

University at Albany, State University of New York

**REPORT OF THE PANEL ON PART-TIME AND CONTINGENT
FACULTY AND STAFF**

**Submitted to:
President Robert J. Jones**

October 1, 2015

Executive Summary

The professional environment for contingent faculty and staff at colleges and universities throughout the United States is the subject of intense national discussion. Like many institutions of higher education, the University at Albany (UAlbany), has relied increasingly on contingent labor (i.e., individuals appointed to positions with no prospect of permanency or tenure) to staff core aspects of its mission. Concerns about this issue were raised in several open forums at UAlbany in the spring and fall semesters of 2014. To advance a campus-wide discussion, President Robert J. Jones called for a “blue ribbon” panel to review UAlbany’s policies and practices relating to contingent faculty and staff and to make recommendations concerning this essential part of the labor force where needed or desired. Accordingly, then Interim Provost Tim Mulcahy appointed a 13-member Panel on Part-time and Contingent Faculty and Staff, to be chaired by the Provost. Convened initially in February 2015, by Provost James Stellar, the Panel met weekly throughout the spring 2015 semester. This document is a report of their findings.

The Panel solicited data from Institutional Research and Human Resources Management. Prior censuses and surveys conducted by Academic Affairs and the Albany Chapter of United University Professions (UUP) were also reviewed. Subcommittees interviewed campus administrators and conducted a focus group in order to develop a clearer picture of campus policies and practices vis-à-vis compensation and benefits; duration of appointments and pathways to permanency; professional development and evaluation; and recognition and awards. A survey was also conducted to measure isolation that contingent faculty and staff might feel in their department or school.

Among other things, the Panel discovered that there are indeed very large numbers of contingent faculty and staff distributed throughout UAlbany.

- Human Resources Management identified more than 1,000 faculty and staff in the Sp2015 semester, most appointed on a temporary basis. This number included more than 500 part-time and full-time contingent faculty (compared to 650 tenure-track faculty).
- Census data developed over the five-year period from 2009 to 2013, shows that the number of part-time and full-time contingent faculty grew steadily from 376 to 535, and the number of such faculty with ten or more years of experience doubled, from 98 to 181 (34% of the total).
- Of the 535 faculty appointed in the F2013 semester, 463 (87%) were appointed part-time, and 390 (73%) were appointed for one semester.
- Business intelligence data provided by Institutional Research showed that contingent faculty (part-time lecturers, GA/TAs, full-time and other non-tenure-track faculty) taught 56% of all lecture and seminar courses (61% of the seats) in the F2014 semester. As might be expected, the percentages increase when discussion and laboratory sections were added in and when the data were limited to undergraduate courses and to general education courses.
- The minimum per course pay rate for part-time lecturers was \$2,800 and has not been increased for over ten years.

The Panel adopted a social justice perspective in developing recommendations designed to create an appropriate administrative structure and campus culture for respecting and valuing the many contributions of contingent faculty and staff to the institution. These recommendations stem from a statement of starting principles, which assert that UAlbany should:

- a. justly compensate contingent faculty and staff in salary and benefits;
- b. clearly describe both duties and privileges in the context of the sponsoring unit;
- c. provide stable, secure employment and supportive work conditions;
- d. provide regular, appropriate and compensated professional development;
- e. feature a fair and transparent system for evaluation designed to both foster and reward excellence; and
- f. explicitly offer, if not indeed guarantee, one or more avenues for advancement (e.g., in compensation, rank, length of contract, etc.).

The Panel believes UAlbany is positioned to be a national leader in demonstrating how to improve the working conditions for this essential part of its labor force, The Panel also believes that such leadership can result in a more engaged academic workforce with resultant improvements in student satisfaction and retention. Following a preamble, a description of the Panel's methodology, and a description of the UAlbany's contingent faculty and staff, our recommendations are presented in two sections. The Panel's final recommendation is for this work to advance into an implementation phase and for the Panel or some version of it to continue to assist the Provost, the deans, and other campus leaders in refining and promoting a substantive and meaningful contingent faculty and staff change agenda.

