USC Academic Senate Committee on Part-Time Faculty Affairs

Interim Report to the Academic Senate

November 19, 2015

In response to a request from Ginger Clark, the President of USC's Academic Senate, the Committee on Part-Time Faculty Affairs submits this Interim Report on its activities during the first months of the Committee's existence.

The Senate gave this Charge to the Committee when it was established in the summer of 2015:

> The Committee on Part-Time Faculty monitors and evaluates the working environment, terms and conditions of employment, job security, compensation, benefits eligibility, opportunities for participation in governance, opportunities for professional advancement, and participation in the academic life of the university provided for part-time faculty. It monitors compliance with the Faculty Handbook and with stated school policies of the schools or units as they relate to part-time faculty. It makes recommendations to relevant Senate and University committees, and to the Academic Senate, concerning any policy issues that have an impact on Part-Time faculty.
>
> Membership will include primarily part-time non-tenure track faculty, as well as the co-chair of the CNTTFA, and tenure-track faculty.

To fulfill the evaluation and recommendation responsibilities under its Charge, the Committee's overall plan has been to identify the issues facing the part-time faculty at USC (the "PTs"), determine the breadth, depth, and priorities of these issues, and prepare and submit recommendations to the Senate as part of a comprehensive White Paper. As discussed below, we also have some initial recommendations for action while we continue work on our overall plan.

From the beginning of Committee discussions, it was evident that the issues facing the PTs at USC are significant and multiple. No surprise here. The Committee's creation is confirming evidence. And no surprise to see that these issues are presented differently in the various USC Schools. Also evident from the outset is the inherent difficulty in gathering information from and about the approximately 2700 PTs teaching across the system (the largest category of USC faculty members). By definition, the on-campus presence and availability of these faculty members is only part-time and is limited by their other responsibilities.

Without specifically referring to USC or any other University, the 2015 *Adapting by Design* Report prepared by the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (at USC's Rossier School of Education) describes (at pp. 22-25) the following general areas of concern that could be worthy of attention when looking at the situation of part-time faculty:

1. The use of the adjunct model to generate cost savings has resulted in inequities in compensation, access to benefits, working conditions, and involvement in the life of the department and campus.
2. Research suggests constraints placed on adjunct faculty have an adverse effect on student success outcomes.

3. A lack of professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty members limits their access to and practice of effective pedagogies, high-impact practices, and innovative strategies to promote student learning, as well as current knowledge in their disciplines.
4. Adjunct faculty receive little, if any, constructive evaluation of their work to assess their effectiveness and allow them opportunities to improve.
5. Since adjunct faculty members are often not included in orientation programs, faculty meetings, and decision making, they may not possess important information about academic policies and practices, programs available to students, the curriculum, or overall learning goals for their departments and institutions.
6. A lack of job security contributes to higher rates of turnover, creating a lack of stability for academic programs and their students.
7. The adjunct faculty model encourages institutions to view faculty members merely as tools for facilitating content delivery, downplaying the important contributions of educators to student learning—to the detriment of both the faculty and the students whose learning they support.
8. The adjunct model distances faculty from their disciplinary (or inter-, cross-, and multi-disciplinary) roots and content knowledge by not providing support for them to participate in conferences or scholarly life.
9. Dependence on the adjunct model makes it more difficult for institutions to meet their broader goals related to service, community engagement, leadership, and larger public good.

[See also the Report's explanatory text on Attachment B.]

Although limited, our preliminary information gives us reason to believe that these are relevant issues to explore as we look at the PT situation at USC. We recognize, however, that we need more data to confirm the presence and extent of these issues, evaluate the significant differences across the campus, and establish priorities.

Information Gathering – Status Overview

To fulfill the responsibilities under its Charge, including identifying and prioritizing issues and formulating recommendations, the Committee needs three basic types of information:

1. The PTs' views - to identify and prioritize issues as seen from their perspective.
2. The PT situation at peer Universities – to see the issues faced and responses made.
3. Data about the current PT situation at USC – to evaluate and prioritize the identified PT issues and the potential applicability of any lessons from the peer Universities. And to help us formulate practical recommendations for action.

