in professional organizations, and may be, in fact, exemplars at integrating theory and practice, given the nature of the work in which we are engaged and where that work takes place. In an era of data-based decision making and policy development, it seemed necessary to take the first step of developing a current profile of demographic information, institutional and intellectual contributions, and trying to better understand our perspectives on current issues. This paper presents one piece of this initial work and hopefully, encourages further discussion on these topics as well as an invitation to pursue other lines of inquiry needed to better understand those who teach in our preparation programs.

## References

- Allen, H. L. (2001). Workload and tenure policies in an era of organizational change. *The NEA 2001 Almanac of Higher Education*, 59-73
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic Career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (1), 94-122.
- Baldwin, R. G. and Chronister, J. L. (2000). *Teaching without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Blimling, G. S. (2002). Reflections on career development among student affairs leaders. *New Directions for Student Services*, 98, 27-36
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc..
- Bowen, H. R. & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Carpenter, D. S., Patitu, C. L. & Cuyjet, M. J. (1999). Faculty and administrators collaborating in student affairs preparation programs: Practicing what we preach. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 19 (1), 17-23.
- Cawthon, T. W., McClellan, M. A., Dunn, M. S., & Grandpré, E. A. (2001). The doctoral experience of student affairs administrators. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 20 (2), 64-71.
- Diamond, R. M. & B. E. Adams (Eds. (1993). *Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000* New Directions for Higher Education, No. 81. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Evans, N. J., & Williams, T. E. (1998). Student affairs faculty: Characteristics, qualifications, and recommendations for future preparation. *In The state of the art of preparation and practice in student affairs: Another look* (pp. 105-123). Lanham: Maryland.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76 (4), 401-422.
- Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (1), 26-48.
- Fairweather, J. S., & Baird, L. L. (2002). The faculty in the new millennium: Introduction to a special JHE issue. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (1), 1-2
- Gappa, J. M. and Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-timers in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Menges R. J., & Associates (Ed.), (1999). *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling in, Becoming Established, and Building Institutional Support*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Newell, L. J., & Kuh, G. D. (1989). Taking stock: The higher education professoriate. *The Review of Higher Education*, 13 (1), 63-90.
- O'Meara, K. A., & Braskamp, L. (2005) Aligning Faculty Reward Systems and Development to Promote Faculty and Student Growth. *NASPA Journal* 42 (2), 223-240.

- Rice, R. E. (1998). Making a place for the new American scholar. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Trower, C., Austin, A., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (May, 2001). Paradise lost. AAHE Bulletin. <http://www.aahebulletin.com/public/archive/paradiselost.asp>
- Tierney, W. G. & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*. (pp. 21-42). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Tierney, William G., & Rhoads, Robert A. (1993). Enhancing promotion and tenure: Faculty socialization as a cultural process. Association for the Study of Higher Education –ERIC Higher Education Report. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*. 30 (2), 91-123.
- Underwood, S. J. & Cawthon, T. W. (1999). Moving from administrator to faculty member: Look before you leap. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 19 (1), 88-96.

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Student Affairs Instructors - Percentages										
Group	Overall		Primary Position				Rank*			
			Faculty	Administrators			Untenured	Tenured		
<b>Gender</b>										
Male	110	50.9	60	44.4	50	61.7	16	42.1	36	45.0
Female	105	48.9	74	54.8	31	38.3	22	57.9	44	55.0
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>										
White	194	86.7	119	89.5	75	91.5	92.5		84.6	
African American	14	6.5	8	6.0	6	7.3	3.8		9.6	
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	1.4	2	1.5	1	1.2	0.0		3.8	
Hispanic or Latino	2	3.0	2	4.6	1	1.3	6.4		2.0	

\* Full-time faculty only

Table 2

Rank and Tenure Status By Gender of Full-Time Faculty					
Rank	Female		Male		Total
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Professor	17	40.5	25	59.5	42
		23.0		42.4	
Associate Professor	31	70.5	13	29.5	44
		41.9		22.0	
Assistant Professor	21	60.0	14	40.0	35
		28.4		23.7	
<b>Tenure Status</b>					
Tenured	44	55.0	36	45.0	80
		60.3		60.0	
On tenure track but not tenured	22	57.9	16	42.1	38
		30.1		26.7	