Panel Members

Dr. James Stellar, Provost (Chair)
Ms. Kimberly Berg, TA/Lecturer (part-time), Anthropology
Dr. Katharine Briar-Lawson, Dean, Social Welfare
Ms. Leslie Carroll, ITS (part-time professional)
Dr. James Collins, Professor, Anthropology
Dr. Susan Cumings, Lecturer, Writing and Critical Inquiry Program
Mr. Rocco Ferraro, Lecturer (part-time), Geography & Planning
Ms. Kristen Hourigan, Lecturer (part-time), Sociology
Dr. William Husson, Lecturer, Communication
Dr. Julie Nokov, Professor and Chair, Political Science
Dr. Stephen North, Distinguished Teaching Professor, English
Mr. Roberto Vives, Coach, Athletics
Dr. Kehe Zhu, Professor, Mathematics & Statistics
Support:
Dr. William Hedberg, Provost's Office
Dr. Ben Weaver, Provost's Office
Ms. Kathleen Gersowitz, CAS Dean's Office

“Fundamentally, it’s about having the work valued. We are professionals, we work hard, and our work should be valued.” – Focus Group Participant

Preamble: Higher Education, Contingent Faculty and Social Justice

The first priority of any 21st-century university pursuing excellence is to create and maintain a productive, stable and committed faculty. This is, to be sure, a matter of sound educational practice; a university can only be as good as its faculty.

More importantly, however, it is a matter of social justice. Employees in every sector of the economy—and surely higher education—have a right to certain workplace basics: a living wage, access to affordable health care, opportunities for professional development, and so on. Indeed, no university, whatever its other accomplishments, can claim to be “excellent” so long as it denies these rights to its employees.

Thus, while an institution might sometimes find it necessary, and occasionally even desirable, to create positions that are not full-time and/or tenure-track (FT/TT), in many instances such positions should be moved toward FT/TT status as expeditiously as possible; and in all instances, the faculty who hold contingent positions must be afforded precisely the same respect as their FT/TT colleagues.

As UAlbany continues its pursuit of excellence, then—as it seeks to move, in President Jones’s words, to the next level—it must treat its contingent faculty and staff accordingly. As contingent and adjunct faculty concerns are a universal issue in higher education, UAlbany is in a position to become a national leader in making necessary improvements to the working conditions of this important campus community group. To that end, we recommend that UAlbany should:

- a. justly compensate contingent faculty and staff in salary and benefits;
- b. clearly describe both duties and privileges in the context of the sponsoring unit;
- c. provide stable, secure employment and supportive work conditions;
- d. provide regular, appropriate and compensated professional development;
- e. feature a fair and transparent system of evaluation designed to both foster and reward excellence; and
- f. have a pathway to one or more avenues for advancement (e.g., in compensation, rank, length of contract, etc.).

What follows is the report of a Panel appointed and charged by Interim Provost Timothy Mulcahy in January 2015 to study the professional environment of part-time and contingent faculty and professional staff at UAlbany and to provide recommendations for improving the employment conditions for individuals who constitute this essential part of the institution’s workforce. The Panel began its work in February 2015, chaired by newly appointed Provost

James R. Stellar. Early on, the Panel adopted a social justice approach to its review of local practices and suggested best practices culled from both other institutions and the national dialogue on contingent and part-time faculty and staff in higher education. This report describes the work of the Panel over the Sp2015 semester and offers a set of recommendations for addressing critical issues related to compensation and benefits; career pathways and professional development; and greater integration of contingent faculty and professional staff into the University's community and culture. The Panel calls for a more vigorous, concerted, and intentional effort to recognize the contribution these important members of our community provide to the University's mission, academic program, and student experience.

Methodology

Formation of the Panel

In January 2015, invitations to join this panel were sent to individuals selected from names submitted by academic deans and the leadership of the University Senate and the Albany Chapter of United University Professions. Potential members were chosen based on their current and/or prior roles within the university, their commitment to the school community, and their demonstrated ability to work effectively on the types of tasks anticipated to be a part of the functioning of the Panel's work. The final Panel consisted of full- and part-time lecturers, graduate students, full- and part-time professionals, tenure track faculty, a department chair and a school dean. This combination of individuals allowed for a wide range of perspectives on the issues relevant to the work of the Panel and represented various schools and departments within the university.

