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FOR over a century in English and other modern language departments, non-tenure-track faculty members have complemented staffs of tenured or tenure-track colleagues. Appointments off the tenure track come under many names, but common to all is their contingent character, embodied in limited, fixed-term contracts—a semester, a year, or occasionally a term of two, three, or five years, sometimes renewable, often not, sometimes full-time, more often not. Since the 1970s, contingent positions have been the fastest growing faculty employment category in higher education. Recent studies document that non-tenure-track faculty members now constitute a majority of the faculty and that they now teach a majority of all undergraduate classes.

None of this information is new to readers of this journal. For over two decades, the sources, implications, and appropriate response to this phenomenon have been widely discussed within higher education generally and disciplinary associations particularly, the MLA prominent among them. The MLA, in its sustained history of analyzing employment practices and working conditions, paid increasing attention to the non-tenure-track faculty in the 1990s, marked by such efforts as the 1994 Statement on the Use of Part-Time and Full-Time Adjunct Faculty Members, the 1997 Committee on Professional Employment: Final Report, and the 2003 Statement on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members. These and many subsequent reports and statements are included in the Academic Workforce Advocacy Kit, an extension of the MLA’s leadership in the Coalition on the Academic Workforce.

This special joint issue of the ADE Bulletin and the ADFL Bulletin continues these efforts, in an initiative sponsored by the MLA Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession (CLIP). Formed in 2009 at the request of the MLA Delegate Assembly, CLIP drafted a policy document that was approved in 2011 by the MLA Executive Council: Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members (http://www.mla.org/pdf/clip_stmt_final_may11.pdf). Following one of our charges to consider proposing association publications, we gained enthusiastic approval from David Laurence and Nelly Furman, editors of the ADE Bulletin and the ADFL Bulletin, respectively, to issue a call for articles that report on and analyze current contingent faculty issues.

We’ve gathered several of those pieces here. In a cluster providing national perspectives on contingent labor, David Laurence collects and analyzes figures regarding employment status, incomes, and working conditions—complex figures that suggest contingent faculty members have a wide range of degree status, incomes (including household incomes), and even professional interests and aspirations. Sue Doe and Mike Palmquist analyze historical and current position statements from professional organizations affiliated with English and language studies, reaching the
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Conclusion that despite long and clear awareness, “our professional organizations—as well as the majority of faculty members in tenure-line positions—have been surprisingly slow to grasp the implications of the growing reliance on faculty who serve in contingent positions.” Jack Longmate argues that the Program for Change, which has improved conditions for contingent faculty at Vancouver Community College, can be implemented broadly across higher education. Among its features is that all faculty members, permanent or probationary, full- or part-time, are compensated according to the same salary schedule.

A second cluster focuses on the experiences of individual schools. Vialla Hartfield-Méndez and Karen Stolley trace the institutional history of lecture-track faculty at Emory University, using the Department of Spanish and Portuguese as a case study. The arc is generally positive, with increasingly improved conditions that complicate historical calls for tenure-track status only; however, recent developments at Emory may—or may not—bend this arc downward. Gillian Steinberg explains a similar set of improvements in the writing program at Yeshiva College, which sought to develop effective job descriptions; institute formal contract renewal policies and graduated contract lengths; eliminate part-time, single-semester positions; and bolster contingent participation in faculty development and administration. Laura Brady and Nathalie Singh-Corcoran also focus on local efforts in a large writing program, at West Virginia University, but with implications for the broad practice of employing non-tenure-track writing program administrators. Their strategy features “a shift away from individual faculty roles and workloads to focus instead on the department and university contexts to which the work contributes.”

Finally, Batya Weinbaum provides a perspective from someone working as a contingent professor. Because of the huge number of people teaching off the tenure track and the vast variety of their circumstances, no one voice can wholly represent or speak for this experience, but Weinbaum’s is a fine-grained narrative of faculty life in all-too-common circumstances.

Given the scope and complexity of contingent faculty issues, and given that they compound monthly and resonate throughout higher education, it’s easy for departments and faculty members to be paralyzed. Unfortunately, assuming that the only meaningful improvement is some distant, sweeping systemic fix simply licenses the status quo. The perfect, as the saying goes, is often an enemy of the good. To suggest worthy, if imperfect, actions that are available, then, we complete this special issue with a set of evaluative questions and recommendations, accompanied by a position paper describing how to implement these ideas and others.

Elizabeth Landers, chair
Sandra Baringer
Dorothea Heitsch
Doug Hesse
Glenn Levine
Karen Lentz Madison
Maria Shine Stewart
OF THE more than 1.5 million members of the academic workforce counted on the United States Department of Education’s 2011 Employees by Assigned Position survey (EAP), nearly 1.1 million (1,092,598, or 71.7%) were teaching off the tenure track in temporary or contingent appointments. This count includes members of the faculty and of the instructional staff in two- and four-year degree-granting institutions in the fifty states and the District of Columbia (graduate student teaching assistants are not included). In 2011, full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty members made up 66.7% of the more than 1.1 million faculty members teaching in four-year institutions and 85.4% of the more than 400,000 faculty members teaching in two-year institutions (table 1).

Despite its huge size and manifest importance to higher education’s teaching mission, the segment of the higher education teaching corps employed off the tenure track continues to be largely invisible in every sense—it is large and yet its members are often invisible to the public and policy makers, as well as to colleagues and administrators in the institutions where they are employed. Ignorance remains surprisingly pervasive about the most basic factual information on this majority segment of the academic workforce. In “Among the Majority,” a reflection on the 28 January 2012 New Faculty Majority Summit in Washington, Michael Bérubé, then president of the MLA, remarks on the comment of an administrator who asserted that there will be no solving the adjunct problem until the profession, and specifically English departments, do something about the overproduction of PhDs. The assumption—a mythology in wide circulation—appears to be that the adjunct academics teaching composition for $2,500 a course are all surplus English PhDs for whom higher education has no tenure-track jobs. In fact, the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04) indicates that in the 2003–04 academic year, across all fields of study, out of a non-tenure-track faculty population then estimated at 617,700, only 22.6% held doctorates; 48.5% held master’s degrees. Of the estimated 85,500 non-tenure-track faculty members in the humanities, 23.1% held a doctorate and 65.2% a master’s degree as their highest degree.

In four-year institutions in the arts and sciences, NSOPF:04 data reveal an especially sharp and telling contrast in the degree qualifications of members of the academic workforce on and off the tenure track. Table 2 displays NSOPF:04 data on the educational attainment of faculty members on and off the tenure track in two- and four-year institutions and in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, three of the eleven broad disciplinary teaching fields the NSOPF series used to classify respondents. (The “all fields” category shows the aggregate breakdown for all eleven disciplinary fields.) In four-year institutions in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences, well over 90% of the estimated 198,000 tenured and tenure-track faculty members held a doctorate—94.9% in the humanities, 97.8% in the social sciences, and 93.0% in the natural sciences; less than 5% held master’s degrees as their highest degree (4.5% in the humanities, including MFAs). In comparison, in four-year institutions only...
32.9% of the population of 49,800 full- and part-time non-tenure-track humanities faculty members held a doctorate; 57.3% held a master’s degree (10.5% the MFA and 46.7% the MA). In the natural and social sciences, doctorate holders constituted a slight majority of faculty members teaching off the tenure track in four-year institutions: 54.4% of the estimated 32,700 non-tenure-track faculty members in the social sciences and 51.8% of the estimated 63,200 in the natural sciences.

The NSOPF:04 data reflect responses from a sample of 35,000 faculty members and instructional staff. Table 3 shows the breakdown across the different tenure statuses of faculty members in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences teaching in two- and four-year institutions. On the basis of its sample, NSOPF:04 provided a weighted estimate of 1,211,900 full- and part-time faculty members in Title IV–participating, two- and four-year, degree-granting, not-for-profit colleges and universities in the United States. Of these, an estimated 40.3% held tenure or were on the tenure track (whether in full- or part-time positions); 51.0% were teaching in non-tenure-track positions; 8.8% were not tenured in institutions with no tenure system. In four-year institutions, NSOPF:04 estimated a faculty population of 841,200, of which 47.3% held tenure or were on the tenure track, 47.7% were non-tenure-track, and 5.0% were teaching off the tenure track in institutions without a tenure system. Two-year institutions had an estimated faculty population of 370,700, of which 24.4% held tenure or were on the tenure track, 58.3% were non-tenure-track, and 17.3% were teaching off the tenure track in institutions without a tenure system.

The faculty population estimated by NSOPF:04 is considerably smaller than the count from the 2011 EAP survey eight years later. Comparing figures from the 2003, 2009, and 2011 EAP surveys confirms that the difference between the NSOPF and EAP totals reflects the growth of the faculty over the intervening years. The 2003 EAP survey counted 1,147,506 full- and part-time faculty members in the institutional universe corresponding to that represented in NSOPF:04 (degree-granting, Title IV–participating, two- and four-year, not-for-profit institutions in the fifty states and the District of Columbia). Of these faculty members, 35.5% occupied full-time tenured or tenure-track positions, 19.2% were full-time non-tenure-track, and 45.3% were part-time. Just six years later, in 2009, the EAP survey counted 1,329,528 faculty members in the same institutional array—and with 33.9% in full-time tenured and tenure-track positions, 20.2% in full-time non-tenure-track positions, and 45.9% in part-time positions. In 2011, the total was 1,385,963, with 31.1% in full-time tenured and tenure-track positions, 22.0% in full-time non-tenure-track positions, and 46.9% in part-time positions. Of the approximately 238,000 faculty members that degree-granting not-for-profit institutions added between 2003 and 2011, over 215,000 (90%) were off the tenure track.

As the NSOPF:04 findings on degree qualifications show, the population of humanities faculty members employed off the tenure track in contingent academic positions cannot plausibly be supposed to be composed chiefly of recent doctorate recipients who were unable to secure tenure-track positions. The NSOPF data also make doubtful another common supposition about the humanities faculty members who teach off the tenure track as part of the contingent academic workforce—that many or most of these master’s degree holders are late-stage all-but-dissertation
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(ABD) doctoral candidates supporting themselves by teaching. NSOPF:04 provides information, as of the date when the data were collected, about the number of years members of the non-tenure-track academic workforce had held their current teaching jobs and their age when they began those jobs. Of the 55,700 humanities faculty members employed off the tenure track and holding a master’s degree, over 60% were over 45 years of age (or were in 2003, when these data were collected); 34.2% were over 55. Moreover, except for those under 35, the age distribution of master’s-degree-holding non-tenure-track faculty members—whether in the humanities or other disciplines—does not differ dramatically from that of their tenured and tenure-track colleagues, especially in the prime 35 to 54 age range (table 4).

A substantial segment of members of the non-tenure-track academic workforce, even those employed part-time, appears to be longer-term, or at least something other than short-term temporary, employees of their primary institutions. Table 5 shows NSOPF:04 findings for the number of years non-tenure-track faculty members held their current job and their age when they began that job, broken out by discipline. Across all disciplines, 39.7% of non-tenure-track faculty members had held their current position more than six years (41.7% of those employed full-time and 39.0% of those employed part-time); 23.5% had held their current position more than ten years (25.6% of full-time and 22.8% of part-time). A query for the age when these faculty members began that current job finds that 53.3% were 40 years of age or older and 24.2% were 50 or older; 29.9% were under 35. This combination of demographic characteristics does not suggest a population that generalization can accurately characterize as made up of newly graduated PhDs, ABDs, or people currently enrolled or soon to be enrolled in a doctoral program, although a good many may be.²

Table 6 shows the breakdowns for full- and part-time employment as reported in NSOPF:04.³ A high percentage—73.9%—of the 617,700 faculty members estimated to be teaching in non-tenure-track positions in 2003 were employed part-time. Among non-tenure-track faculty members whose primary affiliation was with a four-year institution (estimated population 401,500), 63.1% were part-time. Faculty members teaching full-time in non-tenure-track positions are especially rare in two-year colleges. Of non-tenure-track faculty members in two-year institutions (estimated population 216,200), 93.8% were employed part-time.

The humanities disciplines have a higher percentage of their non-tenure-track faculty members teaching part-time—79.3% of the estimated 85,500 humanities faculty members teaching off the tenure track as compared with 73.9% across all disciplines. Of the 49,800 non-tenure-track humanities faculty members whose primary affiliation was with a four-year institution, 67.8% were teaching part-time (compared with 63.1% across all disciplines). And in two-year institutions, 95.4% of the 35,700 non-tenure-track humanities faculty members taught in part-time positions (compared with 93.8% across all disciplines).

Salaries and Income

Across all fields and types of institutions, NSOPF:04 documents for 2003 a median annual salary of $6,000 and an average annual salary of $10,184 for part-time
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faculty members, across all disciplines. Median and average salaries for part-time faculty members in the humanities fall in a narrower range, indicating less variation between the amounts reported—$6,848 (median) and $9,448 (average). Table 7 shows the median and average annual salaries part-time faculty members were paid by their primary institution, broken out by primary affiliation with a two- or four-year institution. The third column shows the percentage of respondents earning a basic salary greater than $15,000; the fourth column indicates the percentage whose annual individual income exceeded $40,000—a rough measure of income from other employment in addition to teaching at the institution part-time faculty members identified as their primary academic employer. The percentage of respondents reporting total individual income over $40,000 is strikingly lower for part-time faculty members in the humanities than for those in the social and natural sciences or the aggregate for all disciplines. Full-time non-tenure-track faculty members, across all fields and types of institutions, reported unadjusted 2003 salaries of $47,000 (median) and $59,471 (average), as can be seen in table 8. As was the case for part-time faculty members, salaries for full-time non-tenure-track faculty members in the humanities are significantly lower and compressed within a much narrower range—$38,000 (median) and $40,995 (average)—than those for their colleagues in the social and natural sciences.

Annual household income reported by full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty members was on average much higher than their annual salaries. Table 9 and table 10 show NSOPF:04 data on household income of full-time non-tenure-track faculty members and of part-time non-tenure-track faculty members, respectively. The top line in each section of the table shows the median and average annual household income reported across all eleven NSOPF disciplinary fields; figures for the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences are broken out separately for comparison. The three right-hand columns show the percentage of the estimated population in each disciplinary category reporting household income greater than $50,000, $75,000, and $100,000. Across all institutional categories, non-tenure-track faculty members in the humanities, both full- and part-time, report lower household incomes than their colleagues in other fields. A notably lower percentage of full- and part-time humanities faculty members also reports household income over $75,000. All dollar amounts are in unadjusted 2003 dollars.

Breaking out salaries of the estimated 67,800 part-time non-tenure-track humanities faculty members by their years of employment may give some insight into the low ceiling limiting these faculty members’ opportunities for economic as well as professional advancement. These breakouts are shown in table 11.

Employment Patterns

These data on salaries and income point to another commonplace of the mythology surrounding part-time faculty members and their employment situations: that they are professionals employed outside postsecondary teaching who bring valuable forms of on-the-job expertise to their classrooms and their students. NSOPF:04 data suggest that, while this commonplace holds some truth for a substantial fraction of the
contingent academic workforce, it severely mischaracterizes the situation for another sizable group—especially in the humanities. Table 12 shows that, overall, more than 70% of part-time non-tenure-track faculty members reported holding another full- or part-time job. Percentages were lower, however, in the humanities and natural sciences. In the humanities, just over 60% of part-time faculty members reported having other jobs; in the natural sciences, just under 60% did.

As the humanities row in table 13 shows, across all fields, humanities programs in four-year institutions have the highest percentage of faculty members for whom part-time teaching at a single institution is their only employment—43.5% of an estimated 33,700 part-time humanities faculty members, followed closely by 42.5% of an estimated 33,400 part-time faculty members in the natural sciences.

But for how many part-time faculty members is part-time employment, whether at a single job or at multiple jobs, their sole form of employment? Information from NSOPF:04 shows that, across all fields and institutions, 47.0% of part-time non-tenure-track faculty members had another full-time job (table 14). But in the humanities the figure was far lower—only 35.0%. In four-year institutions, only 28.4% of part-time faculty members in the humanities held a full-time job elsewhere. Or, put the other way, for just over half of all part-time faculty members, part-time employment (whether at one or more than one part-time job) was their sole form of employment; in the humanities the figure was remarkably higher—64.9% across all institutions and 71.6% in four-year institutions. Looking at the NSOPF:04 data for non-tenure-track faculty members with full-time positions indicates another employment pattern. Across all disciplinary fields and types of institutions, about three-fifths of the non-tenure-track academic workforce had full-time employment, whether in their faculty position or elsewhere (table 15). But, again, in the humanities, the percentage of faculty members with full-time employment is strikingly lower—only 48.5%, including 51.4% of those with positions in four-year institutions and 44.3% of those with positions in two-year institutions.

A more detailed probing of the NSOPF:04 data reveals that for part-time faculty members in the humanities with other, full-time employment, the full-time job is likely outside postsecondary teaching. Across all types of institutions, of the part-time faculty members in the humanities who held other, full-time jobs, 85.0% reported that the other job was outside postsecondary instruction (table 16). By comparison, of the part-time humanities faculty members who reported holding multiple part-time jobs in fall 2003, 44.9% held at least one other postsecondary teaching job, while 55.1% held part-time jobs outside postsecondary teaching.

Regardless of discipline, teaching part-time at a single institution is the prevailing employment pattern for the subset of part-time faculty members whose sole employment is part-time teaching. Nonetheless, across all disciplines, the freeway flier teaching at two or more institutions makes up more than a quarter of the group for whom teaching part-time in postsecondary institutions is their sole form of employment. Table 17 shows the distributions of these part-time faculty members by the number of postsecondary teaching positions they held in fall 2003, broken out by disciplinary field and two- or four-year institutional type. Of part-time faculty members in the humanities, in all types of institutions, 67.7% were employed part-
time at a single institution, 21.0% were employed at two institutions, and 11.3% were employed at three or more institutions.

A review of the NSOPF:04 data underscores the various ways the non-tenure-track faculty is diversified in its characteristics and divided in its interests. While many members of the contingent academic workforce would welcome the opportunity to move to full-time, tenure-track positions, a far larger group who hold degrees other than doctorates would for the most part not be eligible to compete for such positions—at least not in four-year institutions, where over 90% of tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences hold doctorates. Now the largest and long the fastest-growing segment of the entire academic workforce, part-time non-tenure-track faculty members are complexly divided. Some part-time faculty members desperately want full-time academic positions; others prefer part-time employment and vehemently oppose efforts to convert part-time to full-time positions. While it has been easy to know what we are against in the circumstances and treatment of contingent academic workers, it has proven far more difficult to achieve any semblance of consensus on what to advocate. Conversion of contingent appointments to tenure-track positions seems to imply discontinuation of employment for huge numbers of the current occupants of those appointments. Creation of a non-tenure-track career path with professional remuneration, benefits, and privileges appears to concede a further weakening of tenure and the effacement of distinctions crucial to sustaining scholarship as a definitive characteristic of higher education, its faculty, and its faculty members’ teaching. Negotiating these difficulties and differences across the faculty constituencies occupying all these disparate employment situations, and achieving a decent consensus about what professional conditions to support, stand as baseline conditions for any efforts aimed at correcting entrenched institutional labor practices that for four decades have proved as inexorable and intractable as they are unwise.

A Note on the Sources

The best available source of information about faculty members in various disciplines in United States institutions of higher education remains the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04), the last administration of the unfortunately now discontinued NSOPF series. Collected in the academic year 2003–04, the 2004 NSOPF data are now so old as to make them questionable as a reflection of current conditions, but they stand as the only systematic, national data from which differentiated information can be developed about the size and characteristics of faculty populations in the major disciplinary divisions, including the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, engineering, education, business, and fine arts. Complete results of the queries used to develop the information summarized in this data brief are available from the MLA Office of Research on request (research@mla.org). The queries were developed at the NCES Data Lab, the NCES Web interface to the NSOPF:04 data (http://nces.ed.gov/datalab/).

The Fall Staff and Employees by Assigned Position components of the IPEDS continue to provide a regularly updated census of faculty members and other institutional employees with instructional responsibilities, broken out by employment
and tenure status (but, except for the distinction of medical and nonmedical faculty, not by discipline).

Notes

1. As Bérubé noted, in English (estimated population 46,200, including both two- and four-year institutions), only 14.4% of non-tenure-track faculty members held a doctorate, while 73.0% held master’s degrees (12.1% held the MFA, 60.9% the MA or other master’s degree).

2. By comparison, the Survey of Earned Doctorates reported a median age of 35.0 years for humanities doctorate recipients in 2004 and 34.2 years in 2011 (Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities, table 17; Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities, table 27).

3. Faculty members teaching off the tenure track in two-year colleges that do not have a tenure system are not included in these figures. NSOPF:04 estimated this population at 8.8% of all 1,211,900 faculty members—5.0% of the 841,200 faculty members in four-year institutions and 17.3% of the 370,700 in two-year institutions.

