

Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal

Volume 9 | Number 2

Article 8

November 2020

Jesuit Colleges Meet Market Forces: How Ought We to Respond?

AnaMaria Conley

Regis University, aconley@regis.edu

Aimee Wheaton

Regis University, awheaton@regis.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Online and Distance Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Conley, AnaMaria and Wheaton, Aimee (2020) "Jesuit Colleges Meet Market Forces: How Ought We to Respond?," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal*: Vol. 9: No. 2, Article 8.

Available at: <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol9/iss2/8>

This Scholarship is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarly and Peer-Reviewed Journals at ePublications at Regis University. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal* by an authorized administrator of ePublications at Regis University. For more information, please contact epublications@regis.edu.

Jesuit Colleges Meet Market Forces: How to Respond?

AnaMaria Conley
Associate Professor of Economics
Anderson College of Business and Computing
Regis University
aconley@regis.edu

Aimee Wheaton
Professor of Business Management
Anderson College of Business and Computing
Regis University
awheaton@regis.edu

Abstract

Jesuit higher education faces the challenge of responding to changes in market conditions while maintaining its mission. Fiscal pressures arise from declining public support for higher education and increased competition. Degree-granting, for-profit institutions are increasingly competing with traditional universities. Institutions of higher education are adapting to these external pressures in part by changing the composition and working conditions of faculty. As part of this national trend, Jesuit institutions must ensure their response to the increasingly complex environment is consistent with Jesuit values. This paper focuses on the tensions caused by changing market conditions, faculty composition and working conditions, and the Jesuit mission.

Introduction

A confluence of disruptive pressures is eliciting changes in the composition of faculty in both Catholic and secular universities. We begin by describing the external pressures on universities and their responses in terms of changing faculty composition and faculty roles. We find that Catholic institutions have participated in the national trend toward greater reliance on short-term and part-time faculty contracts. Next, we evaluate these internal changes through the lens of Jesuit values and Catholic Social Teaching. Whether in ground-based courses, distance learning courses, liberal arts courses, or vocational-technical courses, Jesuit pedagogy takes place in both moral and intellectual frameworks.¹ As we move from long-term contractual relationships to short-term and part-time faculty in the name of *cura apostolica*, we raise the question: are we keeping faculty engaged with the Jesuit mission and Ignatian pedagogy? We close by asking each of the Jesuit institutions to reflect explicitly on the role of and working conditions for contingent faculty and to use their institutional

resources to implement policies and work environments that are fiscally responsible while still preserving the dignity of work for all employees

External Pressures on Universities

Institutions of higher education are in a time of transition as they face changes in funding sources, pressure from increased competition, and new technologies that have changed course delivery. Fiscal pressures arise from declining public funding support and increased competition. New technologies are enabling e-learning and distance learning environments, often in a for-profit context. These external pressures are changing the operational and competitive environment for higher education institutions.

Federal support for institutions is waning. In 2002-03, private, four-year, degree-granting institutions reported that federal sources provided 16 percent of total revenue, whereas by 2014-15 the federal share of total revenue had fallen to 12 percent. In constant 2015-16 dollars, private, four-

year, degree-granting institutions reported that federal appropriations and grants fell from \$8,099 per full-time equivalent student in 2002-03 to \$7,234 in 2014-15. The decline in public support resulted in rising tuition and fees from \$17,301 per full-time equivalent student to \$20,880 at these institutions.²

Traditional institutions of higher education are facing increased competition from the for-profit sector. The for-profit institutions utilize technology to offer online learning and focus on a student population suited for online education. Online delivery of education is lower cost and represents a disruptive innovation for higher education.³ Full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollment at for-profit degree-granting institutions grew from 86,891 in 1995 to 219,875 in 2000, or by 153 percent, much faster than the 10 percent growth in enrollment at four-year private, nonprofit institutions and faster than the 6 percent growth in enrollment at public four-year institutions over the same period. Between 2000 and 2005, FTE enrollment at for-profit institutions grew even faster, from 219,875 to 654,953, or by slightly less than 200 percent. By contrast, during the same period, FTE enrollment at public four-year institutions and at four-year private, nonprofit institutions grew by 14 percent and 13 percent, respectively. FTE enrollment at for-profit institutions peaked at 1.26 million in 2010.⁴

