

**PART-TIME FACULTY
AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IN THE
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA**

OCTOBER 2003

**REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON PART-TIME FACULTY**



General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION
108 Finance Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

The release of this report should not be interpreted as an endorsement by the members of the Executive Committee of the Joint State Government Commission of all the findings, recommendations or conclusions contained in this report.

**Joint State Government Commission
Room 108 Finance Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0018**

**Telephone 717-787-4397
Fax 717-787-7020**

**E-mail: jntst02@legis.state.pa.us
Website: <http://jsg.legis.state.pa.us>**

The Joint State Government Commission was created by the act of July 1, 1937 (P.L.2460, No.459) as amended, as a continuing agency for the development of facts and recommendations on all phases of government for the use of the General Assembly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Joint State Government Commission.....	5
Task Force on Part-Time Faculty	7
Advisory Committee on Part-Time Faculty.....	9
Letter from Senator Roger A. Madigan, Commission Chair	11
Introduction.....	13
Summary of Recommendations	17
Part-Time Faculty in Pennsylvania.....	21
The Educational Landscape	
Reasons for Hiring Part-Time Faculty	
Salaries, Benefits and Working Conditions	
Professional Development and Decision-Making	
Reappointment and Hiring	
Data Collection	
Appropriation	
Effect on Other Institutions of Higher Education	
Public Hearing	
Tables.....	39
Selected Bibliography	73
Appendix 1: House Resolutions.....	77
Appendix 2: Selected Institutions of Higher Education	85
Appendix 3: Draft Recommendations of the Advisory Committee (April 10, 2003).....	91

JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

OFFICERS

Senator Roger A. Madigan, Chair

Representative Jeffrey W. Coy, Treasurer

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Senate Members

Robert C. Jubelirer
President Pro Tempore

David J. Brightbill
Majority Leader

Robert J. Mellow
Minority Leader

Jeffrey E. Piccola
Majority Whip

Michael A. O’Pake
Minority Whip

Noah W. Wenger
Chair, Majority Caucus

Jack Wagner
Chair, Minority Caucus

House Members

John M. Perzel
Speaker

Samuel H. Smith
Majority Leader

H. William DeWeese
Minority Leader

Brett O. Feese
Majority Whip

Michael R. Veon
Minority Whip

Elinor Z. Taylor
Chair, Majority Caucus

Mark B. Cohen
Chair, Minority Caucus

MEMBER EX-OFFICIO

Roger A. Madigan, Commission Chair

David L. Hostetter, Executive Director

TASK FORCE ON PART-TIME FACULTY

House Members

Nicholas A. Colafella
(2002)

Paul Costa
(2002-03)

Edward H. Krebs
(2002)

James R. Roebuck, Jr.
(2002-03)

Jere W. Schuler
(2002)

Jess M. Stairs
(2002-03)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PART-TIME FACULTY

Ronald R. Cowell, Chairman

President, The Education Policy and
Leadership Center

Pat Halpin-Murphy

Government Relations Director,
The Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers

John Braxton

Jobs With Justice and Part-Time Faculty,
Community College of Philadelphia

Stephen A. Herzenberg

Executive Director, Keystone Research Center

Nancilee Burzachechi, Esq.

Director, Corporate and Government Relations,
Community College of Allegheny County

Patricia Hopson-Shelton

Assistant to the President for Social Equity and
Diversity, Millersville University

Brandon W. Danz

Student Body President,
Millersville University

Marc Kornfeld

Committee Consultant, Pennsylvania Association for
Higher Education, Pennsylvania State Education
Association

Dr. Richard R. Dumaresq

Executive Director, Pennsylvania Association
of Private School Administrators

Billie Kaye Kraus

Director of the Office of Community College
Liaison, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Dr. Richard Englert

Vice President for Administration and
Professor of Educational Administration,
Temple University

Clayton Myers

Graduate Student, Pennsylvania State University

Linda Evans

Part-Time Faculty, Community College of
Philadelphia

Aja Settles

Student, Temple University

George A. Franklin, Jr.

Vice President of Finance and College
Resources, Harrisburg Area Community College

Michelle M. Simmons

Part-Time Faculty, Harrisburg Area Community
College

Dr. Don Francis

President, Association of Independent Colleges
and Universities of Pennsylvania

Irene Strintzis-Guminski

Part-Time Faculty, University of Pittsburgh

William E. Fulmer, Ph.D.

President, Association of Pennsylvania State
College and University Faculties

Meredith Tulli

Executive Director of Human Resources,
Harrisburg Area Community College

Peter H. Garland

Executive Associate to the Chancellor of the
State System of Higher Education

Alice Yarborough

Student, Community College of Philadelphia

FORMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Lisa Kusko^{*}

Part-Time Faculty (former),
Beaver County Community College

Frank Meehan^{**}

Acting Deputy Secretary for Postsecondary and Higher Education,
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Thomas O. Mullikin, Ed.D.^{***}

Higher Education Associate,
Office of Postsecondary and Higher Education,
Division of Program Services,
Pennsylvania Department of Education

^{*} Resigned from the advisory committee October 1, 2002.

^{**} Replaced on the advisory committee by Thomas O. Mullikin, Ed.D.

^{***} Replaced on the advisory committee by Billie Kaye Kraus.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION
ROOM 108 - FINANCE BUILDING
HARRISBURG 17120

717-787-4397
FAX 717-787-7020

October 2003

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

The Joint State Government Commission is pleased to present the report of the Advisory Committee on Part-Time Faculty, which contains a variety of recommendations and data tables concerning part-time faculty at institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania. The recommendations contained in this report represent the consensus of the advisory committee gained after months of deliberation and analysis under the leadership of Ronald R. Cowell.

On behalf of the General Assembly, I thank the members of the advisory committee for contributing their valuable time and expertise in the considerable effort to develop recommendations to improve the education system and ameliorate the public policy concerns regarding part-time faculty in Pennsylvania. I commend the advisory committee for its accomplishment and thank other individuals who have assisted the advisory committee throughout the review process, particularly with respect to providing data and background information.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Roger A. Madigan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Roger A. Madigan,

INTRODUCTION

House Resolution 376 of 2001 (Printer's No. 3002) directed the Joint State Government Commission to study issues relating to the quality of education and the increased employment of part-time faculty at the Commonwealth's institutions of higher education. The resolution instructed the Commission to establish a legislative task force and an advisory committee to conduct this study. Although the task force was to report its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives by October 1, 2002, House Resolution 676 of 2002 (Printer's No. 4351) extended the deadline to October 1, 2003.¹

On March 12, 2002, the task force held its organizational meeting to discuss the scope of the study and the composition of the advisory committee. On April 10 and May 8, 2002, the task force formally approved the list of advisory committee members. Ronald R. Cowell, President of the Education Policy and Leadership Center and former member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives (1975-98), was selected as the chairman of the advisory committee. The advisory committee consisted of part-time faculty members, administrators, representatives of educational organizations and unions, students and a representative from the Pennsylvania Department of Education. In addition, the advisory committee included representatives from state-owned universities, state-related universities, community colleges and private colleges and universities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.²

On June 20, 2002, the advisory committee held its organizational meeting and began to discuss issues relating to part-time faculty and the impact on the education system in Pennsylvania. The advisory committee subsequently met on October 3, 2002; January 13, 2003 and April 10, 2003. Throughout its deliberations, the advisory committee reviewed and discussed data and other background information in order to gain further insight into the issue of the use of part-time faculty.³

On September 30, 2003, the task force authorized the release of this report.

¹ See Appendix 1 for the text of House Resolutions 376 of 2001 and 676 of 2002.

² See Appendix 2 for a list of institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania, including the state-owned universities, state-related universities, community colleges and private colleges and universities.

³ See Appendix 3 for the specific text and recommendations to which a consensus of the advisory committee agreed at its April 10, 2003 meeting. The text and recommendations have been integrated throughout this report.

Although Pennsylvania has a long tradition of non-intervention in the management of affairs at institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth, there is a legitimate public interest to provide for the fair treatment of public employees. Many of these institutions exist as a matter of action by public officials: they are governed by state law and are supported by a substantial amount of public funds. The assurance of fair treatment is provided primarily, though not exclusively, through the Commonwealth's collective bargaining law for public employees. In addition, there is a public interest in assuring that students who attend public and private colleges and universities, with the benefit of direct institutional subsidies or other forms of direct or indirect student financial assistance provided by public funds, have the benefit of quality educational programs. Such programs necessarily entail instruction by faculty members who are appropriately prepared, supported and compensated, regardless of their classification as full-time or part-time.

In Pennsylvania, the increasing use of part-time faculty has been especially significant at the community college level.⁴ Each community college, however, sets its own administrative policies with respect to part-time faculty. Although the Commonwealth and the respective local communities establish and financially support each community college, local boards of trustees govern the institutions. Consequently, each community college acts independently of one another and individually addresses issues regarding employee salaries, benefits and working conditions.⁵

Because the use of part-time faculty in Pennsylvania is most prevalent in community colleges, and increasingly so, and because community colleges in Pennsylvania receive substantial public funds to support their institutions and students directly, the advisory committee emphasized the need to address its recommendations primarily to the community colleges. Nevertheless, it strongly encouraged that the goals and principles underlying the recommendations should apply to all institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania, especially those in the public sector.

Despite the belief that its recommendations would improve the educational climate in Pennsylvania, the advisory committee believed that the recommendations should only be voluntarily applied to institutions; the recommendations should not be interpreted as legislative or regulatory mandates.⁶ Instead, the advisory committee chose to establish a vision for the Commonwealth to implement best-practice standards. In addition, it did not want to stifle or discount creative and meaningful approaches that already may be underway by institutions of higher education to address the concerns

⁴ Table 1 indicates that part-time faculty comprised approximately 82.5% of the total faculty at community colleges in 1999-2000.

⁵ Of course, the salaries, benefits and working conditions are subject to the rights provided by Pennsylvania's collective bargaining law for public employees, which covers community college faculty and staff.

⁶ Nevertheless, the advisory committee acknowledged that the recommendations could serve as a basis for future legislative or regulatory action.

raised in this report. In several instances, the recommendations of the advisory committee entail special financial incentives that will require appropriations by the General Assembly.

This report contains data tables in a separate section that follows the explanatory text. The advisory committee members reviewed and discussed the information provided in the tables and used the tables as a tool in their deliberations. National data and data from the Mid East Region cited in this report take into account community colleges.⁷ Most Pennsylvania data include information from only state-related and state-owned universities and do not include information from community colleges. Community colleges in Pennsylvania are not mandated to provide data as the state-related and state-owned universities are required to do.

A selected bibliography follows the tables and provides many resource materials gathered by the staff of the Joint State Government Commission.

Finally, this report contains appendices listing the institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania, replicating House Resolutions 376 of 2001 and 676 of 2002 and providing the draft recommendations formulated by the advisory committee at its April 10, 2003 meeting.

While this report represents the consensus of the advisory committee, it does not necessarily reflect unanimity among the members on each individual recommendation, nor does it necessarily reflect the position of any educational institution or entity of which the member is affiliated. In addition, inclusion of any finding, recommendation or conclusion in this report does not necessarily reflect the endorsement of the legislative task force.

The explanatory material contained in this report is provided to facilitate both the consideration by the General Assembly of the issues regarding part-time faculty in Pennsylvania and the preparation of any legislative or regulatory remedy.⁸

⁷ The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania.

⁸ The advisory committee did not analyze the impact of part-time faculty on the quality of education, given the highly speculative nature of such an analysis. In addition, the discussion in this report of the disparate incomes and credentials of full-time and part-time faculty members is not intended to lead the reader to draw any specific conclusion regarding the impact on the quality of education.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The advisory committee reached consensus on several recommendations, replicated below. The recommendations regarding salaries, benefits, working conditions, professional development, decision-making, reappointment and hiring with respect to part-time faculty are tailored to community colleges in Pennsylvania because the use of part-time faculty in Pennsylvania is most prevalent in community colleges, such use continues to increase at these institutions and these institutions receive substantial public funds. However, the advisory committee believed that community colleges should voluntarily implement the recommendations. In addition, the advisory committee believed that other institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania should also voluntarily implement these same recommendations. The advisory committee also supported recommendations regarding data collection by community colleges, state appropriations and a public hearing to address additional issues and concerns regarding the use of part-time faculty in Pennsylvania.

Salaries, Benefits and Working Conditions

- (1) Community college administrators and trustees and those who represent full-time and part-time faculty should recognize the increasingly significant role of part-time faculty at community colleges and should support policies and practices that provide fair salaries, benefits and working conditions for all employees of community colleges, including part-time faculty.
- (2) While faculty and staff salaries and benefits will continue to be determined according to the decision-making processes identified for each community college, the Commonwealth must recognize that in order to support the capacity of each community college to fund costs related to increases in salaries and benefits for part-time and full-time faculty and staff and to ameliorate the impact on student tuition, additional financial commitment is required. Accordingly, adequate public funding should be appropriated to fulfill the state's community college financial obligations provided in current law.
- (3) Part-time faculty members at community colleges should be paid a salary that fairly reflects the extent to which their qualifications, experience and job responsibilities are similar to and different from those of full-time faculty members.

- (4) Community colleges should provide part-time faculty access to existing health insurance and retirement benefits, and the Commonwealth should provide categorical financial incentives to assist community colleges in providing access to such benefits.
- (5) Community colleges should provide to all faculty members, both full-time and part-time, the working conditions necessary for them to fulfill their teaching and other related responsibilities.

Professional Development and Decision-Making

- (1) Community colleges and organizations representing faculty should support opportunities for part-time faculty members to participate in professional development activities, including conferences and workshops, and to apply for and utilize grants in a manner similar to opportunities afforded full-time faculty members. The General Assembly should provide categorical financial incentives to assist community colleges in providing professional development opportunities for part-time faculty members.
- (2) Community college administrators and faculty representatives should work together to implement all steps necessary to ensure that part-time faculty members and their representatives are engaged in decision-making or advisory processes at their respective community colleges in the same manner that full-time faculty and their representatives are engaged.

Reappointment and Hiring

After the successful completion of an appropriate probationary period and subject to continuing successful evaluations as determined by each institution, part-time faculty members at community colleges should be given priority for re-appointment to appropriate part-time teaching assignments and should receive fair consideration in hiring for full-time teaching positions.

Data Collection

The Public School Code should be amended to require community colleges to submit annual data, in the same manner as state-owned and state-related institutions of higher education, to the Joint State Government Commission for compilation in an annual report similar to the report on Instructional Output and Faculty Salary Costs of the State-Related and State-Owned Universities (“Snyder Report”).

Appropriation

In addition to appropriating adequate state funds to fulfill the state's community college funding obligations under current law, the General Assembly should appropriate funds to assist community colleges in the implementation of the recommendations of the advisory committee, with an annual appropriation of four million dollars for categorical financial incentives.

Effect on Other Institutions of Higher Education

The administrators, trustees and faculty of all colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, both public and private, should consider the objectives and principles that underlie the recommendations of the advisory committee regarding community colleges and should consider the appropriate and voluntary application of the recommendations for their respective institutions of higher education.

Public Hearing

The task force or an appropriate committee of the General Assembly should conduct at least one public hearing to hear comments regarding the advisory committee's recommendations and other issues relating to part-time faculty.