4. These figures refer to basic salary, in unadjusted 2003 dollars, paid by the postsecondary institution part-time faculty members identified as their primary academic employer.
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Table 1
Faculty Members in Different Tenure and Employment Statuses, by Institutional Type, Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time Tenured</th>
<th>Full-Time Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Full-Time Tenured and Tenure-Track (Subtotal)</th>
<th>Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>303,475</td>
<td>127,542</td>
<td>431,017</td>
<td>330,602</td>
<td>761,996</td>
<td>1,523,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row percentage</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>257,886</td>
<td>113,456</td>
<td>371,342</td>
<td>264,814</td>
<td>479,471</td>
<td>1,115,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row percentage</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column percentage</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>45,589</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>59,675</td>
<td>65,788</td>
<td>282,525</td>
<td>407,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row percentage</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column percentage</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 Employees by Assigned Position (EAP) survey (US Dept. of Educ., IPEDS)

Note
The figures in table 1 were calculated directly from the 2011 EAP data file to match those for full- and part-time faculty members in degree-granting institutions in fall 2011, published in the 2012 Digest of Education Statistics. See table 286 (http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_286.asp).
Table 2
Educational Attainment of Faculty Members Employed On and Off the Tenure Track, by Institutional Type and Discipline (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>First-Professional Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured and tenure-track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>488,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>57,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>114,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure-track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>617,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>85,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>47,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>109,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured and tenure-track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>397,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>92,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure-track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>401,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>49,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>63,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured and tenure-track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>90,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure-track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>216,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>35,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>46,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04
Notes
1. The category “master’s degrees” includes MFAs.
2. As defined by the United States Department of Education, the category “first-professional degrees” includes doctor of chiropractic; doctor of dental science; doctor of jurisprudence; doctor of medicine; doctor of optometry; doctor of osteopathic medicine; doctor of pharmacy; doctor of podiatric medicine; doctor of veterinary medicine; and master of divinity, master of Hebrew letters, or rabbinical ordination.
### Table 3
**Distribution of Faculty Members by Tenure Status, Institutional Type, and Discipline (Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured and Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Not on Tenure Track</th>
<th>Not Tenured (No Tenure System)</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1,211,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>169,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>240,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>841,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>108,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>160,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>370,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>61,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>80,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04

### Table 4
**Age (in 2003) of Master’s-Degree-Holding Non-Tenure-Track and All Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members, by Discipline (Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 35</th>
<th>Age 35–44</th>
<th>Age 45–54</th>
<th>Age 55–64</th>
<th>Age 65 or Above</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-tenure-track</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>299,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>55,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>23,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>45,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured and tenure-track</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>488,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>70,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>57,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>114,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04
Table 5
Years Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Had Held Their Current Job and Age When They Began That Job, by Discipline (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Held Current Job</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One to Two Years</td>
<td>Three to Five Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age When Began Current Job</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>35–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04

Table 6
Full- or Part-Time Employment Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members, by Institutional Type and Discipline (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04
Table 7
Median and Average Basic Annual Salaries Part-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Received from Their Primary Academic Employment, by Institutional Type and Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Basic Salary</th>
<th>Average Basic Salary</th>
<th>Salary Greater Than $15,000</th>
<th>Individual Income Greater Than $40,000</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$10,184</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>456,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$6,848</td>
<td>$9,448</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>67,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$9,429</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$6,840</td>
<td>$10,688</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>78,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$6,914</td>
<td>$11,609</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>253,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,584</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$10,134</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$12,773</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$5,985</td>
<td>$8,403</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>202,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$5,850</td>
<td>$8,323</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>34,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$9,133</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>44,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04

Table 8
Median and Average Basic Annual Salaries of Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members, by Institutional Type and Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Basic Salary</th>
<th>Average Basic Salary</th>
<th>Individual Income Greater Than $50,000</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$59,471</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>161,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$40,995</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$44,659</td>
<td>$48,944</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$56,360</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>31,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$48,800</td>
<td>$61,174</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$40,894</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$49,588</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$57,456</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$38,277</td>
<td>$40,568</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$41,984</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$35,973</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Number of cases too small to report data
Source: NSOPF:04
### Table 9

**Household Income Reported by Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Average Household Income</th>
<th>Percentage with Household Income Greater Than Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$109,952</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>161,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$73,750</td>
<td>$85,468</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$86,700</td>
<td>$100,692</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td>$98,142</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>31,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$89,800</td>
<td>$112,766</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$73,750</td>
<td>$84,494</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$101,454</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$87,100</td>
<td>$99,894</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$68,755</td>
<td>$78,704</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$95,010</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$65,570</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Number of cases too small to report data

Source: NSOPF:04

### Table 10

**Household Income Reported by Part-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Average Household Income</th>
<th>Percentage with Household Income Greater Than Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$79,964</td>
<td>$92,687</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>456,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$74,157</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>67,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$77,800</td>
<td>$87,058</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$79,440</td>
<td>$87,678</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>78,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$87,499</td>
<td>$103,868</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>253,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$77,432</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$82,800</td>
<td>$93,081</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$85,539</td>
<td>$95,934</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>$69,600</td>
<td>$78,720</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>202,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$62,499</td>
<td>$70,912</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>34,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$76,974</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$81,519</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>44,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04
Table 11  
Basic Salary and Individual and Household Income of Part-Time Faculty Members in the Humanities, by Institutional Type and Years in Current Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Median Basic Salary</th>
<th>Average Basic Salary</th>
<th>Median Individual Income</th>
<th>Average Individual Income</th>
<th>Individual Income Greater Than $45,000</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Household Income Greater Than $90,000</th>
<th>Source: NSOPF:04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>$6,848</td>
<td>$9,448</td>
<td>$28,548</td>
<td>$35,313</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to two years</td>
<td>$4,688</td>
<td>$7,693</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$31,280</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>$59,700</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five years</td>
<td>$8,654</td>
<td>$10,481</td>
<td>$27,300</td>
<td>$35,623</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>$62,499</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten years</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>$9,681</td>
<td>$32,850</td>
<td>$37,486</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years</td>
<td>$8,333</td>
<td>$10,766</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$39,828</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,584</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$36,230</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to two years</td>
<td>$6,840</td>
<td>$9,111</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$32,799</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five years</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,510</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$33,947</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten years</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,727</td>
<td>$32,200</td>
<td>$39,207</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years</td>
<td>$8,630</td>
<td>$11,850</td>
<td>$34,200</td>
<td>$43,741</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td>$5,850</td>
<td>$8,323</td>
<td>$30,099</td>
<td>$34,404</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to two years</td>
<td>$3,360</td>
<td>$6,161</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$29,640</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>$11,100</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five years</td>
<td>$7,050</td>
<td>$9,417</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
<td>$37,356</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten years</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$8,674</td>
<td>$32,225</td>
<td>$35,831</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$9,872</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td>$36,601</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 12
**Part-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members Who Have and Do Not Have Other Full- or Part-Time Jobs, by Discipline (Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Have No Other Employment</th>
<th>Have Other Employment</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>456,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>67,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>78,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sciences</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>47,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>55,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>37,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>42,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and home economics</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other programs</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>69,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04

### Table 13
**Part-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members in Four-Year Institutions Who Have and Do Not Have Other Full- or Part-Time Jobs, by Discipline (Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Have No Other Employment</th>
<th>Have Other Employment</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>253,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sciences</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>28,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>35,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and home economics</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other programs</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>34,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04
### Table 14
Full- and Part-Time Employment of Part-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members, by Institutional Type and Discipline (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Other Employment</th>
<th>Part-Time Employment at Other Job</th>
<th>Full-Time Employment at Other Job</th>
<th>Only Employment Is Part-Time Employment</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>456,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>67,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>78,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>253,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>202,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>34,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>44,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04

### Table 15
Full- and Part-Time Employment of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members, by Institutional Type and Discipline (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed Full-Time at This Institution</th>
<th>Employed Part-Time at This Institution</th>
<th>Has Full-Time Employment</th>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With No Other Job</td>
<td>And Part-Time at Other Job</td>
<td>And Full-Time at Other Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-year institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All disciplines</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04
### Table 16
**Part-Time Non-Tenure-Track Humanities Faculty Members with Other Jobs, by Institutional Type and Whether the Other Job Is Full- or Part-Time and in or outside Postsecondary Instruction (Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages)</th>
<th>Has No Other Job</th>
<th>Has Other Instructional Job</th>
<th>Has Other Noninstructional Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All part-time humanities faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other employment</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time at other job</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time at other job</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All part-time humanities faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other employment</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time at other job</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time at other job</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All part-time humanities faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other employment</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time at other job</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time at other job</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSOPF:04

### Table 17
**Number of Part-Time Teaching Jobs Held by Part-Time Faculty Members Whose Sole Employment Was Teaching Part-Time at One or More Postsecondary Institutions, by Institutional Type and Discipline (Percentages)**

| Estimated Population (Basis for Percentages) | This Institution Only | Two Institutions | Three Institutions | Four or More Institutions | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| All institutions                            |                       |                  |                    |                           |
| All disciplines                             | 71.0                  | 15.2             | 10.3               | 3.5                       | 185,400 |
| Humanities                                  | 67.7                  | 21.0             | 7.9                | 3.4                       | 37,200  |
| Social sciences                             | 60.0                  | 18.6             | 17.3               | 4.1                       | 15,200  |
| Natural sciences                            | 78.4                  | 13.2             | 7.0                | 1.4                       | 40,900  |
| Four-year institutions                       |                       |                  |                    |                           |
| All disciplines                             | 70.0                  | 15.6             | 11.0               | 3.4                       | 106,900 |
| Humanities                                  | 70.1                  | 20.4             | 7.0                | 2.5                       | 20,900  |
| Social sciences                             | 60.2                  | 19.2             | 17.4               | 3.1                       | 9,100   |
| Natural sciences                            | 80.3                  | 13.3             | 4.5                | 1.9                       | 17,700  |
| Two-year institutions                        |                       |                  |                    |                           |
| All disciplines                             | 72.3                  | 14.7             | 9.4                | 3.6                       | 78,500  |
| Humanities                                  | 64.6                  | 21.7             | 9.1                | 4.6                       | 16,300  |
| Social sciences                             | 59.7                  | 17.7             | 17.1               | 5.6                       | 6,100   |
| Natural sciences                            | 76.9                  | 13.0             | 9.0                | 1.0                       | 23,200  |

Source: NSOPF:04
An Evolving Discourse: The Shifting Uses of Position Statements on the Contingent Faculty

Sue Doe and Mike Palmquist

OVER the past three decades, faculty members in English studies and the professional organizations to which they belong have attended with increasing urgency to the “plight” of their colleagues in contingent positions. Their attention to this issue has produced what has become a steady stream of scholarly and professional work on what has come to be known as contingency studies, ranging from official position statements from professional organizations (including the Modern Language Association, the Association of Departments of English, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the Council of Writing Program Administrators) to a growing collection of data on the status and working conditions of contingent faculty members to conferences, workshops, and special issues of scholarly journals.

Scholars working within contingency studies have traced the trajectory of contingent appointments in American higher education (Baldwin and Chronister; Gappa and Leslie; Schuster and Finkelstein; AAUP Contingent Faculty Index) and particularly within English studies (Enos; Schell; Horner; Bousquet, Scott, and Parascondola). They have debated its implications (Curtis and Jacob; Jaeger and Eagan; Nelson, Taylor, Kezar, Vedder, and Trower) and linked the issues of contingency to economic debates about the defunding of public education and to other fiscal and managerial factors (Rhoades; Newfield; Tuchman; “What Are”; Watson). Furthermore, they have explored lines of thought about what might be done to move forward in both practical and ethical directions (Kezar and Sam, “Beyond Contracts” and Understanding). Our professional organizations, in the meantime, have established commissions and committees, collected and considered data, and issued statements in an attempt to influence what has become an all-too-clear historical shift in employment patterns within the academy. Professional associations have also consolidated to provide more comprehensive sets of data and discussion (One Faculty).

In this essay, we offer an analysis of the extent to which our professional organizations have been able to shape national and local discourses about contingent positions within our discipline. We suggest that, despite the evident failure of early efforts to preserve the primacy of tenure-line positions, our professional organizations have nonetheless provided a substantial set of resources that have been (and can continue to be) used within local contexts to improve the status and working conditions of faculty members in contingent positions. Looking forward, it seems plausible that work on the local level, supported by these resources and shaped by an evolving discourse about contingency, might ultimately lead to a renewed and potentially more vigorous employment system in which tenure—in a variety of forms—is more widely enjoyed than is currently the case.
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Framing the National Debate

Professional organizations relating to English studies have published more than two dozen position statements, with the highest number coming from the Modern Language Association (MLA) and a steady stream of others from the College Conference on Composition and Communication (CCCC), the Association of Departments of English (ADE), the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), the Association of Writing Programs (AWP), Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). Nevertheless, our professional organizations—as well as the majority of faculty members in tenure-line positions—have been surprisingly slow to grasp the implications of the growing reliance on faculty members who serve in contingent positions. The sense of purpose and outrage that brought forth the Wyoming Resolution (which emerged from the 1986 Wyoming Conference on English and was subsequently published in *College English* in March 1987 [Robertson, Crowley, and Lentricchia]) was all too quickly—but perhaps inevitably—replaced with a bunker mentality: the goal of our professional organizations would be, first and foremost, to preserve the tenure system.

In their discussion of the history of the Wyoming Resolution and its effects, James C. McDonald and Eileen E. Schell observe that reactions to the first organizational position statement following the Wyoming Resolution, the 1989 CCCC draft report (“Statement of Principles”), focused more on the qualifications of those teaching composition and less on the status and working conditions of these faculty members. Indeed, they note that “many part-time faculty members felt that the 1989 ‘Statement of Principles’ weakened attempts to improve their working conditions and could lead to the elimination of their jobs if implemented” (371). This outcome, they note, was a far cry from what had seemed possible in the days immediately following the Wyoming conference. Indeed, the emerging document seemed to erode not build the confidence of contingent faculty members since it implied an underlying inadequacy in them rather than in the institutions that employed them.

Over the next decade, from the early 1990s until the early 2000s, the primary stance taken by professional organizations would be to preserve tenure at all costs. While lip service was paid to the need to improve the conditions under which faculty members in contingent positions labored, early position statements issued by the CCCC, NCTE, and MLA advanced the argument—most often implicitly but on occasion in the baldest terms—that the quality of instruction produced by contingent faculty members would be inferior to that provided by faculty members in tenure-line positions. This view was clearly presented in the 1989 CCCC “Statement of Principles”:

> [W]hen institutions depend increasingly on faculty whose positions are tenuous and whose rights and privileges are unclear or nonexistent, *those freedoms established as the right of full-time tenurable and tenured faculty are endangered*. Moreover, *the excessive reliance on marginalized faculty damages the quality of education*. Even when, as is often the case, these faculty bring to their academic appointments the appropriate credentials and commitments to good teaching, their low salaries, poor working conditions, and uncertain futures mar their effectiveness and reduce the possibilities for loyalty to the institution’s educational goals. All lose: teachers,
students, schools, and ultimately a democratic society that cannot be without citi-
czens whose education empowers them to read and write with critical sophistication.  
(emphasis added)

Subsequent statements echoed this sentiment. In two 1992 statements, the ADE 
argued strongly against the use of adjunct faculty members and in the process dis-
paraged those holding non-tenure-line positions. The ADE statement on the use of 
adjunct faculty members opens by observing, “The expansion of the adjunct ranks 
in English departments over the past two decades threatens the integrity of the 
profession and instructional programs,” before calling attention to the poor working 
conditions and lack of professional respect associated with most contingent positions 
(“ADE Statement on the Use”). Similarly, in its statement on class size and work-
load, the ADE urges, “Part-time and temporary teaching appointments should be 
avoided as a rule” (“ADE Guidelines”). The ADE and the English programs it repre-
sented seem to have found themselves in a compromised position: even as the ADE 
was officially distancing itself from what was being characterized as a subprofessional 
faculty, the programs it represented were relying ever more heavily on contingent 
faculty members for much of the production of instruction.

Throughout the 1990s, professional organizations continued to argue for the pri-
macy of tenure-line positions, attempting in almost all cases to present them, either 
directly or by implication, as leading to a higher quality of teaching than contingent 
positions. It was clear, however, that these arguments were not having their intended 
effect. In 1997, for example, the MLA Committee on Professional Employment 
asserted that the “disturbingly heavy reliance on part-timers in American higher 
education today contributes directly and indirectly to the failures of our academic 
system” (“Committee”). The committee’s solution was unsurprising: “[E]xcellence in 
education for present and future students depends on an increase in full-time tenure-
track faculty positions.” That same year, the NCTE membership adopted a resolution 
that called for the organization to “join other disciplinary and higher-education 
groups in encouraging legislative and policy bodies to adopt and fund initiatives 
that provide for labor equity in graduate employee and adjunct work” (“Resolution 
on Affirming Labor Equity”).

By the early 2000s, position statements and other documents issued by profes-
sional organizations were reflecting a growing awareness that a position of tenure at 
all costs was not advancing the conversation. As the American Association of Uni-
versity Professors (AAUP) would report later that decade, the number of tenure-line 
positions as an overall percentage of all teaching positions in higher education was 
declining rapidly, from 47 percent in 1989 to roughly 30 percent by the middle of 
the decade (AAUP Contingent Faculty Index). It was clear that faculty members in 
contingent positions were fast becoming, if they had not already become, the major-
ity. Increasingly, these documents attended directly to labor conditions and, in some 
cases, to the relationships between faculty members in tenure-line and those in con-
tingent positions. The MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching signaled a shift in per-
spective, avoiding the by then customary cautions that an overreliance on contingent 
positions would lead to inferior learning outcomes while recommending that “insti-
tutions and departments provide professional recognition, appropriate contractual
arrangements, and appropriate compensation” for faculty members in part-time and non-tenure-line positions (MLA Ad Hoc Committee). The MLA’s 2003 “Statement on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members” noted a concern that earlier calls for conversion of non-tenure-line positions to tenure-line positions had not provided clear guidance for the ethical treatment of faculty members in positions that could not be converted to tenure lines. The statement explained that the MLA Executive Council wished “to make sure that departments cannot make personnel decisions on the basis of financial exigency, eroding the limited job security enjoyed by [non-tenure-track] faculty members, while citing MLA committee reports to imply that MLA-recommended practices are being followed.” The statement included a comprehensive set of guidelines on the treatment of non-tenure-track faculty members.

In 2008, the MLA released Education in the Balance: A Report on the Academic Workforce in English. Created by the 2007 ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Staffing, the report painted a picture of employment in higher education as a whole and in English studies in particular that confirmed the growth in reliance on a contingent faculty. The report echoed earlier concerns about the erosion of tenure-line positions as a percentage of all positions, but it also provided clear guidelines regarding the working conditions and professional status of faculty members in contingent positions:

We are deeply concerned to note the dramatic increase in the number of English department faculty members hired outside the tenure track. While working to define an appropriate role for the non-tenure-track segment of the faculty and limit its size, we must ensure that those colleagues employed outside the tenure track have the appropriate salaries, working conditions, status, rights and responsibilities, and security of employment.

The importance of ethical treatment for all faculty members had become widely accepted by 2009. The MLA, in an issue brief published that year, argued, “All college and university teachers, whether in full- or part-time positions, on or off the tenure track, need to see themselves as members of one faculty working together to provide a quality education to all students” (MLA Issue Brief). After addressing such issues as compensation, participation in governance, professional status, job security, and working conditions, the brief concluded, “When all teachers are appropriately compensated and are active participants in curriculum planning, student advising, and campus life, then learning flourishes and student retention and completion rates increase.”

By the end of the decade, the reports, position statements, and resolutions issued by professional organizations in English studies showed recognition that the growth in contingent positions was unlikely to be reversed. The NCTE, in 2010, and the MLA, in 2011, each released detailed position statements that addressed, among other issues, working conditions, compensation, shared governance, and professional status (“Position Statement on the Status”; Professional Employment Practices). Both organizations also pledged to provide Web-based resources intended to support labor actions at the local level. In addition, the arguments made by leaders of the MLA, ADE, NCTE, and CCCC reflected an awareness that the battle for tenure lines had largely been lost. The modest overall increase in the number of tenure lines had been overshadowed by the far greater increase in contingent positions. Yet the belief in the value of long-term security of employment embodied in tenured positions had not
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dimmed. In 2009, the MLA Delegate Assembly passed a resolution recommending that “[a]ll college and university faculty members—full- and part-time—should be eligible for tenure” (“Resolution from the 2009 Delegate Assembly”). This recommendation was echoed by the NCTE in 2010: “Instructors should be afforded the opportunity to earn tenure or, in the alternative, ‘long-term security of employment’ as teaching specialists” (“Position Statement on the Status”). Clearly, the value of tenure had not diminished over the more than two decades since the Wyoming Resolution had been published. What had changed, however, was our understanding of who might be eligible for it.

This brief history of the evolution of reports, position statements, and resolutions issued by professional organizations within English studies raises the question of whether these documents shape or reflect discourse in the field. As members of some of the groups that have contributed to the development of these documents, we can state with confidence that many of the individuals working on these documents do so to influence discourse and, ultimately, action on national and local levels. Our experience suggests, however, that this goal is somewhat naive. Although documents such as the Wyoming Resolution have clearly had a strong influence on debates within the discipline, they have led only indirectly to changes in the status and working conditions of our colleagues employed in contingent positions. What value, then, do these documents have? Our answer is that they can provide important direction for discourse at a national level and, through this discourse, can support action at the local level. Operating on the assumption that, indeed, “all change is local,” we turn next to a discussion of the impact of organizational position statements, resolutions, and reports within local contexts. Our analysis considers several local cases, each representing a distinct but typical set of challenges for faculty members working to bring about change at their institutions.

Supporting Local Action

Although we believe that the statements from professional organizations have had little measurable effect on the national phenomenon of contingency within the discipline, there is strong evidence that they have served an important role within local contexts. This is both intentional, on the part of the framers of at least some of these position statements and the leaders of the organizations that have published them, and opportunistic, since advocates for change have used the statements locally to advance their arguments for equity, respect, shared governance, and improved working conditions.

Recently, for example, during his term as MLA president, Michael Bérubé called attention to Josh Boldt’s Adjunct Project, a crowdsourcing project on adjunct faculty salaries and working conditions (http://adjunctproject.com). Noting a similar project that would shortly be launched by the MLA (the Academic Workforce Data Center [http://www.mla.org/acad_work_search]), Bérubé reflected on the potential of these kinds of resources to help faculty members in contingent positions learn “about [non-tenure-track] working conditions more systematically.” He also noted that the data would help “single out institutions that are doing things right” and “identify
malefactors as well.” These kinds of projects can serve not only to identify best practices and exemplary institutions but also, for those working in local contexts, to support change.

At Colorado State University, we have pursued similar strategies in our own work to support local action. In January 2008, shortly after receiving approval from the NCTE College Section Steering Committee to form what would become the committee’s Working Group on the Status and Working Conditions of Adjunct Faculty, Mike Palmquist invited Sue Doe to join the working group. Sue, who had served in contingent appointments for over two decades before securing a tenure-line position, had worked on a university task force that had developed a robust statement about contingency. Although the report was not published on a sanctioned university Web site, it contributed to several subsequent changes, perhaps the most important being the creation of shared governance structures. These structures in turn led to significantly increased use of open-ended appointments for qualifying faculty members (“Standard Offer Letter”) and revisions to the university’s Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual that recognized senior teaching appointments (“Guidelines for Applications for Senior Teaching Appointments”; “Senior Teaching Appointments”). In an early e-mail message to one member of the working group, Mike indicated that he felt the value of “yet another position statement” would most likely be measured in terms of local action:

I have no illusions that a resolution will do a great deal to materially change adjunct lives. . . . But I suspect (and hope) that a resolution from NCTE might be of some use to faculty as they battle within local contexts to make some sort of progress. And, perhaps, it might help raise consciousness a bit, which can also help lead to change. (“NCTE Adjunct Issues”)

In November 2008, after the annual NCTE convention, Mike informed the working group about a discussion among members of the NCTE College Section Steering Committee, NCTE President Kathleen Yancey, and NCTE Executive Director Kent Williams. Mike reported in an e-mail message that the committee had liked the idea of “trying to do something that doesn’t simply repeat the approaches used in the past” and had voted “to make the development of a resolution (and a supporting Web site that provides examples, support, and so on—essentially, a tool kit for local action) the committee’s top priority for the coming year” (“RE: Report”). In his message, Mike noted that Williams had been particularly interested in “policy level issues (e.g., how we can communicate policy to legislators and government officials and how we might collaborate with other organizations and initiative[s]).” Mike had responded that “those approaches had not yielded positive results over the past two decades” and argued “for the need to provide support for local initiatives,” which he believed would lead, cumulatively, to greater success.

The following January, when the working group was in the midst of developing what would become NCTE’s 2010 “Position Statement on the Status and Working Conditions of Contingent Faculty,” McDonald, a member of the working group, addressed concerns about sanctioning institutions that engaged in exploitive labor practices, as the Wyoming Resolution had called for (“RE: Reminder”). His suggestion, which would eventually lead to an NCTE commitment to create a Web site
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(which to date has not been created) that would serve a purpose similar to that of the *Adjunct Project* and the MLA data center, was to ask NCTE to “make periodic reports about how programs are measuring up to the standards” that would be set out by the position statement. McDonald explained:

> The language could be “objective” and “factual” rather than judgmental: these institutions meet all of the standards, these meet most of the standards, these meet few of the standards. Maybe avoiding terms like “sanction,” “censure,” and “investigation” would eliminate the legal problems and expenses that doomed the censuring passages of the Wyoming Resolution in the late 1980s.

The intention of crafting position statements and sets of resources that would both shape national discourse and support local actions has its origins in early uses of position statements by faculty members in contingent positions (and their allies in tenure-line positions and within the administrative ranks) to work for change within local institutional contexts. It has also been shaped by the observation that leaders at most institutions appear unlikely to enact change solely in response to national calls for reform. Local action supported by the statements, reports, and other resources developed by our professional organizations, however, has been carried out—sometimes successfully—for more than two decades.