Table 3

Relationship Status of Student Affairs Instructors – Percentages							
Relationship Status	Overall	Gender		Position		Rank	
		Male	Female	Faculty	Admin	Untenured	Tenured
Single/never married	17.4	9.6	28.3	20.0	14.8	7.8	38.5
Married	63.6	82.5	50.9	62.3	77.8	72.7	46.2
Partnered	6.8	4.4	10.4	7.7	6.2	6.5	9.6
Separated	0.8	0.0	1.9	1.5	0	2.6	0.0
Widowed	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.3	0.0
Divorced	4.7	2.6	7.5	7.7	0.0	9.1	5.8

\* Full-time faculty only

Table 4

Work Load Preferences Overall, Faculty and Administrator– Percentages						
	Overall		Faculty		Administrators	
	Actual	Preferred	Actual	Preferred	Actual	Preferred
Teaching	37.5	36.9	48.3	44.2	17.1	23.7
Research/Scholarship	19.5	25.5	23.9	30.8	8.2	13.6
Professional Growth	6.0	8.9	5.4	7.2	7.3	11.9
Administration	36.5	26.5	17.5	9.8	67.2	51.9
Service/Other Non-teaching	9.8	9.9	9.8	9.5	9.9	10.8
Consulting/Freelance	3.1	5.9	3.1	6.5	3.1	4.9

\* Full-time faculty respondents only

Table 5

Rank* Work Load Preferences – Percentages	Tenured		Untenured	
	Actual	Preferred	Actual	Preferred
Teaching	50.4	45.5	45.3	42.6
Research/Scholarship	24.1	31.5	23.2	29.4
Professional Growth	6.0	7.6	4.7	7.0
Administration	15.5	9.9	20.2	12.3
Service/Other Non-teaching	9.9	9.6	9.8	9.5
Consulting/Freelance	3.6	7.0	2.6	5.8

\* Full-time faculty respondents only

Table 6

Gender Work Load Preferences – Percentages	Males		Females	
	Actual	Preferred	Actual	Preferred
Teaching	34.2	35.3	40.2	35.3
Research/Scholarship	17.7	23.8	21.1	26.5
Professional Growth	6.9	10.0	5.1	7.8
Administration	41.7	31.1	31.0	22.8
Service/Other Non-teaching	10.1	10.2	9.7	10.3
Consulting/Freelance	5.2	7.0	2.6	5.0

Table 7

Independent-Samples T-Tests Results for Overall Job Satisfaction

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Sample Size	p	t
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	24.69	4.77	116	.02	2.41
Female	23.26	4.07	108		
<b>Position</b>					
Faculty	23.49	4.39	135	.01	2.67
Administrator	25.12	4.29	81		
<b>Rank*</b>					
Tenured	24.12	4.09	81	.05	1.94
Untenured	22.64	4.66	53		

\* Full-time faculty only

Table 8

## Satisfaction and Attitudes for Faculty/Administrators - Percentages

	Very dissatisfied		Somewhat dissatisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Very satisfied	
The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach	0	0	1.5	0	13.5	6.7	85.0	93.3
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	2.3	2.7	7.5	5.5	39.8	24.7	50.4	67.1
The authority I have to make decisions about other (non-instructional) aspects of my job	4.5	0	15.2	6.8	37.1	27.0	43.2	66.2
Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor, etc	3.0	1.3	20.3	10.7	47.4	50.7	29.3	37.3
Time available for class preparation	.8	0	21.8	22.7	47.4	50.7	30.1	26.7
Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here	1.5	0	9.2	6.9	40.8	40.3	48.5	52.8
My work load	7.4	2.5	22.2	12.3	43.7	43.2	26.7	42.0
My job security	6.7	0	9.6	5.0	22.2	32.5	61.5	62.5
Opportunity for advancement in rank at the institution where I teach	9.2	3.8	13.1	25.3	23.1	36.7	54.6	34.2
Time available for keeping current in my field	8.1	3.7	34.1	25.9	40.7	46.9	17.0	23.5
The effectiveness of faculty leadership at this institution (e.g., academic senate, faculty councils, etc.)	15.8	3.7	36.8	30.9	36.1	44.4	11.3	21.0
Freedom to do outside consulting	1.6	1.3	14.3	11.7	40.5	41.6	43.7	45.5
My job here, overall	1.5	2.5	8.9	12.3	43.7	37.0	45.9	48.1