PART-TIME FACULTY IN PENNSYLVANIA

The Educational Landscape

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is home to a wide diversity of institutions of higher education, including fourteen state-owned universities, four state-related universities, fourteen community colleges, scores of private colleges and universities and many other institutions of higher education, including theological seminaries, private two-year colleges and the Thaddeus Stevens School of Technology.⁹ In 2001-02, nearly 131,000 undergraduate and graduate full-time equivalent students attended the state-related universities, while nearly 94,000 such students attended the state-owned universities.¹⁰ In Fall 2000, more than 108,000 students attended community colleges in Pennsylvania, while more than 194,000 students attended private colleges and universities in Pennsylvania.¹¹ Full-time equivalent enrollment in 1999 for the theological seminaries, private two-year colleges and the Thaddeus Stevens School of Technology exceeded 5,700.¹²

Because of the abundance of educational opportunities and the overall quality of education at institutions of higher education, Pennsylvania is well-prepared to integrate its students into a productive workforce for both the public and private sectors. Nevertheless, challenges do remain in the higher education system, particularly in the reliance on part-time faculty and its impact on the quality of education.

Though not formally defined by the advisory committee, the term “part-time faculty” is generally considered to signify non-tenured teaching personnel who are hired to teach less than a full-time course load. The salaries and benefits of part-time faculty members are typically less than those of full-time faculty members, and many part-time faculty members are not required to bear certain administrative and other responsibilities that their full-time counterparts must bear, such as advising students, serving on committees, performing research and writing for professional publications. A part-time faculty member may have only an occasional or temporary affiliation with an institution, as in the case of a professional who maintains full-time employment elsewhere and

⁹ For a list of institutions under these categories, see Appendix 2.

¹⁰ Joint State Government Commission, Pennsylvania General Assembly, *Instructional Output and Faculty Salary Costs of the State-Related and State-Owned Universities* (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania General Assembly, Joint State Government Commission, February 2003), 3.

¹¹ Pennsylvania Department of Education, *Colleges and Universities: Education Digest, 2000-01* (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, April 2002), 26.

¹² Pennsylvania Department of General Services, *The Pennsylvania Manual, Volume 115* (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of General Services, December 2001), 9-41.

teaches a course for professional fulfillment or supplemental income. However, a part-time faculty member may also be a professional whose livelihood centers on teaching at an institution of higher education or at multiple institutions. Nevertheless, the advisory committee attempted not to examine the motivations behind why an individual was a part-time faculty member, but instead simply acknowledged that the individual was a part-time faculty member.¹³ During its deliberations, the advisory committee also recognized that data analysis may be challenging, given different interpretations of what actually constitutes part-time faculty; for example, one survey may include graduate instructors and research assistants in the definition of part-time faculty, while another may not include these individuals.

Among the institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania, the trend over the past fifteen years has been toward hiring more part-time faculty. In general, part-time faculty as a percentage of the total faculty at institutions has increased each year, as shown in Table 1. Community colleges had the highest percentage of part-time faculty in 1999-2000, at 82.5% of their total faculty. Although state-owned universities had a low percentage of part-time faculty during this same period (15.0%), state-related universities and private colleges and universities saw their percentage of part-time faculty hover around 50%.

Table 1 also includes the numerical increases of full-time and part-time faculty in Pennsylvania from 1987-88 through 1999-2000. At all institutions in Pennsylvania in this period, the number of full-time faculty members increased from 24,900 to 31,430, an increase of 26%. During the same period, the number of part-time faculty members more than doubled, from 16,354 to 34,528, an increase of 111%. At community colleges in Pennsylvania, the number of part-time faculty members rose from 3,564 to 8,414, a 136% increase, while the number of full-time faculty members actually decreased, from 1,838 to 1,787. See Table 1 for more specific information regarding full-time and part-time faculty at the various institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania.

Reasons for Hiring Part-Time Faculty

In Pennsylvania and across the United States, institutions of higher education, both public and private, are relying increasingly upon part-time faculty members to teach for-credit and not-for-credit courses. While there may be several explanations for this

¹³ The advisory committee acknowledged that part-time faculty members included the following categories of individuals: practitioners who may want additional professional challenges or income or who may be considering full-time teaching employment in the future; recent retirees who may want reduced workloads or supplemental income and who are not prepared to give up working entirely; educators who are unable to find full-time employment and who may work at more than one institution to make ends meet; and others who may choose not to work on a full-time basis in order to have more time to raise a family, care for aging parents, seek additional educational opportunities or travel.

trend,¹⁴ it is undisputedly related, at least in part, to economics. For example, compensation packages for part-time faculty, including salaries and benefits, are typically much lower than those for full-time faculty. Among the other several reasons that an institution of higher education hires part-time faculty are the desire to offer specialty courses, the need to replace temporarily full-time faculty members who are on sabbatical or extended leave, the desire to provide full-time faculty members with more time for research and the need to provide the institution with added flexibility in course offerings. Regardless of the reason for hiring part-time faculty, it is clear that the issue encompasses a consideration of an institution's business and administrative practices, as well as the overall quality of education and the quality of the life for the part-time faculty members and their families.

Economic Costs. Unquestionably, the increase in the number of part-time faculty largely can be attributed to economics and market conditions. Especially in recent years, the cost of education has risen much faster than inflation, due in part to the rising cost of labor, attributable to escalating health care benefits paid by the institutions. Since labor costs account for the majority of its expenses, an institution always seeks ways to reduce such costs. Institutions have recognized that the salary and benefits for part-time faculty are for the most part significantly less expensive than those for full-time faculty. Faced with limited resources, institutions may feel that they have little choice but to hire part-time faculty. This is especially true in the public sector where efforts to seek relatively lower faculty costs are explained as a reaction to inadequate public subsidies, combined with a desire to ameliorate the need for higher student tuition. In some cases, budget constraints may even compel institutions to place hiring freezes on their departments, thereby forcing the departments to hire part-time faculty exclusively to replace full-time faculty who are retiring or resigning.

The reason that institutions can offer lower compensation and benefits packages for part-time faculty is that the number of individuals willing to serve as part-time faculty exceeds the demand for part-time faculty. Therefore, the market enables an institution to achieve a significant advantage in setting the terms of employment for part-time faculty members.

Specialty Courses. An institution may decide to hire a part-time faculty member with particular expertise that is not present among its full-time faculty. Since it may not be cost-efficient to hire a full-time faculty member with such expertise to teach the

¹⁴ It should be noted that the trend toward increasing part-time faculty may also be a consequence of individuals choosing to be classified as part-time faculty. According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics, 74.2% of part-time faculty members in the Mid East Region (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania) surveyed in Fall 1998 stated that they preferred working on a part-time basis, while only 25.8% said that they would prefer working on a full-time basis. See Table 25.

particular course, the institution can expand its course offerings through the hiring of the part-time faculty member. In addition, if the part-time faculty member is highly regarded in a particular field, the institution gains the added benefit of increased prestige. Although this is a valid rationale for hiring part-time faculty, it is difficult to determine the extent to which an institution hires part-time faculty members specifically to teach specialty courses or increase institutional prestige.

Sabbatical or Extended Leave. An institution may hire a part-time faculty member as a substitute for a full-time faculty member who is on sabbatical or other extended leave, thereby filling a temporary gap that may occur in course offerings. Although the hiring of a full-time temporary faculty member may be preferable in these situations, time constraints often preclude this possibility. Given the large pool of part-time faculty applicants and the business and administrative considerations inherent in hiring a full-time, or tenure-track, faculty member, institutions more likely will choose to fill the vacuum with a part-time faculty member. Nevertheless, it is difficult to evaluate the percentage of part-time faculty hired to replace full-time faculty on a temporary basis solely because of a full-time faculty member's sabbatical or extended leave.

Research Opportunities. A research institution may hire part-time faculty to teach core courses in order to increase the amount of time available for full-time faculty to conduct research, thereby improving its college/university ranking and enticing additional students to apply to the institution. In addition, research often generates additional outside funding and grants for the institution. The number of part-time faculty hired for this reason, however, varies greatly among the different types of institutions. For instance, community colleges rarely hire part-time faculty for this reason; conversely, many four-year research institutions may hire part-time faculty to shift a full-time faculty member's responsibilities from teaching to research.

Flexibility. Another reason that the number of part-time faculty has increased in recent years is that hiring part-time faculty provides an institution with flexibility in course offerings. Over the last few decades, there have been dramatic changes in the nation's education system. Instead of the majority of students being "traditional students,"¹⁵ many institutions are seeing a wide diversity of students with a wide range of educational needs. Colleges not only have to teach traditional students, they must also be able to offer classes for non-traditional students whose needs may be different.

¹⁵ A traditional undergraduate student has been defined as "one who earns a high school diploma, enrolls full-time immediately after finishing high school, depends on parents for financial support, and either does not work during the school year or works part-time." National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, *The Condition of Education 2002* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002), 25.

The needs of a non-traditional student are often difficult to predict accurately. For example, during one semester, a local company may decide to send a large number of its employees back to school for additional computer training; a local hospital may decide to send some of its medical staff back to school for additional training on the most modern medical equipment available for the diagnosis of certain diseases; or a local manufacturing plant may close, prompting many of its former employees to return to school for new training in a number of different fields.

An institution often cannot predict which courses the non-traditional student population will demand until after registration has begun. For example, an institution may discover that it needs two additional sections of basic computer skills training, one section in advanced accounting and one section in basic electronic networks. Although these four courses equal the workload of one full-time faculty member, it is highly unlikely that one individual would be qualified to teach courses in computer skills, accounting and electronic networking. Therefore, the institution has the choice of either not offering these additional courses or hiring several part-time faculty members who are qualified to teach the individual subject areas.

As the non-traditional student population increases, more and more institutions are taking a “wait and see” approach to determine which courses will require additional sections. Since institutions cannot determine which disciplines will be popular from one semester to the next and whether other faculty members will be needed to teach additional sections, it becomes difficult and impractical to hire additional full-time faculty. Hiring part-time faculty to teach the subject areas of fluctuating demands allows the institution to offer many more relevant courses without having to retain additional full-time faculty during semesters of low demand.

The hiring of part-time faculty to increase flexibility in course offerings varies greatly among the different types of institutions of higher learning. Since community colleges account for the largest percentage of non-traditional students,¹⁶ it is reasonable to assume that these institutions probably hire part-time faculty for increased flexibility in course offerings more often than do other educational institutions.

Salaries, Benefits and Working Conditions

In order to evaluate the stated concerns regarding economic hardship for part-time faculty members in Pennsylvania, the advisory committee evaluated two key financial

¹⁶ In 1999-2000, 89.5% of students in public 2-year institutions nationwide were in some way considered non-traditional versus only 57.5% in public 4-year institutions, 50.0% in private not-for-profit 4-year institutions and 88.7% in private for-profit institutions. National Center for Education Statistics, *supra* note 15, at 27.

components: income, which necessarily entails an analysis of hours worked and student credit hours, and benefits. In addition, the advisory committee considered the issue of working conditions in general.

Income and Hours Worked. Because part-time faculty members typically are compensated at a lower rate, with fewer collateral costs than full-time faculty members, the advisory committee spent a great deal of time discussing the issue and analyzing the impact of these disparities. Table 2 shows that during the 2001-02 academic year, the average salary for full-time equivalent faculty in the state-related universities in Pennsylvania was approximately 1.9 times greater than that for part-time faculty, \$64,282 compared to \$33,353. Similarly, statistics for state-owned universities in Pennsylvania reveal a 1.4 average salary differential, \$66,133 compared to \$47,864. Accounting for all these institutions, the full-time equivalent salary is approximately 1.8 times greater than that for part-time faculty, \$65,110 compared to \$36,258. See Table 2 for specific salary information for the individual state-related and state-owned universities in Pennsylvania.¹⁷

Table 3 reveals additional information on salary comparisons by Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), for both state-related and state-owned universities in Pennsylvania in 2001-02.¹⁸

In the Mid East Region,¹⁹ there is also a substantial difference in salary between full-time and part-time faculty, even when other outside income is included. In 1998, for all institutions regionally, the average reported annual income for full-time faculty members, including outside income, was \$75,988, while such income for part-time faculty members totaled \$49,765. These figures reveal that total full-time faculty income is approximately 1.5 times greater than total part-time faculty income. See Table 4 for a detailed analysis of income information at various institution types throughout the Mid East Region.

However, it is important to recognize that despite the income differentials shown in Table 4, full-time faculty members on average reported working more hours per week than part-time faculty members, when outside employment is taken into consideration. In

¹⁷ Salary information in Table 2 takes into account professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors and no-rank faculty. No-rank faculty is nonranked personnel that includes lecturers, administrators, librarians, research staff, graduate assistants and volunteers.

¹⁸ CIP classifications are taken from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Classification of Instructional Programs* (1991). The figures in Table 3 are for specific educational disciplines within the state-owned and state-related institutions in Pennsylvania.

¹⁹ The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania. Data for the Mid East Region came from a survey by the National Center for Education Statistics and include information from community colleges.

fact, full-time faculty members worked approximately 1.4 times as many hours per week as did part-time faculty members, 52.4 hours compared to 36.8 hours. See Table 5.

Table 6 provides more specific information regarding the average number of hours that full-time and part-time faculty work per week in the Mid East Region, including paid and unpaid activities both inside and outside the educational institution. As a point of reference, full-time faculty members averaged 44.4 weekly hours for paid activities at their respective educational institutions and 3.2 hours for unpaid activities; part-time faculty members averaged 13.9 weekly hours for paid activities at their respective institutions and 2.5 hours for unpaid activities. Conversely, full-time faculty members registered a weekly average of 2.9 hours for paid activities and 1.8 hours for unpaid activities taking place outside their educational institutions; part-time faculty members averaged 18.7 hours for paid activities and 1.7 hours for unpaid activities.

Table 7 reveals another enlightening aspect regarding the number of hours worked by part-time faculty members in the Mid East Region in 1998: the overwhelming percentage of part-time faculty members who were employed at other jobs (75.4%) and the average number of additional jobs held by the part-time faculty members (1.7).

In addition to the average number of hours worked by full-time and part-time faculty, it is important to consider student credit hours²⁰ and the salary generated by those hours, as shown in Tables 8 through 12.

Table 8 reveals that during the 2001-02 academic year, the state-related universities in Pennsylvania reported that full-time faculty members, on average, taught 455 student credit hours per instructional full-time equivalent (FTE)²¹ faculty, while part-time faculty members taught 582 student credit hours. At the state-owned universities during this same period, full-time faculty members taught 557 student credit hours compared to 582 student credit hours for part-time faculty. Considering these two types of institutions together, full-time faculty taught 500 student credit hours; part-time faculty taught 582 student credit hours.

Table 9 reveals additional information on student credit hours by CIP, for both state-related and state-owned universities in Pennsylvania in 2001-02.

In most instances, part-time instructional FTE faculty members receive lower salaries per student credit hour taught than their full-time counterparts. In Table 10, statistics show that in the Mid East Region in 1998-99, the average salary cost per student credit hour for full-time faculty was \$111, compared to \$32 for part-time faculty. In addition, Table 10 also sets forth the average salary for full-time and part-time faculty

²⁰ As a point of reference, a three-credit class with 30 students generates 90 student credit hours.

²¹ One full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty represents one full-time workload for two terms (one academic year).

members (\$63,733 and \$11,683, respectively) and the average student credit hours generated for full-time and part-time faculty (573.4 hours and 361.8 hours, respectively).