McDonald reports that his institution, Louisiana State University, Lafayette, has used the CCCC “Statement of Principles and Professional Standards for the Post-secondary Teaching of Writing” several times since its initial publication. English department faculty members first used the CCCC statement in 1990, during an unsuccessful bid—directed to their institution’s vice provost for academic affairs—to reduce reliance on adjunct faculty members and increase the pay of those who served in such positions. They subsequently conducted surveys of Louisiana writing programs based on the statement (McDonald, “Louisiana and the Wyoming Resolution,” “State of Louisiana Writing Programs,” and “Louisiana Writing Programs”). A decade later, during a teach-in that educated the media and upper administration about issues of contingency, department faculty members cited not only the CCCC statement but also statements published by the AAUP (McDonald, “Campus Equity Week”). One year later, this action resulted in a pay increase, led to the initiation of a still ongoing discussion of contingent faculty issues within their faculty senate, and spurred state-wide conversations about academic labor conditions. The effects, McDonald says, have been cumulative (“RE: Have You Used”).

Similarly, Steve Fox, director of writing at Indiana University–Purdue University, Indianapolis, reports on the writing program’s success using professional association position statements in a collective effort involving the program and its director, the Writing Coordinating Committee, part-time faculty members who were also members of the university’s Associate Faculty Coalition, and the dean’s Office of the School of Liberal Arts, which functions as the center of decision making about hiring and salaries. Together, they used a combination of professional association position statements to argue successfully for the principle of converting part-time positions into full-time lecturer lines. Their argument cited the MLA’s recommendation that courses taught by full- and part-time faculty members be maintained at a 62:38 ratio, the CCCC admonition that no more than 10 percent of courses be taught by
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part-time faculty (“Statement of Principles”), and the AAUP’s dual arguments that all faculty members be involved in governance practices and that conversion of part-time to full-time occur if the number of classes taught by a non-tenure-line faculty member exceeds a set threshold (“Tenure”). By drawing on statements from the MLA, CCCC, and AAUP, this collective made a case for the relation of full-time faculty members and quality education, focusing on an extension of the definition of full-time faculty members to include those in full-time, non-tenure-line positions.

At the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, members of the contingent faculty created a report that used language from the 2010 NCTE position statement. That report is being formalized by university committees and will be published as a rights and responsibilities document (Fitz). Justin Jory, a member of the non-tenure-line writing faculty at the time the report was submitted, noted in an e-mail message that the authors of the report had drawn on the NCTE document’s “broad, interpretable language” to establish the need to be “viewed and treated as a valued and integral part of the academic faculty.” Jory stated that he and the other authors of the report made direct connections between statements about salary compensation in the NCTE statement and local conditions as they called attention to national compensation standards. Reflecting on the usefulness of professional organization position statements, he wrote, “We were able to use your document [the NCTE position statement] to create a hybrid genre—a program report that was also a manifesto/critique of the program that we then circulated throughout the department.” The statement, added Jory, “enabled us to develop ethos and to build a movement that developed rhetorical velocity.” This use of an institutional position statement to support local action suggests that the resources provided by professional organizations can be appropriated and leveraged by those lacking official authority.

These examples provide some degree of response to Adrianna Kezar and Cecile Sam’s call for additional discussions of local solutions and plans of action (Understanding). Kezar and Sam argue that such efforts may work to develop foundational literature that will lead to better-informed conversations among stakeholders. What cannot happen, they say, is a failure to do something: “Change is inevitable, and the current status quo cannot hold” (115). Arguing for connecting action to research, and vice versa, they suggest the need for “context-based studies” since too much of the existing literature on contingent faculty draws little connection to context (114). One can imagine a series of case studies focusing on sites where position statements have and have not been used to inform policy. What other mechanisms have been at work? How have sites developed their own policies? What form have those policies taken? What motivated the site to be proactive or reactive? How have things worked out for faculty members on and off the tenure line?

Renewing the Case for Tenure

It might be difficult, given the history of documents produced by professional organizations about contingency, to accept the argument that efforts to address this issue are likely to lead to an improved and invigorated tenure system. Yet we believe, despite this history, that attention to the issue of contingency is likely to lead to a
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renewed approach to tenure in the academy. We believe that the point has already arrived at which faculty members in contingent positions are demanding the long-term security associated with tenure. Currently, these demands are sporadic and widely distributed. The AAUP reports that Penn State University, St. John's University, Santa Clara University, and Western Michigan University have developed successful proposals for teaching-intensive tenure lines and that other proposals have also been made (although unsuccessfully) at Rutgers University and the University of Colorado, Boulder (“Tenure”). Also gaining some traction, the University of California system offers “long-term security of employment”; similarly, the AAUP reports that the City College of New York, the New School, Rider University, Vancouver Community College, and Oakland University have developed structures that offer some degree of job security, providing both a more stable workforce for the institutions and more secure employment for the faculty. Legislative solutions have also been achieved, as suggested by the bill passed in 2012 in Colorado that allows public colleges and universities to enter into long-term contractual arrangements with non-tenure-track teaching faculty members (“Colorado House Bill 12-1144”).

To be viable, an emerging system of tenure that accommodates the economic and institutional needs that have brought about our reliance on a contingent faculty must recognize the significant variance in the duties and interests of faculty members in higher education. The current system of awarding tenure primarily to those who have demonstrated scholarly excellence through publication will not accommodate the needs of an expanded faculty. Instead, we will need to move—as the AAUP, the Coalition on the Academic Workforce, the New Faculty Majority, and other organizations have argued we must—to a system that aligns our evaluation system with the position descriptions that govern faculty work. That is, each faculty member should be judged on the merits of the work he or she is appointed to carry out, whether that work is primarily scholarly or focuses on teaching and service. Faculty members should not be held to the rigid standards of a one-size-fits-all evaluation model, particularly if that model fits only a small number of our colleagues.

Our professional organizations have the opportunity to play a central role in shaping the debate about the merits of tenure eligibility for all members of the faculty. They can do so, however, only if they and their members recognize that the standards currently in place fit only a minority of those who now teach in higher education. If our organizations continue to frame their arguments within an understanding of tenure as it has been traditionally constructed, then new organizations will form to meet the needs of those who seek to make a professional home outside that system. The rapid growth and increasing influence of the New Faculty Majority, founded in 2009, provides an example of the kind of organization that has emerged to meet the needs of our colleagues in contingent positions. Its emergence, as well as the development of initiatives such as Boldt’s Adjunct Project and the University of Southern California’s Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (www.thechangingfaculty.org), suggests that we have arrived at the point where position statements are no longer sufficient to shape the discourse around this issue. We need to publicize and reflect on the outcomes of these efforts, establish partnerships where appropriate, and, perhaps, launch our own projects. These new projects might focus on redefining what
counts in tenure and promotion evaluations, exploring alternative forms of job security, and creating new forms of shared faculty governance, to name but a few of the issues waiting to be addressed. In short, we have a choice. We can sit on the sidelines while others move forward on this issue, or we can join them in working for change.

Note

The authors of this article are listed alphabetically.
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MANY non-tenure-track faculty members dream of a tenured position, to put their days of precarious contingent employment behind them, to receive a stable income, to be accorded the dignity and respect and professionalism they likely do not receive. But fulfillment of that dream is improbable at best, especially for those in disciplines in which the majority of faculty members are nontenured and part-time, such as English as a second language, adult education, English composition, and foreign languages. Even if all tenured professors were to resign, the resulting job openings still wouldn’t be enough to accommodate all the nontenured faculty members.

The dearth of tenured positions, compounded by the lack of meaningful workplace improvements through conventional collective bargaining or legislation, creates a demoralizing outlook. Nontenured faculty members’ dismal prospects recall a 1951 Langston Hughes poem that asks:

What happens to a dream deferred?

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Maybe it just sags
like a heavy load.
Or does it explode?

Soundings of the nontenured temperament rarely suggest an imminent explosion. Indeed, the contingent nature of their jobs induces many to be on their best behavior and undercuts the impulse to become squeaking wheels for change (much as it does for undocumented workers). Cary Nelson, former president of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), suggested tenure for contingent faculty members could provide “the job security they need to advocate for better working conditions without fear of reprisal, and it eliminates the sometimes crippling stress accompanying at-will employment.” Alas, until a certifiable instance of tenure is extended to nontenured faculty members, such statements amount to wishful thinking or, by deflecting attention away from what could be concrete and achievable gains, possibly a step backward.

Excessive reliance on nontenured faculty members has long been a prominent topic within such disciplinary associations as Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), and the Modern Language Association (MLA) and within collaborative initiatives such as the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW). But as Brad Hammer, the former editor of the CCCC’s newsletter Forum, notes, while the causes for the reliance on contingent faculty members might be understandable, less clear is “what can be/is being done . . . and how our professional organizations have worked/failed to reverse employment trends over the past 25 years” (A2).

Fortunately, a viable alternative to dreaming about tenure is offered by colleges in British Columbia, especially in the province’s largest, Vancouver Community College.
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College (VCC). Its workplace features provisions designed to treat all faculty members with equality and professional dignity. The VCC workplace is actual and extant, not hypothetical or conditional, and is at striking variance with the two-tier system typical of institutions of higher education in the United States.

The Program for Change and the Vancouver Model

The Program for Change is a plan of action to transform the precarious working conditions of contingency into those of standard, stable employment. It lays out goals with steps and milestones as guidance for action and as an aid to measuring progress. Frank Cosco, the longtime president of the Vancouver Community College Faculty Association, and I are the joint authors of the Program for Change, which we presented at the conference of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor in 2010. We were assisted by the New Faculty Majority board members Ross Borden, Maria Maisto, Matt Williams, and the late Steve Street, as well as by such long-standing leaders in the contingent faculty movement as Joe Berry and Rich Moser. The Program for Change can be used by an individual grassroots activist or a collective bargaining agent. It is intended “to provide ideas to all those working to reform the academic workplace into one that truly embodies the values of equity, justice, and commitment to providing the highest possible quality of education to all students” (Cosco and Longmate, “Program” 2). It is not meant for those who would resist change. Unlike a set of “should” statements describing an idealized hypothetical vision, the Program for Change is based on the extant workplace provisions of colleges and universities of British Columbia, Canada, particularly VCC.

At VCC, all faculty members, whether permanent (regular) or probationary (term), full- or part-time, are compensated according to a single salary schedule: those teaching at 60 percent of full-time receive 60 percent of full-time wages. Workload assignment is made at the department level, and, unlike the standard commonly used in the United States, where part-time non-tenure-track faculty members are hired only to teach, VCC part-time faculty members are expected to perform the full job of teaching on a proportionally reduced basis. Probationary faculty members, after two years of teaching at 50 percent or more of full-time and assuming no unsatisfactory evaluation, become permanent faculty members, with tenure-like job security that regularized status confers, so that virtually all faculty members are either permanent or on track to become permanent. At VCC, the chief determinant of workload assignment is seniority, not full- or part-time status as it is in the United States, and all faculty members accrue seniority. Probationary faculty members accrue seniority on a prorated basis, whereas permanent faculty members accrue seniority at the full-time rate whether they teach full- or part-time; this convention protects the seniority ranking of those who teach part-time, ensuring that their ranking will not be overtaken by another instructor who happens to teach more classes (for more on the Vancouver model, see Cosco and Longmate, “Instructive Model”; Longmate and Cosco). Although VCC is a two-year institution, the Program for Change is applicable to two- and four-year institutions. VCC faculty members belong to the Federation of Post-secondary Educators (FPSE) of British Columbia; the principle “upon which university-related FPSE
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policies are based is of a collectivist, egalitarian, equitable university workplace model as opposed to a competitive, stratified model of employment” (Policies 1). In addition to VCC, examples of the same type of regularization process exist at Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Vancouver Island University, among others.

How the Program for Change Works

To move institutions toward the sort of equitable one-tier workplace of the Vancouver model, the Program for Change identifies over thirty goals, many of which are segmented into stages or steps, recognizing that even the most benign change may entail opposition and struggle. Regarding hiring, for example, the Program for Change echoes a goal shared by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA), the former recommending that part-time or adjunct faculty members “be initially hired with the same care and subjected to the same interview process as any other applicant to the department” (Standards), and the latter recommending that contingent appointments be “made with the same care, timeline, and schedule accorded to tenure-track faculty” (“Contingent Faculty Bargaining”). The Program for Change breaks achieving this goal into two parts. The initial phase aims to establish standardized, transparent, formal procedures at the department level. The next phase entails developing cross-departmental, institution-wide standards so that departments can learn from one another and best practices can be reinforced.

At VCC, the candidate search can be based on as wide a call and be as rigorous as a department feels is necessary. Candidates can be hired directly into a regular position, but it is more common for them to be hired into term positions; automatic regularization, however, makes it unnecessary for candidates to repeat the interview process.

Achieving full equity for contingent faculty members would require an increase in funding, to be sure. But since the substandard working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members are so extensive, there are literally dozens of ways to improve them, many of which require either no funding or nominal one-time funding, such as establishing a fair, transparent system of hiring or evaluating faculty members or a seniority list. Especially for entities with limited funding at their disposal, such as faculty departments or senates, the Program for Change can provide guidance and a means to monitor progress.

Improving Working Conditions

A distinguishing feature of the Program for Change is its focus on improving the working conditions of nontenured faculty members: “after a faculty member has undergone a defined probationary period, he or she becomes a normal employee whose status is no longer probationary or contingent, with the attendant rights and protections that accompany non-probationary status” (Cosco and Longmate, “Program” 2). This emphasis contrasts with other documents, such as the MLA’s 2003 Committee on Professional Employment’s final report:

To ensure the educational quality of English and foreign language courses and programs, maintain the integrity of the profession, and improve employment opportunities for new PhDs, administrative reliance on part-timers for course
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coverage should be drastically reduced, and additional full-time positions should be created to meet the instructional needs currently handled by part-timers. Ideally such positions should be tenure-track, but even full-time non-tenure-track positions would have the advantage of offering regular benefits and would allow those hired to participate fully in the work of the department. (“Committee”)

Noteworthy in the MLA statement is the emphasis on additional full-time tenured positions instead of on improving the working conditions of nontenured faculty members. Also noteworthy is the presumption that instructors employed part-time threaten program quality and integrity. That presumption, commonplace within the United States academy, is predicated on the two-tier system, where compensation, job protection, professional support, due process, and other services significantly differ between tiers.

Achieving Equity for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members

The Program for Change defends tenure and urges that tenure be extended to qualified part-time faculty members; that it be conferred to the individual faculty member, not the position that faculty member happens to occupy; and that, over time, tenure be disassociated from compensation, which coincides with FPSE’s bargaining principles (Policies 3). In this way, eventually tenure may be granted without significant budgetary impact.

Achieving full equity for non-tenure-track faculty members requires overcoming resistance from those who see contingency not as a problem but as a great idea because it reduces costs and provides greater institutional flexibility. Countering such a position requires consideration of factors beyond cost reduction and institutional flexibility, which brings to mind Einstein’s aphorism that a solution to a problem cannot be arrived at by using the same thought process that created it. Data showing that contingency erodes educational outcomes would be useful in countering contingency, but it is doubtful that compelling evidence is accessible, since we are dealing with human subjects, not test tubes and inert substances. Surely no reasonable person would assert that improving the lot of contingent faculty members would decrease educational quality. Contingent faculty members themselves hardly need research to know that their effectiveness could be improved if they had job security, earned a livable wage, and had the confidence to consider teaching their career.

Full equity means that non-tenure-track faculty members would be contracted not only to teach but also to execute the full range of activities as academic professionals—service, teaching, and, where applicable, research. Such a redefinition would bring about true flexibility for the educational enterprise; moreover, students would surely benefit from their nontenured instructors’ regarding themselves as whole.

Placing the Onus on Those Opposing Equity

Those inclined to dismiss equity for non-tenure-track faculty members as unrealistic or impossible must reconcile contingency with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 23.1, which proclaims, “Everyone has the right to . . . just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.” Contingency defies this right, because the working conditions, discounted pay, and limited
benefits associated with it are hardly just and favorable and provide no protection whatsoever against unemployment, since nontenured faculty members are laid off at the end of each academic term. The declaration further asserts, “Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work” (art. 23.2). The nonprorated pay scales that are common in institutions of higher education in the United States constitute a square violation of this principle. Course fees are the same and the grades and credits awarded by nontenured faculty members are valued the same as those awarded by tenured faculty members. Article 7.c of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights further recognizes the right “for everyone to be promoted in his [or her] employment to an appropriate higher level, subject to no considerations other than those of seniority and competence,” yet nontenured faculty members very rarely have an option for promotion or for transition from probationary to permanent employment. Thus, since contingency violates basic principles and since the establishment of equity is warranted to respect basic human rights, the onus is on those who oppose equity to justify their opposition.

Just as no one is surprised when water runs downhill, no one seems surprised when tenured faculty members receive salaries that may be twice that of their nontenured colleagues who are engaged in the same work or when they receive stipends for professional development, pay raises based on time in position, sabbaticals, and early retirement options, benefits not generally available to non-tenure-track faculty members. As Keith Hoeller and I have written about the resulting cognitive dissonance: “Whenever you treat one class better than another, there is a false assumption that the upper class is somehow more deserving than the lower class.” As a result, many, including non-tenure-track faculty members themselves, are predisposed to oppose equity or do not conceive of it as a possibility.

Attitudes toward non-tenure-track faculty members and equity, even among those who think they may hold common assumptions, can differ. They can be classified according to a simplified three-part taxonomy as egalitarian, advocate or moderate, or elitist, which could be conceived of as a continuum.

**Egalitarian**

The egalitarian motto might be, “If it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it’s a duck.” The egalitarian seeks to minimize status distinction among faculty members and assumes that every faculty member is worthy of respect in his or her own right. While egalitarians support the principle of equal pay for equal work, they might extend it to equal pay and equal work, to reject the workload distinctions imposed by the two-tier status quo.

The model is offered by Vancouver Community College, where all members of the faculty, full- or part-time, permanent or temporary, are paid according to the same salary schedule; where there is job protection; where, after demonstrating one’s competence as an instructor for a defined period of time, probationary instructors automatically become permanent; where all faculty members accrue seniority, and seniority is the primary though not the sole factor in workload assignment; and where a part-timer can be senior to a full-timer.
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The egalitarian position is the left side of the continuum; the solution favored is improvement in the working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty members.

Advocate or Moderate

The most widespread perspective, the advocate or moderate recognizes that reliance on nontenured faculty members is a problem, that their working conditions should be improved, and that, for the sake of educational quality, reliance on them should be kept to a minimum.

While advocates or moderates may agree that “[c]ontingent faculty should be paid at a rate equal to that paid tenured faculty having the same qualifications and for doing the equivalent instructional and non-instructional work” (“2005 Best Employment Practices”) and may subscribe to the principle of equal pay for equal work, they may feel no contradiction in offering discounted pay for nontenured instructors since nontenured faculty members don’t perform the same work as their tenured colleagues.

The advocate or moderate position occupies the midpoint on the continuum; it sees the creation of more tenure-track positions as the solution because, in the United States, tenure is the lone satisfactory model. Yet creating more tenure-track positions does little to improve the working conditions of the majority of non-tenure-track faculty members.

Elitist

The elitist perspective opposes equality for non-tenure-track faculty members. It envisions tenured faculty members as the “real faculty,” who deserve respect for having earned an advanced degree, successfully competed in a national search for their job, undergone the rigors of tenure review, and merit recognition for having been awarded tenure.

This perspective considers nontenured faculty members supplemental employees, hired to fill in when required and not deserving of equal pay, job protection, or access to professional development activities; that is, the elitist views non-tenure-track faculty members more as paraprofessionals than as equal colleagues of tenure-track faculty members. Sometimes the elitist sees nontenured faculty members as uninvited or unwelcomed intruders on the turf of the tenured, whose lack of refinement tarnishes the prestige of the profession. The strongest form sees nontenured faculty members as scabs.

To elitists, nontenured faculty members’ calls for equal pay for equal work are offensive requests for a reward that is not deserved. This perspective occupies the opposite end of the continuum from the egalitarian.

If faculty unions or associations, senates, boards of trustees, and state legislators, among others, are dominated by the advocate or moderate perspective toward non-tenure-track faculty members, which envisions more tenured positions as the solution, or by the elitist perspective, which opposes equity outright, meaningful workplace improvements for non-tenure-track faculty members are unlikely. Advocates or moderates may dismiss the ideas of the egalitarians, arguing that they are simply not realistic or are messianic.
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To Martin Luther King, Jr., the “greatest stumbling block” was not the outright opposition, like the Ku Klux Klan, but the “white moderates” who “become dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress” (817, 817, 818). Likewise if those who consider themselves advocates of non-tenure-track faculty members accept that non-tenure-track faculty members deserve a pay increase but not equal pay or job security or an equal voice, their actions also block progress.

My own perspective on equity for non-tenure-track faculty members underwent a jolting shift at the TESOL convention in 2000, when I learned about the workplace provisions of VCC. I had real trouble believing what I was hearing, since the Vancouver model contrasted so radically with the paradigm in my mind about how the world worked. But once I came to understand the Vancouver model, my perspective shifted from the advocate or moderate to the egalitarian.

Goals of the Program for Change

The Program for Change aims to transform the working conditions of the lower tier of the non-tenure-track faculty into what might be considered “normal” employment and thus assumes a paradigm shift for higher education in the United States. As a strategy, it does not presume a single script for all institutions to follow in lockstep, since it “is not meant to be prescriptive or proscriptive. It is hoped that activists working for change can find some aspects to work on and start to achieve measurable successes” and recognizes the need for local control: “Goals, strategies and tactics have to be determined locally where activists know what’s needed most, what’s achievable with reasonable risk, and how best to achieve it” (Cosco and Longmate, “Program” 2).

In the Program for Change, the more than thirty goals are laid out in incremental steps over time that serve as a means to track progress in a log and are classified as no-cost, cost, union or faculty association, and legislative. Selected goals are elaborated below.

Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is heralded as essential to quality higher education instruction. Yet academic freedom cannot exist without job security. As Hoeller noted at the conference of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor in 2006, because contingent faculty members lack job security, they lack academic freedom, a point elaborated by Sarah Schneewind in response to an Inside Higher Ed feature:

Let’s not forget . . . that tenured faculty in particular, but even tenure-track faculty, don’t have to worry from day to day about losing their jobs. That means they can encourage real discussion of controversial issues in the classroom, try out new pedagogical techniques, require plenty of reading and writing, and hold the line on grades, without fear. That is good for students, and it grants appropriate autonomy to highly-educated, motivated professionals.

The Program for Change proposes that academic freedom for all faculty members, including those working off the tenure track, be protected by due process, seniority,
Job Security

Job security is the antithesis of contingency and must be seen as the primary goal in achieving equity for non-tenure-track faculty members. Even though job security makes no budgetary impact, it is likely to face opposition from several quarters. Those who hold an elitist perspective on equality for non-tenure-track faculty members may argue that protecting the jobs of the nontenured will undermine the institution’s administrative flexibility by limiting the institution’s ability to lay off members of the nontenured faculty at will. Some may argue that protecting nontenured faculty jobs protects inferior instruction since nontenured faculty members have not undergone tenure review; others claim that giving nontenured faculty members job protection would create a middle tier of faculty and complicate the higher education system. Some feign concern for non-tenure-track faculty members, suggesting that callous administrators would dismiss candidates as they approach the job security threshold. Some alarmists claim that job security for contingent faculty members could threaten tenure itself. Many such arguments opposing job security for nontenured faculty members can be a reflection of the direct conflict of interest between tenured faculty course overloads—courses in addition to their full-time load, that is, overtime—and non-tenure-track jobs. When tenured faculty members teach course overloads, they displace those in non-tenure-track faculty jobs; thus tenured faculty members may oppose job security for their nontenured colleagues because it could interfere with their ability to teach course overloads.