To what extent are Jesuit Catholic and non-Jesuit Catholic institutions competing with for-profit institutions? In 2015-16, data from the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) indicate that most Jesuit Catholic institutions offered only a small percent of their programs through distance education. In Fall 2015, the median number of programs offered at Jesuit institutions was 110, of which the median number of distance education programs was four programs, about 3 or 4 percent of the median number of programs. By comparison, in the non-Jesuit Catholic institutions in our sample, the median number of programs offered was sixty-eight programs in 2015-16, of which the median number of distance education programs was two programs, or 3 percent of the median sixty-eight programs.⁵ The medians, however, understate the extent to which some Jesuit and non-Jesuit

Catholic universities compete in the distance education market. In 2015-16, at seven of the twenty-eight Jesuit institutions, distance education programs were 10 percent or more of total programs: Canisius College (17 percent); Gonzaga University (10 percent); Loyola University New Orleans (10 percent); Regis University (62 percent); Saint Joseph's University (16 percent); University of Detroit Mercy (10 percent); and Wheeling Jesuit University (27 percent). By comparison, at forty-one (28 percent) of the 144 non-Jesuit Catholic institutions in our sample, distance education programs were 10 percent or more of total programs offered.⁶ In line with the Jesuit mission, distance education allows these seven Jesuit and forty-one non-Jesuit Catholic institutions to expand the market they serve, but they must do so while competing directly with the part-time, low-wage faculty model of for-profit institutions. Recommendations on how to address this issue are given later in the paper.

For-profit educational enterprises have expanded through growing volume and unit profit margins, which they have achieved in part through standardized curricula taught by a primarily part-time faculty.⁷ Their part-time faculty workforce has no expectations of research or service to the institution.⁸ Tenure and shared governance are absent. Because their students are often working adults who do not need facilities and services found on traditional campuses, for-profit institutions are able to cut the costs associated with these amenities, focusing instead on the convenient course availability their students value.⁹

Both for-profit and nonprofit institutions have adopted new technologies and new methods of delivering education to a larger volume of students at a lower cost. Distance and online learning are increasingly popular among traditional and non-traditional students.¹⁰ The technology has expanded the potential market by allowing geographically dispersed students to take courses at any time of day from any computer location. A standardized course shell can be created, with faculty providing subject matter expertise and curriculum designers providing technical support. This new way of structuring the work, called unbundling, separates the work typically done by a professor to develop and deliver his or her class.¹¹

The institution then offers many sections of the course by employing low-wage, part-time instructors who are not directly involved in curriculum development.¹² The online educational delivery method is more flexible for both the institution and the student. It does, however, change the way students and professors interact.

Declining federal support, increased competition from institutions relying on a part-time, low-paid faculty workforce, and new technologies are changing the landscape of higher education. These external factors are outside the control of any institution of higher education but strongly influence internal strategic choices. Of significant relevance for this paper are changes in faculty composition and in the role of administrative staff.

Internal Changes and Trends within Institutions of Higher Education

Faculty composition and administrative roles are evolving. The composition of faculty has shifted away from full-time, tenure track and tenured faculty in favor of faculty on short-term contracts, hereafter referred to as contingent faculty.¹³ In making this change, universities are creating a tiered faculty composed of a mix of part-time and full-time non-tenure track, tenure track, and tenured faculty.¹⁴ Along with changes in the composition of the faculty, the numbers of administrators are increasing.¹⁵ These trends are influencing internal policies of institutions as job responsibilities shift.