Panel Structure

In February, the Panel met to establish a set of general principles, a list of main concerns to be explored, and a work plan. It was determined early on that the most time-effective method for investigating overlapping but distinct areas of concern was to form subcommittees for the following areas: General Principles; Isolation; Clarity and Communication; Insecurity; Compensation and Benefits; Post-doctoral and Research; Graduate Students; Professional Development and Professional Leave; Management, Policy, and Practice; and Evaluation. Subcommittee members were self-appointed based on the unique strengths and skillsets of each member of the group. Subcommittees created work plans for each area of concern and the full Panel met weekly to communicate findings, share resources, seek suggestions, and remain cognizant of the overlapping nature of each area of investigation.

Methodologies Utilized

Subcommittees utilized a wide range of methods to explore each area of concern. These included surveys, personal interviews, focus groups, literature reviews, and exploration of existing documents both within and outside of UAlbany including previously established policies and procedures in various institutions across the nation. Panel members were in contact with various deans and department chairs as well as representatives from United University Professions, Human Resources, academic deans, the Institute for Teaching Learning and Academic Leadership, the Graduate Student Association, the UUP Contingent Concerns Committee, and colleagues at peer institutions.

Development of the Final Report

In April 2015, each subcommittee began drafting initial reports. These drafts were then integrated and condensed into a cohesive document outlining the Panel's principles, methodology, main findings, and recommendations for addressing the concerns explored. This final report was put together over the summer, with subcommittee reports and key supporting documents retained as appendices.

Who are the Contingent Faculty and Staff?

Much of the national discussion, as well as the Task Force discussion, regarding contingent faculty has focused on the professional environment and employment situation of part-time instructors. While there are substantial numbers of part-time teaching faculty appointed to UAlbany's schools and colleges, contingent status extends to other types of personnel.

By "contingent" the Task Force means any individual appointed to a State-funded position in an academic, professional, or library title or obligation that does not lead to continuing or permanent appointment (i.e., SUNY Trustees parlance for tenure).

This excludes employees of the SUNY Research Foundation, the University Auxiliary Services and its contractors, and the University at Albany Foundation, none of whom are eligible for permanent status. It also excludes University employees who are appointed to Management/Confidential positions as well as employees who are represented by bargaining units other than the United University Professions (UUP) – e.g., CSEA, Council 82, and PEF.

A profile was developed from a dataset obtained from the Office of Human Resources Management for a survey of contingent faculty conducted in April (the survey is described later in this report).

[Insert Table 1 here]

This table shows that there were over 1,000 part-time and contingent faculty and staff appointed to UAlbany at the time of this Panel's work in the Sp2015 semester. The appointments were roughly equally divided between academic faculty and professional staff. In both categories most individuals were appointed on a temporary basis – 55% for academic faculty and 76% for professional. The ratio for professional staff is skewed, however, due to a substantial number of part-time professionals appointed on an hourly basis to the Rockefeller College's National Center for Security & Preparedness. Significant numbers of contingent professional staff are found in Athletics, in research centers and institutes, and as directors of selected administrative units identified for contingent appointment in Appendix A, B, or C of the UUP Agreement.

The profile for adjuncts is illuminated further if we look back at data compiled each fall semester for the five-year period from 2009 to 2013. Here we see a pattern of steady increases that has led us to the current situation.

[Insert Table 2 here]

For the F2013 semester, the most recent available, there were:

- 535 part-time and full-time lecturers
- 463 of these were appointed part-time (87%)
- 72 were appointed full-time (13%).

The census tracked duration of appointment and years of service. For F2013:

- 390 (73%) part-time or full-time lecturers were appointed for one semester,
- 92 (17%) were appointed for a year

- 53 (10%) were appointed for more than one year.

In terms of experience, 373 (70%) had served for more than three years and 181 (34%) had served for more than 10 years.

Moreover, these numbers were the result of a steady increase. Thus, the number of lecturers (full- and part-time) grew from 376 in 2009 to 535 in 2013; while the number with ten or more years of experience doubled over the same time span, from 98 to 181. These trends document the general perception that the institution is relying increasingly on contingent instructors for delivering the curriculum, and that the contingent part of the faculty workforce is becoming less itinerant. The changes argue for a more intentional, focused effort to provide a more respectful, supportive environment for contingent instructors, many of whom are likely to remain at UAlbany for the duration of their careers.

The institution's dependence on non-tenure track faculty for teaching is documented further in data obtained from the Business Intelligence system maintained by the Office of Institutional Research.