The status of our information gathering can be summarized as follows:

As noted above, gathering information by and from PTs will be very difficult and time-consuming. Informal inquiries by the Committee members will continue, but this will not be sufficient to fulfill the Committee's responsibilities. We recommend a USC-wide survey of the PTs to be conducted as soon as possible. The content of the survey questions remains for further discussion as we collect additional information and consult with survey-design experts at USC. The target would be to prepare and circulate the survey in the Spring of 2016. We are also considering the possibility of PT focus groups as a complement to the survey.

The first step in gathering information about peer Universities will be identifying the "peers" and seeing what relevant information is available in their publicly-available materials. On this, we will draw on the experience of the NTT Committee in preparing its 2012 White Paper. Reports already prepared by others may also be useful here.

To obtain data about the current PT situation at USC, we prepared a preliminary list of requests for information from Provost's Office/Schools (including substantially the same items as those listed on Attachment A). We subsequently learned that, under current USC policy/practices, we would not be able to obtain this information from these sources. This is unfortunate. Having such information would expedite the Committee's work and enhance its ability to formulate practicable recommendations and fulfill the responsibilities under its Charge. Rather than stopping the process to engage in further debate about this, we are moving forward with our work, including consideration of the methods and feasibility of obtaining such information through informal Committee inquiries or other means.

Although our information is limited, we recognize the value of prompt action to improve the PT situation at USC. And we have some recommendations for this. . . .

<div align="center">**Recommendations - Overview**</div>

The recommendations that will be in our White Paper cannot be predicted with any certainty at this early point. However, to the extent we can see into our crystal ball, it seems likely that our ultimate recommendations will include suggestions on how to improve the PTs' situation in the following four areas: inclusion of PTs in more aspects of the University's academic and governance functions, increased support for the PTs as they fulfill their teaching responsibilities, improvements in the PTs' compensation/benefits process and levels, and increased job security for the PTs.

Even at this early stage, we have a number of recommendations that we believe can and should be implemented while we continue working toward a more definitive, data-rich White Paper.

 Some explanatory notes:

- In formulating our recommendations, we have clearly in mind an important point made by the Delphi Project in its 2015 Report (at p. 39): Differences can certainly be expected and appropriate when comparing the situation of the PTs with that of the tenured or non-tenured full-time faculty. The objective here is *equity*, not necessarily *uniformity.*
- Although we are admittedly not data-rich now, we have sufficient information to make us highly confident that our initial recommendations are appropriate.
- Except in respect to the USC-wide survey of the PTs (as described above), we have not proposed a specific implementation schedule for our initial recommendations. We need more information about the process and timing required for the Senate's review of our recommendations, communication of the recommendations (if and as adopted by the Senate) to the Provost and Schools, and their consideration and response. We request action as soon as practicable and are hopeful that implementation of many of our initial recommendations will be completed, or be well underway, in time for the beginning of the 2016-17 academic year.

- We recognize that some (hopefully many) of the Schools may have already taken steps to address the issues prompting our initial recommendations. As we learn more, we will certainly acknowledge and compliment these "best practices" Schools.