Data show a movement away from full-time and tenured faculty. In 1999, 58 percent of all faculty at degree-granting institutions (including two-year colleges) were full-time employees; by 2015, 52 percent were full-time employees.¹⁶ Four-year institutions have moved away from tenure. A larger share of public, four-year institutions offered tenure in 2015-16 (95 percent) compared to 1993-94 (93 percent); however, among four-year public institutions that offered tenure, a smaller percent of full-time faculty was tenured in 2015-16 (47 percent) than in 1993-94 (56 percent). At private nonprofit institutions, the movement away from tenure was more pronounced. The percent of private nonprofit institutions offering tenure fell from 66 percent in 1993-19 to 61

percent in 2015-16. Furthermore, at those private nonprofit institutions that offered tenure, the share of full-time faculty with tenure fell from 50 percent in 1993-94 to 43 percent in 2015-16.¹⁷

The movement toward full-time and part-time contingent faculty has occurred across institutional types. At public research institutions, between 2003 and 2008 total instructional faculty grew by 8 percent, compared to a growth of 16 percent in the number of contingent faculty. Between 2008 and 2013, total instructional faculty grew by 19 percent, and the number of contingent faculty by 36 percent. At public master's institutions, growth in total instructional faculty and in contingent faculty followed a similar pattern. The shift was most pronounced at public bachelor's institutions: between 2003 and 2008, total instructional faculty grew by 11 percent, compared to a growth of 18 percent in the number of contingent faculty. The change accelerated between 2008 and 2013, as total instructional faculty grew by 35 percent, while the number of contingent faculty grew by 87 percent. The same pattern occurred at private institutions. For example, at private research institutions total instructional faculty grew by 11 percent between 2003 and 2008 and by 14 percent between 2008 and 2013; however, the number of contingent faculty at these institutions grew 17 percent in both time periods. A similar shift occurred at private master's institutions and private bachelor's institutions.¹⁸

Different contract lengths reflect different employment models. Non-tenure eligible faculty focus on teaching and now teach a majority of U.S. college students.¹⁹ Tenured faculty are expected to teach, research, and serve their institution through shared governance models. Tenured and tenure track faculty are financially more expensive but generate research and provide service to their institution. They are protected professionals and have significant autonomy in the development and delivery of their classes and research agendas. They also participate in committee work and the shared governance of their institutions. Critics argue that tenure discourages faculty productivity and decreases the ability of the institution to adjust to changes in the market.²⁰

Contingent faculty often teach part-time and, on a course-by-course basis, may earn as little as one-third as much as a full-time faculty.²¹ Close to one-third of them earn an income that places them near or below the federal poverty line.²² From the university's perspective, contingent faculty provide a lower cost, flexible labor force. Non-tenure track faculty tend to earn substantially less income than tenured or tenure track faculty. One study estimates that, on an hourly basis, the median full-time non-tenure track faculty earns roughly 27 percent less than the median full-time tenure track faculty; the median part-time non-tenure track faculty earns 40 percent less than median full-time tenure track faculty.²³ Contingent faculty may also face job insecurity, limited or no benefits, and lack of institutional support in the form of office space and administrative support. There are anecdotal indications that part-time, contingent faculty are struggling with their current working conditions. For example, a National Adjunct Walkout Day in 2015 resulted in protests and rallies on dozens of college campuses, including one Jesuit institution. This event was designed to bring to light the poor wages and working conditions for those not on the tenure track. In effect, what is being created is a tiered faculty comprised of tenure track and tenured faculty on the one hand and, on the other hand, lower-paid faculty on multi-year, one-year, or less-than-one-year contracts.²⁴ It is not uncommon for contingent faculty to teach at multiple institutions in order to earn a living. This commitment to multiple institutions may limit the capacity of part-time and non-tenured faculty to enact the Jesuit mission and pedagogy.

Administrative roles within universities are evolving as well. Universities are hiring more administrative staff that do not have faculty experience, with these administrators often setting institutional priorities.²⁵ Schools are increasing the number of non-academic administrators on staff.²⁶ These administrators serve a variety of functions, such as enrolling and retaining students, providing academic support, and contributing as student life staff. The expanding role of administrators is changing the role of faculty. Administrators have discretion over restructuring of academic programs and control over new forms of instructional technologies.²⁷ With fewer permanent faculty available to participate in shared governance, administrators exert greater

influence over academic matters. Faculty members are increasingly treated as "employees" rather than as largely autonomous professionals.²⁸ These internal trends and changes in higher education have the potential to influence the application of Jesuit Catholic values within Jesuit Catholic institutions. Specifically, as Jesuit higher education increasingly employs contingent faculty that have little voice in university governance and in academic affairs, we must ask whether the conditions of work align with human dignity, a foundational concept of Catholic Social Teaching and of *cura personalis*. We describe now how genuinely human development figures in Catholic Social Teaching and, therefore, in the mission and policies of Jesuit Catholic higher education.

