



TIAA-CREF Institute

Globalization and Faculty Work in the United States

William M. Plater
Indiana University



Financial Services



About this Research

The effects of globalization are many and varied—shaping world economic growth, changing cultural norms, and influencing responses to broad societal issues and problems such as poverty, climate change, and terrorism. American higher education, too, is part of an expanding global network as technological advances and demographic shifts and mobility enable ever-increasing connectivity.

To help campus leaders increase their understanding of the effects of globalization on their institutions and faculty, the TIAA-CREF Institute invited this paper by William Plater. From his deeply informed perspective, Plater encourages higher education leaders to take a broad view of the future of their institutions and the academic profession, noting that colleges, universities, and the people who work for them will continue to be “stewards of place”—but that going forward, that place is the entire world.

About the TIAA-CREF Institute

The TIAA-CREF Institute helps advance the ways individuals and institutions plan for financial security and organizational effectiveness. The Institute conducts in-depth research, provides access to a network of thought leaders, and enables those it serves to anticipate trends, plan future strategies, and maximize opportunities for success.

To learn more about our research and initiatives for higher education leaders, please visit our website at www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org.

Executive Summary

Knowledge is essential—and now instantaneously global. Like every other sector, the industry that creates and disseminates knowledge, prepares workers and citizens, and cares for a fragile world must adapt its infrastructure to accommodate emerging realities if it hopes to preserve enduring values and secure its own survival: “Globalization is not only shaping the world’s economy and culture but, without question, is influencing higher education as well...It may be possible to ameliorate the most negative aspects of globalization, but it is not practical to opt out of the global knowledge system” (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbly, 2009, p. 3). The impact of globalization on faculty work is by no means certain, but adaptations by institutions driven by economic and social competitiveness, workforce mobility, a radically changed classroom paradigm, and the waning of academic professionalism already parallel unprecedented innovations in information communication technologies. Changing realities of who academic workers are, how they are qualified, where and how they work, who they teach, how learning is certified, and how the impact of education on economies and societies is measured have altered the professoriate with startling abruptness, even as the transformation has gone quietly unnoticed by the public, elected officials, and, surprisingly, by many professors themselves. Recognizing and understanding the subtleties and complexities of how globalization is transforming faculty work provides the only viable means to guide and shape the academic workforce that America needs today.

Key Take-Aways

- Globalization affects *institutional* capacity and purpose in various ways and, in turn, forces changes in the composition of academic workforces and the nature of the work undertaken to achieve evolving missions.
- The routinization, unbundling, fragmentation (specialization), and global transactional nature of teaching and learning within the broader knowledge services sector is transforming how *individuals* enter, perform in, move about, and exit the workplace, both physical and virtual.
- The *classroom* is transforming into a global learning environment without the constraints that have defined learning until now—expanding content, authority, expertise, competence, certification, credentialing and quality beyond the ability of individual faculty to control as the forms and types of educational providers increase.
- As an unanticipated consequence of the global shift from teaching to learning, *academic professionalism* is eroding, as is the role of higher education as both a public good and a means of providing for future social improvement at a global scale.
- The American professoriate is no longer what it once was, nor will it ever be the same again.

Any opinions expressed herein are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the views of TIAA-CREF, the TIAA-CREF Institute or any other organization with which the author is affiliated.

Current drivers of the globalization of higher education are so familiar as to seem almost banal. Many can mistakenly be presumed to be inevitable, local or national, without global consequence or cause—thus masking the impact of globalization on faculty work. To fully grasp that impact, it is essential that the globalizing aspects of relevant drivers be understood:

- Technology, instantaneous communication, and the emergence of English as the de facto language of higher learning;
- Increased reliance on higher education for economic competition instead of social well-being;
- Consequential vocationalism and specialization of learning and new forms of credentialing with global portability;
- Accelerating pace of the creation and application of new knowledge via global knowledge networks;
- Disaggregation, routinization, and commodification of knowledge and learning to varying degrees;
- Shifting regional demographics based on aging or, alternatively, rejuvenating populations each with challenges for higher education and its alignment with national needs;
- A nexus of mass social change with new expectations for higher education due to a rising global middle class, the massification of higher education, increased participation of women, income disparity, and youth underemployment;
- Urbanization and unprecedented inter- and intra-national migrations and refugee flows;
- Constraints of interdependence due to the needs of transnational corporations to operate globally and the demands on governments to address transnational issues such as the environment, health, water, food, human trafficking, crime, terrorism and conflict; and
- Standardization and commercialization of quality, as both a threshold of the acceptable and a mark of the excellent.

The items on any such list are fungible, and the point of this one is to suggest that while globalization itself is a driver, the interconnectedness of all aspects of such factors necessarily makes them global as well as national and local. Globalization is itself a driver *and* an attribute of other drivers.

Globalization's greatest impact is on *institutions*—colleges and universities, public, private, for-profit, nonprofit—and their ability to achieve their respective missions, fulfill their purposes, and remain viable. Institutional responses to the drivers of globalization are vastly different than the responses *individuals* may make. Consequently, the

impact of globalization on faculty work is mediated in a wide range of ways by the institution—from established elite residential research institutions to new, for-profit online education “providers”—especially as the still-emerging presence of alternative credentialors of educational competence and attainment grows.