Several Program for Change goals address job security, such as reappointment rights during the probationary period, which provide the protection of due process, and seniority rights, which call for accruing seniority from the first hire, retaining seniority between appointments, and ensuring transparency through the annual publication of seniority listings. The key job security measure is conversion from probationary to nonprobationary status, or regularization.

With regard to job security, the Program for Change is somewhat at variance with principles advocated in the United States. The MLA’s Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members: Recommendations and Evaluative Questions, for example, states:

[Non-tenure-track] faculty members should ideally be hired on three-year contracts with full benefits; after six years, they should be eligible for longer-term review; past six years, they should be given longer (five- or six-year) contracts and be allowed to participate in departmental governments regarding [non-tenure-track] lines. (1)

In line with this recommendation, the California Faculty Association (CFA), which represents faculty in the California State University system, has negotiated a revised contract for its non-tenure-track faculty members. Once granted a three-year appointment, “a lecturer has the expectation of reappointment to a subsequent three-year appointment” (CFA Lecturers’ Handbook 12). This virtually automatic renewal
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of a three-year appointment is absolutely remarkable by the usual standards for contingent faculty in the United States.

The Program for Change, however, does not propose three-year (or multiyear) contracts. While certainly superior to a one-year or one-term contract, such multiyear contracts are still fundamentally contingent. CFA members holding these contracts do not consider them the solution to contingency and still seek the protections of tenure (Olson); moreover, holders of these contracts customarily receive unemployment between terms, attesting to the absence of reasonable assurance of employment and the contingent nature of the appointments. The Program for Change relies on the tenure-like job security inherent in regularization, which offers full due-process protections such as reappointment and seniority rights.

At present, some contingent faculty members in the United States face a workload cap that limits their assignments to a percentage below full-time, such as no more than 67 percent in a single district in California community colleges (“EDC 87482.5”). The Program for Change seeks to lift the cap, so that part-time faculty members can ratchet their workload up to full-time, as is standard for their part-time counterparts in Vancouver. As the cap limiting part-time workload is being removed, limits should be imposed on full-time faculty members’ access to course overloads. Allowing full-time faculty members to teach overtime does not always serve the best interests of students and can contribute to full-time faculty members’ reluctance to promote job security for their part-time colleagues, since protecting the jobs of part-timers could interfere with the ability of full-timers to teach course overloads and thus earn more income. Full-time faculty members at VCC are not permitted to take on course overloads.

Evaluations

For most non-tenure-track faculty members, a positive evaluation results in little or no benefit while a negative evaluation can threaten their job. A nonexistent or informal evaluation system contributes to the bias against them that they are lesser members of the faculty and less competent instructors. In replicating the Vancouver model, the Program for Change proposes two evaluation goals. Summative evaluations determine the suitability of the individual as an educator during the probationary period of employment in much the same way that tenure review determines the suitability of the individual to receive tenure. Summative evaluations must be conducted according to an established procedure that is transparent, as free of bias as possible, and with safeguards to protect the rights of the individual being evaluated. A robust summative evaluation system during the probationary period helps allay fears of granting job security to the underqualified. Formative evaluations are for the enrichment of the individual instructor and, after regularization, are conducted periodically as constructive feedback. If no distinction is made between the two, all evaluations of non-tenure-track faculty members become summative, cause unwarranted concern, and defeat one purpose of evaluation—to promote quality instruction. Excessive or unprincipled evaluation can be considered a form of workplace harassment.
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**Compensation and Workload**

The ultimate goal is a single salary schedule for tenured and nontenured, full- and part-time faculty members, determined according to a commonly shared set of workplace expectations (as exists at VCC) that would include compensation for office hours and a fully prorated set of responsibilities and service. At present, while many non-tenure-track faculty members are hired only to teach, the presumed limited scope of their workload stands as hollow justification for the significant distinction in pay and status in the two-tier system.

To quote Rich Moser of the AAUP, “Culture changes slowly, painfully so, and it entails struggle and discomfort.” Thus, even if funding became available at once, it may not be realistic to suppose that equal compensation and workload can occur immediately.

**Professional Advancement and Professional Development**

Non-tenure-track faculty members are integral to higher education in the United States, and their professional development, widely overlooked, is at least as important in maintaining quality instruction as it is for tenured faculty members. Given the often harried lives of non-tenure-track faculty members—coping with low pay and a restricted workload—many must hold multiple jobs, which effectively reduces their disposable time for professional development activity. A time allotment for professional development is a discrete need. Not only should non-tenure-track faculty members have access to the professional development stipends, as tenured faculty members generally do, but they should also have similar incentives to engage in professional development activities such as salary steps, which would lead to full equity in compensation.

**Faculty Governance and Voice in Campus Affairs**

To expand non-tenure-track faculty members’ limited involvement on campus, it is important to reckon with the cultural as well as the pragmatic reasons behind it. First, as noted above, many nontenured faculty members hold more than one job and thus have limited time at their disposal to take part in faculty governance or other campus activities. Second, despite the imperative for non-tenure-track faculty members to have a voice in their own affairs, as argued eloquently by Monica Jacobe at the 2012 MLA convention, the sociopolitical reality is that many are reluctant to speak out about their needs in the presence of tenured faculty members. Some are afraid of offending or alienating those in the dominant social group, others fear losing any hope of being hired for a future tenure-track position, and still others fear retaliation, a response directed at some nontenured individuals courageous enough to call for equal treatment.

Perhaps the primary factor explaining the meager participation of non-tenure-track faculty members in campus affairs is the tendency to overlook them as faculty. An anecdote from my institution suggests this tendency. In an e-mail call for candidates for union officer positions, the announcement implied that only tenured faculty members were eligible candidates. After it was noted that the union bylaws did
not stipulate that officers be tenured, a clarification was promptly issued. But this oversight reflects the underlying presumption that faculty refers to the tenured faculty, not to members of the nontenured faculty, who are secondary, an afterthought.

The Program for Change goal of workplace equity aims to remove roadblocks to non-tenure-track faculty members’ participation in campus governance and affairs. The program’s set of staged goals would ensure the right of non-tenure-track faculty members to elect and be elected and would eventually provide paid release from teaching in order to facilitate their participation. The program proposes a similar goal regarding faculty unions and associations that guarantees non-tenure-track faculty members a voice and vote in any election process. The Program for Change recognizes the need for a union to underwrite the expense of an exclusive non-tenure-track faculty union organizational entity—up to 0.5 percent of the union’s total budget—for a safe, private forum for non-tenure-track faculty members to discuss workplace-related issues with one another. This is an area for faculty unions to “walk the talk.” If they are genuinely working for and with their nontenured members, then they must grant them equity in a form completely under their control, with union meetings, elections, and processes. To make the non-tenure-track faculty voice a reality, additional safeguards—such as those in union bylaws—must be honored.

Benefits

Non-tenure-track faculty members deserve the range of benefits available to tenured faculty members, including educational leaves and sabbaticals; medical, dental, or sick leave; paid vacation; and other paid leaves, such as maternity and parental. Classified as temporary employees, non-tenure-track faculty members are excluded from federal programs such as the flexible spending account and the Family and Medical Leave Act. Once their jobs are no longer contingent and temporary but permanent, non-tenure-track faculty members would gain access to federal benefits programs.

All defenders of higher education in the United States can concur with the Program for Change that the two-tier status quo “cannot go unchallenged”:

It is not acceptable for the majority of those who deliver U.S. higher education to be without job security and academic freedom, to receive pay that is not commensurate with their academic and professional training nor the effective set of responsibilities they execute, and to be denied the professional dignity that is warranted by their station as educators. (Cosco and Longmate, “Program” 6)

But the status quo is unlikely to change spontaneously. The Program for Change aims to serve as a roadmap for those who seek change to help guide the “tireless efforts and persistent work” that are necessary to bring about real progress (King 818).

Those who dream of tenure are not without hope. Those faculty members employed in a system like Vancouver Community College’s or the California State University’s enjoy reasonably stable employment and professional respect. The movement to improve the professional lives of non-tenure-track faculty members has, through examining these systems carefully, the advantage of a working model where equity
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exists. These models can and should be used more widely to lever change wherever and on whatever issue it is possible to do so.

While it may be unrealistic to suppose that the lives of non-tenure-track faculty members can be immediately transformed, there is every reason to believe that most faculty members can hold normal, stable employment where they can presume their jobs will continue and where they are compensated to perform the full range of faculty functions. The Program for Change aims to be a blueprint for such action.

Note

1. In the 2007 legislative session in Washington State, House Bill 1452, a job security bill for nontenured faculty members in Washington's community and technical college, inspired by VCC's regularization, was heard in the House Higher Education Committee. On 29 January 2007, a representative of the Washington's NEA affiliate, Washington Education Association (WEA), opposed HB 1452, characterizing it as a threat to instructional quality, a way of marginalizing nontenured faculty members in a “permanent middle tier,” and, as if to scare legislators, as “lifelong employment.” Below is a portion of the WEA representative’s transcribed testimony:

[T]here’s no evaluative process in [HB 1452]. What it means is the criteria are cumulative, chronological, and retroactive. If you’ve been teaching one course for nine quarters, if this bill passed, you would immediately have this status. As written and without other part-time faculty circumstances significantly revised and improved, this bill could create a permanent middle tier of underpaid faculty, and we don’t want to see that happen. Over the long term this status could potentially be the Trojan horse that could be used against the tenure system itself. Some college administrations will balk at the lack of robust evaluative process to determine the suitability of taking on a nine-quarter part-time teacher candidate for lifelong employment. And what I fear is that administrations will start terminating part-time people at eight quarters because they don’t want to go through this. The collective bargaining part of this bill seems to be gratuitous in a sense because I’m not sure what’s left to bargain. It is very prescriptive.

(House Higher Education Committee)

In voicing concern about the lack of evaluation of nontenured faculty members and the threat to tenure they pose, these words are hardly those one would expect to hear from a union representative. In citing the possibility that administrations could capriciously dismiss adjuncts as they approach the qualification threshold, this union representative effectively underscored the need for legislation mandating protection against such capriciousness—there was no suggestion of union willingness to fight for such protection for non-tenure-track faculty members. Further suggestive of the union leadership’s intent, the next year, in the 2008 legislative session, when a hearing on similar legislation addressing adjunct job security was scheduled to be heard, the AFT Washington and WEA faculty union leadership conducted a premeditated walkout from the legislative hearing as the bill arose on the committee’s agenda.
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ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2012, just after we completed what we thought were the final revisions of this article, the faculty of Emory’s College of Arts and Sciences gathered for the first meeting of the 2012–13 academic year, at which the dean of the college, Robin Forman, announced that numerous cuts and other measures were to be announced in the coming days. Two days later Forman released a letter outlining some of the changes: the elimination of several entire programs or departments and the suspension of two other doctoral programs. These decisions had implications for both the undergraduate and graduate schools and occasioned significant faculty and student consternation and resistance. As a result, faculty governance structures are under intense scrutiny, and there is still considerable uncertainty and tension in the college, in the Laney Graduate School, and extending into the rest of the university.

Many important questions have arisen: Going forward, how will the liberal arts be defined in institutions of higher education like Emory University? What role will the humanities play in that definition? What are the rights and responsibilities of faculty members in major decision-making processes? How viable are current structures of faculty governance? Central to the focus of this article is whether the gains made over the last twenty years for lecture-track faculty members at Emory and, more importantly, their synergistic relationship with tenure-track faculty members are undermined by the decisions announced in fall 2012. Forman has said both privately and publicly that he is committed to the “the idea and the reality” of lecture-track faculty at Emory. Nevertheless, several lecture-track faculty members will lose their jobs at the end of their current contracts, and in general the lecture-track faculty members are feeling very unsettled, even betrayed. The assimilation of this new reality has consumed an inordinate amount of faculty energy across the ranks. In this ongoing process, the governance, representation, appointment, and promotion structures for lecture-track faculty members in Emory’s College of Arts and Sciences that have been put in place over the last fifteen years are now part of the scaffolding needed to address these questions. This article, originally written in the spring 2012 semester to describe the emergence of these structures and then revised during the summer before these events began to unfold, was initially framed as a somewhat exemplary tale; now it must be read, at least in part, as a somewhat cautionary one. Events are still unfolding, and so time will tell which characterization ultimately best fits the narrative.
Introduction

We find ourselves at a “crucible moment” for higher education in the United States. The imperative to reimagine our mission and our praxis has become increasingly urgent in the context of shrinking resources, seismic shifts in student populations, a changing faculty profile, and debates about how to organize and evaluate teaching, learning and scholarship for the twenty-first century. These debates often center on the role that education plays in building civic culture, and a recent report urges us to “embrace civic learning and democratic engagement as an undisputed educational priority for all of higher education” (Crucible Moment 2). But if higher education is to embrace that mission, we faculty members must first consider our own understanding of civic engagement and democratic process within the colleges and universities in which we teach and research. In other words, it is impossible to “do” democracy in the curriculum if it is not practiced in the professoriat.

The challenges facing higher education were in evidence in January 2012 when the New Faculty Majority, an advocacy group for adjunct and contingent faculty members—“over 1 million of the 1.5 million people teaching in American colleges and universities” and, according to Gary Rhoades, almost 70 percent of all faculty appointments (Bérubé)—hosted a national summit in Washington, DC. The summit provided an opportunity for participants to share information and discuss strategies for addressing systemic inequities in how faculty labor is viewed and compensated (Schmidt, “Summit”). Current discussions about the professoriat—including those at the New Faculty Majority summit—often take as their starting point a stark binary between two unequal and nonoverlapping faculty subsets: on one side, tenured or tenure-track faculty members who enjoy job stability, full participation in governance, decent salaries, and a range of perks related to their working conditions; on the other side, non-tenure-track colleagues in adjunct or contingent positions that are precarious and poorly compensated and who, for the most part, are without access to the basic workings of faculty governance. Growing attention to this binary has led to important and long-overdue efforts to address the inequities in working conditions for faculty members off the tenure track—efforts that are described by contributors to this special issue and that must continue. Ongoing debates about working off the tenure track, the crisis in higher education (and, especially, in the humanities and in foreign language departments), and the role of language and literature studies in higher education converge to create either a perfect storm or the proverbial teachable moment.

As members of the MLA who teach and study language, rhetoric, discourse, and textual analysis, we can probably agree that language is powerful, grammar provides scaffolding for thought, and terminology can influence attitudes and action. Perhaps the most egregious example of language that impedes our ability to work together is the frequency with which one still hears tenured colleagues speak of “real faculty” as a way of differentiating tenured or tenure-track faculty members from those off the tenure track. The terms adjunct and contingent carry implications of structural and intellectual subordination that resonate even in the most enlightened efforts to address issues of economic and contractual parity. The MLA’s Professional Employment
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Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members: Recommendations and Evaluative Questions, for example, is implicitly predicated on the limitations and legitimacy of a two-tiered system for faculty, as are expressions of concern that increasing numbers of non-tenure-track faculty members weaken the larger faculty body, compromise faculty governance, and pose a threat to our academic mission.

Yet we address here another dimension that is often overlooked: the assumptions embedded in our thinking about who does what work in our colleges and universities and about how that work is valued. Without minimizing the very real inequities of pay and working conditions that affect a significant number of our colleagues, we want to suggest that approaching the issues of non-tenure-track faculty members solely as a matter of redressing these inequities is too narrow a response. A recent study shows it may even be less effective. Researchers at the University of Southern California found that “adjuncts had made the most progress at colleges where they tried to transform the campus climate to be more inclusive of them, rather than simply fighting to change one employer practice at a time” (Schmidt, “When Adjuncts”). How might we reimagine the different components of the professoriat as something other than the result of a mere accident of hiring circumstances or, worse, as the justifiable enshrinement of long-cherished hierarchies that are increasingly called into question? What if instead we were to imagine a larger body of “regular faculty” composed in an intentional way of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty members (think of a Venn diagram with two overlapping and complementary subsets)? In this new paradigm, we are not arguing for the abolition of tenure; we are arguing for a partnership, a different way of thinking that will permit us to reimagine a faculty as a community of college or university citizens with collective rights and responsibilities who must function as a whole to meet the challenges of undergraduate and graduate education in the twenty-first century.

We use Emory University as a case study, focusing on Emory’s College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. We understand our experience as “radical incrementalism”—an ongoing process in which gains, as they are made, reveal the need for continued change and adaptation. The process is not so much reformist as evolutionary and emerges from a particular institutional context, one which (as noted in the preface) has changed over the past year at Emory. It may not, therefore, prove a compelling model for every case or persuasive to those seeking more immediate change. But it has made it possible for us at Emory—at least within the College of Arts and Sciences—to develop alliances across faculty lines to work together as “regular faculty” to reframe our narrative. Although this process takes place in a particular institution, we suggest that reframing the narrative of faculty roles in higher education in terms of citizenship participation is both possible and necessary in the profession at large.

Lecture-Track Faculty in Emory College: A Narrative in Progress

Emory University in the early 1990s was similar to many American universities and colleges, exhibiting significant growth in the number of faculty members off a tenure path without the institution’s demonstrating clear goals or strategic planning. And as
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in many other research universities, Emory had and still has disparate appointment patterns and polices across its units. According to the latest diversity report, the total number of full-time faculty members (including tenure-track and non-tenure-track) increased by approximately 35 percent from 1999 to 2009, and the total number of non-tenure-track faculty members increased by almost 50 percent (Diversity Profile 6–7). That is, in 1999 approximately 50 percent of the total faculty at Emory was not on the tenure track, and by 2009 that percentage had increased to almost 58 percent. Here we focus on the development of the lecture track in Emory’s College of Arts and Sciences, which is related to but quite distinct from other units.4

Terminology emerged as critical in reform efforts at Emory. Recent discussion in the academy about the role of faculty members described as “adjunct” or “contingent” does not capture the circumstances of many with multiyear contracts, established positions within departments, and increasingly consequential positions beyond their departments. For the last ten years at Emory’s College of Arts and Sciences, non-tenure-track faculty members are not necessarily employed in contingent positions. Early in the process of regularizing this track, we clearly delineated the lecture track from adjunct and visiting appointments and began working on defining rights and responsibilities within that track, while working to avoid adjunct or contingent situations whenever possible.5 Changes in the college policy have been gradual and are driven by collaboration across tenure-track/non-tenure-track lines and with administrators, reflecting a broad commitment to university citizenship.

Of paramount importance is the role that non-tenure-track faculty members played in pushing for changes. Beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s, several pioneering faculty members in non-tenure-track appointments from across the disciplines began meeting and laying the foundations for governance structures that eventually created new avenues for participation in decision making. At the time, many non-tenure-track faculty members were, according to their one-year contracts, “visiting faculty.” From this tenuous position several leaders began organizing meetings of the non-tenure-track faculty, which in time became the Lecture-Track Faculty Group. As this group coalesced, several things became clear: a significant number of faculty members had previously been, for the most part, invisible, both to one another and to the faculty members in the tenure track; there were striking inconsistencies in the conditions of appointment and employment across the college; coming together to raise these issues—an act of university citizenship—made it possible to address them; and there were sympathetic interlocutors among members of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and the administration.

The lack of any clear and consistent policy regarding non-tenure-track appointments and employment was one of the first issues addressed by this group. In 1996, the college created a policy on the appointment and review of lecturers and senior lecturers, ultimately approved by the provost and the board of trustees. An important step, this policy regularized the appointments of all those “visiting” faculty members as lecturers or senior lecturers, created multiyear contracts and a promotion mechanism, and established lecturers as regular members of the faculty with access to many of the benefits accorded those on the tenure track (e.g., office space, retirement programs, professional development funds). This new policy stabilized
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the more than ninety faculty members on the lecture track and affirmed their full investiture in the faculty body. With stability, it became easier for lecturers to play key roles within their departments and in the college and university.⁶

Concurrent with this policy-revision process was a series of publications and campus conversations regarding important issues facing the university. Beginning with a 1994 report from the then provost, Billy Frye, and others titled Choices and Responsibility: Shaping Emory’s Future, the university community was challenged to seriously consider five issues facing higher education and Emory in particular: the balance between teaching and research; the need for a stronger sense of campus community; the reordering of university resources and processes to encourage interdisciplinarity; the balance of infrastructure needs with resources; and the university’s civic responsibility, beyond the campus. Following this “call to action,” Frye and William Chace, the president at the time, established the Commission on Teaching, which issued its report in 1997 with an introduction that strongly emphasized the importance of teaching:

We want to get beyond the notion that excellence in research must preclude excellence in teaching and that universities cannot support, evaluate, and reward teaching and research in equivalent ways. . . . An equivalent commitment to research and teaching does not mean a quantifiable measure from every program nor an equal portion of each for each faculty member at all points in his or her career. It means that we want the culture and structures necessary to ensure an institution in which both teaching and research flourish. (Teaching)

The report did not address the question of tenure-track versus non-tenure-track faculty members (in fact, its unacknowledged assumption is that the faculty members in question are on the tenure track). Nevertheless, this important document opened up the space to talk about the value of teaching. Since lecture-track faculty members were most closely associated with teaching, it became possible to present the value of their work as equivalent to the value of the work of a faculty member whose main focus is research. It also opened up the possibility of conceiving of lecture-track faculty members as pedagogical leaders on campus. And since the deliberations of the Commission on Teaching were informed by Ernest L. Boyer’s 1990 Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, among other documents, there was increasingly space in campus conversations to understand scholarship more broadly and to value the scholarship of teaching.

The distribution of the new policy to department and program chairs in the college in 1996 signaled important progress, but it also pointed to work ahead. An article published later in the campus faculty magazine about lecture-track-faculty noted, “Departments sometimes do not understand the potential contribution of these faculty members, and the resulting lack of communication, professional development, and collaboration represents a lost opportunity” (Hartfield-Méndez, Marsteller, and Patterson 9). By the spring of 2004, under the leadership of a new president, James Wagner, and a new college dean, Robert Paul, Emory was well into a multiyear strategic planning process. There was growing interest among lecture-track faculty members in their role in this new environment, especially since the strategic plan would profoundly influence the allocation of resources. In a meeting in March 2004 with
the Lecture-Track Faculty Group. Paul drew a direct line from the ideas in *Teaching at Emory* to the strategic plan, emphasizing that the role of teaching would be central to the plan and asserting that Emory should strive to be one of the best undergraduate teaching institutions among top-tier research universities. He projected that lecture-track faculty members would continue to constitute about 20 percent of the faculty in the college and recognized the need to find ways to acknowledge and better reward their work. Several changes that ultimately were approved were discussed formally for the first time in this meeting. In the discussion of how to bridge the gap between teaching and research, even within the lecture track, Bobbi Patterson eloquently advanced the idea that the “bridge between scholarship and teaching has to be constructed conceptually and might include the idea of pedagogical scholarship and design, and that this could become part of the criteria for evaluation of [lecture-track faculty]” (qtd. in Kelley). In addition, the participants in the meeting contemplated the creation of a third tier in the lecture track and a college standing committee for promotion and evaluation of lecture-track faculty members.

In fall 2004, Paul appointed a task force wisely made up of a mix of tenured faculty members, administrators, and senior lecturers, charged with making recommendations regarding the lecture track and empowered to think boldly. Emory’s affirmation in its mission statement that it is an “inquiry-driven, ethically engaged” institution also helped frame the task force’s discussions on how to forge productive and ethical faculty relationships. Four working principles informed the group’s deliberations:

1. Emory College [of Arts and Sciences] has a strong group of *regular faculty* of which there are two subsets, namely Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF) and Lecture-Track Faculty (LTF), and these are distinct from faculty on temporary appointments. These subsets are full partners in forwarding the vision of Emory as an institution that combines the opportunities of a tier-one research university with a small liberal arts college experience, which makes possible the inquiry-driven, ethically responsible practice of engaged citizenship to which we aspire for ourselves and our students. The synergy of including faculty of both subsets permits attainment of the vision of the College and the University.