Jesuit Catholic Mission and Policies

The mission of an organization defines an organization's identity and guides its strategic direction, institutional priorities, and goals. Furthermore, the mission provides a strategic framework that impels the organization's response to changes in its external and internal environment. The importance of mission is particularly true of Catholic universities, where they embrace a mission and spirituality.²⁹ The Catholic university mission is further defined in *Ex corde ecclesiae*.

In his 1990 encyclical letter *Ex corde ecclesiae*, Pope John Paul II describes the Catholic university as "an academic community which, in a rigorous and critical fashion, assists in the protection and advancement of human dignity and of a cultural heritage through research, teaching and various services offered to the local, national, and international communities."³⁰ Catholic Social Teaching holds that, endowed with an innate dignity by the Creator, human persons have a capacity for self-consciousness, self-expression, self-determination, spiritual seeking, and a social life.³¹ The purpose of a just social order is the genuine development of each person and the universal good of all creation. The strategy and efforts of our institutions must remain oriented towards this larger purpose of genuinely human formation and the advancement of the common good. This regard for the human person underlies *cura personalis*, a Latin phrase for all aspects of the human person as well as a responsibility towards

others. In Catholic institutions, *cura personalis* must be balanced with *cura apostolica*, care of the institution itself.

How do Jesuit institutions operationalize and balance *cura personalis* and *cura apostolica*? In the case of students, *cura personalis* requires access, affordability, workforce relevant education and transference of knowledge and skills against the backdrop of moral and intellectual frameworks that seek the truth and the good of all. Jesuit institutions are called to remain accessible and affordable for all students, especially for first-generation students and students from marginalized communities.³² Moreover, if students are to become productive members of the common good, their university education must give them a means of developing capabilities and skills appropriate for successful participation in the workforce. In this regard, market-driven programs and distance education can be used in the service of the common good. However, *cura personalis*, the care of the whole person, is not merely a matter of equality of access or of valuable job skills. Nor is *cura personalis* limited to care of students, whose education occurs in the context of an institution comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators. The Church envisions human persons as active, responsible subjects of their own growth, a growth which occurs in the context of relationships with other persons: “*Cura personalis* is a reminder to us, as university employees, that our treatment of both our colleagues and our students include the care and respect for the entire individual.”³³ As we move to distance learning and a tiered faculty, how have these affected the quality of life and the relationships between students, faculty, administrators, and staff?

If our contingent faculty have little voice in university governance and in academic affairs, have we ignored elements of their dignity, specifically, their capacity for self-expression and self-determination? Does lack of institutional support in the form of office space and administrative support isolate contingent faculty from the university community, impoverishing their social life in the university? Do low pay and lack of benefits compromise the capacity of contingent faculty to provide basic human needs? As each institution wrestles with resource

constraints, has the institution reflected on these questions as it sets pay, benefits, and other institutional policies? These concerns for persons must be balanced with *cura apostolica*, which refers to the care for the work, the ministry and, in our case, the institution of higher education: “Although it is important that we care for the whole person, it is equally important that we care for the institution itself. Without a vibrant and effective institution, the work we do is endangered.”³⁴ As we seek to remain economically viable, we must insist on an accessible, affordable, and workforce relevant Jesuit education that protects the dignity of all stakeholders and that is delivered within a moral framework and a search for truth. Jesuit pedagogy is a vehicle through which *cura personalis* and *cura apostolica* are executed.