In F2014, UAlbany offered 2,030 lecture and seminar courses (69,127 seats), of which 56% - or 1,133 - were taught by contingent faculty (part-time lecturers, GA/TAs, full-time and other non-tenure-track faculty). This same group accounted for 61% of all seats offered: 42,378 of 69,127. As we would expect, the numbers and contribution to the schedule increases when discussion and laboratory sections are added in, and when the data are limited to undergraduate courses and to general education courses.

[Insert Table 3 here]

Table 1: Contingent Faculty (Spring 2015)

<u>Status</u>	<u>Adjunct Faculty</u>	<u>Other Academic Qualified*</u>	<u>Professional Staff</u>	
Fulltime				
Temporary				
Lecturers	10	0	0	
Visiting/Other	12	3	0	
Staff Assistant			28	
Postdoctoral Assoc			18	
Sr Staff Assistant			12	
Research Asst/Assoc			6	
Rsdnc Hall Dir			6	
Other			6	
Athletics			4	
Director (Appendix A)			4	
Term				
Lecturers	54	0	0	
Visiting/Other	2	15	0	
Athletics			52	
Director (Appendix A)			9	
Other			1	
Subtotals	78	18	146	
Part-time				
Temporary				
Lecturers	239	0	0	
Visiting/Other	3	11	0	
Staff Assistant **			262	
Sr Staff Assistant			7	
Staff Associate			7	
Athletics			7	
Advisor/Counselor			6	
Other			5	
Instr Support Asst			5	
Sr Staff Associate			2	
Term				
Lecturers	145	0	0	
Visiting/Other	3	6	0	
Staff Asst			23	
Staff Assoc			7	
Research Asst/Assoc			7	
Sr Staff Asst			6	
Athletics			6	
Instr Support Asst			6	
Other			3	
Advisor/Counselor			2	
Sr Staff Assoc			2	
Subtotals	390	17	363	
Totals	468	35	509	
	46%	3%	50%	1,012

*Includes TT faculty temporarily in qualified rank, visiting faculty, research and clinical faculty, and O'Leary Professors.

**Includes many hourly employees appointed to the National Center for Security & Preparedness.

Table 2: Part-time and Other Contingent Faculty Headcount, Fall 2013

	<u>PT</u>	<u>FT</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Duration of Appt</u>			<u>Yrs of Service</u>	
				<u>1 sem</u>	<u>1 yr</u>	<u>>1 yr</u>	<u>3+ yr</u>	<u>10+ yr</u>
Arts and Sciences								
Africana Studies	7	1	8	5	3	0	5	2
Anthropology	3	2	5	3	2	0	4	2
Art	14	2	16	8	7	1	12	8
Atmospheric & Environmental Sc	4	0	4	1	0	3	2	2
Biology	12	0	12	11	1	0	5	5
Chemistry	24	1	25	24	1	0	7	0
Communication	9	4	13	8	1	4	12	6
Dean's Ofc--Coll of Arts & Sci	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Asian Studies	5	4	9	2	5	2	5	3
Economics	25	1	26	23	2	1	13	8
English	34	3	37	25	8	4	34	12
Geography & Planning	10	1	11	6	5	0	11	7
History	19	3	22	15	5	2	19	10
Judaic Studies	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Languages, Lits. & Cultures	14	6	20	13	2	5	14	4
Latin Amer,Caribb & Latino Std	3	0	3	3	0	0	3	1
Mathematics and Statistics	17	1	18	12	6	0	15	3
Music	10	0	10	5	5	0	7	4
Philosophy	4	1	5	4	1	0	3	0
Physics	17	2	19	16	1	2	14	3
Psychology	9	0	9	8	0	1	7	3
Sociology	21	0	21	21	0	0	17	6
Theatre	1	1	2	1	1	0	2	0
Womens Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Business								
Accounting and Law	13	4	17	13	0	4	14	8
Dean's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finance	4	1	5	5	0	0	2	1
Information Technology Mngt	2	3	5	2	0	3	4	2
Management	4	2	6	4	0	2	5	3
Marketing	3	0	3	3	0	0	1	0
Computing and Information								
Computer Science	8	0	8	8	0	0	6	3
Informatics	9	1	10	9	1	0	4	1
Information Studies	6	0	6	6	0	0	6	4
Criminal Justice								
	8	0	8	8	0	0	6	4
Education								
Dean's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education Psych & Method	7	0	7	6	1	0	5	3
Educational & Counseling Psych	15	0	15	13	1	1	13	6
Educational Admin. & Policy St	5	1	6	3	3	0	3	2
Educational Theory & Practice	22	1	23	22	1	0	20	13
Reading	9	0	9	8	1	0	6	4
School Psychology Program	2	1	3	2	1	0	3	2
Special Education	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0