Table 11 shows that the state-related universities in Pennsylvania reported an average full-time faculty salary per student credit hour of \$141 in 2001-02, compared to \$57 for part-time faculty. The state-owned universities in Pennsylvania also reported a disparity in salaries per student credit hour: \$119 for full-time faculty versus \$82 for part-time faculty. Therefore, on average, these institutions reported a wide disparity in salaries per student credit hour, with full-time faculty realizing a figure of \$130 and part-time faculty realizing a figure less than half that, or \$62. Table 11 also provides specific information regarding salary per student credit hour for the individual state-related and state-owned universities in Pennsylvania.

For more specific information by CIP, for both state-related and state-owned universities in Pennsylvania in 2001-02, see Table 12.

Benefits. National statistics confirm that part-time faculty members receive much fewer employment benefits than their full-time counterparts. For example, Table 13 shows the percentage of educational institutions nationwide that contribute to benefits packages for full-time and part-time faculty: while 98% of these institutions contribute to benefits packages for full-time faculty, only 53% do so for part-time faculty. In addition, the average percentage of salary contributed to the benefits package for full-time faculty was approximately 26%; for part-time faculty, the average percentage was approximately 18%.

Table 14 offers a more specific breakdown of benefits for full-time and part-time faculty nationwide, illustrating that in almost every instance, the percentages of institutions offering insurance benefits, family benefits, retirement plans and other specified benefits to full-time faculty are significantly greater than the percentages of institutions offering such benefits to part-time faculty. For example, the percentages with respect to insurance benefits demonstrate a marked disparity: medical insurance or medical care (99% for full-time faculty versus 36% for part-time faculty), dental insurance or dental care (89% versus 29%), disability insurance (90% versus 27%), life insurance (94% versus 28%), medical insurance for retirees (56% versus 15%) and cafeteria style insurance plans (28% versus 9%). The quality of life issues generated by these statistics may lead to general public policy concerns, particularly if a part-time faculty member does not receive these types of benefits through other employment ventures.²²

²² This report does not attempt to analyze either the percentage of part-time faculty members who receive benefits through another employer or the type of benefits that they receive through another employer.

Working Conditions. Part-time faculty members do not necessarily receive other work-related benefits available to full-time faculty members. For example, they may not have office space, thereby eliminating or severely curtailing the ability to schedule office hours to meet with students; office supplies; access to campus telephones; access to secretarial support staff; and other campus perquisites such as access to campus e-mail and internet-connected computers, faculty parking, faculty discounts at the institution's bookstore and faculty lockers at the campus gymnasium.²³

Table 15 shows, for instance, that the average number of office hours held each week by part-time faculty members in the Mid East Region in Fall 1998 is significantly lower than those held by full-time faculty members, 1.9 compared to 5.3 for all listed institutions.²⁴

Because part-time faculty members are generally less accessible to students outside the classroom, the most frequent complaint about part-time faculty members is that they are either not available or not willing to discuss student concerns.²⁵ Consequently, part-time faculty members are less able than their full-time counterparts to develop a rapport with students. In addition, since a student is more likely to have the same full-time faculty member for two or more classes, and more likely to have a part-time faculty member for just one class, the student is less able to develop a rapport with the part-time faculty member. As a result, the part-time faculty member is less likely to write recommendations on behalf of students and less likely to advise students about future classes and possible career opportunities.²⁶

Table 16 provides information that reveals how full-time and part-time faculty rated various working conditions at their respective institutions, including office space, personal computers and local networks, secretarial support and classroom space in the Mid East Region in Fall 1998. The following chart summarizes the data from that table

²³American Association of University Professors, "Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty," *Academe* 84 (January/February 1998), 55; American Association of University Professors, "Background Facts: Part-Time Faculty," <http://www.aaup.org/issues/part-time/Ptfacts.htm> (last accessed May 19, 2003); Richard D. Fulton, "The Plight of Part-Timers in Higher Education," *Change* 32 (May/June 2000), 38-43; Ana Marie Cox, "Study Shows Colleges' Dependence on Their Part-Time Instructors," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 47 (December 1, 2000), A12-A14; Angela Stephens & Scott W. Wright, "The Part-Time Faculty Paradox," *Community College Week* 11 (January 25, 1999), 6-10.

²⁴The information in Table 14 does not reveal the actual reason that part-time faculty members held fewer office hours. Therefore, the reason may be based on factors other than the lack of office space or the lack of compensation for holding office hours, such as scheduling constraints and the decreased need for students to meet with the part-time faculty members.

²⁵Robert Pankin and Carla Weiss, "Introduction," in *Part-Time Faculty in Higher Education: A Selected Annotated Bibliography*, <http://www.providence.edu/soc/pankin.intro.htm> (last accessed May 19, 2003).

²⁶American Federation of Teachers, Higher Education Department, *The Vanishing Professor* (November 24, 1998), http://www.aft.org/higher_ed/reports/professor/index.html (accessed February 6, 2002); Richard Moser, *The New Academic Labor System, Corporation and the Renewal of Academic Citizenship* (June 12, 2001), <http://www.aaup.org/Issues/part-time/cewmose.htm> (last accessed May 19, 2003).

when all the listed institutions are taken into account and shows the percentage of full-time and part-time faculty members who considered working conditions excellent/good and fair/poor.²⁷ As the summary table reveals, the primary area of concern for part-time faculty is office space.

Working Condition	Full-Time: Excellent/Good %	Full Time: Fair/ Poor %	Part-Time: Excellent/ Good %	Part-Time: Fair/ Poor %
Office Space	57.0	37.0	38.1	39.2
Personal Computers and Local Networks	72.8	22.7	53.8	24.2
Secretarial Support	49.4	44.7	58.2	21.3
Classroom Space	55.8	38.7	65.3	27.3

Job Satisfaction. Table 25 provides information regarding the preference of part-time faculty members by institution type for the Mid East Region in Fall 1998 and shows that 74.2% of part-time faculty members prefer their part-time status.

Table 26 provides specific information on the levels of satisfaction expressed by full-time and part-time faculty in the Mid East Region in Fall 1998, as they relate to such things as instructional duties, workload, salary, benefits, job security, advancement opportunity, authority to decide courses taught, authority to decide course content and time available to keep current in the professional field. The advisory committee reviewed the Table 26 data as background information only. Some advisory committee members questioned the reliability of the findings, given the subjective nature of the questions and the inability to determine the methodology used. However, the advisory committee, in consultation with the staff of the Joint State Government Commission and because of the logistics and time constraints, decided not to conduct its own survey of part-time faculty members in Pennsylvania to determine current preferences and levels of satisfaction.

The following chart summarizes Table 26 in terms of the satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels of full-time and part-time faculty members.²⁸ The summary table highlights that the highest levels of dissatisfaction for part-time faculty members, not surprisingly, occur in the categories of benefits (55.7%), advancement opportunity (50.0%), salary (47.2%) and job security (36.4%). Full-time faculty members, on the other hand, registered their dissatisfaction levels in these four categories at significantly lower levels: benefits (19.3%), advancement opportunity (27.9%), salary (39.9%) and job security (15.3%). Part-time faculty members were overwhelmingly satisfied with their authority to decide course content (94.7%), instructional duties (90.4%), workload

²⁷ It should be noted, however, that Table 15 also reveals that more than one-fifth of the part-time faculty members participating in the survey answered that office space, personal computers and local networks and secretarial support were “not available, not applicable or don’t know,” which was significantly higher than that specified for full-time faculty members.

²⁸ The percentages in this summary table include a combination of “very” and “somewhat” satisfied or dissatisfied.

(85.1%) and authority to decide courses taught (80.1%). Coincidentally, full-time and part-time faculty members registered very similar satisfaction levels for their jobs overall (85.0% versus 85.7%).

Category	Full-Time Faculty: Dissatisfied %	Full-Time Faculty: Satisfied %	Part-Time Faculty: Dissatisfied %	Part-Time Faculty: Satisfied %
Job Overall	15.0	85.0	14.3	85.7
Instructional Duties	8.6	91.4	9.5	90.4
Other Job Aspects	21.0	79.0	25.3	74.8
Work Load	31.1	68.9	14.9	85.1
Salary	39.9	60.1	47.2	52.8
Benefits	19.3	80.7	55.7	44.3
Job Security	15.3	84.8	36.4	63.6
Advancement Opportunity	27.9	72.0	50.0	49.9
Authority to Decide Courses Taught	9.8	90.2	19.8	80.1
Authority to Decide Course Content	4.7	95.3	5.2	94.7
Time Available to Keep Current in Professional Field	48.4	51.6	32.2	67.8

Recommendations. In order to address the concerns about salaries and benefits, the advisory committee recommends the following with respect to community colleges in Pennsylvania, to be implemented on a voluntary basis.

1. Community college administrators and trustees and those who represent full-time and part-time faculty should recognize the increasingly significant role of part-time faculty at community colleges and should support policies and practices that provide fair salaries, benefits and working conditions for all employees of community colleges, including part-time faculty.
2. While faculty and staff salaries and benefits will continue to be determined according to the decision-making processes identified for each community college, the Commonwealth must recognize that in order to support the capacity of each community college to fund costs related to increases in salaries and benefits for part-time and full-time faculty and staff and to ameliorate the impact on student tuition, additional financial commitment is required. Accordingly, adequate public funding should be appropriated to fulfill the state's community college financial obligations provided in current law.
3. Part-time faculty members at community colleges should be paid a salary that fairly reflects the extent to which their qualifications, experience and job

responsibilities are similar to and different from those of full-time faculty members.

4. Community colleges should provide part-time faculty access to existing health insurance and retirement benefits, and the Commonwealth should provide categorical financial incentives to assist community colleges in providing access to such benefits.
5. Community colleges should provide to all faculty members, both full-time and part-time, the working conditions necessary for them to fulfill their teaching and other related responsibilities.

Professional Development and Decision-Making

The differences between full-time and part-time faculty are also manifested in the highest level of education attained, the number of years taught in higher education, the amount of material published in professional journals, faculty evaluation and quality control measures, participation in campus meetings and departmental meetings and administrative input into course curricula. Nevertheless, part-time faculty members generally have richer real-world experiences and are capable of bringing those experiences and current events into the classroom to facilitate the learning process.²⁹ In addition, part-time faculty members can expose students to more diverse ideas not commonly expressed by full-time faculty members. As noted previously, part-time faculty members are able to bring to institutions of higher education “expertise that it would be difficult or economically improvident to duplicate through the appointments of tenure-track faculty.”³⁰ Job satisfaction levels regarding professional development and decision-making are represented in Table 26 and discussed briefly in the section titled “Job Satisfaction” on pages 30-31 of this report.

Faculty Education. Part-time faculty members generally have less education than full-time faculty members. Table 17 reveals that regionally in Fall 1998, 75.1% of full-time faculty members had their Ph.D. or first-professional degrees, compared to only 29.4% of part-time faculty members. However, a majority of part-time faculty members did have a

²⁹ Demetrios Louziotis, Jr., “The Role of Adjuncts: Bridging the Dark Side and Ivory Tower,” *Review of Business* 21 (Fall/Winter 2000), 47-52; David Foster and Edith Foster, “It’s a Buyer’s Market: ‘Disposable Professors,’ Grade Inflation and Other Problems,” *Academe* 84 (January/February 1998), 30; Ernst Benjamin, “Variations in the Characteristics of Part-Time Faculty by General Fields of Instruction and Research,” in *New Directions for Higher Education: The Growing Use of Part-Time Faculty: Understanding Causes and Effects* 104 (D.W. Leslie, ed., Winter 1998), 47.

³⁰ American Association of University Professors, “Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty,” *supra*, note 23, at 55.

Master's degree (54.3%). Part-time faculty members with a Bachelor's Degree or less totaled 16.4%, compared to only 3.9% for full-time faculty members. See Table 17 for more specific information on faculty education.

Faculty Teaching Experience. Part-time faculty members generally have less experience in teaching than full-time faculty members. In the Mid East Region in 1998, full-time faculty members averaged 18.1 years of teaching experience in higher education, compared to 11.4 years for part-time faculty members. Table 18 shows additional information regarding the average number of years teaching in higher education in the Mid East Region, according to the highest level of education attained by the faculty members.

Faculty Publications. Part-time faculty members on average publish fewer research papers, books and other professional material than their full-time counterparts. In a survey of faculty members over a two-year period, full-time faculty members in the Mid East Region reported publishing more of every type of material than part-time faculty members. Table 19 shows the average number of publications and presentations for the Mid East Region for Fall 1998 by full-time and part-time faculty and categorizes the publications and presentations by refereed or juried publications; non-refereed or non-juried publications; published reviews of material; books, monographs and reports; and presentations and exhibits.

Faculty Evaluation and Quality Control Measures. Nationally, part-time faculty members are evaluated by both student measures and administrative measures less often than full-time faculty members.³¹ In Fall 1998, 86% of all institutions responding to a national survey reported that they used some type of student measure to evaluate their full-time faculty, while only 82% reported doing the same for part-time faculty. Likewise, 95% of all responding institutions reported that at least one administrative measure was used to evaluate full-time faculty, compared to only 86% for part-time faculty. See Table 20 for a detailed analysis of faculty evaluation and quality control measures.³²

Administrative Participation and Campus Activities. Part-time faculty members are generally not invited to participate in campus committees or department meetings. Even

³¹ Student measures include student evaluations, student test scores and student career placement. Administrative measures include evaluations by department or division chairs, dean evaluations, peer evaluations and self-evaluations.

³² See National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, *Institutional Policies and Practices: Results from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Institution Survey* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 2001), 17 & 19.

if they are invited, many are unable to participate because of time constraints as a result of their other full-time or part-time positions. Often, part-time faculty members do not have the opportunity to choose the textbooks for their courses and, in some cases, may only have minor input into developing their own syllabi for the courses that they teach.³³

Table 21 shows the percentage of time spent on teaching, research, administrative activities and other activities for both full-time and part-time faculty in the Mid East Region during Fall 1998. In the Mid East Region, for example, full-time faculty members spent 55.1% of their time teaching, 17.7% of their time conducting research, 12.8% of their time engaged in administrative activities and 14.4% of their time engaged in other activities. Conversely, part-time faculty members spent 58.4% of their time teaching, 5.5% of their time on research, 4.8% of their time on administrative activities and 31.2% of their time on other activities. Although actual teaching percentages are similar for full-time and part-time faculty members (55.1% compared to 58.4%), Table 21 reveals that full-time faculty members spent much more of a percentage of their time on research activities (17.7% versus 5.5%) and administrative activities (12.8% versus 4.8%) than did part-time faculty members.

Table 22 provides an additional dimension to the data contained in Table 21: the preferences of full-time and part-time faculty members regarding the percentage of time spent on teaching, research, administrative activities and other activities. In the Mid East Region, for example, full-time faculty members preferred to spend half their time teaching, approximately one-quarter of their time performing research (25.8%) and the other one-quarter of their time divided between administrative activities (7.5%) and other activities (16.7%). Therefore, they actually spent more time engaged in teaching and administrative activities, and less time in research and other activities, than they would have preferred. On the other hand, part-time faculty members preferred spending 59.2% of their time teaching, 9.2% of their time conducting research, 3.3% of their time of their time on administrative activities and 28.3% of their time on other activities. Although the data reveal that the percentage of time that part-time faculty members preferred to spend on teaching is approximately the same percentage that they actually spent on teaching, it is apparent that part-time faculty members would have preferred to spend more time conducting research and less time on administrative activities.