Whether in ground-based courses, distance learning courses, liberal arts courses, or vocational-technical courses, Jesuit pedagogy takes place in both moral and intellectual frameworks.³⁵ The role of faculty in Jesuit pedagogy is that of guiding students in asking and addressing the difficult and foundational questions. Within Jesuit pedagogy, it is the teacher’s role to facilitate the learner’s growth.³⁶ To fulfil this role, however, faculty must be qualified in their disciplines, committed to the Jesuit mission, and trained in Jesuit pedagogy. In the past, the way to keep faculty engaged in our Jesuit Catholic mission was through long-term formation supported by full-time tenured employment. In the past, forming such a faculty occurred in the context of long-term, connected relationships between faculty member and institution. As the next section shows, a significant share of the faculty workforce—including faculty at Jesuit institutions and non-Jesuit Catholic institutions—are on short-term contracts and on part-time contracts. Short-term contracts and part-time contracts allow institutions to reduce costs and impart greater flexibility to respond to fluctuations in enrollment. As we move to contingent faculty contracts in the name of *cura apostolica*, Jesuit higher education faces the challenge of fostering connected relationships with these faculty members that facilitate their formation and engagement in the Jesuit tradition. Without this connection and formation, institutions may risk compromising the capacity and willingness of contingent faculty to embrace Jesuit pedagogy.

How are we responding?

An opportunity to examine Jesuit faculty is through the IPEDS survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). To compare Jesuit and other institutions, we extracted Fall 2015 faculty data for a sample of 803 private, nonprofit, doctoral, masters, and baccalaureate institutions. The sample included 631 non-Catholic nonprofit private institutions, 144 non-Jesuit Catholic institutions, and twenty-eight Jesuit institutions.

The IPEDS data indicate that contingent faculty are a significant share of the total non-medical faculty at the private, nonprofit institutions in our sample:

- Table 1 shows the composition of faculty by full-time and part-time status. We arrived at the data shown in table 1 by dividing the total number of non-medical faculty for the institution category by the total number of part-time faculty and full-time faculty employed at each institution category. Table 1 shows that part-time faculty were a larger share of the faculty at Jesuit institutions (42 percent) and non-Jesuit Catholic institutions (49 percent) than at non-Catholic nonprofit private institutions (37 percent). A chi-square test of independence on the data in table 1 rejected the hypothesis of independence ($p < 0.005$), indicating that these are statistically significant differences. We conclude that a faculty member's full-time or part-time status is *not* independent of institution category.
- Table 2 displays the composition of the faculty by tenure status. For each category of institution in the figure, we divided the total number of non-medical faculty in each tenure category by the total number of non-medical faculty. Regardless of full-time or part-time status, a similar share of non-medical faculty was neither tenured

nor on tenure track at non-Catholic, nonprofit private institutions (58 percent); Jesuit institutions (58 percent); and non-Jesuit Catholic institutions (64 percent). A chi-square test of independence on the data in table 2 rejected the hypothesis of independence ($p < 0.005$), again indicating these differences are statistically significant. We conclude that a faculty member's tenure status is *not* independent of institution category.

- Table 3 shows the distribution of full-time non-tenure track faculty by contract length. For each category of institution in the figure, we divided the number of faculty in each contract category by the total number of non-medical faculty. A larger proportion of these faculty are on multi-year or continuing contracts at non-Jesuit Catholic institutions (71 percent) compared to Jesuit institutions (59 percent) and non-Catholic nonprofit private institutions (57 percent). A chi-square test of independence on the data in table 3 rejected the hypothesis of independence ($p < 0.005$). We conclude that, for full-time faculty not on tenure track, contract status is *not* independent of institution category. We constructed a figure like table 3 for part-time non-tenure track faculty; that figure showed that at all three institution types a majority of part-time non-tenure track faculty have contracts that are less than one year long. However, a chi-square test of independence failed to reject the hypothesis that contract length and institution category are independent. With regards to part-time, non-tenure track faculty, therefore, we conclude that institution type does not affect contract length.