2. Emory College can and should lead its peer institutions on the issue of how best to integrate regular faculty who are, by both individual and institutional choice, in positions that offer no possibility of tenure. Although LTF experience less pressure to conduct research and publish findings in top venues, they are clearly in positions that indicate a long-term relationship with the university, strongly supporting the teaching aspect of the university’s mission.

3. Emory College places value on the complementary relationship between teaching and scholarly activity. Lecture-track faculty can and do play an important role in defining that relationship, putting into practice the broadened concepts of scholarship advanced by Ernest L. Boyer . . . and others. These concepts are referenced in the 1997 Report on Teaching at Emory, which expressed the clear aspiration to “an Emory in which there is a balance between teaching and research” but without demanding that every faculty member maintain that balance all the time. The Task Force
acknowledges the important role of lecturers in teaching, and also the integration of scholarly activities that many bring to that role.

4. Any system of evaluation of LTF should be predicated on the LTF having value and voice. In Emory College, LTF are and should be highly valued, with full rights and responsibilities in faculty governance. (Task Force 1)

To fulfill its charge, the task force required an inventory of the lecture-track faculty, which was completed using various sources of information including a survey of the lecture-track faculty members and college records. An important survey question regarded the roles occupied by lecture-track faculty members at the departmental, college, and university levels. At that point (and even more so today), they taught at all levels—from introductory undergraduate courses to graduate seminars—and were actively engaged with students as advisers to student organizations and in directing honors theses, coordinating and training graduate teaching assistants, and serving on dissertation committees. The task force noted the significant number of teaching awards among lecture-track faculty members. They served then, as they still do, in key administrative roles at the department and program levels and were consistently representatives on the Governance Committee and other important college committees. A few had become leaders at the university level, especially in the areas of community engagement and sustainability and in issues of race and difference. Several had played large roles in Emory’s strategic-planning process. The results of this inventory were revealing, even surprising.

First, it was surprising to several members of the task force (and later to many members of the faculty at large, when the Academic Exchange article about the task force’s recommendations was published [Hartfield-Méndez, Marsteller, and Patterson]) that lecture-track faculty members’ level of commitment and activity was so high, given that regularization of the lecture track had occurred only a decade earlier. Second, it was revealing that this high level of integration for some in the life of departments and the college did not extend to all. Many faculty members in lecture-track appointments did not see clear paths for themselves to go beyond teaching introductory courses, were excluded from departmental governance, and were discouraged from seeking expanded roles for themselves outside their departments.

In addition to its internal inventory, the task force gathered information from other institutions in search of best practices and comparison points. After considering all this information, the task force came to consensus on its recommendations, which were grounded in the key statement from the 1997 report Teaching, which called for a revised view of the value of teaching in relation to research. Finding that the work of lecture-track faculty members, while not excluding research, is organized around the teaching mission of the university, the task force explicitly connected the value that the institution places on teaching and the value of the work of those on the lecture track. This connection was seen as one of several avenues open to the university to act on the earlier mandate to value its teaching mission.

The recommendations included the creation of the following:

1. a third tier in the lecture track, promotion to which would “link teaching and scholarship through new pedagogies in and across disciplines and
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between the university and the community, all hallmarks of excellent teaching and research” (Hartfield-Méndez, Marsteller, and Patterson 10), thus providing a clear path for advancement and aspiration while also acknowledging excellent work

2. clearer and more consistent policies for hiring and contracts at each level in the lecture track that were more uniform across the college, making three-year contracts available to lecturers with the possibility of promotion to senior lecturer after two terms and longer-term contracts at the senior lecturer and third-tier levels

3. detailed procedures for evaluation and promotion

4. a national search for all hires, with the possibility of hiring at any level

5. more equitable compensation policies

6. regular professional leaves

Institutional wheels driven by faculty governance tend to move slowly, but in the grand scheme of things, the college and university acted fairly quickly to implement many of these recommendations. A new policy was written, the college bylaws were changed after debate and a faculty vote, and a standing committee for evaluation and promotion of lecture-track faculty members was created. Perhaps the most important shift was that the majority of the faculty members approved the notion of regular faculty with two subsets, from which the rest of the changes flowed logically. Just as important was the alliance between members of the tenure-track and lecture-track faculties. A critical group of tenure-track faculty members worked tirelessly alongside their lecture-track colleagues, leveraging crucial and complementary institutional knowledge and experience. The associate dean of faculty guided the discussions. Of particular importance was the participation of a cochair of the Commission on Teaching from a decade earlier. Several faculty members in the lecture track had long-established relationships of mutual respect with faculty members on the tenure track. The task force’s recommendations and the resulting changes would not have occurred without this alliance. At the same time, it was essential that members of the lecture-track faculty stepped up to leadership roles, for them to exhibit a breadth and diversity of involvement and leadership and to begin to see themselves as active citizens of the university, assuming commensurate rights and responsibilities.

Lecture-track faculty members can now present themselves for promotion to professor of pedagogy, performance, or practice, depending on the emphasis of their work. The creation of this third tier has been an important mechanism for recognizing and rewarding lecture-track faculty members whose scholarly accomplishments are visible throughout and beyond the university. The significance of such a promotion goes beyond simply acknowledging excellent teaching; in fact, the new promotion policy explicitly requires evidence of excellent teaching, service, and contributions to their respective fields, especially as related to teaching, beyond Emory. Scholarship, defined broadly, is an essential piece of the portfolio that must be submitted for promotion. Evidence of leadership on campus but also beyond the campus in the area of teaching innovation and in the scholarship of teaching has been important in the consideration of candidates for promotion. Traditional scholarship in their respective fields is also considered valuable, particularly when the candidate demonstrates...
linkages or complementarity between such scholarship and his or her teaching. Consequently, several members of the lecture-track faculty are now acknowledged campus leaders in questions of pedagogy, enhancing the enterprise of teaching and claiming leadership in an arena that the university has set forth as critical to its mission.

Lecture-track faculty members serve on the standing promotion committee, and now that three cohorts of professors in the lecture track have been promoted, they also serve on committees for promotion to the third tier. Contracts for lecturers are for three years, with the possibility (but not requirement) for promotion to senior lecturer after two terms. Lecturers who do not present themselves for promotion are not penalized with the loss of their jobs; they may continue to serve as lecturers, depending on departmental needs. The term for senior lecturers is five years; senior lecturers may present themselves for promotion to professor after one term but are not required to do so. Promotion to professor is viewed as a special distinction, not necessarily appropriate in every case. Clear procedures are in place for evaluation and promotion, and national searches are required for new hires (“Appointment”).

Among the lecture-track faculty, there has been significant advancement in terms of rank (with a growing cohort of professors of pedagogy, practice, or performance) and aspirations. The promotion process makes visible the accomplishments of the lecture-track faculty and the multiple paths to professional development. The presence of lecture-track faculty members in administrative leadership positions at the highest levels makes their voices more audible and their advancement more evident. It has sometimes been the case that visibility at those levels opened a path for reimagining the role of lecture-track faculty members within departments and across the university. Accelerated possibilities for professional development have also resulted, particularly in emerging areas of institutional investment such as sustainability, engaged scholarship, and digital humanities. Institutional structures have morphed to accommodate the new faculty reality. The Emory College Language Center has become a space for empowerment, collaboration, and coalition building among all lecture-track faculty, not just among those teaching in language and literature departments. For example, in November 2011 the center hosted a panel discussion for all lecture-track faculty members on the lecture-track-faculty promotion process.

Still left unaddressed are the issues of equitable compensation and regular professional leaves. Since 2003, lecture-track faculty members can apply for a semester leave through the competitive Winship Award for Senior Lecturers. This was a major institutional advancement in the support of lecture-track faculty members, but only two awards are offered annually, making it unlikely that most eligible members will be granted a leave within the foreseeable future. Lecture-track salaries are significantly lower than those for faculty members with comparable tenure-track status and seniority. And although there is a merit increase in salary at the point of promotion to senior lecturer and to professor of pedagogy, practice, or performance, these increases do not match those given to tenure-track faculty members at points of promotion. Thus the current salary structure amounts to an institutionalization of inequity and undervaluing of the teaching mission of the institution.

Furthermore, as recent events have signaled, the four core principles that undergirded the work of the 2004 task force, as well as the gains that were made as a result,
have been undercut. Since the cuts, suspensions, and reorganization were announced, questions about the status and role of lecture-track faculty members and their relationship with the tenured and tenure-track faculty members have resurfaced—in other words, the notion of “regular faculty” is frayed. And in the communications about the decision-making process regarding which programs would be eliminated or suspended and how, there was a reversion to previous conceptualizations of the faculty on the basis of contract definitions rather than contributions to the shared missions of the college and graduate school. Fortunately, the structures and practices now in place (a strong executive committee of the Lecture-Track Faculty Group with open lines of communication to the dean and senior associate dean for faculty; representation by lecture-track faculty members on the college’s governance committee, in the Faculty Senate and in other committees; habits of shared responsibility, mutual respect, and sharing of information among lecture-track and tenure-track faculty members) are proving to be useful avenues for addressing these questions.

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese: A Case Study in Implementation

Policies are only guideposts; change in institutional culture is where real transformation occurs. Once new policies regarding appointment and review of lecture-track faculty members and the college’s guidelines for promotion to professor of pedagogy, practice, or performance were in place, an important educational process began for faculty members. Lecture-track faculty members, tenure-track faculty members, and administrators all had to understand the details of the new landscape and then work together to create appropriate pathways for constructing a new reality. For the new structure to become real, changes in the college bylaws were necessary, which required majority votes by the entire faculty. Bylaws changes occurred on several occasions throughout the restructuring process, providing faculty members with opportunities for debate and ultimately for demonstrations of broad support. It is fair to say that the College of Arts and Sciences, the university as a whole, and especially individual departments are still digesting these changes. The regularization and thoughtful reconfiguration of the lecture track has opened up further questions but has also created a pathway for all members of the faculty to grapple with them.

Arguably the last frontier for implementation is at the departmental and program level. Best practices of faculty governance often break down at this level, for many reasons. Effective departmental governance relies on strong, engaged leadership that explicitly recognizes the linkages between college governance and departmental processes, and happily the Department of Spanish and Portuguese benefitted from this kind of leadership during the years immediately following the restructuring of the college’s lecture track.

Spanish has for a number of years been the largest language program at Emory. After a period of expansion in the late nineties (Gold 77), enrollment leveled off. In the 2011–12 academic year, according to reports from the registrar, 1,075 students enrolled in Spanish, and 116 in Portuguese. Lecture-track faculty members currently constitute more than 50 percent of the departmental faculty and teach a majority of the undergraduate curriculum, especially in the lower division but also in upper-
level courses. Graduate pedagogical instruction and supervision is under the purview of a senior lecturer, and multisection undergraduate courses are usually supervised by lecture-track faculty members. Thus all courses taught by graduate students are informed by the perspective of a colleague whose work is closely identified with the university’s teaching mission.

As a result of the regularization of the lecture-track faculty in the 1990s, by 2005 there was already a sense of limited enfranchisement for lecture-track faculty members in the department, who had office spaces, mailboxes, access to departmental communications, multiyear contracts, annual evaluations, and access to opportunities for professional development through pedagogy seminars and workshops. That is, the positioning of lecture-track faculty in the department very nearly mirrored the recommendations of the MLA’s 2003 “Statement on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members.” Missing was the full integration of the lecture-track faculty members in departmental decision making, which made for an unbalanced departmental life and created barriers for their seeing themselves and being seen as fully responsible and capable. Changing those perceptions required a change in the terms of engagement in the department. There had long been an articulation point in the curriculum where members of the lecture-track and tenure-track faculties (and graduate students) collaborated productively (in the “gateway” course to the major), but points of articulation in our departmental governance were less clearly defined.

The department did not have bylaws, and the lack of a well-defined process for departmental governance was becoming increasingly evident, especially in the light of changes in the college bylaws. There was clearly a need to formalize the participation of all members of the department in shared governance. Thus writing departmental bylaws became a laboratory for acting on the spirit of inclusion of lecture-track faculty members that had guided the college’s bylaws changes and policy revisions. It was helpful that the chair of the department and a member of the lecture-track faculty (the authors of this article) had served on the college task force. The bylaws conversation was intentionally constructed as a space in which lecture-track faculty members and tenure-track faculty members would have equal voice and privileged as an important process that required the presence of all faculty members.

The process was guided by the principles set forth by the task force, especially the ideas that evaluation of lecture-track faculty members should be predicated on their having value and voice and that they should have full rights and responsibilities in faculty governance. Several meetings were devoted to the discussion and writing of the bylaws, culminating in their approval by vote of all regular faculty in the department. The process of writing the rules was exemplary of the rules ultimately put in place; in these conversations, lecture-track faculty members were called to step into a new role, and tenure-track faculty members were bound by the newly revised college bylaws to respect that new role. We found that these changes in our departmental governance, initially performative, became increasingly consequential.

This new governance structure informs administrative and teaching decisions in the department, such as how to distribute teaching assignments and administrative tasks equitably and creatively. One challenge is how to move beyond the traditional tagging of certain jobs as appropriate for lecture-track faculty (e.g., director
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of undergraduate studies, study-abroad adviser, Casa Hispana adviser) and others for tenure-track faculty (e.g., chair, director of graduate studies). We strive to think about our teaching assignments departmentally as well as individually not only in terms of coverage but also as opportunities for faculty conversation, collaboration, and development. Put bluntly, we are challenging the traditional thinking of lecture-track faculty members as warm bodies to be plugged into a curricular sequence and tenure-track faculty members as free agents who teach whatever and whenever they want, toward a situation in which all faculty members will work as equal partners to realize the department’s mission and leave behind the hierarchies and value assumptions of the past. What has become clear over the last year, however, is that there is a tension between this process, to which we remain fully committed, and the broad context of the college and graduate school.

Looking Forward

Our experiences at Emory reveal that while there has been much progress, much work remains to be done. Even as we wrote this article, administrative decisions whose ramifications are still emerging appeared to pose unforeseen challenges for the collaborative vision we have just described. The challenges ahead—nothing as simple as revising a single set of documents—must be seen as opportunities for all faculty members to engage together in what is still very much a work in progress of rethinking the academic labor force. An underlying concern is job security for both lecture-track and tenure-track faculty members in the current climate of contraction and reorganization. Other issues are conversion of tenure lines, inter- and intrauniversity portability of appointments, graduate education, and research.

The MLA’s Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members seems to imply that non-tenure-track lines should be converted to the tenure track whenever possible and to assume that conversion to the tenure track will be the desideratum of all those working off it. But this may not necessarily be the case. To what degree are these recommendations driven by the fundamental material and symbolic inequities that define our profession? If the working conditions and remuneration of lecture-track faculty members corresponded to their role in the institution, would there still be a pressing need for conversion? The importance of the conversion of tenure lines might become moot if the goal of symbolic and material parity were achieved. Focusing on conversion of lines as a goal, in addition to reinforcing existing hierarchies, may lead us to overlook other, more transformative possibilities for thinking about the larger body of the faculty.

The issue of portability arises when lecture-track faculty members contemplate moving from one institution or unit to another. The portability of a lecture-track appointment becomes problematic because there is no interinstitutional or cross-institutional context for a common understanding of what a lecture-track appointment means. There is often little parity in terms of conditions of employment and wide variance in titles. There is a need for greater standardization, particularly across similar kinds of institutions (e.g., community colleges, four-year liberal arts colleges, research universities).
The role that lecture-track faculty members play in graduate education is another area that will require concerted and innovative effort. At Emory, as at many research universities, lecture-track faculty members serve most visibly but not exclusively at the undergraduate level. In the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, they are deeply involved in the pedagogical training and mentorship of graduate teaching assistants, including the teaching of the required graduate seminar on pedagogical methods. Yet they are not members of the graduate faculty (as some are in other departments at Emory). As a result, graduate students in Spanish and Portuguese are trained by LTF in ways that are invisible and not legitimized; correspondingly, lecture-track faculty members’ contributions to our graduate program are also invisible. These issues play out across the spectrum of American universities.

New models are needed for training graduate students in a changing academy, as Russell Berman, in his former role as MLA president, noted in a call to rethink doctoral education. Graduate students need, for example, expertise in digital scholarship, technology-based instruction, and engaged scholarship. To be successful on the job market, they need the skills and expertise that many lecture-track faculty members have developed. Given that a shrinking percentage of jobs are tenure-track, we need to make available to our graduate students stellar models in both tracks—because it is likely that they will be working with (if not as) lecture-track faculty members in the future. Thus mentors from the lecture track need to be not only invested in graduate education but also fully enfranchised. As they play an increasingly important role in the training of graduate students, boundaries and assumptions that once seemed self-evident become less so. Who counts as graduate faculty, serves on the Graduate Studies Committee, teaches graduate seminars, serves on dissertation committees, or directs dissertations? Answers will vary depending on the department or program. A positive recent development in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Emory is the appointment of a lecture-track faculty member to the graduate faculty, mirroring a similar previous appointment in the Department of Religion.

The role of lecture-track faculty members in graduate education relates to another important question—research. The initially clear divide between lecture-track faculty members, whose focus was on teaching rather than research, and tenure-track faculty members, whose contributions to the university involved research as well as teaching (with research often valued over teaching), no longer obtains. This is not surprising if one takes seriously the ways in which teaching and scholarship are said to nurture and support each other or if one considers the ways in which traditional definitions of scholarship have expanded in recent years. On a practical level, non-tenure-track faculty members must have access to professional support and development. But as our definitions of scholarship and teaching evolve to meet the needs of the twenty-first century and the sharply drawn lines between the different faculty bodies within the body of “regular faculty” become increasingly blurred, we might productively reimagine their relation.

Currently the driving force behind the expansion of the nontenured faculty is economic. Were that imperative to go away (or be mitigated by other economic forces) and in the face of radical and far-reaching changes in higher education, might we envision a tipping point at which the distinction between lecture-track and tenure-
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track faculty is no longer intellectually or professionally viable? Where, then, are the spaces for continuing these conversations about the professoriat? These pages are an important space for defining and animating the discussion, as are MLA publications, panels, and workshops. MLA leadership is key, and former president Michael Bérubé has used his position as a bully pulpit to play an important advocacy role:

[N]on-tenure-track faculty members will have to learn . . . to assert themselves as faculty members, to comport themselves as if they have every right to be treated with the respect accorded the tenure-track faculty—which they most certainly do. And tenure-track faculty members, for their part, will have to learn not to be such jerks—and, more ambitiously, to learn to challenge cultures of jerkdom where they exist.

Conclusion

We believe that thinking of the professoriat—the “regular faculty”—in terms of university citizenship will free us to move beyond a division of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty that thwarts our progress toward shared pedagogical, intellectual, professional, and institutional goals. In his generous and provocative discussion of global citizenship, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, Kwame Anthony Appiah identifies two intertwined notions that in his view must guide our engagement in the world: “universal concern and respect for legitimate difference” (xv). By this he means that we share mutual obligations that go beyond narrow notions of cohort or community and that we must take seriously the activities and beliefs of others. If we apply these notions to the world of the twenty-first-century university, it becomes clear that we must work together to make it possible for all of us to claim and exercise the full set of rights and responsibilities that pertain to all citizens in that world. Recognizing this reality, we believe, is not a luxury but rather a necessary first step toward reaching our shared goals of civic learning and democratic engagement—toward responding to our crucible moment.

Notes

We gratefully acknowledge the encouragement and careful reading of drafts of this manuscript offered by Associate Dean Michael Elliot and Emory College Language Center Director and Professor of German Studies Hiram Maxim.

1. The report continues, “two-year and four-year colleges and universities offer an intellectual and public commons where it is possible not only to theorize about what education for democratic citizenship might require in a diverse society, but also to rehearse that citizenship daily in the fertile, roiling context of pedagogic inquiry and hands-on experiences” (*Crucible Moment* 2).

2. The MLA’s report *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World* concludes that “[t]he two-tiered configuration has outlived its usefulness and needs to evolve.”

3. In this section we draw on Hartfield-Méndez, Marsteller, and Patterson.

4. This distinction is one of the particularities of a leading research university and may not be the case in other institutions. It is within colleges (whether or not they are part of larger universities), however, that most non-tenure-track faculty members in English and other languages work.

5. Every effort is made to limit adjunct and temporary hires, although there are still occasional instances of them, in response to either academic or economic considerations.

6. In discussing the Emory experience, we use the language that has evolved at Emory: lecture-track faculty and tenure-track faculty.

7. The standard teaching loads for tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese is 2-2; lecturers teach 3-3; and senior lecturers and professors of pedagogy teach 2-3.
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FOREMOST among writing program administrators’ worries are contingent faculty contracts and their accompanying complications. The constant pressures of hiring and evaluating new faculty members, the pedagogical disadvantages that come with faculty members who are disenfranchised and stretched thin by work at multiple institutions, and, especially, the ethical concerns about unfair treatment of colleagues regularly plague writing program administrators. At Yeshiva College, a small, sectarian, all-men’s undergraduate liberal arts college in New York, the English Department has endeavored, particularly since 2010, to implement a series of changes that improve the lives of contingent faculty members and create more equity among all members of our department. Although implementing these proposals has required, and continues to require, concerted effort, our department’s faculty members, working together across ranks and appointment levels, have made significant progress in avoiding some of the biggest potential pitfalls of labor contingency. By including the contingent faculty members in these initiatives and decision-making processes, our department has begun to address, in ways that feel meaningful to all members of the department, some of the difficulties that arise from disparities in the academic hierarchy.

Yeshiva College, one of the nine colleges of Yeshiva University, among which are also the Albert Einstein School of Medicine, Stern College for Women, and Cardozo Law School, is perhaps best known in the world of labor practices for the 1980 United States Supreme Court case *NLRB v. Yeshiva University*. In that surprising Supreme Court decision, the university’s faculty association sought bargaining rights from the central administration and was denied in a 5-4 decision that has since been used to prevent faculty nationwide from unionizing. This unfortunate history of antilabor activity on the part of Yeshiva University’s central administration led to two decades of a demoralized and subordinated faculty, but the recent revision of outdated and incomplete faculty governance documents and the election of a multi-campus faculty council have prompted some optimism on the part of the faculty concerning its relation to the upper administration.