"Inclusion": Initial Recommendations

1. In general, the PTs should be explicitly included as an integral part of the recent steps taken to include the full-time, non-tenure-track faculty in academic and governance functions and faculty information flows.
2. Specifically, all the Schools should be asked to ensure that part-time faculty members are included among the NTT faculty members who are in the faculty governance structure, as required under Section 4-C (2) of the Faculty Handbook (and that the PTs are paid for such service.)
3. Article III (1) of the Academic Senate's Constitution should be amended to include part-time faculty members as members of the Faculty Assembly.
4. PTs should be represented on the faculty committees that are responsible for curriculum planning and other aspects of the School's activities that can benefit from the PTs' perspectives and that can enhance the PTs' teaching skills and other values in advancing the School's education mission. The PTs should be paid for their service on these Committees. [Because of the differences in Committee structures and roles at the various Schools, we cannot now be more specific regarding the Committees on which the PTs should sit.]
5. The rebuttable presumptions should be that PTs are included in all information that the Schools send to the faculty and that PTs are invited to all faculty meetings. We recognize that some exceptions to this principle are appropriate (hence, the "rebuttable" nature of the presumption). Either separately or as one of their listed contractual responsibilities, PTs should be paid for their attendance at faculty meetings to which they are invited. In any event, a reasonable number of the meetings to which PTs are invited should be scheduled with recognition that (again, by definition) they are part-timers, many of whom have full-time jobs elsewhere.
6. PTs who are on Committees should have full voting rights; but the extent to which PTs should have voting rights at faculty meetings is in a "to be discussed" category.
7. PTs who are new members of the USC faculty should receive appropriate orientation regarding their new role and responsibilities, and experienced full-time faculty members (T/TT or NTT) should be asked to provide an appropriate level of on-going mentoring to the School's PTs. The full-time faculty member's service in this should be recognized and compensated.
8. The School's "marketing" staff should be reminded that the PTs are a highly valuable part of the faculty and can/should receive appropriate inclusion in descriptions about why the USC Schools provide exceptional educational opportunities for students.
9. Pictures and brief bios of the PTs should be included on the same website that has such information for the full-time faculty.

"Support": Initial Recommendation

Each School should bring the staff support, office availability, and other support resources provided to PTs up to a level that recognizes their important faculty roles, their need for appropriate office space for class preparation and student meetings, and convenient access to information and assistance. All with recognition that the PTs are not regularly at the campus.

More data would be required to formulate specifics here. Each School (and Department) will have different facts to deal with. How many PTs - compared to full-timers? The current ratios of support staff to PTs and full-timers? Actual staff, space, scheduling, and financial realities? The Schools should assess the current PT-support situation, find out what (if anything) the PTs say they need in addition to their current level of support, and meet this need as completely and promptly as feasible.

"Compensation/Benefits": Initial Recommendations and Observations

For what work should the PTs be paid? How much should they be paid for this work? We need much more information and discussion about these important topics. However, we have some limited initial recommendations and observations.

1. The various categories of work that the PTs are expected to perform should be clearly described in the PT's contract and be fairly compensated. As a start, we recommend that PT contracts include at least the following categories as within the PT's job responsibilities: preparation for the course before the semester begins, orientation sessions, preparation for the class sessions, classroom time, meetings with students during the semester, preparing the exam, grading the exam during or after the semester, meetings with students after the semester ends (e.g., to discuss the exam), meetings with other faculty or staff regarding students or other course-related matters before, during or after the semester, attendance at faculty meetings to which they are invited, and any expected Committee or other "service" work.
2. As a corollary: For PTs paid on an hourly basis, the payroll system should accurately record and pay for the time actually spent by the PTs in these listed work categories.
3. The Schools should have a clearly communicated and effectively implemented promotion path for experienced and qualified PTs (with appropriate compensation and title changes) and a compensation review process for the PTs that includes regular consideration of cost-of-living and merit pay adjustments.
4. We appreciate President Nikias' message (in the Introduction to the 2015 Faculty Handbook) that the new language in Section 2-B (5) (reasonable application of the Handbook rules) should be particularly appreciated by the PTs in respect to the "freeway-flyer" provision in Section 3-I (4). We recommend that the Provost's Office issue some additional clarification regarding the process to obtain approvals under this Section, a description of the factors to be considered in granting or denying an approval, and the steps that should be taken by a PT who now has a job at another educational institution but has not obtained the written approval called for under Section 3-I (4).
5. We recommend that the Schools enhance the scope of the information they provide to the PTs regarding the benefit packages and eligibility criteria.