Globalization of Institutions

Many changes are occurring simultaneously in all economic sectors around the world, including higher education. Increased access and massification of higher education, a shifting balance between perceptions of public good and private benefit, and increased vocationalism have caused U.S. colleges and universities to increase revenues and reduce costs (Delphi Project, 2015; New Majority Faculty, 2015). One inescapable change has been the adjunctification of the faculty, now transformed into an academic workforce with less than a third of its members in the U.S. employed in a status resembling the stereotypical “professor”—that tenured, respected, full-time colleague we once knew—accountable to peers but free to allocate time and interests across teaching, research and service (Kezar & Maxey, 2015). Whether adjunctification is a by-product of globalization is moot (and the topic of another essay): the fact is the condition is real, and this reality is the stage on which globalization is acting.

The evolution of higher education from a sector structured to support teaching (with most of the functions centered on faculty and staff interests) to one that supports learning (with functions increasingly centered on students, pedagogy, outcomes, and a return on investment) has occurred concurrently around the world, in ways perhaps under-appreciated in the United States (Gaston, 2010). The shift is energizing investments by other nations in improving the capacity and quality of higher education as a sure path toward greater economic competitiveness (Garrett, 2015; MacGregor, 2015).

By focusing on the preparation of graduates in critical areas of national need to advance national economic status, there has been a convergence of pedagogy and economics. For example, Japan, one of the developed world's educational leaders, recently announced plans to reduce education in the humanities to “make universities more efficient and to operate better in a globalized environment” (Kakuchi, 2015), even as other commentators advocate for the competitive value of liberal education (Garrett, 2015; Zakaria, 2015). Despite differences regarding content, there is uniform agreement on the value of education as an effective counter to “the most negative aspects of globalization” (Altbach et al, 2009, p.3).

The United States' loss has become an equalizer for most of the rest of the world. That is, while U.S. institutions have

been replacing full-time traditional faculty with contingent faculty—to the detriment of student learning, many would argue (Kezar & Maxey, 2015)—many other nations have been shaping their academic workforces using the building blocks of contingent faculty with design specifications that maximize access to a global labor market and flexible, just-in-time learning. The advantages of this approach are clear in a fast-paced world, where applications of new knowledge create jobs faster than academics can adapt curricula, and where what is learned can be conveyed in smaller packets (commodities) of certifiable competence (Blumenstyk, 2015a; Carey, 2015; Craig 2015a; Crow & Dabars, 2015).

Moreover, the global shift from teaching to learning coincides with the emerging importance of recognizing competence (by assessing learning outcomes instead of just through degrees awarded) for specific purposes (usually vocationally-related and most often defined by external parties—not faculty). The opportunity to certify competence in forms other than degree attainment (or in combination with such degrees) by new kinds of credentialors may well portend further changes in the academic workforce.

Institutions facing the forces of globalization would do well to consider the following factors:

- Efforts to increase revenues by recruiting international students, opening cross-border programs, and offering online global degree and noncredit certificate programs are transforming domestic campus culture with differing demands on conditions of work and faculty competence;
- The commodification of education in the form of commercialized and globalized intellectual property; the unbundling of “education” by defining discrete tasks that can be outsourced worldwide (advising, financial aid, tutoring, assessing, recruitment and procurement, marketing, content development, content delivery, internet services, and so forth); and the modularization of learning into components that can be “taught” (offered) by lower-cost and practicing professionals (i.e., adjuncts) instead of faculty—from anywhere anytime—are giving rise to concerns about educational “services” in both the trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific trade partnership agreements;
- The shift in planning and administrative thinking about faculty from unique members of a community with names, personal histories, and individual interests to the “gig economy” (as described in 2015 by *The New York Times* and *The Economist*) of independent contractors with interchangeable slots, positions, and resource allocations that can be moved among units as enrollments shift;
- The globalization of requirements for education and workforce readiness (especially professions) are following employers’ demands for curricula that satisfy global needs and workforce standards (e.g., engineering,

accounting, management, nursing, public administration, etc.); specialized, program accreditation is emerging as a globalized industry, reshaping worldwide understandings of both competence and quality; and qualifications frameworks are defining what a degree should prepare graduates to *do* in transnational settings (Plater, in press);

- The growing importance of global rankings, displacing national listings and causing consequential shifts of institutional attention to attributes (including international) that can influence movement within rankings; and
- Elite and truly global brands, like Pearson (Zekharia, Panchal, & Ball, 2015), emerging in higher education, many of which will arise from new forms of delivery and authenticity—and not from traditional universities (Bokor, 2012).

The argument that globalization will have minimal impact on U.S. institutions and their faculties because the deeply-entrenched value of shared governance will mitigate against it may appear naïve within the decade. Protests that have interfered with institutionally initiated cross-border programming in Abu Dhabi, Singapore or China, for example, are likely the vestige of a diminished faculty whose sphere of influence cannot maintain pace with the many facets of globalization. As institutions become more corporatized, globalized, and resource-constrained (or resource-focused), their drive for sustainability and competitive advantage requires a shift in control from the U.S.-dominant model of shared governance based on advice and consent to one characterized by less input from faculty members and instead more management of them (Altbach et al, 2009).