Table 2: Part-time and Other Contingent Faculty Headcount, Fall 2013

	<u>PT</u>	<u>FT</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Duration of Appt</u>			<u>Yrs of Service</u>	
				<u>1 sem</u>	<u>1 yr</u>	<u>>1 yr</u>	<u>3+ yr</u>	<u>10+ yr</u>
Public Health								
Biomedical Sciences	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Continuing Education	11	0	11	2	9	0	0	0
Dean's Ofc--Public Health	4	0	4	4	0	0	3	1
Epidemiology & Biostatistics	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	1
Health Policy	3	0	3	3	0	0	1	0
Rockefeller								
Political Science	12	2	14	11	3	0	8	4
Public Administration & Policy	12	0	12	9	3	0	10	6
Ctr for Policy Research	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
Nat'l Ctr-Security & Preparedness	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Social Welfare	28	3	31	25	6	0	21	11
Other								
Educational Opportunity Prgrm	2	4	6	2	2	2	6	4
NYS Writers Institute	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Counseling Center	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Off. of General Studies & Sum.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Off. of International Educatn.	2	0	2	1	1	0	2	2
University Libraries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vice Provost for UG Education	2	16	18	2	0	16	7	3
Totals	463	72	535	390	92	53	373	181
	87%	13%	100%	73%	17%	10%	70%	34%
Fall 2012 Semester	462	32	494	128	336	30	375	175
	94%	6%	100%	26%	68%	6%	76%	35%
Fall 2011 Semester	364	32	396	289	85	23	284	96
	92%	8%	100%	73%	21%	6%	72%	24%
Fall 2010 Semester	350	37	387	291	73	23	281	101
	90%	10%	100%	75%	19%	6%	73%	26%
Fall 2009 Semester	344	32	376	285	71	20	275	98
	91%	9%	100%	76%	19%	5%	73%	26%

Revised: 12-15-13

Table 3: Fall 2014 Semester Courses/Seats

		<u>Total Taught by Contingent Faculty*</u>	
Lecture/Seminar Courses	2,030	1,133	56%
Seats	69,127	42,378	61%
Lecture/Seminar Courses plus Discussion/Lab Sections	2,480	1,534	62%
Seats	77,494	49,238	64%
Undergraduate Courses	1,385	889	64%
Seats	59,398	38,566	65%
General Education Courses	638	458	72%
Seats	32,075	21,738	68%

*Includes part-time lecturers, full-time non-tenure-track faculty, GA/Tas.

Compensation and Benefits

"I will never be able to retire." – Focus Group Participant

As we have already suggested, the use of contingent workers is pervasive throughout the U.S. economy, including higher education. It is part of a broad historical trend towards loss of secure, well-paid employment. According to recent analyses of faculty in American higher education (community college through doctoral granting universities) in 2010, 75% of all faculty held contingent, non-tenurable positions, and only 25% had 'traditional' tenure or tenure-track positions (CAW 2012). In this section, we discuss issues related to both salary and benefits, for professional as well as academic staff, beginning first with professional staff compensation, followed by academic staff, and concluding with a section on benefits. Applicable SUNY Policies and the contractual obligations in this area are contained in the Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions and will be referenced at appropriate points in the discussion that follows. We begin first with our list of recommendations, the rationale for which is provided in what follows:

Recommendations:

- 1. The University should affirm a value for fair and equitable compensation for contingent faculty and staff.**
- 2. The University should affirm that improved compensation is important for recognizing the essential contributions provided by contingent faculty and staff in delivering a quality, student-centered academic program.**
- 3. The University should adopt a goal of raising the minimum per course rate for part-time lecturers to \$5,000 over the next two to three years.**
- 4. The University should establish a policy that encourages deans and department chairs, in assigning courses, to try to insure eligibility for health benefits to part-time lecturers and staff who desire them (e.g. half-time or two courses per term).**
- 5. The University should work with UUP and System Administration to improve access to health and retirement benefits for part-time faculty and staff.**
- 6. The University should compile and promulgate, in a single place, comprehensive information about eligibility and terms for all benefits available to contingent employees.**

Contingent Professional Staff – Salary Compensation

UAlbany's part-time and full-time professional staff are appointed to a range of established State-wide professional and research budget titles. Each title series is ordered and ranked based on established written expectations related to traditional criteria – e.g., scope of responsibility, complexity of tasks, consequences of error, qualifications and experience required, etc. And each title is associated with a published State-wide salary schedule (minimum, maximum) that increases as a result of the negotiated cost-of-living increases in the UUP Agreement.