We recognize that complex factors are involved in the "how much should PTs be paid?" question. Much has already been written on the topic and its multiple aspects, including fairness and equitable treatment of the PTs, and consideration of the School's overall financial situation. One possible approach is to be guided by a principle expressed in a Statement adopted in 2003 by the American Association of University Professors (*Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession*): "As the Association recommended in 1993, compensation for part-time appointments, including those in which faculty are currently paid on a per-course or a per-hour basis, should be the applicable fraction of the compensation (including benefits) for a comparable full-time position."[1] Obviously, if this were to be the guiding principle, the key definitions of "applicable fraction" and "comparable full-time position" in the USC context would remain to be explored and discussed. We will be looking at these and other possible approaches to compensation-related issues as we proceed with our work.

"Job Security": Focus for Future Recommendations

We also appreciate the recent Faculty Handbook changes relating to the "job security" issue, including President Nikias' confirmation that the new "automatic roll over" provisions in Section 4-D (2) can apply to a PT with an annual contract. The new "periodic review" provisions in Section 4-B (4) are also welcomed. The challenge will be to expand these and other rules to deal even more effectively with the prevalent job security issues faced by PTs – with recognition that the Schools need to have reasonable flexibility in managing their courses and financial situation.

We foresee the probability that we would ultimately recommend a clear path on which a PT (after adequate teaching experience and demonstrated quality) could reasonably expect and receive a multi-year contract. Such a contract should include an assurance of reasonable notice and fair compensation if the School exercises a reserved right under the contract to not call on the PT to teach a course if, for example, the course is not to be offered.

We will also be considering possible recommendations to deal with several related concerns, such as the effects of the default non-reappointment provision envisioned by Section 4-D (2), the impacts of a School's deferral of the decision on appointment or reappointment until a very short time before the course begins, and questions about the appropriate role for student evaluations in reappointment decisions. Another possible recommendation is the creation of a "PT resource pool" in which a School would inform other Schools about the potential availability of high-quality PTs with expertise that might be of interest to another School.

Recommendation: Data Gathering by Provost/Schools

Without prejudging the content of the ultimate recommendations that our Committee may make and that the Senate might approve, we have attached (as Attachment A) a list of the information that we believe the Provost's Office and the Schools should have on hand to review and evaluate these recommendations when they are made. We expect that much of this information is already available to the Provost's Office and/or the

---

[1] On page 177 of Statement as downloaded from AAUP website.

Schools. If it is not, we recommend that the listed information should be gathered as soon as practicable. We understand that the Provost's Office has recently asked the Schools to assemble some additional information relating to PTs (including information of the type described in Item 3 on Attachment A.) We welcome this and recommend more of such information gathering by the Provost's Office and the Schools.

We would, of course, appreciate having this information from the Provost's Office or the Schools as we proceed with our work; but (as noted above, with regret) we understand that this might not be consistent with current University policy or practice. However, we are hopeful that, when the Senate's recommendations are made, the Provost's Office and the Schools will then share the relevant information on which they are relying in evaluating and responding to the Senate's recommendations. In any event, the process will be expedited and our overall "for the students" objective will be advanced if the Provost's Office and the Schools have the information listed on Attachment A, even if the Committee and the Senate do not. This information should be useful to the Provost's Office and the Schools as they make decisions regarding the part-time faculty, wholly apart from any recommendations that ultimately might come from the Senate's process. We might add that significant parts of this information should be helpful in evaluating and responding to the initial recommendations made above.

Governance: Implications and Preliminary Thoughts

We have much to learn about USC's governance structure as we work through the process to understand and improve the situation of PTs at the University. We recognize the importance and sensitivity of the balance between the authority of the central Administration and the independence of the Schools, and that some of our recommendations may present governance and "balance" issues. For example: Should the School's Faculty Council have a Committee or Sub-Committee (including PT members) with specific responsibility for evaluating and monitoring PT faculty affairs (similar to the current Committee structure in the Academic Senate)? Should a designated person in the Provost's Office have specific responsibility to be informed about, and monitor, the PT situation across the University in respect to all four of the areas of discussed above (inclusion, support, compensation/benefits, and job security)? Who should have the responsibility to gather the information listed on Attachment A?

 Preliminarily, we answer Yes to the first two of these questions; and this should help answer the third. We welcome further information and discussion on these items. In sum, and in respect to all of the PT issues discussed in this Interim Report, we acknowledge (as we are reminded on page 48 of the Delphi Project's 2015 Report) that recommendations for change must take into account the respective vision statements and missions of the University and its various Schools.