Whether domestic institutions adapt or not, the U.S. academic labor force may find new opportunities in educational providers from other nations that decide to compete in the U.S. domestic market because they not only have price advantages but also can offer special services, such as instruction in Spanish or other languages. Consider, for example, that in the United States in 2012 “Hispanics’ college enrollment rate among 18 to 24 year old high school graduates surpassed that of whites, by 49% to 47%” (Krogstad & Fry, 2014). In some states, institutions from Mexico or South and Central America may be able to compete on ethnicity as well as price and quality for this fastest-growing college market through blended learning and adjunct faculty on site in California, Arizona, Texas, and cities with large Spanish-speaking populations.

Globalization of Individual Faculty: Mobility

Illusions that the faculty will not be as subject to the effects of globalization as workers in other industries have faded as faculty members have become more aware of their altered workplace. Contingent faculty, who comprise 70% the U.S. academic workforce, for example, are beginning to realize

that unlike prior generations, they are entrepreneurs who need to be self-reliant, with career paths that are quite different from their predecessors, open to innovation by some and resulting in paralysis for others.

The United States has long benefited from globalization of the workforce, especially in fields including the sciences, engineering, and others where faculty born elsewhere have come to play a conspicuous role in American colleges and universities. Over decades of drawing on the global marketplace, U.S. institutions (and the U.S. economy) have benefited from immigration, resulting today in a growing number of “dual” citizens—that is, full-time faculty educated and living in the United States but holding citizenship in another nation.

The National Science Foundation, for example, found that in 2010 (the most recent year for which data are available), 26% of full-time faculty teaching in science and engineering disciplines in the United States were foreign-born but U.S.-educated at the Ph.D. level (in computer science, that figure was more than 50%), and foreign-born and foreign-educated Ph.D. faculty accounted for another 17% of U.S. faculty. This adds up to a total academic workforce in these disciplines that is more than 40% foreign-born. At the same time, the share of all U.S.-trained science and engineering doctorate holders employed in academe (both U.S.- and foreign-born) dropped from 55% in 1973 to 44% in 2010, indicating a shift in employment away from higher education, and increasing the probability of sector rotation for an “in-and-out” faculty (National Science Foundation, 2014).

These “dual-citizen” faculty are more mobile than most U.S. faculty, and they are better able to respond to globalization in a variety of ways—by returning “home” as repatriated faculty; becoming adjuncts serving “home” institutions through electronic connectivity or short-term visits while retaining full-time or primary appointment in the U.S.; forming teaching or research collaborations through dual degree programs (or even single co-offered courses), jointly funded grants, and co-authored publications; or participating in institutional partnerships or transnational institutional networks. Globalization places a premium on U.S. institutions’ recognition of the importance of this highly mobile workforce and, more important, finding flexible ways to accommodate it.

Except for short-term appointments elsewhere, however, U.S. academic citizens have not until now been much of a factor in the global marketplace. That could change as conditions in the United States gravitate toward a global median of relative salary and benefits, as offerings elsewhere become more attractive, and as forms of connecting with institutions in other countries become more fluid and favorable both because of advances in technology and the

capacity of other nations to offer a range of incentives. As Ivan Pacheco (2015) of the Center for International Higher Education wrote, “overproduction of Ph.D.s and deteriorating working conditions for faculty, particularly for adjuncts, in industrialised countries may represent an opportunity for the developing world.”

Several countries have begun successful repatriation programs to lure their citizen academics back home. Argentina has repatriated more than 1,000 scientists since 2003 (Pacheco, 2015) and in 2012 China had more than 186,000 of its so-called “sea turtles” return in just one year (Ford, 2015). Argentina and Brazil have formed research networks to engage citizens who are unwilling to return home full-time but who still can contribute to national programs of economic development while living and working in the United States.

Teaching remotely, of course, is an increasingly attractive option due to technological innovations and the commodification of education. There is a plethora of online job sites specializing in placing interested applicants in academic positions worldwide. As virtual appointments become more common, the number of U.S. adjuncts (especially foreign-born, U.S. educated) who find work outside the U.S. will only grow, even without the special inducement to return “home.” It is estimated that 80% of the academic workforce across Latin America is employed part-time, and that the percentage of higher education faculty with doctorates is just 9% in China and 35% in India (Altbach et al, 2009). These countries all are seeking to improve the quality of higher education in the face of both massification and global economic competitiveness. Under these circumstances, U.S. contingent academics become especially attractive.

China, India, Brazil and many other nations have both the resources and the will to recruit globally. Hiring U.S. faculty as adjuncts at salaries matching or topping U.S. institutions on a course-by-course basis is inevitable, especially when travel is not involved. PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) estimates that by 2040 (when U.S. Ph.D. production may have long since saturated its domestic market), the African continent will have the world’s largest labor force, but be in the greatest need of education and training. Nations already are responding to such predictions by focusing on expanding private education and distance learning (ICEF Monitor, 2015). If technology can overcome the need to relocate to polluted and congested megacities or unattractive rural areas, then U.S.-educated faculty of whatever nationality may find acceptable, even attractive, work in currently unappealing locations. Rapidly developing nations are most likely to exploit this shortcut to quality (Massie, 2015).