Longtime tenured faculty members, working alongside new administrators, have attempted to recover from this unpleasant history by taking small steps toward faculty governance and improved tenure-stream working conditions. At the same time, the Yeshiva College English Department has taken significant steps to create more positive working conditions for non-tenure-track lecturers. By working together with full-time lecturers, the department’s tenure-stream faculty members have established superior working conditions for contingent faculty members through four initiatives:

1. Articulating a clear job description that outlines rights and responsibilities for all contingent faculty members
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Articulating a Non-Tenure-Track Lecturer Job Description

Composing a job description was among the first and most important tasks in formalizing and professionalizing the English Department’s treatment of full-time contingent faculty members. In consultation with the department’s non-tenure-track lecturers, four members of the tenure-stream faculty developed this document:

Non-Tenure-Track Job Description and Details

Title
Lecturer in Writing

Contract Terms
A two-year contract followed by two possible three-year renewals followed by possible five-year renewals

Teaching Load
Three courses per term (six per year), at least four per year of which must be First Year Writing, three of which will typically be taught in the fall semester

Service Requirements
- Participation in relevant faculty development programs
- Participation in fall orientation program and other relevant first-year programming
- Attendance at two department meetings per term (to be specified by the chair)
- One significant service activity per semester, to be determined in conjunction with the department and department chair

Research and Scholarship (Highly Desirable)
An active writing life outside the classroom

Salary and Benefits
- Starting salary of $55,000 per year, with annual review to determine salary increases
- Full health, dental, and pension benefits
- Standard, nonsabbatical, Yeshiva University–paid parental leave or disability leave benefits, accrued at a rate of twenty days per year of full-time employment
- Up to an additional year of unpaid parental leave
- Travel funds to one conference relevant to appointment per year
- Eligibility to compete for funding from non-tenure-track research funding pool
- Attendance at two department meetings per term (to be specified by the chair)
- Shared office space

Terms of Renewal
Departmental review based on at least two teaching observations, review of syllabi, review of feedback on student papers, review of service to department and college, student evaluations, samples of ongoing writing projects, and a self-reflective portfolio cover letter. Renewal and notification for the first (two-year) contract will take
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place in the fall of the second year; for the three-year contracts, in the spring of the second year; and for the five-year contracts, in the spring of the fourth year.

Additional Notes

• These lines will remain non-tenure-track, but individuals holding them may apply for new tenure-track openings.
• The department will revisit departmental needs at the time of each contract renewal.

Some aspects of this document, including the non-tenure-track research funding pool and the (admittedly optimistic) $55,000 average salary, have not yet been put into place because of college-wide budget cuts. Others are in the process of being implemented or have been already, and they reflect several meaningful changes for our full-time contingent faculty members. For instance, never before had the English Department offered contracts of longer than three years to contingent faculty members. In the past, full-time lecturers began on a two-year contract, successful completion of which could lead to a three-year appointment. Thereafter, all appointments would continue in three-year increments. The move to eventual five-year contracts indicates a more significant commitment on the part of the college, a meaningful improvement in job security for the lecturers, and the influence of the MLA’s Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members, which recommends that such faculty members “should ideally be hired on three-year contracts with full benefits; after six years, they should be eligible for longer-term review; past six years, they should be given longer (five- or six-year) contracts” (1). Because our job description is relatively new, we have not yet offered any lecturer a five-year contract, but the Yeshiva College dean has indicated support of the plan moving forward, so we will see at the outset of the next contract period whether this part of the document is implemented.

The teaching load for lecturers did not change with the new job description, and one way in which the Yeshiva College English Department has long been a leader in contingent faculty employment is in teaching load: tenured and non-tenure-track faculty members alike have 3-3 loads. Of course, that apparent equity has a number of inequities built into both sides: tenure-stream faculty members, unlike lecturers, are entitled to junior leaves, sabbaticals, administrative course reassign time, and the possibility of course releases for developing and teaching new courses. They also have full-semester parental leaves that are separate from time granted under the Family and Medical Leave Act, whereas lecturers must earn maternity or paternity leaves at a rate of twenty days per year of full-time employment. At the same time, tenure-stream faculty members have significant scholarly responsibilities that are not required of lecturers and a much heavier service expectation. Junior tenure-track faculty members are under intense pressure to publish and still teach a 3-3 load. Nonetheless, the equity in teaching load is a powerful signal of colleagues’ equal worth in the department.

Because more than half the department’s students in any given semester are registered for courses in the First Year Writing Program, and because our lecturers are all members of the writing faculty rather than the literature faculty, the equity in teaching load also reflects a reality of the department: if the lecturers did not bear so heavy a burden in teaching writing, the tenure-stream faculty members would not have the flexibility they currently do to teach upper-level courses in areas of their
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literary specialization. A few tenured faculty members regularly reassert this truth, and the fact that most tenure-stream faculty members in our department would prefer to teach even fewer writing classes than they already do has encouraged all department members to feel a personal stake in the lecturers’ job satisfaction. Our writing courses in both the first and second semester are capped at fifteen students per section, so the lecturers’ student load, even in a semester with three sections of First Year Writing, is around forty-five students per term, a relatively reasonable load and one that encourages significant one-on-one interaction with students and a personalization of teaching that cannot occur when student loads are heavier.

Creating a Respectful Work Environment

This job description document also clarifies some aspects of the lecturer position that had never been discussed previously. In past years, for instance, lecturers were expected to attend all department and faculty meetings, even when those meetings were not relevant to their work. This expectation felt excessive to the contingent faculty members, but they hesitated to complain for fear of seeming resistant to participation. This document specifies instead that they will be invited by the chair to two relevant department meetings per semester, a number that the document’s authors and the lecturers determined not to be onerous but to still allow the maintenance of regular communication and close contact among all members of the department.

The document also clarifies the expectation that lecturers will participate in a single service activity without pressuring them to take on additional service as a way to ensure contract renewal. Before the document was created, general announcements were frequently sent to the faculty requesting help with poetry readings, a variety of committees and working groups, the annual writing contest, the English Club, the senior colloquium series, and a number of other events, but lecturers were seldom certain for how many events they should volunteer and ended up shoulder the burden for more than their fair share of such activities. Under the new job description, and at the request of the lecturers, each person in this position has chosen to focus her or his extracurricular work on one service activity: one lecturer organizes the annual writing contest, another serves on the First Year Seminar faculty working group, a third participates in the senior colloquium, and so on. Any additional activities, of which there are many, are assigned to tenure-stream faculty members.

One area about which the writers of this job description had the most debate was the section on research and scholarship. All the department’s lecturers actively write and publish and among them claim a forthcoming novel from a prominent international publishing house, an essay in one of the foremost creative nonfiction journals, conference presentations, published volumes of poetry, plays in production, and a major national fiction award and accompanying book contract. Yet publication has never been an explicit requirement for the position, and the job description’s authors wanted to distinguish between the writing expectations for tenure-stream faculty members and the writing expectations for lecturers, whose positions clearly emphasize teaching above research. Our solution was to describe “an active writing life” as “highly desirable,” phrases we felt would help us in future hiring decisions.
and in renewal evaluations while honoring the many successes of lecturers without restricting them to certain amounts or types of writing.

In addition to these significant measures, the English Department has endeavored to indicate in smaller but still meaningful ways that the work of contingent faculty members is valued as highly as the work of tenured faculty members. For instance, whereas some Yeshiva College departments house contingent faculty members in the cubicles of an adjacent building’s renovated basement, the English Department fought for faculty offices for full-time lecturers on the same floor as tenure-stream faculty members. The workspace for lecturers is identical to that of their tenure-track colleagues: they have office space, desktop computers, and access to shared printers and copiers. The physical marker of contingent faculty members’ offices alongside the offices of their tenured colleagues sends a powerful message to all levels of faculty and, certainly, to students, who need not search the basement cubicles for an English professor.

Instituting a Formal Renewal Policy

Beyond our creation and implementation of this job description document, the English Department has instituted a formalized review process in preparation for contract renewal. This process involves a review of classroom observations; portfolios that include teaching evaluations, sample syllabi, and sample teaching materials; examples of current creative or scholarly projects; and a cover letter in which each lecturer reflects on his or her teaching and writing. In addition to formalizing the work to be considered in contract renewals, we have established a calendar of dates by which each step of the process will take place, including the dates by which lecturers will be notified of their contract status. In the past, lecturers were reviewed in much more informal ways with no regularized portfolios, and they may not have been notified about contract renewals until after the expiry of the previous contract. This new procedure offers some sense of surety about their continued employment and, for those whose contract will not be renewed, sufficient time to search for other employment. Our first implementation of this process resulted in a renewal period that was less stressful than in past years and gave the department as a whole a sense of professionalism and tangible proof of the lecturers’ contributions to the life of the college.

An additional benefit of this formalized contract-renewal process is that upper administrators, who may be less familiar with the work of contingent faculty members than with that of tenure-stream faculty members, have access to portfolios to see the kind and quality of the lecturers’ work. A portfolio that resembles the teaching portfolio of faculty members applying for tenure or promotion speaks the language of the upper administration and makes physically evident the work of lecturers who are often invisible to upper administrators or who may seem to be fully interchangeable and endlessly replaceable.

Eliminating Part-Time Contingency

In addition to the measures described above, the Yeshiva College English Department has embarked on a new curriculum that allows us to eliminate all one-semester
Contingent Labor Practices in the Yeshiva College English Department: A Case Study

Gillian Steinberg

part-time contracts. In 2000, the English Department successfully lobbied to replace some adjunct instructors with full-time composition specialists. Since that time, we have maintained those new lecturer lines while continuing to rely—to a lesser extent, but to rely nonetheless—on between four and eight adjunct instructors each semester, some teaching one course and some teaching two. While we have long observed national standards for part-time labor by not hiring any adjunct for more than two classes in a term, these positions were paid at a rate of $1,200 per credit with no benefits or security, courses were subject to last-minute cancellation due to low enrollments, and the only available office space was in shared basement cubicles.

As part of a college-wide curriculum review, the curriculum working groups decided to move to a new first-year sequence, in which students take the writing-instructive course First Year Writing in the first term and a seminar in the disciplines in the second term. By sharing writing responsibilities with faculty members in other departments during students’ second semesters, we have been able to redistribute the heavy burden placed on the English Department to staff enough classes to serve all first-year students for two full semesters. This redistribution has significant pedagogical benefits, which were the primary motivation for the curricular change, but a happy side effect is the releasing of writing instruction to the college as a whole rather than limiting it to the English Department. The English Department will continue to shoulder a significant number of these courses and administer the courses’ scheduling, staffing, faculty development, and oversight, but the teaching load is now distributed across the college, leaving the English Department with enough full-time faculty members to cover all its classes.

Because we knew well in advance about the impending curricular changes, we were able to inform our adjuncts with a year’s notice that their work would no longer be needed. Of course, for these individuals, our efforts to move toward more ethical labor conditions do not improve their situations, and they are justifiably upset to lose their part-time positions. Yet we hope that once the college sees the pedagogical and collegial benefits of having a department of fully enfranchised faculty members, future hires will inevitably be full-time. This may be wishful thinking, and we may need to fight regularly to avoid a return to reliance on part-time, per-course labor, but we hope that the current change will lead to a deeper and more lasting change in the college’s culture.

Empowering Non-Tenure-Track Lecturers through Programming

Finally, because the new curriculum and its accompanying policy of eliminating adjunct labor require tenured and tenure-track faculty members to teach additional writing classes, we recently offered a two-day faculty development program on writing pedagogy. Although administrators initially suggested bringing in an outside expert to lead the sessions, the English Department decided to use in-house experts: our lecturers. Their expertise as teachers of writing, especially in the unique context of our student population and with their experience having taught under the new curriculum during its pilot phase, made them ideal candidates to teach and guide their tenured and tenure-track colleagues. The Deans’ Office and College Honors
Program provided funding, which would otherwise have gone to bringing in an outside workshop leader and which provided respectable stipends to each of the participating lecturers. The lecturers thus had the opportunity to work together, for pay, to plan the sessions and decide what information would most benefit the tenured faculty members, most of whom have significantly less experience teaching writing. The Deans’ Office also provided money for materials, and so we compiled a bound volume of lecturers’ sample syllabi, assignment prompts, classroom activities, and handouts to share with every member of the department. By relocating power in this way, we reminded all members of the English Department, very visibly, that each of us has something to teach the rest and that the academic hierarchy that exists among us is not necessarily a marker of knowledge, ability, or departmental worth.

In general, we have aimed, as much as is possible, to reach consistency in the treatment of our faculty. The significant differences among contingent and tenure-stream positions are obvious: job security, allowances for scholarly work, the protection of full academic freedom, and lack of uncertain contracts. These differences will, unfortunately, not disappear. At the same time, we have endeavored to eliminate the other distinctions that are, all too often, integral to the lives of contingent faculty members but need not be so. Equitable teaching loads, comparable office space, inclusion in departmental decisions, opportunities to make scheduling requests, participation in the social and curricular life of the department, institutional valuing of one’s writing and scholarship, respectable salaries, an ethical benefits package, and other such markers of respect need not be absent from the lives of contingent faculty members simply because they work off the tenure track. Contingency necessarily means that tenure will not be an option, but it need not mean that contingent faculty members are valued less, that their scholarly and pedagogical contributions are seen as inferior, or that they are excluded—explicitly or subtly—from the lives and work of their tenured colleagues.

If anything, our articulated inclusion of contingent faculty members in the department means that tenured faculty members must work to protect lecturers from taking on more work than they should and that we must all occasionally remind ourselves of our different statuses and their accompanying differences in responsibility. This mindful approach to contingent labor is fully attainable if tenure-stream faculty members are willing to acknowledge and appreciate the ways in which their freedoms and opportunities rest on the work of their contingent colleagues. Several members of the Yeshiva College English Department voice that truth whenever suggestions arise about how we might place additional burdens on contingent faculty members. By reminding our colleagues that contingent faculty members are already upholding their end of a clearly articulated bargain, the English Department is able to avoid the potential pitfalls of depending on lecturers’ contingency to extract additional labor from them.

We hope that a decades-old institutional legacy of disenfranchising faculty members that has not yet fully been fixed from the top down can gradually be improved from the bottom up. By offering contingent faculty members opportunities to be publicly valued and by articulating for them fair and equitably applied responsibilities, we can continue to move toward their more ethical treatment as well as toward
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concurrent improvements in pedagogy and departmental collegiality. The essential differences between lecturer and tenure-stream positions will not be erased, but the unfortunate and unnecessary inequities that often accompany lecturers’ contracts can be eliminated or lessened through collegial efforts, supportive administrators, and concerted attention to the ways that contingent faculty members’ jobs can be made more transparent, more central to the department and college, and more closely aligned with tenure-stream positions.

Notes

1. The document’s four authors are Adam Zachary Newton, University Professor of English and department chair; Lauren Fitzgerald, associate professor of English and director of the Wilf Campus Writing Center; Joanne Jacobson, professor of English and former department chair; and Gillian Steinberg, associate professor of English and director of First Year Writing.

2. The first success of this document was in securing a higher salary for lecturers, although the current salary is still lower than what we believe the lecturers deserve, and their average salary has not yet reached our $55,000 goal.

Work Cited

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members as Administrators: Planning and Evaluation
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THE expanding role of non-tenure-track faculty members has been highlighted in recent discussions of job trends on college and university campuses. The Association of Departments of English (ADE), the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL), the Modern Language Association (MLA), and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) all have policy statements on the status and working conditions of part-time and full-time faculty members employed off the tenure track. The search pages for the ADE Bulletin and the ADFL Bulletin include such categories as Adjunct Faculty / Part-Time Faculty, Conditions of Work and Employment, and Faculty Evaluation and Reward.

The study by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) on higher education job growth—American Academic: The State of Higher Education Workforce, 1997–2007—indicates that, in 2007, the total number of faculty jobs has increased as college enrollments have surged by more than three million students over the last ten years; the increase, however, has only been in the non-tenure-track faculty. Where full-time and tenure-track faculty members represented thirty-three percent of all faculty in 1997, that number has since dropped to twenty-seven percent; contingent faculty members now comprise the majority of the teaching workforce (9–11). English departments have followed the trend with a dramatic rise in the number of non-tenure-track lines. In the 2008 publication Education in the Balance: A Report on the Workforce in English, the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Staffing notes that the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty positions within English departments remained constant while the number of full- and part-time positions outside the tenure track increased sharply (2).

While English departments have long had a history of diverse faculty roles, these roles have recently changed. Education in the Balance puts our profession’s varied employment categories in context, tracking the increase in the number of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members to rising undergraduate enrollment but also noting a widening division between teaching and research (3, 15). As institutions increase research expectations for tenure-track faculty members, support for that research often takes the form of decreased teaching loads. As a result, non-tenure-track faculty members are taking on responsibility for lower-division as well as upper-division undergraduate courses (7). Since teaching faculty members occupy the bulk of non-tenure-track positions, it is not surprising that most of the scholarship on contingent faculty members focuses on the teaching population. The ADE report raises important questions about the relation of teaching and research. We want to add another consideration: the relation of teaching, research, and administration.

A small but growing number of non-tenure-track appointments are in undergraduate program administration. We recognize that there are many complex issues
related to the use of non-tenure-track faculty members, but we draw attention to this facet because we believe it raises significant questions about how we value undergraduate program administration within departments and universities, the relation of research and administration, and the complexities of evaluating administrative service for faculty renewal and promotion. Thus we examine here two related questions: What specific factors do departments and job candidates need to consider before creating or accepting a full-time, non-tenure-track administrative position? Once a department creates a full-time, non-tenure-track position (or a candidate accepts such a position), how might evaluation and promotion guidelines provide specific support for non-tenure-track faculty members in administrative roles?

Creating Non-Tenure-Track Administrative Positions

Non-tenure-track administrative positions need to be considered from at least two perspectives: that of the department hiring for the position and that of a job candidate considering the position. As part of a forum in a *College English* special issue on contingent faculty (Arnold et al. 411–12), we raised questions for both sides to consider:

- **Stability.** Does the position have a clear source of renewable funding? Is the position eligible for pay increases?
- **Centrality.** How does the position correspond to department, college, and university goals?
- **Integration.** Will the person employed in the position be a fully participating member of the departmental community with a voice in governance?
- **Security.** What strategies are in place to protect academic freedom in the absence of tenure? Do evaluation procedures or guidelines need to be revised to assist in equitable annual reviews and promotions?

Here we want to address some of these questions with examples that show why the stability, centrality, integration, and security of non-tenure-track administrative positions are so important and how they apply to a wide range of departments and job seekers, starting with the hiring process and continuing through annual reviews.

The Hiring Perspective

Previous studies of changes in the academic labor force have largely neglected issues concerning non-tenure-track faculty members in administrative positions. We offer as a sample case our department’s decision to define the position of writing center coordinator as non-tenure-track. Like many universities, our institution (a large, public, research-oriented, land-grant university) has seen sharp increases in undergraduate enrollments over the past ten years. The rising number of undergraduates has resulted in more sections of required composition courses and new needs for academic support services such as a writing center.

We received permission to hire a non-tenure-track writing center coordinator, but we worried that a non-tenure-track position would imply a separation between research on current developments in our field and administrative practice. The pay inequity between non-tenure-track and tenure-track positions at our institution raised
additional concerns about institutional hierarchies. We had to weigh these problems against the fact that a full-time line represented far more support and stability than the half-time appointment of a graduate teaching assistant or two that we currently had for tutoring. When we decided in favor of the full-time line, we did so with a concurrent commitment to changes at the department level that would make the position stable, central, well-integrated, and secure.

An equitable salary scale and renewable funding are two factors that indicate a position’s long-term stability. The funding for our writing center coordinator is stable even if the full-time position is not tenure-track. The college and university invested significant funds to create a new physical space for the writing center and also committed an annual budget for the coordinator and peer tutor stipends. We would not have moved forward without having secured long-term funding. While we were disappointed that the salary for the non-tenure-track position began at eighty percent of what a new tenure-track position would earn, we were able to redefine the position as “clinical faculty” rather than “faculty equivalent,” which made it eligible for annual merit money and the pay raises associated with promotions. Over time, merit pay has somewhat lessened the salary inequity, but the lower pay scale for non-tenure-track positions remains a challenge.

The writing center coordinator position connects well to department, college, and university goals to improve undergraduate education and student retention. While connection to college and university goals helps with stability as well as centrality, it is also important in annual evaluations. (We’ll say a bit more about this below.)

Following the advice of the 2008 ADE report, we wanted to make sure that the person employed in this position would be a fully participating member of the department community with a voice in governance, but realizing this role involved two key changes. First, we needed to redefine the position as “clinical faculty” rather than “faculty equivalent.” At our institution, faculty-equivalent positions are primarily administrative, with no expectations of research. Clinical faculty positions started in the health sciences to recognize health-care professionals who held continuing appointments and usually, but not always, devoted the majority of their professional effort to clinical service. By using this existing faculty category, we could define the writing center coordinator’s role to recognize administrative responsibilities as central while still being able to value teaching and research. Specifically, we configured the position as fifty percent administrative work, forty percent teaching, and ten percent research. In this way, a clinical faculty position had a distinct advantage over a teaching faculty line, which, at the time, did not recognize any time allocated to research. The research component was important to us, because a coordinator who was actively engaged with the profession and aware of current theories, research studies, and practices would understand his or her work in a much larger context than one who focused solely on student-tutor interactions. Given the opportunity for research, the writing center coordinator could collaborate with the undergraduate writing program on planning, curriculum development, and faculty outreach.

The terms of the contract and the performance expectations that follow also contribute to the security of any position. At our institution, those in clinical faculty positions can be promoted from assistant professor to associate professor to
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Although none of these promotions carry tenure, “[c]linical-track faculty have all rights and privileges of academic freedom and responsibility” (West Virginia University Policies 9). At the department level, we took steps to revise our faculty evaluation procedures to recognize and value new categories of work. We updated our evaluation procedures to include full-time, non-tenure-track positions to be sure that our new writing center coordinator (and any other full-time, non-tenure-track colleagues) could be confident of receiving equitable annual reviews and promotions.

The Job Seeker’s Perspective

The decision to accept a non-tenure-track administrative position in a writing program involves various professional and personal considerations. We recommend that, when faced with such a decision, job seekers pay close attention to department stability, collegiality, campus support for writing, and the overall institutional culture.

Non-tenure-track administrative appointments are often attractive because—as Roger Baldwin and Jay Chronister aptly state—one can “pursue an academic career without the liabilities often associated with the quest for tenure” (140). There is little pressure to publish and no tenure clock. In theory, one can pursue research of any kind and at any point in one’s career. And because of the limited requirements to produce publishable research, one’s job could be more focused. That is, unlike tenure-track colleagues, a non-tenure-track person who spends time away from research to attend to administrative duties can still receive a positive annual evaluation for that service.

Again, we offer an example to illustrate these points. Because the writing center coordinator’s work directly connects to the university mission and to specific goals related to student learning, it has led to positive and productive relationships with writing faculty members outside the department and with deans outside the college, lending the position an important voice in university-wide conversations about core writing requirements and student retention. As a result, this non-tenure-track position is integrated within institutional structures and the person employed in it understands budgets and decision-making processes on our campus from an administrative as well as a faculty perspective.

The non-tenure-track position works because of several factors we outline earlier: the writing center has stable funding; the goals of the center and the responsibilities of the administrative position coincide with department, college, and university goals; and, because of the recent positive changes in the department’s faculty evaluation guidelines, all full-time colleagues (regardless of tenure status) have a voice in governance, are eligible for professional development leaves (which are similar to sabbaticals but focus on teaching or administration), and can apply for elective promotion on their own timetable.

Of course there are cautions attached to any position off the tenure track. As graduate students, we are trained to become scholars and are often advised against taking on service-oriented work. We learn very early that the institution arranges hierarchically the work we do. When faculty members are asked by their colleagues what they are working on, they mention their current research and upcoming publications, not their committee work or their administrative duties. Service activities
do not hold intellectual currency; the implicit message is that academicians advance the discipline while administrators manage or direct the affairs of the institution without actively creating knowledge (Strickland 49). Because the workload of non-tenure-track faculty members may be defined in terms other than the 40-40-20 division typical of teaching, research, and service for tenure-track faculty members, candidates need to assess any offer carefully. While each job candidate’s situation is unique, we believe there are some common questions for any candidate considering a non-tenure-track position: Are teaching loads variable? Are the terms of the contract clearly defined? How is research valued? Do faculty evaluation guidelines explicitly include performance expectations for non-tenure-track faculty members?

