education review // reseñas educativas
editors: david j. blacker / gustavo e. fischman / melissa cast-brede / gene v glass

a multi-lingual journal of book reviews

January 16, 2013 ISSN 1094-5296
Education Review/Reseñas Educativas is a project of the National Education Policy Center http://nepc.colorado.edu
and the College of Education and Human Services of the University of Delaware
Follow *Education Review* on Facebook and on Twitter: #EducReview

Martin, Randy. (2011) *Under New Management: Universities, Administrative Labor, and the Professional Turn.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Pp. 253 ISBN 978-1439906958

Reviewed by Jillian Ryan Wood
Chapman University

Higher education institutions have transformed over the past decade. What used to be reserved for the elite, particularly male, members of society is now available to a diverse array of individuals. The quintessential research university that focused on learning as the end to the means now shares the academy with liberal arts schools, state universities, and for-profit universities. Students now attend universities to earn a degree or credential that will lead to a professional career rather than going for the sole purpose of learning. College students are no longer always straight out of high school and most rely on student loans to fund their education.

With the types of university and student body changing, it is only natural that the internal structures of universities

Citation: Wood, Jillian Ryan. (2013 January 16) Review of *Under New Management: Universities, Administrative Labor, and the Professional Turn* by Randy Martin. *Education Review, 16.* Retrieved [Date] from http://www.edrev.info/reviews/rev1205.pdf

need to be re-examined. Randy Martin's *Under New Management: Universities, Administrative Labor, and the Professional Turn* extensively addresses universities' shift from learning institutions to professional development institutions. Using historical and current examples, Martin discusses higher education's changing administrative processes and what is required for faculty, staff, and administrators to succeed in this altered environment. *Under New Management* is an essential book for aspiring and current professionals in higher education to understand how the history of the university has changed and how to adapt to the modern management of universities.

What is education for? Martin poses this question immediately in Chapter 1. Although seemingly simple to answer, Martin proves this question is convoluted with the new management of universities. During the early years of higher education, "learning was rigorous, comprehensive, original, enlightening-but above all, autonomous" (p. 27). The goal of higher education was to develop autonomous, critical-thinking individuals who grew intellectually during their university experience. This autonomous environment allowed faculty to own their work and evaluation methods were not needed to prove the faculty's impact.

This autonomy has diminished as universities shift from a private to a public good. Modern society wants to evaluate the output of education, a phenomenon that according to Martin results from industrialization. Due to the rising student loan debt, "colleges must look to the quality of the services they provide…the investment in the student promises long-range return" (p. 53). Donors, the public, parents, current and potential students want to see the university's product; education is now a commodity of labor. This evaluation process is primarily judged by the professional development universities provide their students. One particularly troubling statement Martin ventures is that "students will enter university as they were already leaving it" (p. 28). While I desire to disagree with this statement, it is impossible to ignore. Some students may attend college for the sole purpose of learning. However, living in a culture where standardized tests and finding a job are at the forefront of a college student's

mind, the beauty of learning is reduced or in some cases, eliminated.

The blame cannot be placed on the students for attending college in order to earn a degree and get a job. Martin believes this mentality has been ingrained in students since elementary school. Citing the *No Child Left Behind Act*, Martin argues that the focus of learning has shifted from enriching every student to testing students, specifically at-risk students, to ensure accountability. Martin's argument is further developed with the term *professional turn*. The professional turn causes college to be "reconfigured for professional advancement and development" (p. 30). Elementary, intermediate, and high school educators prepare their students for this new professional college. Martin vividly describes how education has been professionalized for students at an early age and how pre-college preparation has overshadowed true learning. While the student academic experience is addressed in the beginning of the book, a dominant theme in *Under New Management* is the most troubling for incoming, new, and current faculty members. This theme is the declining number of tenure-track and tenured faculty at universities.

An attractive incentive for joining the academy is the possibility of earning tenure. Tenure's permanency creates a level of financial security and academic freedom that is appealing to aspiring faculty (Becker & Toutkoushian, 2003). However, using a variety of statistics, Martin emphasizes that tenure is now the exception rather than the norm. According to Martin, part-time faculty now outnumber full-time faculty. In addition, tenured faculty members represent less than half the faculty at universities. Martin's focus on the declining tenure-track is a crucial topic that other researchers in the field have also discussed (Finder, 2007; Stripling, 2011).

Finder (2007) states that part-time faculty employment and full-time contractual employment outnumber tenured and tenure-track professors at universities. The decline in tenured faculty is a direct result of administrators preferring part-time faculty and full-time faculty contracts. Those who are not familiar with university operations would say faculty run higher education institutions. However, under the new management, administrators have taken control of the operations, budget, and require a

certain level of productivity from their professors. With this shift in control, the university does not want to commit to the life-long employment that tenure provides. The results of a Pew Research Center survey found 69% of university presidents prefer faculty to work under annual contracts (Stripling, 2011). The autonomy experienced by tenured faculty is replaced by contracts subjected to the administrators' guidelines. Although the statistics are distressing for academics that aim for tenure, it is commendable that Martin brings this dilemma to the forefront for public discussion.

The diminishing number of tenured faculty also affects faculty service activities. Service has always been part of professional productivity for faculty working towards tenure. According to Martin, the professional turn of universities now emphasizes service activities more than ever. The issue with this shift is that service is *gendered* and does not benefit faculty in an equal manner. Women are generally tasked with the majority of service duties and receive little reward for their work (Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004; Gerdes, 2003). Martin agrees that service needs to be restructured since some faculty members are rewarded for their service while others are not.