Attachment A

Recommended: Information to be gathered by the Provost's Office and the Schools

1. **Numbers** (Number of PTs at each School? As % of total faculty?)

2. **"Contact Hours"** (% of total student classroom hours taught by PTs?)

3. **Categories** (Do the PTs have other non-teaching jobs? Full-time? Type? Retired? Do PTs have other teaching jobs? Where and how much time? What can appropriately be learned about the PT's benefit eligibility at their other jobs?)

4. **Definitions, titles, and workload** (What is considered "part-time"? Consistency? What threshold for benefits? What titles are being used for PTs*?* What are the ranges of the PTs' course workload? Compared with the workload of the full-time faculty? Recognition of the workload differences between "stand alone" courses and "core" courses that are also taught by others?)

5. **Experience years** (Teaching experience years at USC – or elsewhere?)

6. **Contract terms**
    a. **Form(s)** (Is there a "model form" recommended by the Administration? What are representative forms in actual use? Is there a central review process to approve forms?)
    Duration (Are contracts by course, semester, or year? Any multi-year contracts?)
    Compensation
        i. **Method** (Salary or hourly pay?)
        ii. **Amount** (Representative, ranges, averages? How calibrated? With pay for the teaching portion of full-time faculty compensation (T/TT or NTT)? With PT pay at "peer institutions"? With other benchmarks? With "the market" (i.e., pay what is necessary to balance the supply of qualified PTs with the School's need for PTs)? Relation to the School's overall budget?)
        iii. **Benefits** (What workload threshold to benefit eligibility? What benefits are available when threshold is crossed? Ability to opt into benefits?)
        iv. **Adjustment provisions** (Recent trends in compensation amounts? Any cost-of-living or merit adjustments? On a regular basis?)
    b. **Job description(s)** (How are the PTs job responsibilities defined in the contract or related documents? How specifically? Are there any % allocations among the various responsibilities?
    c. **Hour assumptions/limits?** (What do the "hourly pay" contracts say about the categories of work to be compensated? In addition to classroom time, do these include: preparation of the course (before semester begins), orientation sessions, preparation for classes, meeting with students during or after the semester, preparing exams, grading exams during or after the semester, attending faculty meetings to which the PTs are invited, meetings with other

faculty or staff on course-related matters before, during, or after the semester? What is the basis for the assumptions about how many hours are allocated to the various work categories? What are the reasons for any maximum daily, weekly, or total hours described in the contract? How frequently are exceptions to these maximums sought/granted? Compliance with overtime pay rules and other legal requirements?)

7. **Method of recording/reporting hours** (How are "hours worked" numbers reported and recorded for compensation purposes? Using time sheets or Trojan Time entries by the PT reflecting actual hours spent in that day or week? Using data submitted by a payroll or other staff person reflecting certain assumptions about the number of hours worked by the PT? Cross-checks on the accuracy of these assumptions?)

8. **Evaluation, reappointment, mentoring**
   a. **Evaluation** (What policies/practices are in place to review and evaluate the performance of the PTs in fulfilling their responsibilities? What criteria are used? Role of student evaluations? Feed-back process? Comparison with evaluation process for other faculty?)
   b. **Appointment/reappointment practices** (Policy/practice re timing of appointment/contract and beginning of the course? Timing of discussions/decisions/contract re reappointment or extension of contract? Hiring criteria (academic degree requirements, etc.?) Reappointment criteria? Comparison with appointment/reappointment practices for other faculty?)
   c. **Orientation/Mentoring** (Policy/practices for orienting new PTs and mentoring all PTs? Specific programs or ad hoc? Training on the use of innovative classroom technology? Comparison with orientation/mentoring practices for other faculty?)

9. **Administrative focus point** (Does the Administration or School have a designated individual or group responsible for monitoring the PT situation?)