Recommendations. In order to address the concerns over professional development and decision-making, the advisory committee recommends the following with respect to community colleges in Pennsylvania, to be implemented on a voluntary basis.

³³ Eugene Arden, "Ending the Loneliness and Isolation of Adjunct Professors," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 41 (July 21, 1995), A44; American Association of University Professors, "Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty," *supra*, note 23, at 55; National Education Association, "Will Part-Timers Win Parity?," *NEA Today* 17 (November 1998), 11.

1. Community colleges and organizations representing faculty should support opportunities for part-time faculty members to participate in professional development activities, including conferences and workshops, and to apply for and utilize grants in a manner similar to opportunities afforded full-time faculty members. The General Assembly should provide categorical financial incentives to assist community colleges in providing professional development opportunities for part-time faculty members.
2. Community college administrators and faculty representatives should work together to implement all steps necessary to ensure that part-time faculty members and their representatives are engaged in decision-making or advisory processes at their respective community colleges in the same manner that full-time faculty and their representatives are engaged.

Reappointment and Hiring

For Fall 1998 in the Mid East Region, part-time faculty members comprised 44.7% of the workforce at institutions of higher education; full-time faculty members comprised 55.3%. Table 23 provides more specific workforce information at the various types of institutions and sets forth the percentage of full-time and part-time faculty in such disciplines as business, law and communications; health sciences; humanities; natural sciences and engineering; and social sciences and education. Of the disciplines listed, the percentage of full-time and part-time faculty members was nearly equal with respect to business, law and communications; humanities; and social sciences and education. In the disciplines of health sciences and natural sciences and engineering, the percentage of full-time faculty members was approximately double that of part-time faculty members.

Because increases and decreases in student enrollment can be more easily accommodated through the employment of part-time faculty, institutions readily hire part-time faculty members. However, job security for these faculty members may become an issue since institutions can often dismiss part-time faculty members with little notice and without due process rights afforded to full-time faculty members.³⁴ In

³⁴American Association of University Professors, "Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty," *supra*, note 23, at 55; American Association of University Professors, *State Legislation Affecting Part-Time Faculty: A Report from the AAUP Committee on Government Relations*, <http://www.aaup.org/Issues/part-time/ptleg-01.htm> (last accessed May 19, 2003); Robert Pankin and Carla Weiss, *supra*, note 25.

addition, part-time, untenured faculty members can lose their jobs for activities such as teaching controversial material or challenging grade changes.³⁵

Tenure and union representation, therefore, are key considerations regarding the issue of reappointment and hiring, particularly given the climate in which the number of non-tenured faculty members, who are not on a tenure track, has increased dramatically from 1997-2000 in Pennsylvania. Table 24 shows that the number of non-tenured faculty not on a tenure track has increased from 3,710 in 1997 to 4,542 in 2000, a 22.4% increase. At the same time, the number of faculty with tenure has decreased from 14,180 to 13,563, a 4.4% decrease. However, it should be noted that the number of non-tenured faculty on a tenure track has increased from 4,490 to 5,062, a 12.7% increase. See Table 24 for specific information for each institution type in Pennsylvania.

Recommendation. In order to address the concerns over the reappointment and hiring of part-time faculty members, the advisory committee recommends the following with respect to community colleges in Pennsylvania, to be implemented on a voluntary basis.

After the successful completion of an appropriate probationary period and subject to continuing successful evaluations as determined by each institution, part-time faculty members at community colleges should be given priority for re-appointment to appropriate part-time teaching assignments and should receive fair consideration in hiring for full-time teaching positions.

Data Collection

The advisory committee acknowledged the importance of data collection in any detailed education analysis, citing in particular the information compiled by the Joint State Government Commission for each annual report on Instructional Output and Faculty Salary Costs of the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania, commonly referred to as the “Snyder Report.” Currently, there is no formal mechanism to receive comparable information from community colleges across the Commonwealth.

Recommendation. In order to address the need for data collection concerning community colleges in Pennsylvania, the advisory committee recommends the following.

³⁵ American Federation of Teachers, *supra*, note 26; Timothy Haggerty, “First Person: Confessions of a Grade Inflator,” *Post-Gazette*, December 15, 2001, <http://www.post-gazette.com/forum/20011215edhag1215p3.asp> (last accessed May 19, 2003).

The Public School Code should be amended to require community colleges to submit annual data, in the same manner as state-owned and state-related institutions of higher education, to the Joint State Government Commission for compilation in an annual report similar to the report on Instructional Output and Faculty Salary Costs of the State-Related and State-Owned Universities (“Snyder Report”).

Appropriation

The advisory committee believed strongly that Pennsylvania should not only meet its funding obligations under current law for its community colleges, but categorical funding incentives should be created to implement the recommendations of the advisory committee as they relate to the issues of salaries, benefits and working conditions; professional development and decision-making; reappointment and hiring; and data collection.

Recommendation. In order to address the funding issues raised in this report, the advisory committee recommends the following.

In addition to appropriating adequate state funds to fulfill the state’s community college funding obligations under current law, the General Assembly should appropriate funds to assist community colleges in the implementation of the recommendations of the advisory committee, with an annual appropriation of four million dollars for categorical financial incentives.

Effect on Other Institutions of Higher Education

The advisory committee strongly encouraged other institutions of higher education to consider the recommendations for the community colleges. The advisory committee observed that although the language of the recommendations implicates only community colleges, the reason was not to single out community colleges but merely to acknowledge that the issues raised in this report stemmed primarily from concerns at the community college level. Because the recommendations have taken the form of “best practice standards,” the advisory committee believed that all institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania should analyze their own current practices and consider how to improve their systems regarding the use of part-time faculty.

Recommendation. In order to emphasize best practice standards for all institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania, the advisory committee recommends the following.

The administrators, trustees and faculty of all colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, both public and private, should consider the objectives and principles that underlie the recommendations of the advisory committee regarding community colleges and should consider the appropriate and voluntary application of the recommendations for their respective institutions of higher education.

Public Hearing

The advisory committee believed that additional input would be helpful in providing information to the General Assembly regarding the issue of the use of part-time faculty in Pennsylvania. Individual case studies could personalize the subject matter and emphasize the impact on part-time faculty members, their families and the students attending institutions of higher education in this Commonwealth.

Recommendation. In order to gain additional information regarding part-time faculty in Pennsylvania, the advisory committee recommends the following.

The task force or an appropriate committee of the General Assembly should conduct at least one public hearing to hear comments regarding the advisory committee's recommendations and other issues relating to part-time faculty.

TABLES

1. Number and Percent of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty in Pennsylvania by Year and Institution Type, 1987-88 through 1999-00
2. Average Salaries for Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty by Employment Status for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania, 2001-02
3. Average Salaries for Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty by Employment Status and CIP Classification for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania, 2001-02
4. Average Income of Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status, Source of Income and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
5. Average Number of Hours That Instructional Faculty and Staff Worked Per Week by Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
6. Average Number of Hours That Instructional Faculty and Staff Worked Per Week by Compensation, Location, Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
7. Percentage of Part-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff Employed at Another Job and Their Average Number of Additional Jobs Held by Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
8. Average Student Credit Hours Generated by Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty by Employment Status for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania, 2001-02
9. Average Student Credit Hours Generated by Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty by Employment Status and CIP Classification for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania, 2001-02
10. Basic Salary, Student Credit Hours and Average Salary Per Student Credit Hour for Instructional Faculty and Staff by Institution Type for the Mid East Region, 1998-99

11. Average Instructional Salary Per Student Credit Hour by Employment Status for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania, 2001-02
12. Average Instructional Salary Per Student Credit Hour by Employment Status and CIP Classification for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania, 2001-02
13. Percentage of Institutions That Contribute to Benefits, and Average Percentage of Salary Contributed by Institutions to the Total Benefits Package by Employment Status and Institution Type for the United States, Fall 1998
14. Percentage of Institutions Offering Benefits to Faculty by Type of Benefits and Employment Status for the United States, Fall 1998
15. Average Number of Office Hours of Instructional Faculty and Staff Held Per Week by Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
16. Percentage Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff Rating Office Space, Personal Computers, Secretarial Support and Classroom Space by Rating Category, Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
17. Percentage Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status, Highest Education Credential Attained and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
18. Average Number of Years Teaching in Higher Education of Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status, Highest Level of Education and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
19. Average Number of Publications and Presentations in the Past Two Years by Employment Status of Instructional Faculty and Staff and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
20. Percentage of Institutions Using Student and Administrative Measures to Evaluate Teaching Performance of Faculty by Employment Status and Institution Type for the United States, Fall 1998
21. Percentage Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status, Time Spent on Various Activities and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998

22. Percentage of Instructional Faculty and Staff Time Spent and Time Preferred on Various Activities, by Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
23. Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff in Various Teaching Disciplines by Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
24. Tenure Track Status for Full-Time 9 and 12 Month Instructional Faculty by Institution Category for Pennsylvania, 1997-2000
25. Percentage Distribution of Part-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff That Prefer to be Part-Time by Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998
26. Instructional Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Their Jobs by Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region, Fall 1998

Table 1
Number and Percent of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty in Pennsylvania
by Year and Institution Type
1987-88 Through 1999-00

Year	Full-time faculty	Part-time faculty	Percent of total part-time faculty	Year	Full-time faculty	Part-time faculty	Percent of total part-time faculty	Year	Full-time faculty	Part-time faculty	Percent of total part-time faculty
State-owned universities				State-related universities				Community colleges			
1987-88	4,506	464	9.3%	1987-88	7,522	5,630	42.8%	1987-88	1,838	3,564	66.0%
1989-90	4,662	298	6.0	1989-90	8,199	6,236	43.2	1989-90	1,760	4,118	70.1
1991-92	4,789	254	5.0	1991-92	8,449	6,313	42.8	1991-92	1,878	5,360	74.1
1993-94	4,716	342	6.8	1993-94	8,783	10,357	54.1	1993-94	2,004	6,719	77.0
1995-96	4,871	653	11.8	1995-96	9,656	10,299	51.6	1995-96	1,949	6,404	76.7
1997-98	4,853	716	12.9	1997-98	9,385	10,048	51.7	1997-98	1,880	6,219	76.8
1999-00	4,793	847	15.0	1999-00	10,016	10,616	51.5	1999-00	1,787	8,414	82.5
Private state-aided institutions				Private colleges and universities				Theological seminaries			
1987-88	4,401	1,933	30.5	1987-88	6,292	4,470	41.5	1987-88	127	97	43.3
1989-90	4,398	3,556	44.7	1989-90	7,566	5,997	44.2	1989-90	143	63	30.6
1991-92	3,950	5,328	57.4	1991-92	7,709	6,742	46.7	1991-92	134	92	40.7
1993-94	3,971	5,240	56.9	1993-94	8,202	7,421	47.5	1993-94	157	96	37.9
1995-96	3,709	4,878	56.8	1995-96	8,488	8,132	48.9	1995-96	143	60	29.6
1997-98	4,330	5,427	55.6	1997-98	8,631	8,691	50.2	1997-98	155	114	42.4
1999-00	5,505	5,730	51.0	1999-00	8,993	8,558	48.8	1999-00	159	102	39.1
Private two-year colleges				Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology				All institutions			
1987-88	214	196	47.8	1987-88	NA	NA	--	1987-88	24,900	16,354	39.6
1989-90	165	284	63.3	1989-90	NA	NA	--	1989-90	26,893	20,552	43.3
1991-92	217	367	62.8	1991-92	39	5	11.4	1991-92	27,165	24,461	47.4
1993-94	222	173	43.8	1993-94	37	3	7.5	1993-94	28,092	30,352	51.9
1995-96	169	303	64.2	1995-96	39	0	0.0	1995-96	29,024	30,729	51.4
1997-98	161	159	49.7	1997-98	38	4	9.5	1997-98	29,433	31,378	51.6
1999-00	130	257	66.4	1999-00	47	4	7.8	1999-00	31,430	34,528	52.3

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Education, Colleges and Universities, Education Digest, various years.

Table 2
Average Salaries for Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty
by Employment Status
for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania
2001-02¹

University	Faculty	
	Full-time	Part-time
State-related		
Lincoln	\$43,621	\$20,920
Penn State	62,427	34,800
Pittsburgh	61,217	33,708
Temple	78,139	31,379
Total	64,282	33,353
State-owned		
Bloomsburg	63,183	44,926
California	71,099	56,967
Cheyney	78,945	40,055
Clarion	64,956	52,736
East Stroudsburg	66,245	42,696
Edinboro	62,913	64,507
Indiana	69,769	56,806
Kutztown	65,963	37,197
Lock Haven	59,573	23,703
Mansfield	65,125	34,923
Millersville	68,597	42,066
Shippensburg	64,286	63,853
Slippery Rock	66,898	46,960
West Chester	64,600	44,765
Total	66,133	47,864
All universities	65,110	36,258

1. This table represents the salary that individuals would receive if they were to work full-time at the current pay rate. The figures in this table take into account the salaries of professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors and no-rank faculty.

SOURCE: Data provided by the individual universities, 2002.

Table 3
Average Salaries for Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty
by Employment Status and CIP Classification
for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania
2001-02¹

CIP classification	State-related		State-owned		All universities	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Agriculture	\$63,743	\$57,228	\$71,476	\$38,446	\$64,157	\$56,238
Architecture and environmental design	54,422	24,436	67,701	35,900	54,850	24,583
Area and ethnic studies	57,281	30,310	68,878	50,415	60,084	34,558
Business	82,169	31,520	71,098	52,550	77,561	35,065
Communications	60,181	27,785	63,286	45,201	61,951	32,307
Computer and information sciences	65,841	32,690	65,133	39,466	65,604	33,568
Consumer, personal and miscellaneous services	--	--	63,449	--	63,449	--
Education	59,302	27,791	64,264	46,160	62,743	35,446
Engineering	78,429	45,576	74,770	49,822	78,279	45,625
Foreign languages	51,046	30,089	62,929	43,238	55,455	31,303
Health	61,540	36,102	63,451	45,196	62,122	37,437
Home economics	56,276	30,660	68,274	51,887	59,378	32,887
Industrial Arts	--	--	70,851	51,163	70,851	51,163
Law	98,142	28,681	68,581	46,007	96,820	29,516
Letters	50,009	32,695	62,296	43,434	55,992	34,447
Liberal/general studies	46,021	37,876	66,856	75,563	48,545	41,988
Library and archival sciences	68,408	37,601	72,066	45,898	70,138	41,764
Life sciences	57,819	36,000	70,402	56,214	63,659	40,303
Mathematics	60,804	32,110	65,206	47,178	62,707	34,220
Military sciences	44,586	--	84,192	--	48,705	--
Multi/interdisciplinary studies	52,144	25,516	61,068	42,744	53,705	27,177
Parks and recreation	50,369	43,146	62,566	40,510	60,062	41,400
Personal and social development	--	--	77,021	46,940	77,021	46,940
Philosophy, religion and theology	69,974	38,756	70,800	35,039	70,339	38,388
Physical sciences	66,028	46,587	70,020	71,619	67,746	50,500
Psychology	66,282	36,617	69,499	47,796	68,071	39,832
Public affairs and protective services	67,589	29,058	65,282	47,585	66,663	31,474
Social sciences	66,606	34,462	66,379	50,373	66,486	38,097
Trade and industrial	46,720	35,760	56,494	58,210	47,953	41,330
Visual and performing arts	57,373	30,099	65,281	47,681	61,724	34,735
Other	38,468	--	115,294	34,827	112,050	34,827
Total	64,239	33,353	66,133	47,864	65,086	36,258

1. This table represents the salary that individuals would receive if they were to work full-time at the current pay rate. CIP classifications are taken from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Classification of Instructional Programs*, 1991.