As individual faculty are globalized, consider these trends:

- An acceleration of the existing tendency of faculty (both traditional and contingent) to be entrepreneurial in approaching their work, giving priority to personal instead of institutional interests as they seize incentives made available through globalization;
- The gradual but certain dissolution of tenure as it has been known in the United States, replaced with performance-based contracts at all but a few of the elite universities, where the faculty may not much notice or even care about the presumed values of tenure;
- A growing recognition among international program accreditors, like the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), that the traditional full time professor is not necessary to ensure globalized standards of threshold quality based on their conclusion that “faculty contractual relationships, title, tenure status, full-time or part-time status, etc., can help to explain and document the work of faculty, but these factors are not perfectly correlated with participation or with the most critical variables in assessing faculty sufficiency, deployment, and qualifications” (AACSB, 2015);
- The potential for highly regarded (and self-marketed) individuals to be seen as credible certifiers of competence along with new organizational providers of educational services, a looming reality recognized in the United States by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in its 2014 call for a new system to recognize alternative (non-institutional) providers because “the world is witnessing a rapidly emerging national and international campus without boundaries” (CHEA, 2014);
- The emergence of intermediaries and brokers to aggregate individual faculty into groups that can offer specialized, customized, and “certified” learning through continuing and non-credit programs; to market individuals (including recent, under-employed Ph.D. graduates) to institutions around the world; and/or to review and “bundle” credited and life experiences into packages to be presented to degree-granting institutions, among other possibilities, for example, the Learning Counts program of the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL), or the American Council on Education’s Alternative Credit Consortium; and
- The growth in transnational collaboration among institutions (research, joint and dual degrees, student and credit exchanges, etc.) that promotes joint faculty appointments, with a full-time faculty member at one institution assuming an adjunct, but corresponding, appointment at the partner institution—often with the goal of addressing a programmatic need for specialization or internationalization coverage.

The globalization of individual faculty work, in combination with other factors changing the academic workforce (most notably economic factors), is having a pronounced impact on how faculty prepare for, enter, perform in, exit, and re-enter higher education. The globalizing forces are uncoupling individual faculty not only from long-term relationships with one or a few institutions as the bonds of tenure weaken, but also from the straight-line career track that once so predictably moved through metered stages from graduate student to professor. Indeed, companies such as The Scholarpreneur (<http://thescholarpreneur.com/about/>), or The Versatile Ph.D. (<http://versatilephd.com/about/>) have sprung up to help graduate students and Ph.D.s prepare for non-traditional careers.

These same forces are also giving entrepreneurial faculty potentially transformative advantages as the traditional faculty role unravels somewhat unevenly among institutional types and disciplines. The Ph.D. once required as the entry credential for tenure-track positions may give way to master’s degrees and professional experience in applied fields in a world where as many as half or more of all faculty in higher education globally have only a baccalaureate degree, and the overwhelming majority are hired part-time (UNESCO, 2015a). With worldwide higher education participation expected to double by 2025 to more than 262 million enrolled (Maslen, 2012), the demand for qualified faculty by nations around the world will be extraordinary, leading some economists to predict that education will be one of the largest *global* businesses of the 21st century (Straumshein, 2015b).

The growing global market is so attractive that for-profit credential-granting institutions, intermediary academic labor contractors, specialized educational service providers, and entrepreneurial individuals all will compete with traditional universities and colleges for market share. One can readily imagine a current ratings company, like Rate My Professors (<http://www.ratemyprofessors.com/About.jsp>) evolving into a global ranking system for individual entrepreneurial faculty/educational service providers who wish to offer their own courses independent of an institution. They soon may be able to rely on such rankings in lieu of an institution to bestow credibility and value through certificates, badges, or nano-degrees recognized by one of CHEA’s newly accredited, non-institutional accreditors.

Intermediaries for contract employees such as Uber (<https://www.uber.com/>), Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (<https://www.mturk.com/mturk/welcome>), or HourlyNerd (<http://start.hourlynerd.com/>) already are transforming contingent workforces across sectors, accounting for 18% of U.S. employment (Scheiber, 2015). And companies such as LinkedIn (<https://www.linkedin.com/>) along with other companies such as Manpower (<http://www.manpower.com/>) or Kelly Services (<http://www.kellyservices.com/Global/Home/>) are positioning themselves to be not only

managers of credentials and certified competencies as placement intermediaries in a global market, but also as providers of certified training and assessed competencies that can augment, if not replace, college-issued credentials (Blumenstyk 2015b; Craig 2015b). The opportunity—and threat—is real enough that seven U.S. “brand” universities have formed a new consortium called the University Learning Store to create “a joint online platform that will feature modular content, skills assessments and student-facing services” (Fain, 2015). Can others be far behind?

Globalization of the Classroom

The greatest catalyst globalizing faculty work is the transformation of the classroom from the private, physical “walled garden” of individual faculty specifications into the open, social media-space wrought by the latest technology. According to Google’s “chief education evangelist,” in 1995 just 1% of the world’s population was online; today, more than 40%—3 billion people—are online (Casap, 2015). Classes and classrooms that do not use technology platforms by design have been changed by students’ iconoclastic personal use of smart phones, tablets and laptops (and who surreptitiously take videos of the classroom or make copies of materials) that bring the world into the “closed” space despite faculty prohibitions to the contrary.