Table 9

## Satisfaction and Attitudes for Females/Males - Percentages

	Very dissatisfied		Somewhat dissatisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Very satisfied	
The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach	1.0	0	9.8	1.8	88.4	9.8	1.0	88.4
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	1.0	4.5	5.8	8.1	44.2	24.3	49.0	63.1
The authority I have to make decisions about other (non-instructional) aspects of my job	1.9	3.7	11.4	11.9	42.9	25.7	43.8	58.7
Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor, etc	1.0	4.5	21.0	11.6	50.5	49.1	27.6	34.8
Time available for class preparation	0	1.8	24.8	20.5	49.5	46.4	25.7	31.3
Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here	2.0	0.9	7.9	10.0	37.6	44.5	52.5	44.5
My work load	6.5	4.3	22.2	14.7	45.4	44.8	25.9	36.2
My job security	4.6	2.6	7.4	8.7	32.4	21.7	55.6	67.0
Opportunity for advancement in rank at the institution where I teach	6.7	6.4	18.1	20.0	29.5	27.3	45.7	46.4
Time available for keeping current in my field	8.3	4.3	38.9	25.2	40.7	43.5	12.0	27.0
The effectiveness of faculty leadership at this institution (e.g., academic senate, faculty councils, etc.)	13.1	9.6	36.4	31.6	40.2	39.5	10.3	19.3
Freedom to do outside consulting	3.0	0	16.0	9.0	44.0	41.4	37.0	49.5
My job here, overall	10.8	0	14.9	5.3	37.8	38.9	36.5	55.8

Table 10

## Satisfaction and Attitudes for Untenured/Tenured Full-time Faculty - Percentages

	Very dissatisfied		Somewhat dissatisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Very satisfied	
The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach	0	0	1.9	1.2	11.5	14.8	86.5	84.0
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	5.8	0	13.5	3.7	38.5	40.7	42.3	55.6
The authority I have to make decisions about other (non-instructional) aspects of my job	3.9	4.9	17.6	13.6	37.3	37.0	41.2	44.4
Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor, etc	1.9	3.7	28.8	14.8	48.1	46.9	21.2	34.6
Time available for class preparation	0	1.2	23.1	21.0	51.9	44.4	25.0	33.3
Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here	3.9	0.0	11.8	7.6	47.1	36.7	37.3	55.7
My work load	11.3	4.9	18.9	24.7	41.5	44.4	28.3	25.9
My job security	11.3	2.5	18.9	3.7	35.8	13.6	34.0	80.2
Opportunity for advancement in rank at the institution where I teach	17.0	3.9	13.2	13.0	20.8	24.7	49.1	58.4
Time available for keeping current in my field	5.7	9.9	28.3	37.0	50.9	34.6	15.1	18.5
The effectiveness of faculty leadership at this institution (e.g., academic senate, faculty councils, etc.)	9.8	19.8	39.2	35.8	47.1	28.4	3.9	16.0
Freedom to do outside consulting	4.2	0	10.4	16.9	41.7	39.0	43.8	44.2
My job here, overall	1.9	1.2	13.2	6.2	43.4	43.2	41.5	49.4

Table 11

## Satisfaction and Attitudes for Faculty/Administrators - Percentages

	Disagree Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Strongly	
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	11.1	6.1	29.6	13.4	40.0	51.2	19.3	29.3
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	12.6	11.0	39.3	37.8	34.8	40.2	13.3	9.8
Outreach scholarship should be a strong consideration for consideration for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	12.9	1.2	25.8	32.9	50.8	61.0	10.6	4.9
Service to the field/profession should be a strong consideration for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	1.5	0.0	22.8	18.3	60.3	65.9	15.4	15.9
At the institution where you taught, research is rewarded more than teaching	11.1	8.5	25.2	19.5	23.7	24.4	40.0	47.6
Female faculty members are treated fairly at the institution where you taught	6.7	2.5	20.7	22.5	53.3	50.0	19.3	25.0
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at the institution where you taught	7.4	2.5	27.2	22.5	41.9	50.0	23.5	25.0
If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career	1.5	1.2	6.0	2.4	20.9	19.5	71.6	76.8
The quality of students who choose to pursue academic or administrative careers in my field has declined	23.5	22.2	55.3	54.3	18.2	23.5	3.0	0.0
The professional competence of individuals entering my academic field has declined	13.7	17.1	67.9	62.2	16.8	18.3	1.5	2.4
The quality of graduate education has declined	14.6	18.5	58.5	60.5	23.1	17.3	3.8	3.7
It has become more difficult for faculty to obtain external funding	3.1	5.2	17.1	23.4	55.8	59.7	24.0	11.7