SOURCE: Data provided by the individual universities, 2002.

Table 4
Average Income of Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status,
Source of Income and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Source of income									
	Total earned income		Basic salary from institution		Other income from institution		Outside consulting income		Other outside income	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Mid East Region										
Public research	\$79,580	\$53,640	\$68,693	\$10,422	\$4,359	\$1,257	\$2,031	\$2,075	\$4,497	\$39,887
Private not-for-profit research	103,686	72,808	83,924	15,056	6,999	414	5,559	3,995	7,205	53,344
Public doctoral ²	95,595	a	75,114	a	2,087	a	901	a	17,494	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	89,522	58,049	69,683	10,878	4,655	272	3,780	4,062	11,404	42,837
Public comprehensive	64,169	42,431	54,567	10,746	3,384	1,220	1,108	2,563	5,110	27,902
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	64,206	50,097	54,104	12,338	3,823	824	1,701	1,949	4,577	34,987
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	59,186	34,865	49,230	7,362	2,977	538	1,575	844	5,404	26,121
Public 2-year	58,566	49,711	48,625	13,297	4,708	759	1,072	1,052	4,160	34,603
Other ³	58,633	41,608	50,285	12,250	2,377	1,106	1,292	1,508	4,679	26,744
Total ⁴	75,988	49,765	62,916	11,792	4,300	793	2,338	2,104	6,434	35,077

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). All instructional faculty and staff are included in averages, regardless of whether they had that type of income. Income is for the 1998 calendar year for instructional faculty and staff employed in the fall of 1998. Details may not sum to total because of rounding.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for-profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 5
Average Number of Hours That Instructional Faculty and Staff
Worked Per Week by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Average hours worked per week	
	Full-time	Part-time
Mid East Region		
Public research	53.9	38.9
Private not-for-profit research	55.1	41.5
Public doctoral ²	58.4	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	52.0	39.8
Public comprehensive	51.7	38.5
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	50.0	28.9
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	54.1	34.5
Public 2-year	46.3	39.3
Other ³	49.6	31.5
Total ⁴	52.4	36.8

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g. teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). The average number of hours worked per week includes all paid and unpaid hours worked at the postsecondary institution and all paid and unpaid hours worked outside of the postsecondary institution.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 6
Average Number of Hours That Instructional Faculty and Staff
Worked Per Week by Compensation, Location, Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Average total hours worked per week		Average hours per week for paid activities at institution		Average hours per week for paid activities not at institution		Average hours per week for unpaid activities at institution		Average hours per week for unpaid activities not at institution	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
	Public research	53.9	38.9	48.4	17.1	1.8	15.9	2.0	3.5	1.7
Private not-for-profit research	55.1	41.5	46.9	12.6	3.2	23.7	3.0	3.1	2.0	2.1
Public doctoral ²	58.4	a	46.1	a	5.8	a	2.4	a	4.0	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	52.0	39.8	41.9	10.9	4.7	23.9	3.4	3.0	1.9	1.9
Public comprehensive	51.7	38.5	44.3	14.0	1.7	19.6	3.9	2.8	1.9	2.0
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	50.0	28.9	42.5	14.6	3.0	12.2	3.2	1.2	1.2	0.9
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	54.1	34.5	46.6	13.8	3.2	17.2	3.3	2.7	1.0	0.8
Public 2-year	46.3	39.3	37.3	16.4	3.0	18.5	4.6	2.3	1.4	2.1
Other ³	49.6	31.5	41.7	10.2	2.8	17.8	3.1	1.8	2.1	1.7
Total ⁴	52.4	36.8	44.4	13.9	2.9	18.7	3.2	2.5	1.8	1.7

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g. teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). The average number of hours worked per week includes all paid and unpaid hours worked at the postsecondary institution and all paid and unpaid hours worked outside of the postsecondary institution.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 7
Percentage of Part-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff Employed
at Another Job and Their Average Number of Additional Jobs Held
by Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Percent employed outside current institution ²	Average number of additional jobs held by those who indicated they had other employment
Public research	75.6%	1.7
Private not-for-profit research	69.3	1.9
Public doctoral ³	a	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ³	79.6	1.8
Public comprehensive	67.1	1.5
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	77.5	1.6
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	75.5	1.7
Public 2-year	74.5	1.5
Other ⁴	87.9	1.8
Total ⁵	75.4	1.7

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. Consulting jobs are not included as other employment in this table. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g. teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities).

2. This column represents the percent of part-time instructional faculty and staff employed at a non-consulting job outside their current institution.

3. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.

4. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized medical schools and medical centers.

5. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 8
Average Student Credit Hours Generated by Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty
by Employment Status
for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania
2001-02¹

University	Faculty	
	Full-time	Part-time
State-related		
Lincoln	365	339
Penn State	434	709
Pittsburgh	455	493
Temple	540	467
Total	455	582
State-owned		
Bloomsburg	595	662
California	666	588
Cheyney	463	311
Clarion	560	602
East Stroudsburg	559	595
Edinboro	513	362
Indiana	544	781
Kutztown	592	599
Lock Haven	508	1097
Mansfield	473	435
Millersville	541	542
Shippensburg	600	554
Slippery Rock	591	587
West Chester	528	581
Total	557	582
All universities	500	582

1. The figures in this table take into account the student credit hours generated by professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors and no-rank faculty. As a point of reference, a three-credit class with 30 students generates 90 student credit hours.

SOURCE: Data provided by the individual universities, 2002.

Table 9
Average Student Credit Hours Generated by Full-Time Equivalent Instructional Faculty
by Employment Status and CIP Classification
for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania
2001-02¹

CIP classification	State-related		State-owned		All universities	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Agriculture	375	552	820	924	399	572
Architecture and environmental design	415	658	408	415	415	654
Area and ethnic studies	451	689	622	651	493	681
Business	600	783	619	660	608	762
Communications	503	511	552	599	531	534
Computer and information sciences	483	561	543	657	503	574
Consumer, personal and miscellaneous services	--	--	1,519	--	1,519	--
Education	271	413	500	457	430	431
Engineering	310	452	405	271	313	449
Foreign languages	380	556	504	518	426	553
Health	308	331	332	419	316	344
Home economics	464	891	599	618	499	862
Industrial Arts	--	--	432	477	432	477
Law	631	351	669	799	633	372
Letters	405	589	564	577	483	587
Liberal/general studies	477	592	290	728	454	607
Library and archival sciences	263	478	459	258	355	368
Life sciences	494	544	496	544	495	544
Mathematics	580	772	654	730	612	766
Military sciences	185	983	6,700	1,254	862	1,074
Multi/interdisciplinary studies	422	807	664	541	465	781
Parks and recreation	420	658	459	886	451	809
Personal and social development	--	--	459	448	459	448
Philosophy, religion and theology	536	769	783	570	646	749
Physical sciences	512	490	483	572	499	502
Psychology	622	764	674	971	651	824
Public affairs and protective services	396	548	531	649	450	562
Social sciences	641	741	715	814	680	758
Trade and industrial	344	320	454	224	358	296
Visual and performing arts	395	532	473	452	438	511
Other	300	--	476	776	468	776
Total	455	582	557	582	500	582

1. CIP classifications are taken from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Classification of Instructional Programs*, 1991. As a point of reference, a three-credit class with 30 students generates 90 student credit hours.

SOURCE: Data provided by the individual universities, 2002.

Table 10
Basic Salary, Student Credit Hours and Average Salary Per Student Credit Hour
for Instructional Faculty and Staff by Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
1998-99

Institution type	Basic salary per faculty member from institution		Student credit hours per faculty member		Average salary cost per student credit hour	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Public research	\$69,916	\$12,077	518.0	513.4	\$135	\$24
Private not-for-profit research	85,295	15,462	603.8	392.4	141	39
Public doctoral ²	75,081	a	532.6	a	141	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	71,199	10,871	814.0	291.4	87	37
Public comprehensive	54,934	10,478	585.0	485.8	94	22
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	53,765	11,351	539.8	287.0	100	40
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	50,465	7,080	419.0	281.8	120	25
Public 2-year	48,939	12,992	652.0	320.0	75	41
Other ³	51,714	12,132	518.8	389.6	100	31
Total ⁴	63,733	11,683	573.4	361.8	111	32

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). Basic salary is for the 1998-99 academic year.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 11
Average Instructional Salary Per Student Credit Hour
by Employment Status
for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania
2001-02

University	Faculty	
	Full-time	Part-time
State-related		
Lincoln	\$119	\$62
Penn State	144	49
Pittsburgh	135	68
Temple	145	67
Total	141	57
State-owned		
Bloomsburg	106	68
California	107	97
Cheyney	171	129
Clarion	116	88
East Stroudsburg	119	72
Edinboro	123	178
Indiana	128	73
Kutztown	111	62
Lock Haven	117	22
Mansfield	138	80
Millersville	127	78
Shippensburg	107	115
Slippery Rock	113	80
West Chester	122	77
Total	119	82
All universities	130	62

SOURCE: Data provided by the individual universities, 2002.

Table 12
Average Instructional Salary Per Student Credit Hour
by Employment Status and CIP Classification
for the State-Related and State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania
2001-02¹

CIP classification	State-related		State-owned		All universities	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Agriculture	\$170	\$104	\$87	\$42	\$161	\$98
Architecture and environmental design	131	37	166	86	132	38
Area and ethnic studies	127	44	111	77	122	51
Business	137	40	115	80	128	46
Communications	120	54	115	75	117	60
Computer and information sciences	136	58	120	60	130	59
Consumer, personal and miscellaneous services	--	--	42	--	42	--
Education	219	67	128	101	146	82
Engineering	253	101	185	184	250	102
Foreign languages	134	54	125	83	130	57
Health	200	109	191	108	197	109
Home economics	121	34	114	84	119	38
Industrial Arts	--	--	164	107	164	107
Law	155	82	102	58	153	79
Letters	123	55	110	75	116	59
Liberal/general studies	96	64	231	104	107	69
Library and archival sciences	261	79	157	178	197	114
Life sciences	117	66	142	103	129	74
Mathematics	105	42	100	65	102	45
Military sciences	241	--	13	--	56	--
Multi/interdisciplinary studies	124	32	92	79	116	35
Parks and recreation	120	66	136	46	133	51
Personal and social development	--	--	168	105	168	105
Philosophy, religion and theology	130	50	90	61	109	51
Physical sciences	129	95	145	125	136	101
Psychology	107	48	103	49	105	48
Public affairs and protective services	171	53	123	73	148	56
Social sciences	104	46	93	62	98	50
Trade and industrial	136	112	125	260	134	139
Visual and performing arts	145	57	138	106	141	68
Other	128	--	242	45	239	45
Total	141	57	119	82	130	62

1. CIP classifications are taken from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Classification of Instructional Programs*, 1991.

SOURCE: Data provided by the individual universities, 2002.

Table 13
Percentage of Institutions That Contribute to Benefits, and Average
Percentage of Salary Contributed by Institutions to the Total
Benefits Package by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the United States
Fall 1998¹

Institution type	Percent of institutions that contribute to benefits package		Average percent of salary contributed to benefits package	
	Full-time faculty	Part-time faculty	Full-time faculty	Part-time faculty
Public research	100%	84%	28%	24%
Private not-for-profit research	100	84	27	19
Public doctoral ²	100	81	27	21
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	98	74	27	18
Public comprehensive	100	67	27	21
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	94	39	31	16
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	97	48	24	15
Public 2-year	96	48	27	18
Other ³	100	55	24	19
Total ⁴	98	53	26	18

1. In this table, faculty includes all faculty and instructional staff.
2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.
3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized medical schools and medical centers.
4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey" (NSOPF:99).

Table 14
Percentage of Institutions Offering Benefits to Faculty
by Type of Benefits and Employment Status
for the United States
Fall 1998¹

Benefits	Faculty	
	Full-time	Part-time
Insurance benefits		
Medical insurance or medical care	99%	36%
Dental insurance or dental care	89	29
Disability insurance	90	27
Life insurance	94	28
Medical insurance for retirees	56	15
Cafeteria style	28	9
Family benefits		
Tuition remission/grants for spouse	67	21
Tuition remission/grants for children	67	21
Paid maternity leave	58	20
Paid paternity leave	39	17
Child care: fully-subsidized	0	0
Child care: partially subsidized	7	3
Child care: unsubsidized	16	8
Specified retirement plans		
TIAA/CREF	72	35
Other 403(b)	54	29
State plan	46	26
401(k)	19	6
Other retirement	29	13
Other specified benefits		
Wellness or health programs	57	36
Housing/mortgage, rent	9	1
Transportation, parking	56	33
Paid sabbatical leave	76	5
Employee assistance program	54	25
1. In this table, faculty includes all faculty and instructional staff.		
Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey" (NSOPF:99).		

Table 15
Average Number of Office Hours of Instructional Faculty and Staff
Held Per Week by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Average number of office hours held per week	
	Full-time	Part-time
Public research	5.1	2.3
Private not-for-profit research	5.3	2.1
Public doctoral ²	4.3	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	5.7	2.3
Public comprehensive	5.3	2.2
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	5.4	1.0
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	4.2	2.6
Public 2-year	5.0	1.3
Other ³	7.9	2.0
Total ⁴	5.3	1.9

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g. teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities).