No less authority than Educause (Brown, Dehoney, & Millichap, 2015) has advocated for letting “students move freely between public and online spaces and capture collaborations no matter where on the internet they occur” (Straumsheim, 2015a). In this “post-course era,” as Randy Bass, Vice Provost for Education and Professor of English at Georgetown University, has labeled it, the traditional role of the course as an institutionally-convenient way of managing enrollments, staffing, time, resources, space, credits, and credentials (with courses as the building blocks of degrees) is giving way to an open, unbounded, global classroom even when the intent is entirely local (Bass, 2012; Siemans et al, 2015; Siemens, Gašević, & Brown, 2015).

The opened classroom thus also has the capacity to make “glocalism” a reality as faculty and students can both find the meaningful elements to respond to “demand from the emerging segment of ‘glocal’ students—who have aspirations to gain a global education experience but want to remain in their local region/country,” thus creating new opportunities for institutions, (Choudaha & Edelstein, 2014) even as the institutions struggle to understand what the new economic model of delivery will be (Armstrong, 2014).

When the classroom is opened to the world, no faculty member can expect to “know” more than the collective expertise that lies within the crawling grasp of the internet, a growing array of search engines, and experts from around the world whose opinions or declarations can be evoked from

a variety of sources—including live chat through Skype and other such tools. Authority—and probably control—can be better maintained by faculty’s recognition of globalization as a reality and by adapting practices that allow them to manage the flow of content and the authentication of expertise.

As the academic workforce transforms due to adjunctification and retirements, as technology continues to evolve and increase its hold on the education sector, and as global access moves the understanding of competence in any particular field toward a global standard, the implications for faculty work begin to emerge from the uncertainty of rapid change in the global classroom. Some possibilities to consider:

- Capacity to function effectively in global knowledge networks and to thrive in global electronic communities will be as important as social communities and face-to-face interactions;
- Faculty subject matter expertise will move beyond remaining current in the field to knowing how to authenticate and manage the expertise of others, and the ability to discriminate between the authentic and the fake will be highly-valued expertise of both individual faculty and credentialors;
- Employment will be tied less to earned degrees than to verified subject matter competence;
- Employment will increasingly be on-demand, contingent, and term-limited;
- As they move among sectors, faculty will both draw from non-academic work experience and transfer academic expertise to other sectors, with consulting and non-academic working being a major vector for knowledge transfer;
- Assessed competence in a defined, globally standardized content area will replace the course, the time-bound term, and the credit hour as the dominant form and space of learning;
- Assessing competence by adherence to externally and globally-defined rubrics for levels of attainment, such as qualifications frameworks or accredited standards for professional practice, will displace both faculty and institution-defined standards;
- Professional identity will be increasingly determined by personal expertise instead of institutional affiliation;
- Continuing professional development in technology and internationalization, as well as subject area, will be a necessary condition of employment and a personal

responsibility (and a problem for institutions with large numbers of tenured faculty who must be “developed” if the institution is to remain competitive);

- Aggregation of information from multiple global sources will be necessary, but not sufficient, as the limits of what is known expand beyond any person’s ability to know it all;
- Maintaining authority over students in the classroom will depend on a new set of skills, including intercultural communication and continuous external validation of expertise; and
- In the not too distant future, some such set of indicators might be refined and developed into an index of institutional global transformation for the benefit of trustees, accreditors or investors.

One key consequence of these trends is likely to be growing numbers and types of educational providers without research obligation or pretention. That is, the majority of the faculty who manage the classrooms—and other learning spaces, virtual and physical—will be employed on a part-time, learning objective-specific basis, with their employability less dependent on their degrees than on proven, relevant, and externally validated (accredited) competence. As the unbundling of faculty work unfolds on a global stage, separate traditional functions once united in the “complete scholar” (Rice, 1996) can be commercialized and monetized by investors with access to academic labor worldwide.

It is noteworthy that an estimated \$772 billion is spent annually in the United States on post-secondary education, with about \$248 billion of that total going to four-year institutions and \$40 billion going to two-year colleges. That leaves nearly \$484 billion being spent outside formal higher education institutions through corporations and others, leading the CEO of Strayer University, a for-profit with its eye on this large resource base, to claim that “the only way the U.S. can maintain its economic leadership role in the world is for companies and universities to partner together and build the workforce of the 21st century” (Straumsheim, 2015b). This also means that they must collaborate in supporting a new academic workforce, one that has the capacity to move from one sector to another while maintaining professional integrity.

Of all the changes globalization may visit on the classroom, the nature of the academic community may change the most. The personal, physical community of scholars that has long been one of the appealing qualities of the American professoriate may be hollowed out at all but the most elite institutions as fewer full-time, traditional faculty remain. And those who do remain will function more as managers of adjuncts than as professional colleagues. At the same time,

globalization will offer the rewards of very large, worldwide communities of interest that both follow disciplinary lines and allow for the perpetual exploration of new and evolving interests, whether pedagogical, scholarly, social or economic. The classroom always has been a highly personal, though temporary, community; its nature is being changed through globalization by the introduction of remote, largely anonymous, but still unique individual participants—with the potential to remain an evolving community of interest after the course is officially “over.”

