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Full-time instructional staff new hires, by appointment type, 2016-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/tenure track</td>
<td>21,516</td>
<td>20,574</td>
<td>21,345</td>
<td>20,490</td>
<td>16,869</td>
<td>14,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>26,803</td>
<td>27,306</td>
<td>28,730</td>
<td>29,043</td>
<td>22,639</td>
<td>26,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,319</td>
<td>47,880</td>
<td>50,075</td>
<td>49,533</td>
<td>39,508</td>
<td>41,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure
• Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed seven years
• Under AAUP policy, there are no full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members; after seven years, we consider full-time faculty to have de facto tenure
• Recognizing the gap between this policy recommendation and practices at many institutions, the AAUP also makes recommendations to improve conditions for contingent appointments
Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments (2014)

The best practice for institutions of all types is to convert the status of contingent appointments to appointments eligible for tenure with only minor changes in job description.
Data source

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)
• System of interrelated surveys conducted annually by the US Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for Title IV eligible schools
• Human Resources survey collects data on academic workforce
• Published annually as a set of data tables: https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/
• IPEDS offers a variety of tools for online analysis or download
Data definitions

- Degree-granting nonprofit institutions participating in Title IV federal financial aid programs in the United States (50 states and DC), consistent with the Digest of Educational Statistics

- “With faculty status, tenured” and “With faculty status, on tenure track” categories combined into one “Tenured/tenure track” category

- “With faculty status not on tenure track/annual contract,” “With faculty status not on tenure track/multi-year contract,” and the “With faculty status not on tenure track/indefinite contract” categories combined into one “Contingent” category

- Historically underrepresented racial/ethnic minorities (Black/African American, Hispanic, Native American/Alaskan Native, and Hawaiian Native/Other Pacific Islander) were combined into one under-represented minority category

- IPEDS collects gender as a binary construct, and it’s so reported here
IPEDS instructional staff table
More about this data source

The IPEDS Instructional Staff table

- Full-time instructional staff on payroll as of November 1
- Degree-granting institutions with 15 or more full-time employees and related administrative offices
- Includes both medical school instructional staff, non-medical school instructional staff
- Does not include part-time instructional staff or graduate students
The environment: from a distance the trend lines seem fairly consistent and gradual.
Graphing the annual change gives us significantly greater detail: big drops in the number of tenured/tenure track positions.
Among institutions with tenure systems, there’s a noticeable shift from annual to multiyear contracts.
While other types of contracts experienced a decline in 2020, multiyear contracts continued to increase in number.
Annual increases in contingent appointments until 2020, a slight decline and a recovery in 2021
Note the decline in the number of men in tenured/tenure track positions and increase in the number of contingent appointments for women.
Women increase their tenured/tenure track proportion by 2% to 43.7%, and contingent proportion to 54.7% from 53.0%
Overall, we see an increase in the underrepresented minority percentage among US citizens and permanent residents.
URM percentage increased 1.3% for tenured/tenure track faculty
URM percentage increased 1.2% for contingent appointments
IPEDS new hires table
More about this data source

The IPEDS New Hires table

• Full-time new hires Oct 31-Nov 1

• Hired for the first time or rehired after a break in service

• Degree-granting institutions with 15 or more full-time employees and related administrative offices

• Includes medical school instructional staff, non-medical school instructional staff

• Does not include part-time instructional staff or graduate students
The overall trend is clear: the hiring recovery is concentrated among contingent faculty and remains incomplete.
Contingent faculty hiring has recovered to an extent, but not so tenured/tenure track
There’s a slight uptick in multiyear contracts offered to new hires
Annual change in the number of FT instructional staff on contingent appointments at institutions with tenure systems, by contract duration, 2017-2021.
The 2020 declines are not yet matched by the increased hiring in 2021.
Hiring recovery at schools with tenure systems remains incomplete

FT new hires on contingent appointments at institutions with tenure systems, by contract duration, 2016-2021
# Top 10 employers of contingent new hires, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Contingent new hires percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Los Angeles</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington-Seattle Campus</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Denver/Anschutz Medical Campus</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor College of Medicine</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health &amp; Science University</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-San Francisco</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, there are more women new hires than men.
Women comprised a majority of all new hires in 2021, both tenured/tenure track (51.6%) and contingent (55.6%).
New hires on contingent appointments exceeded the 2019 count in 2021; only partial recovery among tenured/tenure track new hires.
While the number of new hires declined, the proportion that are under-represented minorities increased.
This is particularly true of tenured/tenure track new hires
And holds true to a lesser degree for contingent new hires
This proportional increase among tenured/tenure track new hires crosses Carnegie basic classifications.
The increase in the URM proportion holds true to a lesser degree among contingent new hires.
Greater increases are seen in private as opposed to public institutions.
Hiring trends in US higher ed: further research

• What is driving the surge in underrepresented minority hiring percentages?
• Will the trend against FT tenured/tenure track positions continue to accelerate?
• Whither the hiring recovery among FT contingent faculty? Will the proportion of multiyear contingent contracts increase in the next few years?
• Will the proportion of women new hires remain in the majority?
• Can we spot similar or complementary trends taking place among part-time instructional staff?
• Leverage the relationship between the new hires and instructional staff tables for additional insight
Questions?
Thank you!