The quality of research has declined	9.2	6.4	70.8	67.9	18.5	24.4	1.5	1.3
Faculty workload has increased	1.5	6.2	9.8	21.0	51.1	48.1	37.6	24.7
Too many full-time faculty have been replaced by part-time faculty	4.6	6.3	23.7	49.4	49.6	32.9	22.1	11.4

---

Table 12

## Satisfaction and Attitudes for Females/Males - Percentages

	Disagree Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Strongly	
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	10.0	7.8	27.3	19.1	48.2	42.6	14.5	30.4
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	11.8	13.0	40.0	37.4	36.4	36.5	11.8	12.2
Outreach scholarship should be a strong consideration for consideration for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	7.4	8.8	28.7	31.6	53.7	53.5	10.2	6.1
Service to the field/profession should be a strong consideration for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	0.9	0.9	22.7	21.6	58.2	66.4	18.2	11.2
At the institution where you taught, research is rewarded more than teaching	11.0	8.6	21.1	26.7	21.1	25.0	46.8	39.7
Female faculty members are treated fairly at the institution where you taught	9.2	0.9	33.9	11.4	47.7	55.3	9.2	32.5
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at the institution where you taught	8.3	3.5	38.9	13.0	38.0	51.3	14.8	32.2
If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career	1.8	0.9	6.4	3.5	23.9	17.4	67.9	78.3
The quality of students who choose to pursue academic or administrative careers in my field has declined	21.3	22.1	54.6	57.5	21.3	19.5	2.8	0.9
The professional competence of individuals entering my academic field has declined	14.0	14.9	67.3	64.0	15.9	19.3	2.8	1.8
The quality of graduate education has declined	12.1	18.8	60.7	58.9	22.4	19.6	4.7	2.7
It has become more difficult for faculty to obtain external funding	2.9	4.6	16.2	20.4	56.2	61.1	24.8	13.9

The quality of research has declined	8.5	8.3	70.8	69.7	18.9	21.1	1.9	0.9
Faculty workload has increased	0.9	6.1	7.4	19.3	47.2	52.6	44.4	21.9
Too many full-time faculty have been replaced by part-time faculty	4.6	6.4	38.9	27.3	37.0	50.0	19.4	16.4

---

Table 13

## Satisfaction and Attitudes for Untenured/Tenured Full-time Faculty - Percentages

	Disagree Strongly		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Agree Strongly	
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	7.5	13.6	43.4	19.8	28.3	48.1	20.8	18.5
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	7.5	16.0	56.6	28.4	28.3	39.5	7.5	16.0
Outreach scholarship should be a strong consideration for consideration for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	17.6	10.0	19.6	28.8	52.9	50.0	9.8	11.3
Service to the field/profession should be a strong consideration for promotion of faculty/instructional staff at the institution where you taught	0.0	2.5	18.5	24.7	66.7	56.8	14.8	16.0
At the institution where you taught, research is rewarded more than teaching	7.5	13.6	35.8	18.5	13.2	30.9	43.4	37.0
Female faculty members are treated fairly at the institution where you taught	5.7	7.4	20.8	19.8	60.4	49.4	13.2	23.5
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at the institution where you taught	9.3	6.2	24.1	28.4	48.1	38.3	18.5	27.2
If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career	0.0	2.5	7.4	5.1	16.7	22.8	75.9	69.6
The quality of students who choose to pursue academic or administrative careers in my field has declined	23.5	22.5	52.9	57.5	19.6	17.5	3.9	2.5
The professional competence of individuals entering my academic field has declined	11.8	13.9	66.7	69.6	21.6	13.9	0.0	2.5
The quality of graduate education has declined	13.5	14.3	57.7	59.7	25.0	22.1	3.8	3.9
It has become more difficult for faculty to obtain external funding	0.0	5.1	18.0	15.4	56.0	56.4	26.0	23.1

The quality of research has declined	7.7	9.1	73.1	70.1	17.3	19.5	1.9	1.3
Faculty workload has increased	0.0	2.5	15.4	6.3	44.2	55.0	40.4	36.3
Too many full-time faculty have been replaced by part-time faculty	5.9	3.8	21.6	25.3	51.0	48.1	21.6	22.8

---