Globalization of Academic Professionalism

As professionals, the American professoriate has enforced, primarily through peer pressure and review, the conditions essential to any profession, including: ensuring adequate preparation, an understanding of the “rules” or patterns of professional conduct, being subject to peer scrutiny, continuing competence in the field of one’s practice, personal integrity and ethical conduct, and a duty to the public good (Plater, in press). In the deinstitutionalized and unbundled emerging reality for most members of the academic workforce, these conditions underlying professionalism will still prevail, but individual academic workers will no longer have the support of an institutional community or the validation of recurring (tenured) employment to affirm and reinforce professional conduct and validate authority. Instead, faculty will be increasingly responsible for demonstrating that they are professionals by their own merit and effort, apart from any employer. Consider the irony of a time not far distant when a credential awarded by LinkedIn may carry greater economic value than the degree awarded by a college or the prestige of a current place of employment.

Long under attack in the United States for economic, political and ideological reasons, tenure has retained an aura of necessity despite the fact that more than two-thirds of the academic workforce no longer has the benefit of tenure. Tenure is always and only local. Competence, on the other hand, is ever more global and increasingly validated through transnational knowledge networks and global professional disciplinary associations—soon to be joined by other forms of credentialors. The foundational bond of mutual responsibility between the individual holding tenure and the university awarding it is crumbling with commodification, adjunctification and specialization. Further, with the unbundling of teaching, research and service, colleges and universities have less need for tenure to bind individuals to their organizations, because the flexibility offered by part-time and contract faculty helps to ensure institutional economic viability and intellectual currency.

As U.S. institutions strive to retain their competitive advantage worldwide, tenure could be a handicap when most of the rest of the world's improving institutions are not burdened with a costly, permanent workforce whose competence must be upgraded periodically at institutional expense (whether through sabbaticals, centers for professional development, or other means). Nations without tenure but with civil service employees whose rights may resemble tenure's "lifetime" employment can—by decree—more easily alter employment at their government as well as non-government institutions. Accelerating adaptability favors newer institutions and newer forms of learner engagement.

Similarly, shared governance is fading as anything but symbolic practice for many of the same reasons, but especially because faculty's traditional hold over curriculum and certification of student accomplishment is being displaced by global professional associations via specialized accreditation, national qualifications frameworks, worldwide industry standards, and regional recognition of credentials that facilitate student and employee mobility.

Academic freedom, as the third and perhaps most important pillar of academic professionalism, is universally endorsed in the U.S. by all but a tiny handful of constituents of higher education, even including most of those who oppose tenure. That is not to say that academic freedom is unchallenged and uncontested, especially as difficult specific cases test the underlying principle. So far, the greatest attention that globalization has brought to the precept of academic freedom are cases in other nations where faculty of U.S. cross-border programs face local laws or practices that do not honor the U.S. tradition and concept.

With fewer full-time tenured faculty at home to insist on academic freedom for all, tenure and academic freedom have become uncoupled. In fact, most academic workers do not enjoy a full measure of academic freedom, especially when it comes to freedom to allocate time among duties, to pursue interests independent of administrative or management direction, or to teach according to a syllabus free from review and approval. While a distinct issue, the nature and management of research resulting in intellectual property is also linked to academic freedom and globalization—and is even the subject of international trade agreements and definitions of work-for-hire by contract employees (European University Association, 2015). As more academic workers move in and out of academic institutions, rotating among governments, nonprofits, corporations, an emerging array of social benefit and social entrepreneurs, as well as independent contracting, the more they will be expected to negotiate ownership and control of intellectual property as a condition of employment—not an inherent right.

Finally, not surprisingly, concerns about authenticity and integrity of courses and credentials in a world where fraud is rampant abound. With the fragmentation of academic work, professional integrity may become an issue of special concern if "influence networks" or cultures tolerant of corruption—perhaps perpetuated as entitlement for elites—spread to academic work. And there is a cautionary note with regard to the centrality of peer review in ensuring quality and integrity as a skeptical public worries about peer cronyism and conflicts of interest, perhaps leading to greater trust in third-party verifiers and certifiers. For now, institutions with credibility (and accreditation) are still the best arbiters of quality and value. For traditional, time-tested, elite universities worldwide, little will change in the value of their affirmation of credentials and the faculty who generate them.

But for most other environments—non-elite institutions, emerging educational service providers, independent entrepreneurs, new institutions in developing economies, intermediaries, course and credit bundlers—individual faculty will have to take increased personal steps to ensure academic professionalism, including integrity, credibility and accountability. As the mutual responsibilities of tenure weaken, as control over the content, forms and media of teaching are corporatized, and as academic freedom is largely defined by a contract for specified services and allocations of time, globally-mobile academic workers will need a system of external verification and authentication—much as CHEA has foreseen and companies such as LinkedIn or Manpower are beginning to operationalize. With the uncoupling of credentialing from the monopoly of accredited colleges and universities, teaching and other academic services very much belong to a global marketplace.

Conclusion

Despite the alarm sounded a decade ago by Schuster and Finkelstein in documenting the "restructuring of academic work and careers" (2006), little has been done to slow, let alone reverse, the adjunctification of faculty, the commodification of learning, the corporatization of institutions, and the segmentation of the educational sector into elites and all others. Masked by familiarity with the latest pressing drivers of change, we also may be missing the impact of globalization on U.S. higher education despite a number of studies and startling anecdotes. In a recent Ernest & Young report on the university of the future, for example, analysts predicted that within a decade or two the current disruptive drivers of change, including globalization, will result in three business models for higher education: the streamlined status quo, niche dominators, and transformers (Bokor, 2012). In any case, all three models for surviving institutions depend on the transformation of the academic workforce and the nature of the work they undertake.