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 16
Percentage Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff Rating Office Space,
Personal Computers, Secretarial Support and Classroom Space
by Rating Category, Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Percentage in each rating category								Not available/ not applicable/ don't know	
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor			
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Rating of office space										
Public research	20.6%	16.1%	35.9%	28.3%	29.9%	25.3%	8.8%	14.7%	4.9%	15.6%
Private not-for-profit research	19.6	16.5	32.3	29.2	30.1	13.4	10.8	9.7	7.2	31.3
Public doctoral ²	10.3	a	44.3	a	22.6	a	5.4	a	17.4	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	22.7	13.2	32.5	25.3	22.7	14.8	18.4	21.8	3.8	24.9
Public comprehensive	12.8	14.0	44.5	28.8	23.5	26.7	15.1	19.1	4.0	11.5
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	23.8	8.6	41.2	23.4	18.5	19.7	12.1	22.4	4.4	26.0
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	19.7	9.0	46.3	23.0	21.7	23.0	10.6	27.6	1.7	17.5
Public 2-year	15.7	11.2	42.2	28.9	20.5	21.8	14.5	12.9	7.1	25.2
Other ³	23.4	7.1	24.7	24.0	23.9	18.6	18.1	20.7	9.8	29.7
Total ⁴	18.5	11.6	38.5	26.5	24.6	20.7	12.4	18.5	6.0	22.6
Rating of personal computers and local networks										
Public research	40.3	25.5	38.6	40.4	13.8	6.0	4.5	10.9	2.7	17.2
Private not-for-profit research	39.7	25.0	35.9	41.5	13.7	12.7	4.7	2.1	6.0	18.7
Public doctoral ²	24.3	a	39.3	a	21.2	a	2.0	a	13.2	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	34.7	19.7	33.4	24.8	23.4	20.5	5.4	5.7	3.1	29.3
Public comprehensive	24.6	23.6	47.6	24.4	17.0	22.3	6.9	8.0	3.9	21.7
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	31.3	28.5	40.0	29.5	17.8	12.7	8.3	5.1	2.5	24.3
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	39.0	21.1	40.9	29.1	16.7	17.6	1.3	12.5	2.1	19.7
Public 2-year	26.3	25.0	40.6	30.3	20.1	18.3	9.3	5.8	3.8	20.6
Other ³	30.6	27.6	36.6	21.0	16.7	15.3	7.7	11.9	8.4	24.2
Total ⁴	33.1	24.4	39.7	29.4	17.0	16.6	5.7	7.6	4.5	22.0
Rating of secretarial support										
Public research	16.8	16.6	29.6	37.5	25.3	14.9	20.8	10.2	7.5	20.7
Private not-for-profit research	20.0	25.6	26.3	27.0	24.0	13.2	24.7	11.5	5.0	22.8
Public doctoral ²	8.9	a	27.1	a	44.0	a	20.0	a	0.0	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	16.9	25.6	23.7	31.9	28.4	11.0	20.9	10.1	10.1	21.5
Public comprehensive	20.3	24.5	25.7	43.6	26.7	13.8	22.3	9.3	5.0	8.7
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	19.2	25.9	33.6	27.7	27.1	14.9	13.9	8.4	6.2	23.1
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	28.1	39.5	34.3	17.2	21.9	10.8	11.4	7.1	4.3	25.4
Public 2-year	23.6	36.8	34.1	26.6	20.7	11.8	14.3	5.7	7.2	19.1
Other ³	25.3	21.8	33.6	30.4	16.0	12.9	19.3	7.1	5.8	27.6
Total ⁴	20.1	28.2	29.3	30.0	25.4	12.8	19.3	8.5	5.9	20.5

CONTINUED

Percentage Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff Rating Office Space, Personal Computers, Secretarial Support and Classroom Space by Rating Category, Employment Status and Institution Type for the Mid East Region,¹ Fall 1998 -- (Continued)

Institution type	Percentage in each rating category									
	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Not available/ not applicable/ don't know	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Rating of classroom space										
Public research	13.8	12.3	36.6	48.9	33.0	26.7	10.8	2.7	5.8	9.4
Private not-for-profit research	19.1	25.2	36.7	37.8	30.8	20.1	6.7	2.7	6.7	14.2
Public doctoral ²	20.3	a	35.0	a	26.7	a	2.5	a	15.5	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	14.1	29.3	41.3	31.5	22.4	26.6	11.4	8.2	10.8	4.4
Public comprehensive	11.9	13.9	37.5	38.5	34.5	35.7	13.5	3.9	2.5	8.0
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	19.5	33.8	39.7	37.9	27.6	18.0	10.4	4.4	2.7	6.0
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	14.5	21.6	55.3	50.2	20.6	15.4	5.3	7.3	4.4	5.5
Public 2-year	15.3	21.3	42.8	51.9	33.7	13.5	7.1	6.6	1.3	6.6
Other ³	15.7	24.3	41.5	38.7	25.3	23.4	10.7	6.6	6.8	7.0
Total ⁴	15.7	22.6	40.1	42.7	29.6	21.8	9.1	5.5	5.5	7.5

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 17
Percentage Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status,
Highest Education Credential Attained and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Highest credential attained					
	PhD or first- professional degree		Master's degree		Bachelor's degree or less	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Mid East Region						
Public research	87.5%	46.9%	11.2%	45.6%	1.3%	7.4%
Private not-for-profit research	90.7	48.0	6.6	33.8	2.7	18.1
Public doctoral ²	97.5	a	2.5	a	0.0	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	88.1	37.3	11.6	47.3	0.3	15.4
Public comprehensive	79.3	29.2	18.9	61.5	1.9	9.4
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	77.4	34.3	16.2	56.8	6.3	8.9
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	67.1	22.9	30.7	63.3	2.2	13.8
Public 2-year	23.6	7.9	63.5	63.1	12.6	28.9
Other ³	55.7	32.5	33.9	49.1	10.4	18.7
Total ⁴	75.1	29.4	20.9	54.3	3.9	16.4

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g. teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 18
Average Number of Years Teaching in Higher Education of Instructional Faculty and Staff
by Employment Status, Highest Level of Education and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Average number of years teaching in higher education:									
	All levels of education		Doctorate		First- professional		Master's		Bachelor's or less	
	Full- time	Part- time	Full- time	Part- time	Full- time	Part- time	Full- time	Part- time	Full- time	Part- time
Public research	17.3	11.5	18.1	a	15.2	a	13.8	6.7	a	a
Private not-for-profit research	17.4	13.7	17.6	a	15.9	a	a	a	a	a
Public doctoral ²	19.0	a	21.3	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	15.6	12.5	16.8	a	a	a	a	11.1	a	a
Public comprehensive	18.6	10.1	19.3	11.0	a	a	16.8	10.5	a	a
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	19.4	11.9	21.2	a	a	a	a	9.8	a	a
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	18.3	8.6	18.8	a	a	a	17.8	8.0	a	a
Public 2-year	18.8	11.1	23.8	a	a	a	18.1	12.8	a	6.8
Other ³	18.7	12.6	19.5	a	a	a	19.2	10.3	a	a
Total ⁴	18.1	11.4	19.0	14.6	15.1	13.1	17.1	10.7	14.6	8.7

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities).

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 19
Average Number of Publications and Presentations in the Past Two Years by Employment Status
of Instructional Faculty and Staff and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Publication and presentations										
	Refereed or juried publications		Non-refereed or non-juried publications		Published reviews of material		Books, monographs, and reports		Presentations and exhibits		
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	
Mid East Region											
Public research	6.6	2.6	2.6	1.8	2.4	0.4	1.3	0.9	12.5	9.1	
Private not-for-profit research	8.8	4.1	3.1	2.7	2.7	1.5	1.1	1.4	17.1	11.1	
Public doctoral ²	6.4	a	2.0	a	1.3	a	0.8	a	8.7	a	
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	3.9	1.1	1.8	1.3	1.6	0.5	1.3	0.6	8.2	14.1	
Public comprehensive	2.4	1.1	2.0	1.5	1.2	0.7	1.1	0.8	8.1	8.7	
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	2.2	1.8	2.5	1.1	1.6	0.5	0.9	0.8	7.6	7.2	
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	2.2	1.4	1.2	0.3	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.3	8.0	9.2	
Public 2-year	0.8	0.7	1.8	1.0	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.6	8.0	5.2	
Other ³	1.5	2.3	1.3	1.2	0.9	0.3	0.7	0.5	4.1	5.6	
Total ⁴	4.3	1.7	2.2	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.7	10.1	8.5	

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). All instructional faculty and staff are included in averages, regardless of whether they had that type of activity.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small the produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 20
Percentage of Institutions Using Student and Administrative Measures to Evaluate
Teaching Performance of Faculty by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the United States
Fall 1998¹

Institution type	Percent of institutions with any student measure ²		Percent of institutions with any administrative measure ³	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Public research	95%	93%	96%	91%
Private not-for-profit research	84	84	91	91
Public doctoral ⁴	90	82	95	81
Private not-for-profit doctoral ⁴	86	84	90	84
Public comprehensive	92	85	96	85
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	72	70	93	88
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	89	77	96	81
Public 2-year	84	80	95	88
Other ⁵	88	91	95	85
Total ⁶	86	82	95	86

1. In this table, faculty includes all faculty and instructional staff.

2. Student measures include student evaluations, student test scores, student career placement, etc.

3. Administrative measures include department/division chair evaluation, dean evaluations, peer evaluations, self evaluations, etc.

4. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.

5. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized medical schools and medical centers.

6. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Institution Survey" (NSOPF:99).

Table 21
Percentage Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status,
Time Spent on Various Activities and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Percentage of time spent on:							
	Teaching		Research		Administrative		Other	
	activities		activities		activities		activities	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Mid East Region								
Public research	46.0%	55.6%	28.9%	6.4%	12.2%	3.4%	12.9%	34.7%
Private not-for-profit research	41.0	44.7	29.1	8.5	13.6	2.9	16.3	44.0
Public doctoral ²	39.3	a	23.6	a	10.6	a	26.5	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	44.2	46.8	18.9	7.8	17.5	5.2	19.5	40.1
Public comprehensive	63.5	57.3	11.8	6.3	12.6	3.1	12.1	33.2
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	63.8	72.0	11.2	6.2	12.5	2.3	12.5	19.5
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	67.4	64.8	12.1	2.4	11.1	6.8	9.4	26.0
Public 2-year	69.4	60.1	4.3	3.9	12.2	6.6	14.2	29.4
Other ³	68.1	61.5	7.2	5.0	12.9	6.8	11.8	26.9
Total ⁴	55.1	58.4	17.7	5.5	12.8	4.8	14.4	31.2

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 22
Percentage of Instructional Faculty and Staff Time Spent
and Time Preferred on Various Activities
by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Percentage of time spent on:							
	Teaching activities		Research activities		Administrative activities		Other activities	
	Actual	Preferred	Actual	Preferred	Actual	Preferred	Actual	Preferred
Full-time instructional faculty and staff								
Public research	46.0%	44.0%	28.9%	35.7%	12.2%	5.9%	12.9%	14.3%
Private not-for-profit research	41.0	37.9	29.1	37.7	13.6	7.7	16.3	16.7
Public doctoral ²	39.3	32.6	23.6	35.5	10.6	6.7	26.5	25.3
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	44.2	40.1	18.9	26.7	17.5	10.5	19.5	22.7
Public comprehensive	63.5	55.6	11.8	22.0	12.6	7.4	12.1	15.0
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	63.8	58.2	11.2	19.0	12.5	7.5	12.5	15.3
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	67.4	59.9	12.1	21.9	11.1	6.5	9.4	11.8
Public 2-year	69.4	64.5	4.3	8.9	12.2	7.5	14.2	19.0
Other ³	68.1	60.8	7.2	12.9	12.9	9.6	11.8	16.7
Total ⁴	55.1	50.0	17.7	25.8	12.8	7.5	14.4	16.7
Part-time instructional faculty and staff								
Public research	55.6	50.6	6.4	13.6	3.4	2.4	34.7	33.4
Private not-for-profit research	44.7	42.9	8.5	11.5	2.9	2.5	44.0	43.2
Public doctoral ²	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	46.8	49.6	7.8	11.0	5.2	3.9	40.1	35.5
Public comprehensive	57.3	57.6	6.3	10.4	3.1	2.5	33.2	29.5
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	72.0	68.0	6.2	10.2	2.3	2.0	19.5	19.9
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	64.8	68.7	2.4	5.9	6.8	3.4	26.0	22.1
Public 2-year	60.1	67.5	3.9	4.3	6.6	5.2	29.4	22.9
Other ³	61.5	56.5	5.0	13.2	6.8	2.8	26.9	27.5
Total ⁴	58.4	59.2	5.5	9.2	4.8	3.3	31.2	28.3

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 23
Distribution of Instructional Faculty and Staff in Various Teaching Disciplines
by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Percentage in each teaching discipline:													
	All disciplines		Business, law, and communications		Health sciences		Humanities		Natural sciences and engineering		Social sciences and education		All other programs	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Public research	71.8%	28.2%	a	a	76.3%	23.8%	67.2%	32.8%	80.6%	19.4%	80.7%	19.3%	56.5%	43.5%
Private not-for-profit research	69.5	30.5	64.6%	35.4%	76.9	23.1	70.1	29.9	90.4	9.6	63.0	37.0	37.4	62.6
Public doctoral ²	91.8	8.2	a	a	82.3	17.8	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	45.8	54.2	51.4	48.6	71.9	28.1	33.0	67.0	62.2	37.8	39.1	60.9	22.9	77.1
Public comprehensive	58.5	41.5	56.1	43.9	a	a	50.6	49.4	55.9	44.1	70.4	29.6	51.2	48.8
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	48.0	52.0	53.6	46.4	a	a	60.6	39.4	65.7	34.3	34.0	66.0	a	a
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	49.3	50.7	a	a	a	a	52.9	47.1	45.2	54.8	44.0	56.0	60.3	39.7
Public 2-year	40.4	59.6	41.7	58.3	55.8	44.2	30.8	69.3	46.4	53.6	25.8	74.2	50.3	49.8
Other ³	40.3	59.7	a	a	a	a	a	a	54.9	45.1	37.4	62.6	29.6	70.5
Total ⁴	55.3	44.7	51.2	48.8	67.1	32.9	52.3	47.7	66.2	33.8	51.2	48.8	43.3	56.7

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g., teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 24
Tenure Track Status for Full-Time 9 And 12 Month Instructional Faculty
by Institutional Category
for Pennsylvania
1997-2000

Institution type	1997 Full-time faculty total	1998 Full-time faculty total	1999 Full-time faculty total	2000 Full-time faculty total	1997-2000 Full-time faculty total percentage change
Faculty with tenure					
State universities	3,346	3,298	3,185	3,156	-5.7%
State-related universities	3,599	3,558	3,468	3,435	-4.6
Community Colleges	1,289	1,275	1,176	1,102	-14.5
Private state-related	1,107	1,064	1,078	1,057	-4.5
Private colleges and universities	4,705	4,727	4,751	4,695	-0.2
Theological seminaries	74	69	65	62	-16.2
Private two-year colleges	25	20	22	26	4.0
College of technology	35	34	31	30	-14.3
All Institutions	14,180	14,045	13,776	13,563	-4.4
Non-tenured faculty on tenure track					
State universities	804	831	870	947	17.8
State-related universities	982	975	1,049	1,128	14.9
Community Colleges	171	179	194	265	55.0
Private state-related	375	396	431	410	9.3
Private colleges and universities	2,132	2,097	2,093	2,234	4.8
Theological seminaries	22	23	28	40	81.8
Private two-year colleges	2	32	26	22	1,000.0
College of technology	2	11	16	16	700.0
All Institutions	4,490	4,544	4,707	5,062	12.7
Non-tenured faculty not on tenure track					
State universities	368	307	362	317	-13.9
State-related universities	1,441	1,514	1,600	1,781	23.6
Community Colleges	320	295	354	373	16.6
Private state-related	202	235	266	264	30.7
Private colleges and universities	1,259	1,320	1,618	1,706	35.5
Theological seminaries	45	38	47	58	28.9
Private two-year colleges	75	49	46	43	-42.7
College of technology	0	0	0	0	--
All Institutions	3,710	3,758	4,293	4,542	22.4

SOURCE: Data provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2002.

Table 25
Percentage Distribution of Part-Time Instructional Faculty
and Staff That Prefer to be Part-Time by Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Institution type	Percent part-time because part-time is preferred	
	Yes	No
Public research	67.5%	32.5%
Private not-for-profit research	77.2	22.8
Public doctoral ²	a	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	79.6	20.4
Public comprehensive	70.4	29.6
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	84.2	15.8
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	70.7	29.4
Public 2-year	71.2	28.8
Other ³	73.8	26.2
Total ⁴	74.2	25.8

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g. teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities).

