

# AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

*Science* serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

## Editorial Board

1980: RICHARD E. BALZHISER, WALLACE S. BROECKER, CLEMENT L. MARKERT, FRANK W. PUTNAM, BRYANT W. ROSSITER, VERA C. RUBIN, MAXINE F. SINGER, PAUL E. WAGGONER, F. KARL WILLENBROCK

1981: PETER BELL, BRYCE CRAWFORD, JR., E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, SALLY G. KOHLSTEDT, EMIL W. HAURY, MANCUR OLSON, PETER H. RAVEN, WILLIAM P. SLICHTER.

## Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

## Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

## Editorial Staff

Managing Editor

ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Managing Editor

JOHN E. RINGLE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Production Editor

ELLEN E. MURPHY

News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON

News and Comment: WILLIAM J. BROAD, LUTHER J. CARTER, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, R. JEFFREY SMITH, NICHOLAS WADE, JOHN WALSH. Editorial Assistant, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: BEVERLY KARPLUS HARTLINE, RICHARD A. KERR, GINA BARI KOLATA, JEAN L. MARK, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON. Editorial Assistant, FANNIE GROOM

Consulting Editor: ALLEN L. HAMMOND

Associate Editors: ELEANORE KUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, SYLVIA EBERHART, RUTH KULSTAD

Assistant Editors: CAITILIN GORDON, STEPHEN KEPPEL, LOIS SCHMITT

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, Editor; LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG

Letters: CHRISTINE KARLIK

Copy Editor: ISABELLA BOULDIN

Production: NANCY HARTNAGEL, JOHN BAKER; YA LI SWIGART, HOLLY BISHOP, ELEANOR WARNER; MARY MCDANIEL, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, SHARON RYAN

Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, Editor; CORRINE HARRIS, MARGARET LLOYD

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER. Assistant to the Editor: JACK R. ALSIP

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE

Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Advancements, Washington. For "Instructions for Contributors," write the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 28 September 1979.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

## Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager: GINA REILLY

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581)

ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050.

## Currency in Subject Matter

Of some 300,000 scientists and engineers employed in American colleges and universities, approximately two thirds teach undergraduates. The vast majority teach in nonresearch university settings such as the community and junior colleges and many of the former state teachers colleges. Even in universities offering advanced degrees, a number of faculty teach undergraduate courses exclusively. Although there is nothing startling or new about this pattern, there is emerging concern about this group of faculty: How are they to maintain currency in disciplinary (and in many cases interdisciplinary) subject matter? The problem is increasingly recognized by leaders in professional organizations of scientists and educators; executives of major private and public foundations; leaders in academic science, government agencies, and industry and business; and persons knowledgeable about needs for faculty development throughout the nation.

This state of potential stultification of faculty results from a combination of factors, some internal to institutions of higher education and others developed outside them. Budget cutbacks resulting from declining enrollments and loss of confidence in the ability of higher education to deliver are restricting already tight sabbatical leave and professional travel opportunities. Increased percentages of tenured faculty coupled with the pending extension of the retirement age and the leveling of retrenchment of faculty size will minimize the infusion of new talent and produce an aging, and hence more expensive, professoriat over the next decade. Exacerbating these limiting factors are the erosional effects of nearly double-digit inflation. Under the circumstances, no significant initiatives addressing the subject matter needs of faculty will be forthcoming from the collegiate sector. All this while science continues to advance, sometimes explosively.

College faculty will continue, nonetheless, to educate and train the nation's next generation of scientists and engineers. It is thus in its own best interest that the federal government ensure a continuing high level of subject matter currency. The present response is far from adequate. For example, the college faculty-oriented programs of the National Science Foundation involve only about 3200 faculty per year. Of these, some 3100 participate in the Chautauqua Short Courses Program. Another 100 benefit from the Science Faculty Development Program, a fellowship program allowing up to 12 months of study but averaging about 9 months. The Chautauqua program operates on an annual budget of slightly less than \$1 million and thus reaches its audience at an extremely low cost per person. By contrast, the Science Faculty Development Program, operating on a budget of about \$2 million, reached only 119 individuals in fiscal year 1977, 127 in 1978, and 84 in 1979 (the smaller number in 1979 reflects, in part, longer tenures and upward shifts in the average salary of the recipients). Quality-oriented and excellent as it has been for the small number of recipients, the impact of this program in the fast moving world of science is woefully inadequate.

The National Science Foundation is considering ways to complement the existing faculty development programs in order to reach substantially greater numbers of college faculty. But the problem of maintaining currency and vitality among the nation's college and university science teachers is too massive to leave to one poorly financed activity by a single federal agency. The matter is of sufficient importance to warrant the attention of state governments, industry, and the imaginative and creative responses of a variety of academic and professional organizations. Perhaps most important are the professors themselves. While they cannot be expected to bear the entire burden for initiatives in self-renewal, their positions require that they make special efforts to maintain currency.—EDWARD J. KORMONDY, *Provost, University of Southern Maine, Portland 04103*