If the changes discussed in this paper are inevitable, what can—and should—be done to anticipate and manage them? Champions of niche domination or transformation models may see little point in resisting change and instead seize the opportunity for re-starting higher education as a global entrepreneurial enterprise. The status quo institutions may preserve many of the current forms of faculty work and title, even if hollowed out, but they will be deeply affected as they accommodate inevitable changes, all rhetoric to the contrary aside.

If there is one area where urgent action and attention might be focused, it is on the evolving nature of academic professionalism and the ability of the traditional professoriate to transform itself into a global academic workforce. Ideally, this new workforce will retain the essential elements of a profession, especially one with the centuries of continuous, self-aware, and self-directed qualities that are widely shared among academicians (Sullivan, 2012). A sense of duty to the common good and the betterment of society underlies much of academic work as well (Katz, 2014; Shaker, 2015). That sense of duty is the subject of a recent UNESCO report: *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good?*

While the trends [of globalization] point to a growing disconnection between education and the fast-changing world of work, they also represent an opportunity to reconsider the link between education and societal development... Regarding citizenship, the challenge for national educational systems is to shape identities, and to promote awareness of and sense of responsibility for others in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world. (UNESCO, 2015b, p.10)

Academic professionalism is grounded in the idea that faculty work is a vocation, a calling to contribute to the public or common good through the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Globalization of the classroom and the local community give faculty new possibilities for redefining the public good as both local and global, thus helping the professoriate adapt to a globalized sector in an “interconnected and interdependent world.”

Perhaps the best single way to prepare for a disrupted and contingent future is to develop a broader view of the academic profession. That new sense of the faculty could encompass a more diverse view of the core values of *tenure*, as an individual faculty member’s relationship to a larger community of peers; *shared governance*, as a responsibility for “recognizing, validating and assessing learning” based on peer-certified competence; and *academic freedom*, as the ability to apply and share knowledge for the betterment of the common good. Colleges, universities, and the people who work for them undoubtedly will continue to be “stewards of place” (Saltmarsh et al, 2014), but now that place is the whole wide world.

About the Author

William M. Plater is Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties Emeritus at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) and Chancellor’s Professor Emeritus of Public Affairs, Philanthropic Studies, and English. From 2012 through 2014, he was Senior Advisor for International Affairs of the WASC Senior Colleges and Universities Commission, where he served as a commissioner from 2005 through 2011. Plater has served as senior advisor for education strategies at Course Networking, a learning technologies company providing global networking services for academic purposes through social media, and as a director of the management committee and senior advisor for education of Epsilen, a learning technologies company. Plater currently serves as a member of the advisory boards for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, the IU Center on Global Health, the Greater Indianapolis Red Cross, and the Board of Governors of Antioch University. In 2006, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities established the William M. Plater Award for Civic Engagement, the first national award of any kind to recognize provosts.

References

- AACSB International (2015, January 31). "Eligibility procedures and accreditation standards for business accreditation." Retrieved from <http://www.aacsb.edu/~media/AACSB/Docs/Accreditation/Standards/2013-bus-standards-update-jan2015.ashx>, p.23
- Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, R.E. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution (executive summary). Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001831/183168e.pdf>
- Armstrong, L. (2014). Barriers to innovation and change in higher education. New York: TIAA-CREF Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/public/pdf/barriers-to-innovation-and-change-in-higher-education.pdf>
- Bass, R. (2012, March 21). Disrupting ourselves: The problem of learning in higher education. Washington, DC: Educause Review on Line
- Blumenstyk, G. (2015a). *American higher education in crisis? What everyone needs to know*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Blumenstyk, G. (2015b, April 17). How LinkedIn's latest move may matter to colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/article/How-LinkedIn-s-Latest-Move/229441/>
- Bokor, J. (2012). *University of the future: A thousand year old industry on the cusp of profound change*. Ernst & Young. Retrieved from [http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/University_of_the_future/\\$FILE/University_of_the_future_2012.pdf](http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/University_of_the_future/$FILE/University_of_the_future_2012.pdf)
- Brown, M., Dehoney, J., & Millichap, N. (2015, April). *The next generation digital learning environment: A report on research*. Washington, DC: Educause Learning Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/library/resources/next-generation-digital-learning-environment-report-research>
- Carey, K. (2015). *The end of college: Creating the future of learning and the university of everywhere*. New York: Riverhead Books
- Casap, J. (2015, May 18). Jamie Casap explains why global competence matters: It's not really a small world. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/global_learning/2015/05/jaime_casap_explains_why_global_competence_matters_its_not_really_a_small_world.html
- Choudaha, R. & Edelstein, R.J. (2014, October 15). Towards quality transnational education, *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20141015210003860>
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2014, August). Quality assurance and alternative higher education: A policy perspective. Washington, DC: Council for Higher Education Accreditation
- Craig, R. (2015a). *College disrupted: The great unbundling of higher education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Craig, R. (2015b, July 23). Keynote address. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Summer Academic Affairs Meeting, Portland, Oregon
- Crow, M. M. & Dabars, W.B. (2015). *Designing the new American university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (2015). Los Angeles: University of Southern California. Retrieved from <http://www.thechangingfaculty.org/>
- European University Association (2015, January 30). EUA statement on TTIP and TiSA. Brussels, Belgium: European University Association
- Fain, P. (2015, August 14). Establishment goes alternative. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/08/14/group-seven-major-universities-seeks-offer-online-microcredentials?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=820b41e168-DNU20150814&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-820b41e168-197672737
- Ford, P. (2012, October 21). Reverse brain drain: China engineers incentives for "brain gain." *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Global-Issues/2012/1021/Reverse-brain-drain-China-engineers-incentives-for-brain-gain>
- Garrett, R. (2015, July 17). Competitors challenge universities on employability. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20150717220219962>
- Gaston, P. L. (2010). *The challenge of Bologna: What United States higher education has to learn from Europe, and why it matters that we learn it*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing
- ICEF Monitor (2015, June 30). Demand for job skills heating up in Africa. Bonn, Germany: ICEF GmbH. Retrieved from <http://monitor.icef.com/2015/06/demand-for-job-skills-heating-up-in-africa/>