Table 1. Part-Time and Full-Time Composition of Non-medical Faculty, Fall 2015

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Total
Jesuit Catholic	57.8%	42.2%	100%
Non-Jesuit Catholic	51.2%	48.8%	100%
Non-Catholic nonprofit private	63.2%	36.8%	100%
All Private, Nonprofit	60.9%	39.1%	100%

Source: IPEDS 2015-16 Access database, Human Resources Survey.³⁷

Table 2. Distribution of Tenure Status, Total Non-medical Faculty, Fall 2015

	Jesuit Catholic	Non-Jesuit Catholic	Non-Catholic nonprofit private
Tenured	31.7%	24.9%	30.1%
Tenure Track	10.5%	11.2%	12.0%
Not on Tenure Track	57.8%	63.9%	57.8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Source: IPEDS 2015-16 Access database, Human Resources Survey.³⁸

Table 3. Percent of Total Full-Time Non-Medical, Non-Tenure Track Faculty on Multi-Year, Annual, and Less-Than-Annual Contract, by Institution Type, Fall 2015

	Jesuit Catholic	Non-Jesuit Catholic	Non-Catholic nonprofit private
Multi-year, continuing	39.2%	26.5%	38.5%
Annual	59.3%	70.8%	57.3%
Less-than-annual	1.5%	2.7%	4.2%

Source: IPEDS 2015-16 Access database, Human Resources Survey.³⁹

Finally, we questioned whether contingent faculty were a larger share of faculty at the seven Jesuit institutions that have ventured most into distance education. The distribution of contingent faculty by contract length and as a percent of the total faculty at these institutions appear in table 4. To arrive at the data in table 4, we divided the number of faculty in each contract category by the total number of faculty (tenured, on tenure track, and not-on-tenure track) at each of the seven institutions. The seven institutions in table 4 tend

to rely more heavily on multi-year contracts and annual contracts compared to Jesuit institutions as a whole in table 3. In addition, table 4 shows that the contingent faculty share was highest at the two institutions with the highest percent of distance programs—Regis University and Wheeling Jesuit. These two institutions also tended to rely more heavily on faculty on less-than-annual contracts compared to the other five institutions in this distance-education group.

Table 4. Percent Distribution of Contingent Faculty by Contract Length at Select Jesuit Institutions

Institution	Distance Programs as Percent of Total Programs	Distribution of Contingent Faculty, by Contract Length			Contingent Faculty as Percent of Total Faculty
		Multi-Year Contract	Annual Contract	Less-Than-Annual Contract	
Canisius College	17%	0%	3%	54%	57%
Gonzaga University	10%	7%	10%	39%	56%
Loyola University New Orleans	10%	5%	18%	30%	53%
Regis University	62%	18%	7%	63%	88%
Saint Joseph's University	16%	0%	16%	0%	16%
University of Detroit Mercy	10%	1%	26%	0%	27%
Wheeling Jesuit University	27%	0%	3%	63%	66%

Source: IPEDS 2015-16 Access database, Human Resources Survey.⁴⁰

On these measures—commitment to tenure, employment of part-time faculty, and contract length—we conclude that Catholic institutions, both Jesuit and non-Jesuit Catholic, are part of the national trend away from tenure and in favor of part-time, short-term faculty contracts. We note that those Jesuit schools with relatively large investments in distance programs have progressed further in the use of contingent faculty compared to Jesuit institutions as a group.

Results, Discussion, and Recommendations

Institutions of higher education have adapted to external pressures in part by unbundling course delivery from curriculum development, by offering distance education courses, and by adopting a more flexible, short-term contract faculty model. Our data show that Catholic institutions, both Jesuit and non-Jesuit, are part of that trend. Efforts to reduce costs, improve flexibility, and increase student access do not necessarily conflict with the Catholic university's consecration to the truth and to serving the dignity of mankind *if* done in a way consistent with Catholic values. We must balance course

standardization with academic freedom and with faculty capacity to experiment with innovative pedagogies. We must ensure that our curricula still explicitly mingle technical content and moral content. We must ensure that contingent faculty are not isolated from the university community and are trained and committed to Jesuit pedagogy. As we rely on a tiered faculty and use new technology to deliver the curriculum, we must neither isolate university members from each other nor neglect their capacity for responsible, creative, and productive work.

We exhort each Jesuit institution to reflect on how its programs, policies and work environments foster the dignity of work, given institution-specific circumstances. Contingent faculty should be explicitly included in this reflection as well as in Examen and Reaffirmation reports from Jesuit institutions. We encourage all Jesuit institutions to reflect on the following questions:

- Jesuit institutions are reconciling the need to keep costs low while making education available to all. To do so they have cut costs, improved faculty workforce

flexibility and been mindful of student access. Have these changes been implemented in a way that preserves Jesuit pedagogy? Regardless of the delivery modality, our courses must continue to offer both moral and intellectual components, and faculty must continue their role in guiding students as they explore difficult and foundational issues. Jesuit institutions must do this while competing directly with for-profit institutions.