**Administrative Work and Evaluation Challenges**

Our example illustrates how departments and individuals need to address whether a full-time, non-tenure-track position is a good option for program administration. While stability and support are crucial for success, we also need to consider how to integrate and secure new positions. What, for instance, are alternative ways for faculty to gain recognition and centrality when research and publication are not the primary goals or criteria for their appointments?

Our department chair and our dean recognize the need to value and promote faculty members who take on administrative roles (probably because they are administrators). We continue to seek ways to demonstrate the value of administrative work to the teaching and research colleagues who serve on promotion and evaluation committees. This is where expanded definitions of scholarship and the move away from rigid distinctions of teaching and research and service continue to prove valuable—but also difficult to enact, particularly in areas of faculty evaluation.

The hiring and assessment section of the MLA’s *Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members: Recommendations and Evaluative Questions* helps us identify areas that would count in evaluating a non-tenure-track faculty member’s contributions to the institution. But we also need to scrutinize the rigid categories that constitute all faculty members’ work. Whether program administrators are on or off the tenure track, their work is difficult to evaluate because so much of the typical workload defies neat categorization as purely research, purely teaching, or purely administration or service. Institutions and departments therefore often struggle with identifying and categorizing administrative work for annual evaluation and promotion. New, non-tenure-track administrative positions have the potential to make evaluation easier because they overtly give more value to administrative work, often identifying it as accounting for fifty percent or more of the position’s workload. But even when the duties tied to a position are more clearly defined, the productive overlap of teaching, research, and service often gets lost. *Service*, the category most often associated with administrative work, is a particularly slippery term that can denote either administrative responsibilities or contributions to the academic institution or profession more broadly. At issue is who defines the term, how service counts toward individual evaluations and promotions, and how service is valued within a program or department.
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Let’s say, for example, that two colleagues, one tenure-track and one non-tenure-track, copresent a faculty workshop. For the tenure-track person, who receives a course reassignment in exchange for a host of service-related activities, the workshop is considered teaching-related and should thus be counted as teaching for the purposes of the annual review. For the non-tenure-track person, however, whose job description calls for fifty to sixty percent of his or her time to be allocated to administrative service, such a workshop would normally be classified as service. When the tenure-track person lists the workshop under teaching and the non-tenure-track person lists the same workshop under service, it creates confusion for the faculty evaluation committee that reviews both files. Where does the workshop “count”? Can it be counted differently for each faculty member? Who decides?

In an effort to aid institutions and departments in evaluating faculty work, the MLA produced the 1996 report *Making Faculty Work Visible: Reinterpreting Professional Service, Teaching, and Research in the Fields of Language and Literature*. The report is a nod to Ernest Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered*, but instead of categorizing labor in terms of the traditional triad of research, teaching, and service, the MLA model assesses faculty work according to its “quality, significance, and impact” (2). The report recommends giving equal weight to all work that forwards a discipline as well as work that sustains and improves the infrastructure of the academy. This model divides faculty work into two categories: intellectual work (e.g., the production of original research, grant writing as related to scholarship, administering a writing center, co-teaching, mentoring, and offering faculty workshops) and academic and professional citizenship (e.g., serving on local, regional, or national boards; designing or participating in a community literacy project; fund-raising; or organizing academic conferences).

In 1998 the Council for Writing Program Administrators (WPA) published “Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Administration,” drawing on Boyer’s 1990 report and on the MLA’s 1996 report. To create a context for discussing and evaluating writing program administrative work, the WPA suggests that much administration falls into one or more of the following five categories of intellectual work: “Program Creation, Curricular Design, Faculty Development, Program Assessment and Evaluation, and Program-Related Textual Production.” Furthermore, administrative activity in one of these categories should count as intellectual work if it meets any of the following criteria, as outlined in guideline 2:

- It generates, clarifies, connects, reinterprets, or applies knowledge based on research, theory, and sound pedagogical practice;
- It requires disciplinary knowledge available only to an expert trained in or conversant with a particular field;
- It requires highly developed analytical or problem solving skills derived from specific expertise, training, or research derived from scholarly knowledge;
- It results in products or activities that can be evaluated by peers (e.g., publication, internal and outside evaluation, participant responses) as the contribution of the individual’s insight, research, and disciplinary knowledge.

To assess the quality, significance, and intellectual value of the administrative work, guideline 3 of the WPA document asks evaluators to consider how activities in the
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five categories serve to innovate, improve, disseminate, or demonstrably accomplish effective teaching and learning. In a final recommendation, the guidelines call for peer reviews as another way to place the intellectual work of program administration in an expanded, national context.

Despite such efforts, department standards often remain rigid—an issue that is especially problematic for faculty members with administrative responsibilities. The documents noted here, as well as those from other organizations, share a sincere attempt to expand definitions of scholarship and recognize diverse faculty roles. Yet two decades of scholarship seem to have had relatively little impact when it comes to recognizing the varied and complementary contributions of faculty members, both tenured and untenured. The ADE report concludes with the reminder that, although we must collectively work “to define an appropriate role for the non-tenure-track segment of the faculty and limit its size,” we also must “ensure that those colleagues employed outside the tenure track have the appropriate salaries, working conditions, status, rights and responsibilities, and security of employment” (Education 15). What, then, can departments do to support full-time, non-tenure-track positions?

Collegiality, Collective Action, and Flexible Allocations

R. Eugene Rice and Mary Deane Sorcinelli identify two competing cultures that dominate the current academic reward system: the collegial and the managerial. The collegial culture, dominant from the 1950s through the 1970s, assumes a community of scholars, academic freedom, and shared governance; it values professional autonomy and disciplinary affiliation. The collegial culture generated a prestige economy with ranking systems and hierarchical categories that control relative status. The managerial culture, in contrast, relies on a market economy “where resource providers [not the faculty] determine priorities and value products and services” (105). Increasingly, university governing boards and legislators at the state or even national level are calling for greater attention to undergraduate teaching, more outreach to the community, more attention to new technologies, and so forth. As a result, Rice and Sorcinelli report, untenured faculty members often feel under siege and overwhelmed by competing demands to excel at research, teaching, and service.

Michael Murphy provides another way of looking at the academic market economy. He argues that teaching-intensive faculty members (and here we would add administrative faculty members), as active consumers of the scholarship that research-intensive faculty members produce, play an integral role in sustaining the intellectual integrity of the discipline. Murphy outlines a careful and strategic two-tier system to enfranchise the teaching-intensive faculty while safeguarding the ongoing need for the traditional research-oriented track (25, 35). While his essay is both thoughtful and thought-provoking, we would like to extend his concept with specific workplace strategies for supporting an ever-increasing, full-time, service-intensive faculty track.

To integrate non-tenure-track faculty members into departmental culture, we propose a shift away from individual faculty roles and workloads to focus instead on the department and university contexts to which the work contributes. Such a shift would potentially benefit tenure-track faculty members as well. We argue that
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A department’s collective effort can provide a framing context for recognizing and valuing the contributions of non-tenure-track faculty members, especially those who serve as writing administrators, and that adopting a collective approach is a step toward reestablishing a collegial culture that values a community of scholars and shared governance.

Our department had the chance to try a collective approach when we revised our evaluation guidelines to include new full-time, non-tenure-track faculty categories. We began by listing and defining the various types of faculty roles in our department (e.g., research, teaching, and administration or service) in terms of each one’s primary contributions to the department and typical workload. This process of listing and defining helped us consider the larger work of the department and the need for varied roles to meet our collective goals. That is, members of the teaching faculty help us excel at meeting the needs of undergraduates, which in turn helps us meet enrollment and retention goals set by the college and university. Likewise, members of the research faculty advance the reputation of our department and graduate programs. And members of the administrative faculty ensure that our curriculum and professional development programs support both teachers and students while staying current with national research on writing.

The conversations also helped make some sense of the faculty workload forms required by our university, which ask individual faculty members to quantify discrete units of time devoted to teaching, research, and service. Practices in place at other universities suggest how workload allocations might help articulate the ways that individuals work together to contribute to collective department goals. Victoria Clegg and Gretchen Esping, for instance, describe the system of flexible workload allocations in place at Kansas State University (KSU). Unlike stand-alone faculty workload forms that rely on simple percentages of effort (the model currently in place at our university), the KSU model depends on a rich and specific departmental context. The department head meets “with each faculty member, individually, at the beginning of the evaluation period, to set broad terms for allocating the faculty members’ time and effort in teaching, research, service, and other activities during the year, and also to agree on reasonable expectations for performance standards” (170). The department head puts the results of this conversation in writing and in terms that are “consistent with more general criteria and standards for evaluation, promotion, and tenure” (171). In this model of flexible allocation, the department head clearly plays an important—and time-intensive—role, and faculty members need to trust their chair to negotiate fair allocations and evaluations (183). Clegg and Esping are quick to note that if shared governance is to remain “an important reality and expectation” within this system, then departments who use flexible allocation methods need to make decisions collaboratively, establish expectations clearly, and communicate those decisions and expectations well (184).

When our department revised its guidelines for the evaluation and promotion of full-time non-tenure-track faculty members, we kept Clegg and Esping’s advice in mind. Beyond defining the various roles in our department in relation to our overall department goals, we also drew on the ADE, MLA, and WPA guidelines to help us take stock of our specific local culture and establish clear expectations for evaluations.
We were able to draw on several self-studies of our department (one that we had completed for an external review and others required for regular institutional reporting). We also had a faculty-evaluation task force that consulted with colleagues at other universities. This departmental-level committee (chaired by one of us) included tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track representatives. After a good deal of research on faculty evaluation, reviews of guidelines in place at several other schools, and several months of faculty meetings, our department agreed on the following framework for documenting and evaluating the wide range of work that each person contributes.

1. **Significance or Impact.** To what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, or research, or service) benefit or affect students, our department, our college, our university, our profession, or other communities or individuals? And/or to what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) reflect originality and development within a body of work?

2. **Engagement.** To what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, or research, or service) generate, apply, and/or use knowledge and insight consistent with current directions in our field of study? And/or to what degree does the faculty member demonstrate thoroughness, reliability, and availability?

3. **Context.** To what degree are the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, or research, or service) consistent with goals important to our department, our college, our university, or our profession? And/or to what degree do the faculty member’s activities (in teaching, research, or service) rely on knowledge of the department, college, institution, or professional organizations? To what degree is the faculty member willing to learn about the department, college, institution, or profession or keep current with changes? ("Department 7–8)

The new guidelines have been in use since the 2009–10 academic year. By framing the entire set of faculty evaluation guidelines in terms of significance, engagement, and context, we are trying to break down rigid barriers among teaching, research, and service. The three points are helping us create a common way of talking about the work we do individually and collectively that always places individual contributions within a larger perspective. The required workload allocation forms still ask faculty members to identify discrete percentages of time devoted to each of the categories, but now those numbers are always accompanied by a faculty member’s reflective narrative and a portfolio of supporting material.

The transition has not always been completely smooth, but our new guidelines strive to guide faculty members toward success, clarify faculty goals, inform annual assignments that reflect the short- and long-term vision of the department, include faculty members in discussions and decisions, and provide consistent and clear criteria for performance-based salary increases and for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable. Approved unanimously by the department, the revised guidelines include the following several significant changes from our previous department guidelines:

- adding non-tenure-track representatives to the faculty evaluation committee
- expanding and detailing the service section to make the process of documenting and evaluating service more transparent
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- establishing some deliberate overlaps of categories so that faculty members can, depending on the nature of their appointment and work, determine when their administrative work counts as research or teaching or service
- creating examples of how faculty members with nontraditional workloads will be evaluated
- specifying promotion criteria for non-tenure-track faculty members

In other words, our new guidelines strive to recognize and value what faculty members—regardless of their tenure status—accomplish by their efforts without becoming constrained by rigid category boundaries. In the example of program administration, these guidelines prompt evaluators to look at the effects of the administrative work in terms of its significance, its engagement, and its context in relation to the department’s goals.

Having clear and equitable development and evaluation guidelines—starting with the job ad and interview process and continuing through the appointment letter and faculty evaluation—protects all faculty members from being dismissed without adequate cause by specifying the types of evidence that demonstrate satisfactory or unsatisfactory job performance. Such guidelines also help departments promote stability, centrality, integration, and security among diverse faculty roles, even as those roles continue to change.

Notes
1. On changes in the profession generally, see Baldwin and Chronister; Boyer; Chait; Rice and Sorcinelli; Wergin and Swingen. On the shifting balance of tenure-track and contingent positions, see Bartholomae; Harris; Murphy; Webb and Boardman; Schell; Trainor and Godley.
2. For our institution’s emphasis on enriching the student learning environment, see West Virginia University’s 2020 Strategic Plan, goal 1; Eberly College of Arts and Sciences 2020 Strategic Plan, goals 1 and 2.
3. For the definition of clinical track faculty as it emerged in the School of Medicine, see West Virginia University School of Medicine Guidelines for Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (8–11, 31, 32–33, 43).
4. Our institution’s more general policies and procedures for faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure specify that “all tenure-track, clinical-track, or tenured faculty members must do scholarly, creative, or professional work that informs their teaching and service” (West Virginia University Policies 3; emphasis added).
5. On the importance of linking research and teaching for all faculty members, see Bartholomae 25–27.
6. On tensions between the planning goals of departments and institutions, see Wergin and Swingen 3; Lynton.
7. For guidance on initiating such actions, see Council of Writing Program Administrators; Checklist.
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Expropiation of the Professoriat: View of an Untenured Radical

Batya Weinbaum

ONE day last winter I turned the corner of my tree-lined suburban block and was actually disappointed to see that the trash had already been collected in my efficiently run midwestern neighborhood. I had returned to rescue the student portfolios I had thrown out. Trying to make room for the new by clearing out the old, as all good feng shui books recommend, I had discarded this proof of effective pedagogy in my last face-to-face brick-and-mortar teaching position. Having just come back from the Modern Language Association convention in Seattle, where, interacting with a full range of colleagues, I had been reminded of my extremely marginalized status and of my own much better, more privileged days, I did not want evidence around my home of a time when I had been allowed to offer courses I created myself. Ah, what is the use? I had uttered ruefully and wandered back into the house. I was as distraught about my underutilized skills and abilities as I was about the low pay. Yet at the same time I found myself realizing that perhaps Cary Nelson had been correct in prophesying in Manifesto of a Tenured Radical that different kinds of classroom structures are relevant for different historical conditions. Perhaps I needed to adjust to this change in my workplace and pedagogical orientation. Although I was not tenured for enough time to have his long-view perspective, I had to admit that a moment he had written about had actually come, one necessitating a change in the mode of production of education. This recognition led me to reconstruct my identity as a professor, to turn to teaching online. Perhaps we are like the expropriated peasants working in factories, longing for their homes in the country, looking back to what they lost instead of figuring out how to improve where they are. Perhaps we need to evolve a conceptual scheme to see new ways to organize, not necessarily to get back the material plots we have lost. The period of relative stability for professors has come to an end even if our intellectual understanding about our situation lags behind.¹ As Vladimir Biti has argued, often there is a discrepancy between contemporary theories and the actual practices of history.

Remarks at a panel I attended at the 2011 annual conference of the National Women’s Studies Association made me realize how rapidly online distance education has grown (Dolhinow, Freehling-Burton, Jolna, and Malhotra). When I started working in online instruction, the ability to teach remotely seemed like a lifesaver. On some days, the opportunity still is. I overcome my isolation and offer my support, wisdom, and knowledge, and the students seem to appreciate me. Yet at times my frustrations mount, because I am not allowed to alter courses to keep students active enough to complete a term. I do not understand why I cannot bring to bear all my years of experience to do the most I can to teach them, since they will only have to pay to take the course again. To this an adviser wisely points out that the
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Institutions are run not for the sake of students’ learning but to operate at a profit. If students fail a required course, they, or the government agencies paying for their education, will have to pay for it again.

By the end of my time as a tenure-track assistant professor, I was earning $51,000 for teaching five courses a year, including summer teaching assignments. Now I piece together courses and assignments from three different institutions, work year round, and constantly seek more work. My total salary from online teaching—on a peak year, in which I taught eleven courses—was only in the neighborhood of $20,000, before taxes and deduction of expenses. I do not yet define myself as a career adjunct, instead holding out hope for another tenure-track position, and I operate a few small businesses on the side. In answer to the persistent questioning of why I continue this online adjunct work, clearly the most contingent of the contingent, I begin with the details of the positive before I suggest reasons to condemn practices that cripple those of us still willing to toil in the cracks of higher education.

After struggling through the unpaid training period, I thought that teaching only online suited me quite well. As long as the personal credit line behind my house held out, I had the freedom to travel. I often work and carry out research in Uruguay, Argentina, Mexico, and India and do so more cheaply than I would stateside. I write about my research in class blogs as I travel not only abroad but in the United States, engaging students in news about alternative lifestyles. Sometimes I inform them about women artists I am interviewing while they themselves are interviewing women for a course; at other times, in a course called Myth and Modern Life, I explain how mythic enactments occur at musical festivals where I vend. Because I live a life of passionate engagement, I model the life of someone pursuing higher knowledge and creating live, ongoing academic research. I hold office hours at home by Skype, send original documents from the women’s movement from my attic, and mentor a student moving from India to Finland. I use Skype from a rooftop restaurant in India at three in the morning with a student doing an independent study in Los Angeles. I work with students in the military and invite them to women’s studies meetings once they get to the United States.

I get to draw on my capabilities as an interdisciplinary scholar when I teach online. I can teach outside the box, since people are willing to hire me in fields in which I excel rather than only in institutional departments in the field in which I earned my doctorate. Administrators actually seem to review what I do, looking at my current activities, and offer me a range of courses. I have found that some new institutions use flexible criteria as the basis for hiring decisions that extend beyond the traditional narrow criterion of pedigree. Thus as a member of an arts, humanities, and writing faculty group, rather than as a member of an English department, and as a member of an arts and sciences program in a for-profit institution, I can teach three courses in women’s studies in the same semester, which I see as a definite advantage. In this climate, special hires allowing one to teach only women’s studies courses are very rare. And as I have learned from applying for around one thousand jobs either in women’s studies or English, only to have very few interviews, these positions are more likely to get filled by new PhDs, who are younger and cheaper to employ, than by someone entering an assistant professor slot with over fifteen years of solid college teaching.
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experience (Weinbaum, “Consciousness-Raising,” “Creating,” “Exploring,” “Keeping,” “Teaching Feminist Approaches”). Whereas for-profit institutions of higher education seeking accreditation and legitimacy might hire me because of the extent, width, and breadth of my qualifications, including publications, it is likely I have been eliminated as an overqualified candidate for positions in traditional institutions, where remuneration is tied to experience and achievement. It is counterintuitive to academic hierarchy to bring in a candidate who has published as extensively as I have.

Online teaching has allowed me to develop a career in art. I exhibit in a number of galleries, which I would not have been able to do if I were still employed in one institution full-time. Like many artists struggling to survive, I started a small wearable-arts business, featuring designs from my travels to Indonesia. I had this business running by the time of my first online job interview. I was hired for a course that included teaching about women’s art in clothing and fabric design, traditional women’s work for the last twenty thousand years (Barber). Now that my work appears in galleries and I am having shows, my art has appeared on the cover of an issue of Lesbian Connection (34.4 [2012]). My art sells, not only in galleries but also in festival booths and online, yet not enough to support me. For that, I rely on my day job, which is flexible and does not tie me down other than having to lay out money for laptops, roving service, and computer repairs and to get to an Internet connection at all costs and at all hours—a search that has necessitated coming down a mountain from an ashram in India in the middle of a nine-day goddess festival, working in dining rooms of Indian hotels with workers sleeping on the floors around me, teaching on the porch of a hostel in Uruguay in the midst of crowds appearing to catch a channeling of the Divine Mother, driving from music festivals in the early morning to McDonald’s and cafés for Wi-Fi, and imposing on strangers and friends. All this has been challenging, but doable.

As a single mother, I can combine some aspects of parenting and still maintain some semblance of an academic career. The flexibility offered by teaching online has allowed me to take my daughter to weeklong homeschooling and circus camps in Vermont and to Virginia for weeklong teen meditation retreats. During one of those weeks I was able to complete a book; in all those trips, I was able to take my online teaching with me while I enjoyed the woods.

Out of the nearly one and a half million part-time faculty members in higher education in America, one million are women (“Employees”). Perhaps this information can help us conceptualize the adjunctification of the university as a way of coping with the unruly specter of feminization. Rather than let women invade the workplace, erecting elaborate glass ceilings and carrying out gross gender discrimination to drive them away, it might be simpler and less expensive to create a way to employ them cheaply in their own homes, as a sort of cottage industry in which they can combine teaching and mommy work. If the pay for adjunct work and full-time in-person teaching were the same, institutions might be able to successfully accommodate working mothers this way. Other benefits include funds for intermittent travel to conferences and other opportunities to socialize with colleagues. I even receive health-care and retirement contributions from one institution.

Yet, despite the numerous advantages of teaching online, there are big creative drawbacks to it. Generally the instructor is not in control of the course and the
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The learning experience of the student. The hired-on pieceworker professor is like an auto mechanic, tooling the car driving through the pit for a quick fix. One rarely gets to design and offer an original course, choosing the books, articles, or films one wants to teach or implementing chosen methods of instruction. One can barely tinker the design of someone else’s product and must be careful not to leave too much of one’s imprint on the student experience. Even when hired as a subject-matter expert at a for-profit institution, I was given a structure to follow and could not organize forums as I liked since the college wanted its courses to be uniformly standard.

The implications for higher education of this major disadvantage are quite serious. As Barbara McKenna explains, institutions are failing to support their instructional staff members. Much like the many part-time faculty members paid by the course, I get paid in the neighborhood of $2,500 per fully enrolled distance-education class (sometimes $2,200, sometimes $2,600, sometimes $1,200, depending on enrollment; in another institution, I was paid $1,800 per course, no matter what the class size, which varied from five to twenty-five students). In one institution I get to teach eight such courses, if lucky, in a good year, but the slot is still referred to as part-time, even though I carry more there than I did as a full-time assistant professor elsewhere. When I brought up the inaccuracy of this wording to a union leader, he told me that, in his twelve years of working in that state institution, discussion of changing this language was not something administrators wished to hear. The part-time misnomer excludes me from quite a few grants and other professional development opportunities; it also means that the university is only paying me $2,500 to teach a class. The MLA recommends paying around $7,000 for each three-credit adjunct course, and I usually teach four-credit courses. At another university, I got paid $25 an hour for mentoring, but I was only paid for two hours and am still in touch with the student, who continues to turn to me for mentoring, as I do to my adviser, as is only natural once one connects solidly with someone who can open doors and have an influence on you. The difference is my adviser is retired after earning a full professor’s salary, and I am still working, trying to piece together an underpaid living. At another institution, I am paid $1,800 per course before taxes and $1,000 for course design and development. True, each university has its own costs, such as paying license fees for use of software programming, yet over this period, fitting with the picture of undersupport of adjunct professionals that McKenna discusses as the general trend nationally (4), none of these universities has provided me with computers, office space, paper, supplies, overhead, or electricity or compensated me for any other out-of-pocket costs of operations, such as a cell phone. Compensation for course development is another area of concern. The hourly rate for developing a course rapidly reduces to about $2 or $3 an hour, which I suspect to be less than the pay rate of the unionized janitors. The product remains owned by the institution, and it is the institution, not the creator, that continues to earn profit over the years.