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

Table 26
Instructional Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Their Jobs
by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region¹
Fall 1998

Category	Percentage in each satisfaction category:							
	Very dissatisfied		Somewhat dissatisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Very satisfied	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Satisfaction with job overall								
Public research	4.9%	8.3%	12.5%	11.5%	49.8%	45.0%	32.8%	35.2%
Private not-for-profit research	5.2	1.0	7.8	9.4	34.8	41.0	52.2	48.6
Public doctoral ²	2.2	a	9.6	a	49.1	a	39.2	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	2.6	2.6	13.9	8.1	53.4	40.7	30.1	48.6
Public comprehensive	2.0	2.9	13.0	10.1	52.5	58.1	32.4	29.0
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	5.6	1.8	15.1	12.8	40.6	40.5	38.8	44.8
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	0.8	9.7	18.4	10.5	38.0	37.6	42.8	42.2
Public 2-year	1.7	6.3	4.7	8.7	55.8	37.9	37.8	47.1
Other ³	5.2	3.1	10.8	8.3	38.2	42.9	45.8	45.7
Total ⁴	3.5	4.5	11.5	9.8	45.9	42.8	39.1	42.9
Satisfaction overall with instructional duties								
Public research	0.7	3.7	6.4	9.9	59.7	52.6	33.2	33.7
Private not-for-profit research	0.8	1.1	4.8	4.7	47.0	28.1	47.5	66.2
Public doctoral ²	0.0	a	12.3	a	56.1	a	31.6	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	0.0	0.0	17.2	6.5	52.3	44.5	30.5	49.0
Public comprehensive	0.3	1.4	10.3	8.5	57.3	60.8	32.1	29.3
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	1.2	0.0	8.5	8.6	49.5	40.2	40.9	51.2
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	0.5	0.8	2.3	16.6	55.4	33.3	41.9	49.3
Public 2-year	0.0	1.1	7.8	7.4	57.8	42.3	34.4	49.2
Other ³	0.0	1.9	9.4	6.4	47.8	42.8	42.8	48.9
Total ⁴	0.5	1.1	8.1	8.4	54.0	43.4	37.4	47.0
Satisfaction overall with other parts of job								
Public research	1.0	3.0	23.8	31.1	56.3	45.0	19.0	20.9
Private not-for-profit research	2.5	1.0	13.6	18.6	59.7	60.4	24.1	19.9
Public doctoral ²	2.2	a	13.6	a	65.9	a	18.3	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	0.7	0.9	20.3	24.6	58.3	54.5	20.7	19.9
Public comprehensive	0.6	1.8	21.1	27.6	56.3	59.1	22.0	11.5
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	3.8	1.8	27.6	16.4	53.6	57.8	15.0	24.0
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	0.8	3.3	14.9	23.4	58.7	55.9	25.6	17.4
Public 2-year	0.3	4.2	19.4	21.6	56.8	46.7	23.5	27.6
Other ³	0.9	3.0	21.7	20.9	46.2	52.9	31.2	23.2
Total ⁴	1.4	2.6	19.6	22.7	57.1	53.7	21.9	21.1

CONTINUED

**Instructional Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Their Jobs
by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region,¹ Fall 1998 -- (Continued)**

Category	Percentage in each satisfaction category							
	Very dissatisfied		Somewhat dissatisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Very satisfied	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Satisfaction with work load								
Public research	7.2	7.6	19.6	9.6	45.8	34.3	27.3	48.5
Private not-for-profit research	10.4	2.1	16.3	7.8	41.9	41.0	31.4	49.2
Public doctoral ²	3.1	a	21.8	a	57.8	a	17.3	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	11.0	4.0	16.4	8.2	39.7	37.3	32.9	50.5
Public comprehensive	11.6	3.8	23.4	14.5	33.5	35.4	31.5	46.3
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	18.8	0.8	26.0	10.9	28.6	25.0	26.6	63.3
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	7.3	3.8	27.2	19.6	30.9	28.6	34.6	48.0
Public 2-year	10.9	7.1	22.5	7.0	30.3	30.4	36.4	55.5
Other ³	11.0	3.1	13.2	9.8	35.7	34.9	40.0	52.2
Total ⁴	10.3	4.2	20.8	10.7	37.9	32.8	31.0	52.3
Satisfaction with salary								
Public research	18.9	27.5	24.2	31.4	40.2	27.3	16.7	13.9
Private not-for-profit research	12.1	21.7	24.4	26.1	42.1	34.1	21.4	18.1
Public doctoral ²	4.6	a	19.4	a	53.4	a	22.6	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	20.7	21.0	21.2	25.4	45.4	38.4	12.7	15.3
Public comprehensive	13.4	25.6	21.9	32.3	47.0	33.1	17.7	9.0
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	21.9	19.2	32.7	23.2	31.6	41.5	13.7	16.1
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	14.5	22.4	19.0	18.8	43.9	46.5	22.6	12.3
Public 2-year	16.2	20.1	31.6	18.8	31.5	36.5	20.8	24.5
Other ³	15.4	21.4	23.3	33.0	33.0	32.0	28.4	13.7
Total ⁴	15.4	22.0	24.5	25.2	40.9	36.5	19.2	16.3
Satisfaction with benefits								
Public research	6.1	26.9	10.5	26.9	42.0	28.5	41.4	17.7
Private not-for-profit research	4.8	23.2	11.5	27.7	41.4	34.5	42.3	14.7
Public doctoral ²	3.3	a	6.0	a	49.1	a	41.6	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	11.2	34.8	9.2	19.2	44.8	27.2	34.8	18.9
Public comprehensive	3.9	41.1	14.8	19.0	43.1	26.7	38.2	13.2
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	13.0	28.4	21.6	18.1	44.9	34.4	20.5	19.1
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	8.7	38.6	11.3	21.0	45.7	30.6	34.3	9.8
Public 2-year	2.5	37.9	18.2	18.2	48.5	25.5	30.8	18.4
Other ³	6.3	41.3	11.1	24.0	44.2	26.3	38.4	8.4
Total ⁴	6.2	34.8	13.1	20.9	44.2	28.7	36.5	15.6

CONTINUED

**Instructional Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Their Jobs
by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region,¹ Fall 1998 -- (Continued)**

Category	Percentage in each satisfaction category							
	Very dissatisfied		Somewhat dissatisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Very satisfied	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Satisfaction with job security								
Public research	7.0	27.1	12.3	16.4	27.7	24.1	53.0	32.5
Private not-for-profit research	7.8	26.4	8.7	13.4	29.7	23.3	53.8	36.9
Public doctoral ²	4.7	a	10.8	a	31.8	a	52.7	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	8.0	21.7	12.7	16.1	25.6	32.1	53.6	30.2
Public comprehensive	6.8	18.2	7.2	24.3	27.3	33.8	58.7	23.8
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	5.8	16.9	9.3	9.5	27.6	36.6	57.3	37.0
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	2.2	19.4	5.9	13.9	40.9	27.7	51.1	39.1
Public 2-year	3.4	21.5	7.2	14.0	27.6	40.4	61.7	24.1
Other ³	12.2	16.5	5.2	17.9	24.1	38.2	58.6	27.3
Total ⁴	6.4	20.7	8.9	15.7	29.1	33.2	55.7	30.4
Satisfaction with advancement opportunity								
Public research	17.8	34.6	18.2	23.5	32.2	29.5	31.7	12.4
Private not-for-profit research	10.1	25.6	16.7	16.4	29.9	38.1	43.3	19.9
Public doctoral ²	8.7	a	9.3	a	38.6	a	43.4	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	13.1	25.6	17.2	26.7	36.9	26.4	32.8	21.2
Public comprehensive	12.3	27.7	16.1	34.0	36.1	23.3	35.5	14.9
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	11.6	19.1	13.0	19.1	41.9	40.2	33.5	21.6
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	7.4	26.1	12.0	29.1	36.4	24.7	44.3	20.0
Public 2-year	7.3	24.6	20.6	23.4	32.0	26.2	40.1	25.7
Other ³	18.6	19.6	15.6	26.1	29.6	42.1	36.2	12.2
Total ⁴	11.9	24.9	16.0	25.1	34.3	30.4	37.7	19.5
Satisfaction with authority to decide courses taught								
Public research	2.9	5.9	7.6	16.0	42.7	30.5	46.8	47.6
Private not-for-profit research	2.3	4.7	5.3	3.5	30.6	14.0	61.7	77.8
Public doctoral ²	0.0	a	8.3	a	41.5	a	50.2	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	1.5	6.0	8.8	6.3	38.0	35.4	51.6	52.3
Public comprehensive	4.3	9.1	9.4	20.3	35.0	38.9	51.3	31.6
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	5.6	3.8	3.0	11.2	36.3	32.4	55.1	52.6
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	1.1	6.4	9.2	11.8	23.1	32.3	66.6	49.5
Public 2-year	2.2	5.9	6.7	19.6	32.9	25.5	58.2	49.0
Other ³	4.2	8.0	3.7	12.3	41.7	28.0	50.4	51.7
Total ⁴	2.8	6.3	7.0	13.5	35.3	29.8	54.9	50.3

CONTINUED

**Instructional Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Their Jobs
by Employment Status and Institution Type
for the Mid East Region,¹ Fall 1998 -- (Continued)**

Category	Percentage in each satisfaction category							
	Very dissatisfied		Somewhat dissatisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Very satisfied	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Satisfaction with authority to decide course content								
Public research	1.1	3.7	3.2	9.8	16.7	18.4	79.0	68.1
Private not-for-profit research	0.8	1.1	2.3	0.0	14.9	8.2	82.1	90.7
Public doctoral ²	3.1	a	7.9	a	18.2	a	70.9	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	0.4	0.4	2.5	3.7	15.4	18.0	81.8	77.9
Public comprehensive	1.8	1.5	3.9	2.6	12.6	24.1	81.7	71.8
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	3.3	0.0	3.8	2.7	7.0	13.8	86.0	83.5
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	0.5	3.8	1.9	2.7	15.0	13.9	82.7	79.6
Public 2-year	0.5	2.4	3.9	4.2	14.8	17.2	80.8	76.2
Other ³	0.5	3.0	3.4	2.0	13.4	15.7	82.7	79.3
Total ⁴	1.3	1.9	3.4	3.3	14.2	16.6	81.1	78.1
Satisfaction with time available to keep current in field								
Public research	14.1	10.5	28.2	28.7	36.8	32.5	21.0	28.3
Private not-for-profit research	13.2	11.4	23.0	26.0	44.0	34.4	19.7	28.2
Public doctoral ²	18.5	a	45.7	a	22.6	a	13.2	a
Private not-for-profit doctoral ²	8.4	10.0	41.3	21.2	32.7	36.7	17.6	32.2
Public comprehensive	17.1	8.0	38.2	30.0	30.5	39.8	14.2	22.2
Private not-for-profit comprehensive	24.1	4.6	32.8	17.3	30.8	48.4	12.2	29.7
Private not-for-profit liberal arts	17.0	5.1	32.2	32.0	32.0	33.4	18.7	29.5
Public 2-year	13.9	10.5	37.4	18.9	31.5	33.6	17.2	37.0
Other ³	13.1	6.0	30.7	23.5	31.1	35.6	25.1	34.9
Total ⁴	15.4	8.3	33.0	23.9	33.9	37.0	17.7	30.8

1. The Mid East Region consists of Delaware, District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. This table includes only faculty and staff with instructional responsibilities for credit (e.g. teaching one or more classes for credit, or advising or supervising students' academic activities). Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

2. Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical school and medical centers.

3. Public liberal arts, private not-for-profit 2-year, and other specialized institutions except medical schools and medical centers.

4. All public and private, not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the Mid East Region.

a. The number of valid cases is too small to produce a reliable estimate (fewer than 30 cases).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamany, David. "A University President Reflects on the Role of Adjunct Faculty in the Contemporary Research University" (Wayne State University, 1997).
- American Association of University Professors. *State Legislation Affecting Part-time Faculty: A Report from the AAUP Committee on Government Relations*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, June 2001. <http://www.aaup.org/Issues/part-time/ptleg-01.htm> (accessed February 7, 2002).
- _____. *Background Facts: Part-time Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors. <http://www.aaup.org/issues/part-time/Ptfacts.htm> (last accessed May 19, 2003).
- _____. "Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty." *Academe* 84 (January/February 1998): 54-60.
- American Federation of Teachers, Higher Education Department. *The Vanishing Professor*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers (November 24, 1998). http://www.aft.org/higher_ed/reports/professor/index.html (accessed February 6, 2002).
- Arden, Eugene. "Ending the Loneliness and Isolation of Adjunct Professors." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 41 (July 1995).
- Benjamin, Ernst. "Variations in the Characteristics of Part-Time Faculty by General Fields of Instruction and Research." *New Directions For Higher Education: The Growing Use of Part-time Faculty: Understanding Causes and Effects* 104, vol. 26 (D.W. Leslie, ed., Winter 1998): 45-59.
- Berger, Leslie. "The Rise of the Perma-Temp." *New York Times*, August 4, 2002. <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed August 8, 2002).
- Bishara, Michael N., Charles R. King and Tony Lotito, Jr. "Part-time Faculty in Technology: Special Needs, Special Responses." *Proceedings from National Conference on Professional Development of Part-Time Occupational/Technical Faculty*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education (November 1990): 59-72.

- Cline, L. "Work to School Transition: Part-Time Faculty Bring Expertise, Challenges to Colleges." *Vocational Education Journal* 68 (February 1993): 26-27, 49.
- Cox, Ana Marie. "Study Shows Colleges' Dependence on Their Part-time Instructors." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 47 (December 1, 2000): A12-A14.
- Foster, David and Edith. "It's a Buyer's Market: 'Disposable Professors,' Grade Inflation, and Other Problems." *Academe* 84 (January/February 1998): 28-35.
- Fulton, Richard D. "The Plight of Part-Timers in Higher Education." *Change* 32 (May/June 2000): 38-43.
- Gappa, Judith M. "Part-time Faculty: Higher Education at a Crossroads." Association for the Study of Higher Education, ERIC Digest 84-4 (ERIC Identifier: ED284513). Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1984. http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed284513.html (last accessed May 19, 2003).
- Haggerty, Timothy. "First Person: Confessions of a Grade Inflator." *Post-Gazette*, December 15, 2001. <http://www.postgazette.com/forum/20011215edhag1215p3.asp> (accessed January 21, 2002).
- Leitzel, Thomas C. "Implementing a Team Teaching Approach for Part-time Faculty Development." *Proceedings From National Conference on Professional Development of Part-time Occupational/Technical Faculty*, Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education (November 1990): 139-151.
- Louziotis Jr., Demetrios. "The Role of Adjuncts: Bridging the Dark Side and the Ivory Tower." *Review of Business* 21 (Fall/Winter 2000): 47-52.
- Moser, Richard. *The New Academic Labor System, Corporatization and the Renewal of Academic Citizenship*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, June 12, 2001. <http://www.aaup.org/Issues/part-time/cewmoser.htm> (last accessed May 19, 2003).
- National Education Association. "Will Part-Timers Win Parity?" *NEA Today* (November 1998): 11-15.
- Pankin, Robert and Carla Weiss. "Introduction." *Part-time Faculty in Higher Education: A Selected Annotated Bibliography*. <http://www.providence.edu/soc/pankin.intro.htm> (last accessed May 19, 2003).
- Pennsylvania Department of Education. *Colleges and Universities: Education Digest*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education, various years.

Pennsylvania Department of General Services. *The Pennsylvania Manual, Volume 115*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of General Services, December 2001.

Pennsylvania General Assembly, Joint State Government Commission. *Instructional Output and Faculty Salary Costs of the State-Related and State-Owned Universities*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania General Assembly, Joint State Government Commission, February 2003.

Philadelphia Area Workers' Rights Board. *Hearings on the Conditions for Part-Time Faculty at Community College of Philadelphia* (November 2, 2001).