10. **Support levels** (What staff resources are available to the PTs? Ratio of designated Assistants to number of PTs? Designated offices? Rooms for meeting with students? Ability to hire TAs? Access to computers, printers, copy machines, phone, internet, faculty lounge, office supplies, tech support, library services, etc.? Comparison with support levels for other faculty?)

11. **Inclusion** (to what extent are PTs included in these aspects of the School's faculty life? Comparison with other faculty on these items?)
    a. Faculty information flow
    b. Invitations to faculty meetings
    c. Voting rights
    d. Separate meetings of PTs
    e. On faculty Committees
    f. Curriculum planning

12. **Hiring and turn-over situation** (What is the School's recent experience in hiring and retaining the number of PTs considered necessary to fulfill the School's curriculum needs?

a. New PT hires (quantity and quality of those who express an interest in a PT position. Any active recruiting efforts necessary? Results?)
    b. Departures (numbers and reasons – voluntary, involuntary, mixed?)

13. **Other policies/practices**
    a. Access to promotion opportunities?
    b. Eligibility for School-funded professional development?
    c. Eligibility for sick leave?
    d. Availability of convenient, safe, and free or discounted-rate parking for PTs, who arrive for their classes at various times of the day or night.
    e. Scheduling classes/meetings/events with recognition of PT schedules?
    f. Recognition of particular issues faced by PTs teaching on-line course?
    g. Opportunities for joint teaching with T/TT or NTT faculty?
    h. Extent (if any) of classroom teaching by student TAs?

14. **Recent changes** (What, if any, changes has the School made recently to affect the work environment for PTs? Results?)

Excerpts from pages 21-25 of *Adapting by Design*
Creating Faculty Roles and Defining Faculty Work to Ensure an Intentional Future for Colleges and Universities

Adrianna Kezar and Daniel Maxey (2015)

A report from The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success and the University of Southern California Earl and Pauline Pullias Center for Higher Education.

. . .

Critiques of the Adjunct Faculty Model

The original reason for hiring adjunct faculty was to facilitate opportunities for practitioners to contribute to the education of students in a field of study, particularly in professional or vocational programs. Within this scope, adjunct faculty roles seemed appropriate; individuals with practical, real-world experience and knowledge from their fields were employed to help enrich the educational experience and instructional quality for students, supplementing the work of the permanent faculty. Individuals were hired on short-term contracts, received modest compensation and no benefits—an honorarium, in effect—and were not to be involved in service tasks, campus governance, and decision-making. Since individuals holding these positions would typically have jobs outside of the institution, issues like job security, a living wage, lack of access to benefits, and exclusion from decision-making about curricula and other such matters were not initially seen as significant problems.[13]

> **This is an opportunity not just to reconcile the ethical and functional shortcomings of our current arrangements, but also to conceive a vision—or visions—for new faculty models and roles, and perhaps even for the academic profession as a whole.**

However, this has not been how things have played out. Although the sort of adjunct faculty member described in the preceding paragraph is often still utilized, particularly in professional education programs—and they still can make great contributions to the educational missions of institutions—the adjunct model has been expanded and exploited as a way to provide instruction to students at the lowest possible cost.[14] Critics of the adjunct model contend that this growth and change in the purposes of the adjunct model has occurred without much apparent concern for how working conditions affect instructional quality. Over time, the positive

[13] There are, however, still important questions to consider in judging the effectiveness of utilizing these sorts of faculty. For example, such professionals who teach in colleges and universities on adjunct contracts may have very little experience teaching and thus might lack familiarity with effective teaching strategies or pedagogies. Since they are employed only on a part-time basis and do not consider teaching to be their primary career, they may not seek out development opportunities to enhance their knowledge and skills when such opportunities are available to them. They may also lack awareness of institutional or departmental goals for teaching and student learning outcomes.

[14] As was noted in the introduction, reliance on part-time or adjunct faculty has escalated to the point that these positions represent approximately half of the instructional faculty among nonprofit institutions.

and useful model for integrating people with practical knowledge and experience into the education of the next generation has become strained. These positions have increasingly been used to provide administrators with greater flexibility over the faculty workforce and to provide instruction to students without the long-term obligations associated with hiring tenure-track faculty—obligations such as providing access to professional development opportunities, office space and instructional resources, and inclusion in decision-making. The adjunct model served an important role in another time—and in many cases, it still does—but these positions have generally come to be abused and have deviated from their original purposes.