As far as the Panel can determine, salaries for individuals serving as contingent professionals are established at the time of initial appointment, taking into account the advertised compensation for the position and the qualifications and experience of the individual being recruited and appointed. Salaries for part-time professional staff are pro-rated against the full-time annual rate for each title. Salaries increase during an individual's career as a result of negotiated increases (across-the-board adjustments) and selective increases (e.g., discretionary salary awards, currently one-time awards that are not added to the base salary). Salaries (and titles) can also be adjusted during an employee's career based on increased duties and performance. In addition, Appendix A-28 of the Agreement sets out a process for reviewing professional employees for promotions and salary increases.

Academic Staff – Salary Compensation

UAlbany's full-time academic staff are similarly appointed to a range of established State-wide academic and library budget titles, each ordered and ranked based on performance expectations and experience. As with the professional staff, each title is associated with a published State-wide salary schedule that escalates with the negotiated across-the-board increases in the Agreement. Salaries for academic staff appointed to contingent titles are negotiated at the time of initial appointment taking into account the advertised range for the position, the faculty member's experience and attainments, and the salaries of other similarly situated faculty appointed to the department or school. Initial salaries typically increase over time with both across-the-board and discretionary increases. Selective adjustments are also possible (for retention, for example).

A major focus of the national discussion about contingent faculty has been the compensation of part-time instructors or lecturers. The Panel also made a significant effort to study compensation patterns for part-time lecturers at UAlbany as well as recommended practices at other institutions.

Part-time lecturers are typically paid a salary on a per course basis. In some cases, depending on the nature of the assignment, another basis may be used (e.g., on a per student basis). The range in compensation is wide, referenced to market factors that operate within each discipline or field. Compensation for faculty in subjects where there is a substantial supply of qualified instructors is comparatively low; rates are comparatively high for faculty in highly technical subjects or where a program must compete for expertise with other private-sector options.

Stipends for service in the summer sessions are governed by a campus-wide framework promulgated each year by the Office of Summer Sessions. The framework establishes a standard salary based on the rank of the instructor (e.g., professor, associate, assistant, lecturer, graduate student).

Part-time lecturers are members of the professional services negotiating unit represented by United University Professions (UUP) and as such are eligible for cost-of-living adjustments and discretionary awards as authorized under the applicable Agreement. Until very recently, part-time lecturers did not compete very successfully for discretionary salary attention. The 2011-16

Agreement introduced a new State-wide methodology for creating a separate discretionary award pool of funds to be assigned, as a lump-sum award (not to base salary), specifically to part-time faculty and staff.

UAlbany has a minimum pay rate of \$2,800 for a three-credit course. This rate has not changed since it was first established more than ten years ago. A standard widely referenced in the national discourse is \$5,000 for a three-credit course. Actual compensation for part-time lecturers at UAlbany is difficult to track with precision. While salary data are available from Human Resources for each semester, information about the number of courses taught by each part-time lecturer each semester is dispersed in the individual schools and colleges. The issue is further problematic for individuals who may be appointed to more than one school or college. A simple average rate of compensation is not a particularly meaningful statistic as many of these individuals teach more than one course. Part-time lecturers may also teach a course and perform another administrative function or assignment. Per course rates for individuals teaching a single course ranged from \$2,800 to several times this amount.

One way to rationalize a pay-scale for part-time lecturers is calibration against the State's minimum salary rate for a full-time lecturer. For the 2015-16 academic year, the amount is \$39,229. The per course rate is then derived as a function of the number of courses the institution considers to constitute a full-time obligation as follows:

\$4,359 = the minimum for nine courses (5/4)
\$4,904 = the minimum for eight courses (4/4)
\$5,000 = the suggested national standard

There will be costs associated with raising the minimum per-course rates, to be sure, but those costs are currently being borne by the ever-increasing cohort of our colleagues – many of them our current and former students – who are tied to the current salary structure. The Panel feels it is unjust for this group to bear these costs. We also note that the overall costs would be less if the UAlbany simultaneously installed funding to provide an additional year of support for graduate teaching assistants, thereby reducing the use of part-time lecturers for a substantial amount of instruction.