- Has unbundling course development and delivery been done in a way that stifles or that harnesses the creative self-expression of faculty members? Catholic Social Teaching holds that human persons have a capacity for self-consciousness, self-expression, self-determination, spiritual seeking, and a social life. How can we standardize our courses while still allowing leeway for faculty creativity and academic freedom?
- Do our tenured and tenure track faculty remain trained in and committed to Ignatian pedagogy? Tenure and tenure track contracts provide the basis for a long-term relationship between faculty

and university, allowing for training and formation of faculty in Jesuit pedagogy and values. As we move to contingent faculty contracts, Jesuit higher education faces the challenge of fostering connected relationships with these faculty members that facilitate faculty formation and engagement in the Jesuit tradition.

- How can we engage contingent faculty in Jesuit pedagogy and in traditional faculty roles (including shared governance responsibilities, for which they would be compensated)? One possibility is to rely on slightly longer-term contracts; one-year and multi-year contracts could include responsibility for committee work, curriculum development, and training in Jesuit pedagogy.

Note that such reflection does not exclude the possibility of cutting or rebalancing programs and faculty to reflect new technologies and shifting market demand for specific programs. We encourage Jesuit institutions as a group to reflect on and collaborate on these and other solutions that respond to market conditions while preserving the Jesuit mission and dignity of their students, faculty, administrators, and staff. HJE

Notes

¹ The International Commission on the Apostolate of Jesuit Education (ICAJE), *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach* (1993), http://www.sjweb.info/documents/education/pedagogy_en.pdf.

² Thomas D. Snyder, Cristobal de Brey, and Sally A. Dillow, "Postsecondary Education," *Digest of Education Statistics 2016*, 52nd ed. (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education, February 2018), NCES 2017-094, table 333.40, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_333.40.asp.

³ John Aubrey Douglass, "The Rise of the For-Profit Sector in U.S. Higher Education and the Brazilian Effect," *European Journal of Education* 47, no. 2 (2012): 242-259.

⁴ Thomas D. Snyder, Cristobal de Brey, and Sally A. Dillow, "Postsecondary Education," *Digest of Education Statistics 2016*, 52nd ed. (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education, February 2018),

NCES 2017-094, table 307.10, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_307.10.asp.

⁵ Authors' calculations using IPEDS 2015-16 Access database, Completions Survey, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Access Databases (object: 2015-16 Access; accessed January 2019), <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data/download-access-database>.

⁶ Authors' calculations using IPEDS 2015-16 Access database, Completions Survey.

⁷ William G. Tierney, "Too Big To Fail: The Role of For-Profit Colleges and Universities in American Higher Education," *Change* 43, no. 6 (2011): 27-32, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2011.618079>.

⁸ Larry G. Gerber, *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalization and the Modern American University* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2014), 146-148.

⁹ Tierney, "Too Big to Fail," 27-32.