Several problems have been identified with overreliance on the adjunct faculty model, and they can inform future efforts at developing appropriate faculty models. These include the following points:

1. **The use of the adjunct model to generate cost savings has resulted in inequities in compensation, access to benefits, working conditions, and involvement in the life of the department and campus.** Adjunct faculty members are customarily paid significantly less than other faculty members for the same work, and they are typically not provided access to health benefits (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Curtis, 2005; Hollenshead, et al., 2007; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). They also receive inadequate support from their institutions and departments and are excluded from activities such as governance and service. The main reasons for hiring them have shifted from putting practitioners in the classroom to creating a cheap, flexible, and expendable faculty workforce. The inequities encountered by many adjunct faculty members reflect a failure to value the commitments and contributions of these educators to our institutions, departments, and disciplines, and to students. The growth in numbers of adjunct faculty have also degraded the profession overall, as the pay, benefits, and other aspects of the role no longer reflect the status of a group of professionals. This makes faculty work, overall, less attractive over time, and it will impact the capability of the academy to attract talented individuals to pursue faculty jobs.

2. **Research suggests constraints placed on adjunct faculty have an adverse effect on student success outcomes.** Studies suggest rising numbers of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education are negatively affecting student success (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Gross & Goldhaber,

2009; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2004; Harrington & Schibik, 2001; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). The committed educators serving on adjunct faculty appointments are not to blame for these adverse effects on student learning, though. Rather, poor working conditions and a lack of support diminish their capacity to provide a high-quality learning environment and experience for students. The cumulative effect of such working conditions constrains individual instructors' abilities to have important faculty-student interactions and to apply their relevant talents, creativity, and subject knowledge to maximum effect inside and

outside the classroom (Baldwin, & Wawrzynski, 2011; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Jacoby, 2006; Umbach, 2007).[15]

3. **A lack of professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty members limits their access to and practice of effective pedagogies, high-impact practices, and innovative strategies to promote student learning, as well as current knowledge in their disciplines.** Many institutions do not provide professional development for non-tenure-track faculty, which affects their performance and ability to stay current on knowledge in their disciplines (Kezar & Sam, 2010). It also limits their knowledge about and use of emerging and innovative pedagogies and classroom strategies. This not only constrains their ability to offer the very best educational experience for their current students, a goal to which they are often very committed, but it hinders their ability to succeed when they apply for tenure-track positions. Professional development on campus is often limited, if it is offered at all, but it is even less common for non-tenure-track faculty to be eligible for or receive funds to travel off campus for conferences and workshops, or for the purpose of conducting research (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Even when professional development is available to non-tenure-track faculty, it is typically offered at times when they are unable to participate, or it is offered without pay for their time, so in order to participate they have to do so at their own expense.

4. **Adjunct faculty receive little, if any, constructive evaluation of their work to assess their effectiveness and allow them opportunities to improve.** Often the only feedback adjunct faculty members receive about their teaching comes from student evaluations (Marits, 1996). They typically do not benefit from formal or informal evaluations from department chairs or faculty colleagues, such as mentors who could observe and provide feedback about their instruction and possible areas for improvement. This denies adjuncts the opportunity to enhance their performance or to make improvements to the courses that they teach. Also, because adjunct faculty contracts are largely dependent on student evaluations, research has shown that even when they receive professional development, they are less likely to adopt new practices than faculty members with greater job security for fear that any changes would result in a decline in quality of evaluations, thus jeopardizing their continued employment (Rutz, et al., 2012). This concern is compounded by the fact that the use of challenging pedagogies that improve student learning are often resisted by students at first and result in lower faculty evaluations (Hall, Waitz, Brodeur, Soderholm, & Nasr, 2002; MacGregor, 1990; Mills & Cottell, 1997; Paswan & Young,

2002).