- Kakuchi, S. (2015, June 26). Universities pressed to streamline, and cut humanities. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20150626132414546>
- Katz, S. N. (2014, January 13). Borderline ignorance: Why have efforts to internationalize the curriculum failed? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Borderline-Ignorance/143865/?key=S2whcll9aiMRM3kxN2kWajtQaSRtYU52MHVJa34kbltVFA==>
- Kezar, A. & Maxey, D. (2015). Adapting by design: Creating faculty roles and defining faculty work to ensure an intentional future for colleges and universities. University of Southern California: Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success. Retrieved from www.thechangingfaculty.org
- Krogstad, J.M. & Fry, R. (2014, April 24). More Hispanics, blacks enrolling in college, but lag in bachelor's degrees. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/04/24/more-hispanics-blacks-enrolling-in-college-but-lag-in-bachelors-degrees/>
- Maslen, G. (2012, February 19). Worldwide student numbers forecast to double by 2025. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120216105739999>
- Massie, S. (2015, July 18). It's a bird! It's a plane! It's a professional foreigner! *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/19/jobs/when-taking-a-step-back-can-make-a-difference.html?ref=todayspaper>
- MacGregor, K. (2015, April 10). Higher education is key to development – World Bank. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20150409152258799>
- National Science Foundation (2014). Science and engineering indicators 2014. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind14/index.cfm/overview>
- New Faculty Majority (2015). Akron, Ohio: New Faculty Majority. Retrieved from <http://www.newfacultymajority.info/>
- Pacheco, I.F. (2015, June 5). Your PhD oversupply crisis is our opportunity. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20150603160027984>
- Plater, W.M. (In press). The impact of globalization, internationalization, and glocalization on the future of faculty work." In A. Kezar & D. Maxey (Eds.), *The Faculty for the 21st Century*. Rutgers, N.J.: Rutgers University Press
- Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Washington, DC: AAHE & Stylus Publishing
- Saltmarsh, J., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L., Giles Jr., D., Cowdry, K., Liang, J., & Buglione, S. (2014). *Becoming a steward of place: Lessons from AASCU Carnegie Community Engagement Applications*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from <http://www.aascu.org/bookstore/lessonslearned/>
- Scheiber, N. (2015, July 12). Growth in the 'gig economy' fuels workforce anxiety. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/13/business/rising-economic-insecurity-tied-to-decades-long-trend-in-employment-practices.html?ref=todayspaper&_r=0
- Schuster, J.H. & Finkelstein, M.J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Shaker, G.G. (2015). *Faculty work and the public good: Philanthropy, engagement, and academic professionalism*. New York: Teacher's College Press
- Siemens, G., Gašević, D. & Dawson, S. (2015). *Preparing for the digital university: A review of the history and current state of distance, blended, and online learning*. Athabasca, Canada: Athabasca University
- Straumsheim, C. (2015a, May 11). Brick by brick. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/05/11/educause-releases-blueprint-next-generation-learning-management-systems>
- Straumsheim, C. (2015b, June 3). Corporations go to college. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/06/03/improving-economy-brings-opportunities-corporate-partnerships-higher-education>
- Sullivan, W.M. (2005). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- The Economist (2015, January 3). There's an app for that. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21637355-freelance-workers-available-moments-notice-will-reshape-nature-companies-and>
- The New York Times (2015, July 18). Defining 'employee' in the gig economy. Editorial. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/19/opinion/sunday/defining-employee-in-the-gig-economy.html?ref=todayspaper&_r=0

- UNESCO (2015a). *Global inventory of regional and national qualifications frameworks: Volume I thematic chapters*. Paris: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002330/233043e.pdf>
- UNESCO (2015b). *Rethinking education: Toward a global common good?* Paris: UNESCO Senior Experts Group. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002325/232555e.pdf>
- Zakaria, F. (2015). *In defense of a liberal education*. New York: W.W. Norton
- Zekaria, S., Panchal, T., & Ball, D. (2015, August 13). Pearson sells stake in the Economist. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. B5