Stephens, Angela and Wright, Scott W. "The Part-time Faculty Paradox." *Community College Week* 11 (January 25, 1999): 6-10.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *Background Characteristics, Work Activities, and Compensation of Faculty and Instructional Staff in Postsecondary Institutions: Fall 1998*, NCES 2001-152, by Linda J. Zimble. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001.

_____. *The Condition of Education 2002*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002.

_____. *Institutional Policies and Practices: Results From the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Institution Survey*, NCES 2001-201, by Andrea Berger, et al. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 2001.

_____. *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty NSOPF:99*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 2001.

Voci, Carol. *32nd Annual Faculty Salaries and Selected Terms and Conditions of Employment: Pennsylvania Community Colleges, 2002-2003*. Pittsburgh, PA: Community College of Allegheny County, 2002.

Worthen, Helena and Joe Berry. *Contingent Faculty in Public Higher Education in Pennsylvania, Spring 1999: Focus on Community Colleges*. Harrisburg, PA: Keystone Research Center, 1999.

APPENDIX 1:
HOUSE RESOLUTIONS

House Resolution 376 of 2001..... 79
House Resolution 676 of 2002..... 83

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE RESOLUTION

No. 376 Session of
2001

INTRODUCED BY ROEBUCK, D. EVANS, JAMES, WOJNAROSKI, HERMAN,
SHANER, YOUNGBLOOD, CURRY, BELFANTI, CREIGHTON, GRUCELA,
JOSEPHS, MELIO AND CRUZ, DECEMBER 5, 2001

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES, DECEMBER 5, 2001

A RESOLUTION

1 Directing the Joint State Government Commission to establish a
2 task force to study issues relating to the quality of
3 education and the increased employment of part-time faculty
4 at the Commonwealth's institutions of higher education and to
5 make a report to the House of Representatives.

6 WHEREAS, Over the past 30 years, institutions of higher
7 education have increased the practice of hiring part-time
8 instructors, and the Statewide percentage of part-time
9 instructors has dramatically increased from 22% in 1970 to 43%
10 currently; and

11 WHEREAS, The percentage of part-time workers in Pennsylvania
12 as a percent of all employees has slowly increased on average
13 4.7% from 16.1% in 1979 to 20.8% in 1996; and

14 WHEREAS, Calculations of the Department of Education for
15 1995-1996 indicated that approximately 76% of the Commonwealth's
16 community college faculty employees were part-time employees
17 when graduate instructional and research assistants were
18 included; and

19 WHEREAS, Part-time instructors receive a lower wage per

1 credit hour and generally earn 40% of what their full-time
2 colleagues earn per course; and

3 WHEREAS, Most part-time instructors receive no health
4 insurance or other benefits from their employment at the
5 Commonwealth's institutions of higher education; and

6 WHEREAS, The increased use of part-time faculty results in
7 considerable economic hardship for part-time faculty members and
8 has the potential for limiting college instruction as a career
9 for prospective faculty; and

10 WHEREAS, There is a need for a comprehensive examination of
11 whether any adverse impact on the quality of education at
12 institutions of higher education in this Commonwealth originates
13 from the institutions' increased employment of part-time faculty
14 and instructors and the resulting two-tiered structure of
15 faculty employees at those institutions; therefore be it

16 RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives direct the Joint
17 State Government Commission to conduct a study on the impact of
18 an increasing trend in the use of part-time faculty on the
19 quality of education provided at institutions of higher
20 education in this Commonwealth; and be it further

21 RESOLVED, That the study shall also examine whether the two-
22 tiered faculty structure has an adverse impact on part-time
23 faculty and their families and whether it discourages
24 prospective instructors and faculty from entering or remaining
25 in the college instruction profession; and be it further

26 RESOLVED, That to assist in the accomplishment of this goal
27 the Joint State Government Commission establish a task force of
28 six members of the House of Representatives which shall consist
29 of the chairman of the Education Committee of the House of
30 Representatives or a designee, the minority chairman of the

1 Education Committee of the House of Representatives or a
2 designee, two members of the House of Representatives to be
3 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives or
4 their designees and two members to be appointed by the Minority
5 Leader of the House of Representatives or their designees; and
6 be it further

7 RESOLVED, That the task force create an advisory committee
8 composed of individuals deemed appropriate by the task force;
9 and be it further

10 RESOLVED, That the task force report its findings and
11 recommendations to the House of Representatives not later than
12 October 1, 2002.

1 force continue to serve in that capacity.

APPENDIX 2:

SELECTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania.....	86
State-Related Universities in Pennsylvania	86
Community Colleges in Pennsylvania.....	87
Private Colleges and Universities in Pennsylvania.....	88
Theological Seminaries in Pennsylvania	90
Private Two-Year Colleges in Pennsylvania	90
State School of Technology	90

State-Owned Universities in Pennsylvania. The State System of Higher Education, which governs the state-owned universities, was created by Act 188 of 1982 and can trace its history back to the establishment and state purchase of teacher-training institutions in Pennsylvania (“normal schools”).³⁶ The state-owned universities in Pennsylvania are as follows.

- Bloomsburg University
- California University
- Cheyney University
- Clarion University
- East Stroudsburg University
- Edinboro University
- Indiana University
- Kutztown University
- Lock Haven University
- Mansfield University
- Millersville University
- Shippensburg University
- Slippery Rock University
- West Chester University

State-Related Universities in Pennsylvania. State-related universities are so classified because of their initial charter or subsequent legislation that defined such institutions as “instrumentalities of the Commonwealth.”³⁷ The state-related universities in Pennsylvania are as follows.

- Lincoln University
- Penn State University³⁸
- Temple University
- University of Pittsburgh

³⁶ Pennsylvania Department of Education website, <http://www.pdehighered.state.pa.us> (last accessed April 25, 2003).

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ Includes the Penn College of Technology and the Penn State Dickinson School of Law.

Community Colleges in Pennsylvania. Under Article XIX-A of the Pennsylvania Public School Code of 1949, a community college is defined as “a public college or technical institute which is established and operated in accordance with the provisions of this act by a local sponsor which provides a two-year, postsecondary, college-parallel, terminal-general, terminal-technical, out-of-school youth or adult education program or any combination of these. The community college may also provide area vocational-technical education services to secondary senior high school students.”³⁹ The community colleges in Pennsylvania are as follows.⁴⁰

Bucks County Community College
Butler County Community College
Cambria County Area Community College
Community College of Allegheny County
Community College of Beaver County
Community College of Philadelphia
Delaware County Community College
Harrisburg Area Community College
Lehigh Carbon Community College
Luzerne County Community College
Montgomery County Community College
Northampton County Area Community College
Reading Area Community College
Westmoreland County Community College

³⁹ Act of Mar. 10, 1949, P.L.30, No.14, amended by the act of July 1, 1985, P.L. 103, No. 31, which added Article XIX-A (community colleges).

⁴⁰ CAM Tech (formerly Northwest PA Technical Institute) is no longer part of the group of Pennsylvania community colleges. It became a private two-year college in 2001. Carol Voci, *32nd Annual Faculty Salaries & Selected Terms and Condition of Employment: Pennsylvania Community Colleges, 2002-2003* (Pittsburgh, PA: Community College of Allegheny County, 2002).

Private Colleges and Universities in Pennsylvania. The following is a list of private colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. Those marked with an asterisk are classified as private state-aided institutions.

Albright College
Allegheny College
Alvernia College
American College
Arcadia University
Art Institute of Philadelphia
Art Institute of Pittsburgh
Baptist Bible College and Seminary
Bryn Athyn College of the New Church
Bryn Mawr College
Bucknell University
Cabrini College
Carlow College
Carnegie-Mellon University
Cedar Crest College
Chatham College
Chestnut Hill College
College Misericordia
Curtis Institute of Music
Delaware Valley College (of Sciences and Agriculture)
DeSales University
* Drexel University
Dickinson College
Duquesne University (of the Holy Ghost)
Eastern University
Elizabethtown College
Franklin and Marshall College
Gannon University
Geneva College
Gettysburg College
Gratz College (Hebrew Education Society of Philadelphia)
Grove City College
Gwynedd-Mercy College
Haverford College (The Corporation of)
Holy Family College
Immaculata College
Juniata College
Keystone College
King's College
La Roche College
La Salle University
Lafayette College
Lake Erie College of Osteopathic Medicine

Lancaster Bible College
 Lebanon Valley College
 Lehigh University
 Lycoming College
 * MCP Hahnemann University
 Marywood University
 Mercyhurst College
 Messiah College
 Moore College of Art and Design
 Moravian College/Theological Seminary
 Mount Aloysius College
 Muhlenberg College
 Neumann College
 * O.S. Johnson Technical Institute
 Pierce College
 Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts
 * Pennsylvania College of Optometry
 Pennsylvania School of Art and Design
 Philadelphia Biblical University
 * Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine
 Philadelphia University
 Point Park College
 Reconstructionist Rabbinical College
 Robert Morris College
 Rosemont College (of the Holy Child Jesus)
 St. Francis College
 St Joseph's University
 St. Vincent College
 Seton Hill College
 Susquehanna University
 Swarthmore College
 Thiel College
 * Thomas Jefferson University
 * University of Pennsylvania
 University of Scranton
 * The University of the Arts
 University of the Sciences in Philadelphia
 Ursinus College
 Valley Forge Christian College (Assembly of God)
 Villanova University
 Washington and Jefferson College
 Waynesburg College
 Westminster College
 Widener University
 Widener University School of Law
 Wilkes University
 Wilson College
 York College of Pennsylvania

Theological Seminaries in Pennsylvania. The theological seminaries in Pennsylvania are as follows.

Biblical Theological Seminary
Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary
Christ the Savior Seminary
Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Evangelical School of Theology
Faith Theological Seminary
Lancaster Theological Seminary
Lutheran Theological Seminary (Gettysburg)
Lutheran Theological Seminary (Philadelphia)
Pittsburgh Theological Seminary
Reformed Episcopal Seminary
Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Saint Charles Borromeo
Saint Tikhon's Orthodox Theological Seminary
St. Vincent Seminary
Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
Westminster Theological Seminary

Private Two-Year Colleges in Pennsylvania. The private two-year colleges in Pennsylvania are as follows.⁴¹

Central Penn College
Harcum College
Lackawanna Junior College
Manor College
Pennsylvania Institute of Technology
Valley Forge Military College

State School of Technology. The State School of Technology in Pennsylvania is the Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology.

⁴¹ See note 40.

APPENDIX 3:
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (APRIL 10, 2003)

In Pennsylvania and across the United States, higher education institutions, both public and private, are relying increasingly upon part-time faculty members to teach for-credit and not-for-credit courses. While there are disputes about the reasons for this trend, it is undisputedly related, at least in part, to economics. In fact, part-time faculty members typically are compensated at a lesser rate with fewer collateral costs than are full-time faculty members. Especially in the public sector, these efforts to seek relatively lesser faculty costs are explained as a reaction to inadequate public subsidies combined with a need to ameliorate the need for higher student tuition. In addition, institutions cite educationally related reasons for the use of part-time faculty that include significant increases and fluctuations in enrollment and the need for faculty focused on specific specialty areas of study.

In Pennsylvania, the increasing utilization of part-time faculty has been especially significant at the community colleges. These community colleges are each established and financially supported by local communities and the state and governed by locally appointed boards of trustees. Each community college acts independent of the others and its policies for employee salaries, benefits and working conditions is determined by the institution, always subject to the rights provided employees by Pennsylvania's collective bargaining law for public employees, which covers community college staff and faculty.

Although Pennsylvania state lawmakers have a long tradition of not intervening in the management affairs of public and private higher education institutions in the state, there is a legitimate public interest to be served by attention to the fair treatment of public employees. The employing colleges exist as a matter of action by public officials, they are governed as provided in state law, and they are supported with a substantial amount of public funds. The assurance of fair treatment is provided primarily, although not exclusively, through the state's collective bargaining law for public employees.

There is also a public interest in assuring that students who attend public or private colleges and universities, with the benefit of direct institutional subsidies or other forms of direct or indirect student financial assistance provided by public funds, have the benefit of quality educational programs that are instructed by appropriately prepared, supported and compensated faculty members, both part-time and full-time.

Because it is at the Commonwealth's fourteen community colleges that the use of part-time faculty is most prevalent, and increasingly so, and also because it is at the fourteen community colleges that we witness the most intensive use of public funds to support the institution directly as well as to directly support students, the Advisory Committee for the Part-Time Faculty Task Force chooses to focus its recommendations on issues pertaining to part-time faculty at community colleges. Nonetheless, the goals and principles that underlie most of the recommendations should also be considered for voluntary application at each higher education institution in Pennsylvania, especially in the public sector.

Finally, it is the intention of the Advisory Committee that the recommendations relevant to part-time faculty members at community colleges be voluntarily implemented, sometimes with special financial incentives funded by the General Assembly as suggested in the recommendations.

1. Community college administrators and trustees, and those who represent full-time and part-time faculty, should recognize the increasingly significant role of part-time faculty at community colleges, and should support policies and practices that provide fair salaries, benefits and working conditions for all employees of community colleges, including part-time faculty.
2. While faculty and staff salaries and benefits will continue to be determined according to the decision-making processes identified for each community college, the General Assembly should recognize that in order to support the capacity of each community college to fund costs related to any increase in salaries and benefits for part-time and full-time faculty and staff, and to ameliorate the impact on student tuition, it is imperative that the General Assembly ensure that adequate state funding is appropriated to fulfill the state's community college funding obligations provided in current law.
3. Part-time faculty at community colleges should be paid a salary which fairly reflects the extent to which their qualifications, experience and job responsibilities are similar to and different from those of full-time faculty.
4. Community colleges should provide part-time faculty access to existing health insurance benefits and retirement benefits and the General Assembly should provide categorical financial incentives to community colleges that would assist a college to provide financial support for such health insurance and retirement benefits.
5. Community colleges should provide to all faculty, full-time and part-time, the working conditions necessary for all faculty members to perform their teaching and related responsibilities.

6. Community colleges and organizations representing faculty should support opportunities for the part-time faculty members to participate in professional development activities, including conferences and workshops, and to apply for and utilize grants, in a manner similar to the opportunities afforded full-time faculty members. The General Assembly should provide categorical financial incentives to community colleges that would assist a college to provide financial support for professional development opportunities for part-time faculty members.
7. Community college administrators and faculty representatives should work together to implement all steps necessary to ensure that part-time faculty members and their representatives are engaged in decision-making or advisory processes of the college as full-time faculty and their representatives are engaged.
8. After the successful completion of an appropriate probationary period, and subject to continuing successful evaluations as determined by each institution, a part-time faculty member at a community college should be given priority for re-appointment to appropriate part-time teaching assignments, and should be assured fair consideration in hiring for full-time teaching positions.
9. The General Assembly should amend the Public School Code to require community colleges to submit annual data to the Commonwealth as other higher education institutions submit in the annual “Snyder Reports.”
10. The administrators, trustees and faculty of all colleges and universities in the Commonwealth, both public and private, should consider the objectives and principles that underlie Recommendations #1 through #8 and should consider their appropriate voluntary application for each higher education institution in Pennsylvania.
11. The Task Force on Part-Time Faculty should conduct at least one public hearing to hear comments about these recommendations and related issues pertaining to part-time faculty.
12. In addition to appropriating adequate state funds to fulfill the state’s community college funding obligations under current law, the General Assembly should appropriate funds to assist community colleges in the implementation of these recommendations with categorical financial incentives, with an initial annual appropriation of four million dollars.