[15] For additional information on research about the adverse impacts of adjunct faculty working conditions on student success, see the following Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success resources: *The Imperative for Change, Review of Selected Policies and Practices and Connections to Student Learning,* and *Faculty Matter: Selected Research on Connections between Faculty-Student Interaction and Student Success.* These resources can be found online at http://resources.thechangingfaculty.org.

5. **Since adjunct faculty members are often not included in orientation programs, faculty meetings, and decision making, they may not possess important information about academic policies and practices, programs available to students, the curriculum, or overall learning goals for their departments and institutions.** As the numbers of adjunct faculty continue to increase, there are proportionally fewer faculty members who understand the learning goals of their academic programs and institutions, as well as how those are related to the curriculum (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Although accreditors continue to press for the development of policies, practices, and curricula that foster student learning outcomes, institutions are decreasing their capacity to both develop and support the attainment of learning goals by excluding this important and growing segment of the faculty from participating in these activities.

6. **A lack of job security contributes to higher rates of turnover, creating a lack of stability for academic programs and their students.** There is often no process in place to ensure non-tenure-track faculty will be rehired or to notify them in advance of their contract status, even when they perform in an excellent manner. During any given semester, an adjunct faculty member may not know whether or not they will have work for the next semester, which may cause them to seek out other employment. They can also often be terminated or their appointments can be discontinued for no reason and with very little notice. The high turnover rate for adjuncts impairs the ability of students to find mentors and to develop relationships with faculty members. Such relationships are critical to student learning and self-efficacy, and their absence creates barriers to enacting key activities like writing letters of recommendation for students or helping with job placement (Benjamin, 2003). Such turnover also interferes with the formation and vitality of a community of scholars at an institution, particularly at institutions with very large part-time employment.

7. **The adjunct faculty model encourages institutions to view faculty members merely as tools for facilitating content delivery, downplaying the important contributions of educators to student learning—to the detriment of both the faculty and the students whose learning they support.** As institutions move away from cultivating a stable faculty that is knowledgeable about the entire curricular and programmatic experience, the profession becomes increasingly aimed toward information delivery. Faculty are no longer expected to teach competencies like critical thinking, writing, or quantitative reasoning in a way that develops across various courses toward successful learning outcomes. Instead classes are seen as discrete learning opportunities, where only particular content is delivered. Some worry that, as faculty roles have less of a scholarly component, there will be a breakdown between the generation of ideas and their delivery. When faculty members are viewed and

treated as idea generators, they keep up with scholarly developments and work to contribute to furthering knowledge and understanding, even when conducting research is not their main role. But, we have little history to inform an understanding of how faculty will perform when they are no longer considered scholars, and they are disconnected from knowledge generation so completely.

8. **The adjunct model distances faculty from their disciplinary (or inter-, cross-, and multi-disciplinary) roots and content knowledge by not providing support for them to participate in conferences or scholarly life.** While all faculty may not need to conduct traditional scholarship, it is important for faculty to remain current about advances in their fields. Most adjuncts are not supported in maintaining a connection to disciplinary societies or professional organizations that could foster such ongoing knowledge development. As a result, their knowledge can become outdated, hindering both their teaching and their prospects for future jobs.

9. **Dependence on the adjunct model makes it more difficult for institutions to meet their broader goals related to service, community engagement, leadership, and larger public good.** The fact that adjuncts' roles are largely limited to teaching alone—or sometimes, but less often, to research—means that they are not expected or paid to fulfill roles, traditionally served by faculty, that help higher education meet its greater mission and goals. For example, tenure-track faculty sometimes conduct civic engagement work that helps to meet important needs of communities by addressing health and economic challenges or enriching living conditions and raising civic awareness. Because they are not included in or empowered to pursue these types of activities, adjuncts are not able to support the broader service missions of institutions— missions that are often as important to society as the mission of delivering quality teaching and learning. Furthermore, since they do not enjoy the same level of job protection as full faculty, adjuncts cannot safely engage in constructive social critique—even in their classrooms—without the risk of losing their jobs.

. . .