Some administrators have become sensitive to adjunct issues and are spotting ways to work on our behalf from the inside, yet structurally they are positioned to create conditions of alienation as well as exploitation. For example, at any point in time, administrators can pop in to the course I am teaching, and they have the right to tell me to remove postings at their discretion. To those schooled in old-
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school face-to-face teaching, including me, this intervention can be rather jarring. The first time it occurred felt like a violation of academic freedom, as if Big Brother were watching, especially since I was not forewarned of the administrator’s intent to observe the class. Or, for instance, an online instructor may be questioned about providing students with scholarship in fields corollary to the one being taught, for background context discussion and possible further student research, although providing such information would be a matter of course in face-to-face classrooms.

The people who are in administrative positions may be more recently minted PhDs with less teaching experience on the college level and fewer publications in the area of expertise in the field of hire than the online instructors they are overseeing or they might have a different pedagogical perspective. They may also lack doctorates and operate according to a business model that includes statements in contracts specifying instructors will not be paid until after grades are delivered and evidence of effective teaching has been provided.

Although we can presume that full-time administrators have the advantage of considerable advanced planning, they frequently expect adjuncts to jump in and teach a course at the drop of a hat. One possible explanation for this short-term notice is that if adjuncts are offered contracts and then a course is canceled, we are eligible for unemployment benefits, which add to university costs. This placing of economic concerns ahead of pedagogical ones means we may not receive the syllabus and the materials ahead of time and cannot prepare for a course with the learning goals for each module in mind, if we can prepare for it at all. For example, I once agreed to teach a course without even having seen the books. Such hasty arrangements are further indicators of the lack of respect for adjuncts that McKenna describes (5). We are often slapped in at the last minute to teach books we have not read, to meet learning objectives that someone else has thought up, using a syllabus we cannot stand behind. Students evaluate us in our ability to lead them through materials that do not engage us. This kind of underpay, alienation, and exploitation of the labor crop toiling to produce the pay of the supervisory structure can create resentment that may even, for some, encroach on the ability to perform well as teachers. I admit that, given the number of papers I have to read, when teaching a course for which I am paid the same amount whether there are five or twenty students, I actually have caught myself uncharacteristically feeling happy that some students have dropped off. The collective literally overrides the individual professional identity.

The mistreatment of adjunct or contingent faculty members can make a negative impression on students. Before I began my online teaching career, I held a one-quarter adjunct job in California. My graduate students there were disappointed to hear that I was answering advertisements to deliver newspapers as the period for which I was under contract ran out. They were spending upward of $100,000 on their doctorates, and yet one of their most loved professors—I was accessible to them and helping them get their needs met—was living in a one-room studio with her teenage daughter, talking about the trauma of getting fingerprinted for food stamps, and seeking supplemental income. After I left, I was still mentoring students, helping them publish, present at conferences, and even procure professional jobs, but the institution was not paying me for these ongoing services. It is only so long before operating out
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of the goodness of one’s heart stops. When students pay money to an institution, they do not necessarily differentiate the specific reason a professor is there or understand the limitations of a position. As long as some of us are undersupported the students remain underserved, a fact that has propelled the filmmaker Chris LaBree of 2255 Films to team up with the adjunct instructor Debra Leigh Scott and make a documentary film interviewing those working in the adjunct positions. The filmmakers’ goal is primarily to educate the parents of students whose college education has become vastly different from what the parents experienced many years ago. That the institutions are crumbling and cannot offer the teachers a solid basis of support can undermine students’ learning and hence desire to reenroll and pay; the strategy seems counterintuitive across the board, not only as it applies to online adjunct work.

When I was working in a face-to-face job in a southern university, I spent the first semester fighting to get my own office. I also spent much time fighting for the opportunity to teach graduate and literature courses. Eventually I developed an excellent proficiency at teaching composition, with students reaching out to me on Blackboard to get into my classes and clamoring for the creation of more sections to which they were recruiting their friends. I still can recall fond moments in that teaching office, but teaching composition was not the reason I had relocated. I remember going around to various administrators in that southern university with the MLA suggestions for appropriate pay (“MLA Recommendation”), but to no avail. Those two years I continued to publish research and to present at scholarly conferences. Yet in my work review, the space on scholarship was simply left blank. It was as if I never did anything, as if my scholarship had become unimportant since it had also not helped me fight the battle against my nonrenewal at a previous university. Such an insult makes for embitterment in what is becoming an increasingly divided and hypocritical profession. I was teaching research and writing, in English 1100 and 1200, yet my own writing remained invisible to the institution. I was passed over for an assistant professor opening and saw there was no room for advancement. In my eyes, tenure-track and tenured faculty members were treated like a privileged class. In a budget crunch, for example, they were able to take over literature courses that had been promised to the contingent faculty members. How does this build coalitions within an institution and a department? My second year, I only went to one departmental meeting. When I first arrived I had been set on going to all of them, even sending items to go on the agenda, expecting to participate equally in the discussion. I couldn’t understand how the department meetings were all scheduled during my teaching hours. I didn’t understand that it didn’t matter to the department whether I attended the meetings.

My first employment offer from the institution—given at the last minute—was for a one-year appointment, and I was saddled with keeping up the expenses of my house in Cleveland Heights and getting an apartment near the school on such short notice. At the end of the year, I packed everything up and left it in people’s garages and in the office I had finally gotten and went to Vermont over the summer. In the middle of that summer I got an offer for one semester further.

I took the position at the encouragement of the banker that has the home equity line behind my house—since the crash in 2008 people had been leaving the
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Cleveland area left and right. I went back for one semester and made the commitment to live there with my daughter for only one more semester. One-semester, and even one-year, last-minute offers that require relocation almost always have the added expense of a second house, and I was not the only suddenly transplanted contingent faculty member, either fall semester, who owned a home elsewhere. And because the offers were given at the last minute, we did not have time to clear out our houses and rent them to subsidize our temporary moves. How could we rent anyway, for four months, knowing we might need to come back?

Then halfway through that semester I was offered a second semester. My daughter got very depressed; struggling with all this uncertainty was not a sufficient container for growing into young adulthood, and the impact on families of these administrative policies is relevant to note. I became overwhelmed with the idea of moving and trying to pack up at the end of that first semester. I tried to stick it out, even though this broke my commitment of staying only one semester, for the benefit of my daughter’s security. I stayed a second semester. Then in the last few weeks of the first semester I became ill, but, on a one-semester contract, I had no right to sick leave and had to keep going in to work in what I felt was a physically unhealthy environment. Not surprisingly, given my objections to the adjunct working conditions, mine was one of the first heads to roll when budget cuts swept through the system. Maybe it was then that I figured that teaching online in distance-learning programs suited me better than moving around for short-term gigs.

The bottom line for anyone who considers teaching a calling, and not just something one does for money, is, What kind of education can be offered like this? I once popped my head into a departmental meeting where the faculty members were discussing how to retain students. It seemed so obvious to me. If an institution wants to retain students to get a bigger piece of the state budget, as this one did, then why not make the jobs of the freshman composition contingent faculty members more secure? We have the most contact time with the first-year students and are the most helpful to and supportive of them. Yet we are the most disgruntled and underpaid. Not knowing if we will even be there semester by semester, how can we concentrate on students and what works in a classroom for them? The threat to my own family’s stability continually distracted me. Undercutting people in these underpaid, insecure slots creates discouragement, despair, and despondency, keeping alienated educators from delivering what students deserve.

There are only so many times those with professional training can perform well while being treated in such an abominable fashion. What is at risk is not only institutional life but the life of the country as well. As Debra Leigh Scott argues, this impoverishment of faculty members might be an intentional part of the design of stifling revolt. In other countries, Scott maintains, the ruling powers would throw dissenters into prison. Yet in the United States, “instead of doing anything so obvious as throwing them into prison, here those same people are thrown into dire poverty. The outcome is the same. Desperate poverty controls and ultimately breaks people as effectively as prison . . . and some research says that it works even MORE powerfully.” Then Scott presents a recipe for killing universities. After World War II, with the passage of the GI bill and the general affordability of the university, there
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was an upsurge of college students nationally. Scott points out that this made universities often become “the very heart of intense public discourse, passionate learning, and vocal citizen involvement in the issues of the times.” She continues, “It was during this time, too, when colleges had a thriving professoriate, and when students were given access to a variety of subject areas, and the possibility of broad learning.” With liberal arts at the center of a college education, students were exposed to philosophy, anthropology, literature, history, sociology, world religions, foreign languages, and cultures, Scott says. And she reminds us that then something else began to happen: “the uprisings and growing numbers of citizens taking part in popular dissent—against the Vietnam War, against racism, against destruction of the environment in a growing corporatized culture, against misogyny, against homophobia.”

Since much of that revolt incubated on college campuses, Scott argues that warmongers, corporations, and “those in our society who would keep us divided based on our race, our gender, our sexual orientation” would most likely have liked nothing more than to shut down the universities and destroy them outright. But a country claiming to have democratic values can’t just shut down universities, so the debate that used to be fostered has been easily clamped down by defunding the public universities, deprofessionalizing and impoverishing the faculty, corporatizing the culture, and giving increased funds to managers who are not educators themselves. Such practices result in taking away the power from what used to be a self-governing faculty and in undermining collegiate culture.

More than anything Scott’s metanarrative makes sense to me. It helps me understand and place my personal story in a large social and national picture. I hope my story and what I have reported here from Scott’s analysis have done that for further readers as well. When Scott came to interview me and other adjuncts for her film, I was on the verge of writing a letter to the dean of the institution where I had just been recognized for five years of service. I was going to say, now that you know I am reliable and competent, why can’t you give me $50,000 a year and job security to continue to teach your eight courses a year? I felt that this was a negotiable offer, in that I was ready to settle for less just to have security. Now I realize that thinking my proposal was reasonable and that the dean might agree was a fantasy. Unlike Scott, I had not begun to fantasize about how to change everyone’s situation equally. Perhaps if we stop thinking like peasants wanting to get back to our land (offices, classrooms), we could imagine new ways to go forward as a group, having accepted the changes in higher education. Having worked with Occupy and attended their educators’ forums, my thoughts go back to the 1960s and campus protests against the Vietnam War. Then, students burned draft cards and engaged in other acts of civil disobedience. Is it so hard to imagine the kinds of disruption a campus protest movement might create today? Sit-ins, teach-ins, and building occupations might find their networked equivalents. Then, protesters occupied the offices of campus administrators; today, one imagines, protest might well look to occupy online institutions’ servers.

In books such as Rebooting the Academy, tech innovators are advocating ways to integrate technological change into the management of colleges. Perhaps we need to write books about how to transform the proliferation of technology so that it benefits academic laborers. That is, while the Chronicle of Higher Education’s Wired
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Campus e-report includes articles such as “Harnessing the Power of Digital Learning in Higher Education,” by Jeff Borden, still missing are the articles recommending job stability and a living wage to the online professors or suggesting how such an evolution might come about. Borden recommends maximizing an institution’s online teaching and learning investments but not maximizing the job security of the professors who design and teach the courses. He offers ways to improve student engagement and retention, but these ways include course redesign and customized digital learning tools, not improving the working conditions of the professors.

Could we form an online adjunct teaching union of our own not subject to agreements made by unions representing tenured and tenure-track faculty members, organizing all online instructors, internationally and nationwide? If so, how? And what risks would we be taking? It is time for the expropriated academic laborers to prepare for the demands of the digital learning environments in higher education. Only in this way could we truly make way for the new.

Notes

With many thanks for support and comments to Adlai Neubauer, Nick Birns, Sharon Leder, Karen Stupski, Christine Donofrio, Libby Hubbard, Jill Turner, and Joseph Skerrett, as well as to those who have consistently hired me and given me the opportunity to work and to continue to learn, and my numerous inspiring and wonderful students for making teaching even in these conditions so rewarding.

1. According to Maclean, such a mechanism is arguably visible.

2. Unpaid training in online work is par for the course and functions as a screening process (see Babb and Mirabella). Paying for training is an aspect of corporate business culture that has not yet penetrated our realm.

3. My work is so interdisciplinary that I have been hired in both psychology and English departments, have been questioned as to why I was teaching anthropology in an English course when I started a multicultural literature of the United States survey with Yaqui deer song, and was hired as subject-matter expert to design and teach a course called Comparative Cultures and then was given a course in remedial composition.

4. For accounts of gender discrimination in the academy and its impact on education, see Clark, Garner, Higonnet, and Katrak; Is Academic Feminism; McCoy and DiGeorgio-Lutz; Martin; Nerad; Coiner and George; Ferber and Loeb.

5. For further enumeration, see Weinbaum, “Teaching Feminism”; Kramarae.

6. See McKenna for statistics on the proportion of the overall professoriat off the tenure track and for discussion of the similar pay structures in face-to-face instruction. According to recent surveys, the median pay for a three-credit face-to-face course is $2,700, and per-course pay ranges from a low of $2,235 at two-year institutions to a high of $3,400 at four-year colleges or research universities (5). See also Portrait (2).

7. See Scott’s The Homeless Adjunct (http://junctrebellion.wordpress.com/), a blog that follows the making of the documentary film Junct: The Trashing of Higher Education in America.

8. In the process of leaving my first tenure-track job in an English department, I sat through sixteen days of arbitration hearings during which I was not allowed to speak unless under examination by a lawyer. Always looking for predecessors, which I found originally in accounts of the McCarthy Era, I recently discovered another one in Emma Goldman, who, as described in Living My Life, also went through persecutory hearings in which she was required to remain silent. On my experience, see Weinbaum, This Could Happen, “Memoir,” and “How Work Reviews.”
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**Issues for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members and the Institutions That Hire Them**

The reality of today’s academy is that roughly two-thirds of the teaching faculty is ineligible for tenure (*American Academic*; see Laurence, in this issue). The ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure-track (NTT) instructional staff has been increasing at least since the 1980s and likely will continue to increase for the foreseeable future. There are many and diverse problems associated with the status quo, which are detailed in the MLA’s 2011 *Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members: Recommendations and Evaluative Questions*, put together by the Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession (CLIP), and in the contributions to this issue. Of these problems, three in particular stand out as pervasive and consistent across many institutions: compensation, working conditions, and marginalization.

While compensation and benefits for NTT faculty members vary widely by institution, as a rule they are paid significantly less than tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Many institutions have opted to navigate the lean years since the recession by increasing the ratio of NTT to tenure-line faculty members, as well as by increasing the ratio of part-time to full-time NTT faculty members (see Laurence, in this issue). To address these shifts in the faculty composition, administrators need to assess and understand the importance of paying a fair salary for the expert work NTT faculty members do, and NTT faculty members need to communicate across the campus about all aspects of pay and equity and, where feasible, organize so that they can negotiate with the administration on a more equal footing, whether as a consortium or through a formal structure such as a labor union. For institutions that already have unionized or those that don’t allow for unions, cross-campus alliances, such as a contingent faculty association that meets once a month, may help ensure that NTT faculty members feel heard, make their concerns public, and receive updates on the treatment of their colleagues in different schools. As an extension, regional alliances could be envisaged afterward that may eventually result in a conference.

The second issue, working conditions, covers many aspects and areas of life for NTT faculty members, from the widespread practice of hiring NTT faculty members on very short notice and the frequently nebulous ways of rehiring them to inadequate office space and access to campus resources. Many of the contributors to this issue of the bulletins address circumstances that affect NTT faculty members’ quality of life and the quality of their work: the lack of paid medical leaves or retirement...
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benefits, exclusion from departmental affairs, little or no visibility, commuting between several campuses, grading in multiple venues, and seeking access 24/7 to student populations across the globe are only some of the difficulties encountered by our NTT colleagues in the profession.

While the severity of problems with working conditions for NTT faculty members varies immensely from campus to campus, and even within campuses, the marginalization of NTT faculty members is perhaps the most insidious aspect of the status quo. Seldom are NTT faculty members integrated into the life of a department or college, and, although they often are teaching a disproportionately high number of a department’s students, they rarely are included in decision-making or planning processes related to curriculum and instruction. By and large NTT faculty members, including those employed full-time, are little more than fill-ins hired to cover core courses that need to be taught. The widespread change from a collegial culture in favor of a managerial one is felt first and foremost by them.

Working from the conspicuous effects of the interaction of compensation, working conditions, and marginalization on adjuncts’ experience, we should probe deeper to attempt a comprehensive strategy for intervention in a systematic dynamic. In doing so, we may encounter local issues such as the functioning of institutions’ economics and the accessibility of such information. How do short-term positions created with soft money “count” toward the overall budget of a department? How can surplus funds be reallocated toward instructional budgets? For example, how many part-time faculty members’ per-course compensation comes from soft-money funds created from salaries that actually, in an accounting sense, belong not to their positions but to lines held by tenured faculty members, half of which can be recaptured when those faculty members go on sabbatical at half pay? Half the salary of a tenured faculty member who teaches two courses a semester can be leveraged into several deliveries of those two courses.

Some more general issues would be the widely varying processes and standards used for hiring, both on and off the tenure track; the discrepancies among the processes in place; and the inadequate means to evaluate them. For example, an NTT faculty member hired on a per-course basis at the last minute will hardly have the same privileges as a tenure-track faculty member hired in a national search. The lack of parity is usually perceived by the NTT faculty member as an unspoken institutional standard. Instituting guidelines for hiring NTT faculty members would help remedy such imbalances, so as to promote some sense of consistency among the NTT and tenure-track faculty populations of an institution. Such guidelines would suggest to NTT faculty members that they are welcome not only to fulfill their contact hour and grading obligations but also to contribute to departmental life, without laying the burden of remedying the institutional standards on them. The more inclusive environment would then enhance the quality of instruction and student learning.

In view of this complex dynamic, the widespread and insidious marginalization of NTT faculty members and their unsatisfactory working conditions would appear to be insurmountable hurdles to a healthy, productive new academic order. And yet there is much one can do, as this MLA committee as well as several advocacy groups and individuals have shown. In this supplement to our 2011 publication we make
explicit the links among marginalization, working conditions, and the quality of the education institutions provide, suggesting that positive reforms regarding the NTT faculty can contribute to the improvement of overall instruction.

Current Reports on Instructional Integrity

Apart from cost savings during bad budget years, of paramount concern to department chairs and colleagues in the modern languages and to administrators is the quality of the education provided to students. A robust and growing body of scholarly work has begun to unpack the myriad negative effects of the increased use of NTT faculty members on the quality of students’ education. Ronald G. Ehrenberg and Liang Zhang found that increased usage of NTT faculty members adversely affects graduation rates of students at four-year colleges. Eric Bettinger and Bridget Terry Long reported that having a part-time faculty member as an instructor in the humanities is associated with a decreased likelihood that a student will take subsequent classes in that subject (see also Benjamin). Roger Baldwin and Matthew Wawrzynski found a notable difference in instructional strategies reported between part-time and full-time faculty members, with full-time NTT faculty members approaching instruction similarly to tenure-line faculty. All the studies to date that highlight the negative impacts on instructional quality associated with the use of part-time faculty members attribute the negative effects not to the quality of the instructors but to the quality of the conditions under which they must work. Indeed, the studies to date suggest that negative associations may have to do with students’ access to faculty members and with faculty members’ investment in the life of the department vis-à-vis participation in activities and initiatives outside the classroom. Two campaigns sponsored by the American Federation of Teachers focus on the significance of these associations to instructional integrity: FACE (Faculty and College Excellence; http://www.aftface.org/) and Just Ask (http://www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/justask0309.pdf).

Such studies and efforts add to the now very clear imperative for institutions to initiate reforms at all levels. The threefold purpose needs to remain explicit and in focus throughout all initiatives, as institutions work to do the following:

1. improve all aspects of working and professional conditions for NTT faculty members, using as a guide what we now know can bring about that improvement
2. integrate NTT faculty members into a systemic and articulated approach to academic programs
3. ensure that there are optimal conditions for all NTT faculty members to offer outstanding instruction at all levels and in all instructional settings, including online instruction

There are many ways to bring about change that will allow institutions to retain the cost-saving advantages of employing NTT faculty members while acknowledging the realities of today’s academy, and each institution must approach change in the context of its idiosyncratic characteristics, goals, and plans. Yet a fairly simple and user-friendly framework for change can be identified, namely along two axes. The first axis
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runs from minor changes that imply little or no cost increases, or indeed involve cost savings, to major reforms that would require cooperation and decision making across disciplines and colleges within the university or across campuses in multicampus systems. The second axis articulates vertically, from the program or departmental level, which would include cooperative efforts or collaboration among NTT faculty members, through the levels of chair, dean, and upper administration. As ideas are generated and initiatives discussed, participants can identify where these fall along the two axes in order to help set priorities and sequence activities. Changes along these two axes would take place within an institution, but all parties involved in change should also make use of external initiatives and information, such as those from advocacy groups like the New Faculty Majority or CLIP. In addition, institutions might also consider the advantages of creating or joining multicampus consortia, such as the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning (http://www.languageconsortium.org/), the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (http://www.cic.net/), or the recently eliminated University of California Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching (http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/). The University of Southern California's Rossier School of Education, the New Faculty Majority, the American Association of University Professors, and others have also taken up the task.

Of particular interest in this context is the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (http://thechangingfaculty.org), founded by New Faculty Majority members Adrianna Kezar and Dan Maxey, of the University of Southern California (Changing Faculty; Delphi Project). The Delphi Project examines the causes of the increased use of NTT faculty members and analyzes the impact of this change on the teaching and learning environment. The first phase of the project is a policy study intended to provide a robust framework of ideas to be shared in the second phase, which will include the dissemination of ideas in partnership with the Association of American College and Universities and potentially other organizations. The Delphi Project resources pages can be used in conjunction with the MLA's 2011 Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members, which also details questions for discussion, planning, and reform. Among the available Delphi Project resources are the Imperative for Change and The Path to Change, a compilation of eight institutional case studies. Together these resources call attention to consequences of current arrangements and employment practices for NTT faculty members that make them institutionally problematic, including the following:

Adverse impact on student learning. Poor working conditions and a lack of support diminish NTT faculty members’ capacity to provide a high-quality learning environment and experience for students.

Employment inequities. Human resources professionals, tasked with examining issues of equity and fairness in employment practices, need to examine carefully several key issues on college campuses, such as salary, benefits, governance, professional development, and rehiring.

Risk management. In examining the potential risk-management factors related to faculty members and their working conditions, many administrators may have overlooked the legal issues that can arise from the current working conditions of NTT faculty members.
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Some Practical Steps

The data reveal some very clear steps that should be taken to improve working conditions and facilitate better integration of NTT faculty members into the life of the department. Where these fall along the two axes will vary by institution, but here we arrange them from least to most costly and from lowest to highest administrative levels.

- Provide sufficient orientation and access to professional development for all NTT faculty members.
- Include NTT faculty members in curricular planning, revisions, and decision making, particularly regarding the courses they teach.
- Provide NTT faculty members with adequate office space, equal in quality to that of tenure-line faculty members. In addition, ensure that NTT faculty members have equal access to instructional resources, including technological resources.
- Include NTT faculty members in departmental meetings. Where possible, allow NTT faculty members to be voting members of the department, at least on matters related to curriculum and planning. Create recommendations for specific types of involvement in faculty governance. Promote adjunct involvement in outcome assessment and curricular decisions. Develop a statement on adjunct involvement in governance and department issues.
- Encourage advocacy efforts among NTT faculty members (e.g., how to petition, how to use CLIP recommendations to start a conversation on campus, how to reach across departments and campuses, how to form alliances with professional organizations).
- Reward NTT faculty members’ creative activity and achievements through reviews and promotions and annual awards.
- Set aside funds for NTT faculty members to present at regional or national conferences, so that they can remain engaged with their respective fields. Participation in conferences for the purpose of professional development (e.g., ACTFL) should also be supported.
- Make hiring and contract renewal transparent, fair, and equitable processes for all NTT faculty members, with clearly articulated rules and guidelines for all parties.
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