- ¹⁰ Michael L. Essary, "Key External Factors Influencing Successful Distance Education Programs," *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal* 18, no. 3 (2014): 121-36.
- ¹¹ Ernest L. Boyer, Drew Moser, Todd C Ream, and John M Braxton, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016), 32.
- ¹² Gerber, *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance*, 146-148.
- ¹³ Richard D. Clark, Carrie Buchanan, and Christina Rawls, "The Poor and Marginalized Among Us: Contingent Faculty in Jesuit Universities," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal* 7, no. 2 (2018): 19, <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol7/iss2/3>.
- ¹⁴ Adrianna Kezar and Cecile Sam, "Special Issue: Understanding the New Majority of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in Higher Education—Demographics, Experiences, and Plans of Action," *ASHE Higher Education Report* 36, no. 4 (2010): 1-133.
- ¹⁵ Ben Cosman, "Universities Are Cutting Tenured Faculty While They Load Up on 'Non-Academic' Administrators," *The Atlantic*, February 7, 2014, 2, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/02/universities-are-cutting-tenured-faculty-while-they-load-non-academic-administrators/357858/>.
- ¹⁶ Thomas D. Snyder, Cristobal de Brey, and Sally A. Dillow, "Postsecondary Education," Digest of Education Statistics 2016, 52nd ed. (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education, February 2018), NCES 2017-094, table 315.10, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_315.10.asp
- ¹⁷ Thomas D. Snyder, Cristobal de Brey, and Sally A. Dillow, "Postsecondary Education," Digest of Education Statistics 2016, 52nd ed. (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education, February 2018), NCES 2017-094, table 316.80, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_316.80.asp
- ¹⁸ Steven Hurlburt and Michael McGarrah, "The Shifting Academic Workforce: Where Are the Contingent Faculty?" TIAA Institute (2016), Appendix Table A-1, https://www.tiaa.org/public/pdf/shifting_academic_workforce.pdf.
- ¹⁹ Kezar et al., "Special Issue," 1-133.
- ²⁰ Adrianna Kezar, Elizabeth Holcombe, and Daniel Maxey, "Rethinking Faculty Models/Roles: An Emerging Consensus about Future Directions for the Professoriate," TIAA Institute (April 2016), 1-20, https://www.tiaa.org/public/pdf/rethinking_faculty_models_roles.pdf
- ²¹ Barry Chametzky, "Surviving Situational Suffering: A Classic Grounded Theory Study of Post-Secondary Part-Time Educators in the United States," *Grounded Theory Review* 14, no. 1 (2015): 26-40.
- ²² Caroline Fredrickson, "There Is No Excuse for How Universities Treat Adjuncts," *The Atlantic*, September 15, 2015, 15.
- ²³ James Monks, "The Relative Earnings of Contingent Faculty in Higher Education," *Cornell Higher Education Research Institute (CHERI)*, December 1, 2004, 1-26, <https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cheri/22/>
- ²⁴ Colleen Flaherty and Kaitlin Mulhere, "Adjuncts Deem National Walkout Day Success," *Inside Higher Ed*, February 26, 2015, 26, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/02/26/adjuncts-deem-national-walkout-day-success#:~:text=Day%20of%20Protest,dozens%20of%20campuses%20saw%20protests.&text=And%20as%20a%20result%20C%20adjunct,be%20Wednesday%20was%20the%20West>
- ²⁵ Fredrickson, "There Is No Excuse for How Universities Treat Adjuncts," 1-14.
- ²⁶ Cosman, "Universities Are Cutting Tenured Faculty," 2.
- ²⁷ Gerber, *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance*, 146-148.
- ²⁸ Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fall of the Faculty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 1.
- ²⁹ Sarah Bonewits Feldner, "Living Our Mission: A Study of University Mission Building," *Communication Studies* 57, no. 1 (2016): 67-85, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970500483371>.
- ³⁰ John Paul II, *Apostolic Constitution Ex Corde Ecclesiae of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II On Catholic Universities* (Vatican City, Italy: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990), sec. 12, http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_15081990_ex-corde-ecclesiae.html.
- ³¹ Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church* (Vatican City, Italy: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004), sec. 4, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/documents/rc_pc_justicepeace_doc_20060526_compendio-dott-soc_en.html.
- ³² Drew Roberts and Desiree D. Zerquera, "A Call for Upholding Access and Affordability at Jesuit Institutions," *Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal* 5, no. 2 (2016): 4-14, <https://epublications.regis.edu/jhe/vol5/iss2/3/>
- ³³ Clark et al., "The Poor and Marginalized Among Us," 19.
- ³⁴ Clark et al., "The Poor and Marginalized Among Us."
- ³⁵ *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach*.
- ³⁶ *Ignatian Pedagogy: A Practical Approach*.
- ³⁷ Authors' calculations using data from National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Access Databases (object:

2015-16 Access; accessed January 2019),
<https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data/download-access-database>.

³⁸ NCES, IPEDS Access Databases.

³⁹ NCES, IPEDS Access Databases.

⁴⁰ NCES, IPEDS Access Databases.