This restructuring needs to occur promptly since full-time faculty members spend about twelve percent of their time doing administrative tasks. Martin lists in detail all that is expected of faculty members. Senior faculty may remember a time when research and teaching were their main activities. With the professional turn, administrative tasks now play a key role in the faculty's lives with advising, committee service, civic engagement, and peer evaluations dominating working hours. Some faculty may not mind this service work while others would argue it takes away from their main purpose of the professorship: teaching and research.

The emphasis on service is a result of the peer university ranking system discussed in the earlier chapters of *Under New Management.* The commodity of education requires administrative, specifically service, work to be done by faculty in order to show a measurable end product. The irony with service is threefold. First, faculty members are required to complete administrative tasks yet higher education administrators are the ones with the actual

control. In addition, this service work is required yet is stigmatized since it does not directly relate to an academic's research and teaching skills. Service is also not delegated fairly, with researchers agreeing that women are assigned the majority of service work without reasonable compensation (Bird et al., 2004; Gerdes 2003). Rightfully, Martin believes something needs to change in the compensation and framing of service work to make it appealing as well as fair to faculty.

Diminished tenure-track positions and lack of faculty controls are not the only issues affecting universities. Martin's *Under New Management* also discusses interdisciplinarity, where there is a "strong boundary between what lies within and outside the university" (p. 145). This interdisciplinarity has led to active scholarship supported by life-long learning programs. The advent of life-long learners and for-profit universities has taken the "hold that Universities have on higher education" (p. 163). Martin demonstrates this shift by citing the for-profit University of Phoenix, which receives the largest amount of federal aid in the nation. In addition to elevated federal aid, the number of students attending for-profit universities has grown from 766,000 students in 2001 to 2.4 million in 2010 (Lee, 2012). Martin believes receiving industrial knowledge from these for-profit institutions entices non-traditional students to return to college. This change in higher education from a learning institution to a means of market placement is the definition of Martin's professional turn.

With the professional turn in higher education, Martin believes administrative labor will continue to gain importance and needs to be repositioned as a positive piece of an academic's labor. Framing administrative work from something that is valuable rather than required is a change that Martin accurately believes needs to occur. While reframing the importance of service needs to be done, Martin only briefly suggests how to accomplish this task. For incoming faculty, it is a matter of training them early to understand how to work in a managerial academy that educates the professional-managerial class. But what about senior faculty who have been in the field for years? As Martin mentions multiple times in the book, the autonomy faculty experienced early in their careers no longer exists. How to address these changes with senior

faculty is an arduous task that needs further explanation beyond this book.

In addition to Martin not providing a model for specifically handling the changes in university management, the historical information woven throughout the book can sometimes overshadow the current higher education context. However, even with these critiques, *Under New Management* is an essential read for higher education professionals, especially faculty. What Martin does so eloquently and forcefully in *Under New Management* is open the discussion about the future of higher education. Through vivid examples and startling statistics, Martin has brought distressing issues into a public discussion in a memorable way.

The new student body, the professional turn, lack of faculty autonomy, limited academic freedom, a departure from tenure, and more administrative labor, are issues that need to be addressed in the academy. While some may disagree with Martin's pointed way of highlighting higher education's more wicked dilemmas, the urgency in handling the professional turn is hard to discount. These issues directly affect doctoral students hoping to enter the academy in a tenure-track position. The issues also affect senior faculty who are accustomed to working under the old management terms as well as junior faculty who have been in the academy for only a few years. Every professional in higher education needs to invest in reading this book to understand the history of how we came to the professional turn. This book will also help higher education professionals acknowledge the issues their universities face, which will allow them to learn how to adapt to the changing managerial environment.

References

Becker, W. E., & Toutkoushian, R. K. (2003). Measuring gender bias in the salaries of tenured faculty members. *New Directions for Institutiona*l *Research, 117,* 5-20.

Bird, S., Litt, J., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as "women's work." *NWSA Journal, 16,* 194-206.

Finder, A. (2007, November 20). Decline of the tenure track raises concerns. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/20/education/20adjunct.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Gerdes, E. P. (2003). Do it your way: Advice from senior academic women. *Innovative Higher Education, 27,* 253-275.

Lee, S. (2012, August 9). For-profit higher education: The industry, by the numbers. *Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/09/for-profit-highereducati_n_1761369.html

Stripling, J. (2011, May 15). Most presidents prefer no tenure for majority of faculty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/MostPresidents-Favor-No/127526/

About the Reviewer

Jillian Ryan Wood is a PhD in Education student at Chapman University. Her research interests include examining higher education leadership styles, effective non-profit management strategies, and gender inequities in leadership as well as higher education.

Copyright is retained by the first or sole author, who grants right of first publication to the *Education Review*.

Education Review/Reseñas Educativas is a project of the National Education Policy Center http://nepc.colorado.edu and the College of Education and Human Services of the University of Delaware

Editors
David J. Blacker
blacker@edrev.info
Gustavo Fischman
fischman@edrev.info
Melissa Cast-Brede
cast-brede@edrev.info
Gene V Glass
glass@edrev.info
Follow *Education Review* on Facebook
and on Twitter: #EducReview