While the Panel finds the situation of part-time lecturers the most sorely in need of improvement, we wish also to recognize that full-time contingent lecturers also face significant challenges. Most have terminal degrees in their fields, strong teaching records, and in many cases also have been UAlbany for years, yet are currently barred from many activities through which TT faculty can support students outside regular courses – e.g., the sponsorship of student organizations or supervisions of directed study. Full-time lecturers may also be undercompensated, at least in individual cases. We recommend that the next iteration of this Panel, in the phase of implementation, also give attention to remedies for full-time lecturers where warranted.

Extra-service

“Extra-service” refers to compensation for additional work beyond an employee’s normally assigned duties and responsibilities. Contingent faculty and staff are eligible for extra-service compensation. For full-time contingent faculty and staff, the compensation may not exceed 20% of the annual full-time salary in any twelve month period. SUNY Policies also require prior approval of extra-service compensation.

Benefits

Employee benefits for full-time and part-time faculty members and staff are described in detail on the University's web-page at <http://hr.albany.edu/content/benptuup.asp>. Full-time contingent faculty and staff are eligible for the full menu of options for all full-time University employees – e.g., retirement, health, dental, vision, etc.

Benefit eligibility is more limited for part-time contingent staff (see Appendix A for an updated summary of benefits for part-time faculty). Part-time professional employees must be paid at least a \$555 bi-weekly salary to be eligible for health benefits. Part-time lecturers must teach at least two courses in an academic semester, or the equivalent FTE, to qualify for benefits. While many departments intentionally make course assignments to provide access to benefits for part-time faculty who desire or need them, the Panel believes that sensitivity to this issue and practice across all units varies, placing some individuals at risk and creating cross-campus inequities. There can also be gaps in coverage as well as gaps (perhaps unintended) in the negotiated terms of the benefit – for example, for part-time lecturers teaching two quarter-length courses (1+1 in a single semester).

The Panel’s value for fair and just compensation and job security extends also to benefits. The health and well-being of the institution’s entire workforce, including part-time and contingent faculty and staff, is paramount for creating an environment for effective and productive teaching and learning.

Professional Environment

“It would be nice to be valued by being included in departmental things. We teach the exact same students but it’s not equal pay for equal work. We have the same degrees in many cases. In some cases, more experience teaching than those tenured. There are lots of invisible barriers, we feel ‘less than’ and ‘less valued’.” – Focus Group Participant

In addition to addressing compensation and benefits, the Panel identified other opportunities to create a more collegial, integrated and professional environment for contingent faculty and staff. The Panel’s professional environment subgroup convened with the Panel throughout the Sp2015 semester, analyzed the Isolation subcommittee’s 2015 survey, reviewed a UUP Survey of Contingent Faculty (F2014), and conducted focus groups on campus in Sp2015. The Panel believes that more intentional efforts on the part of institutional leaders and citizens to include, support, evaluate, and respect contingent faculty and staff can yield very positive outcomes in integration over a short period of time. Recommendations 7 through 13 address key aspects of the professional environment for contingent faculty and professional staff.

Recommendations:

- 7. The University should develop and promulgate policies and practices to encourage increased integration of contingent faculty and professional staff in the programs and cultures of departments, schools, and colleges.**
- 8. The University should promulgate a policy and framework for providing longer-term employment commitments for contingent faculty and professional staff.**
- 9. The University should create career ladders and pathways for progression to permanence for contingent faculty and professional staff.**
- 10. The University should establish a set of “best practices” for hiring and supporting contingent faculty and professional staff and should incorporate these practices in a handbook for deans, chairs, directors, and contingent faculty and staff.**
- 11. The University should develop and install an effective (i.e., timely, multi-faceted) mechanism for evaluating the performance and contribution of contingent faculty and staff, including both formative and summative components.**
- 12. The University should enhance and increase support for the professional development of contingent faculty and professional staff.**
- 13. The University should promote existing opportunities and develop additional mechanisms to recognize and reward exemplars of excellence among the part-time and contingent faculty and professional staff.**

Increased Integration

A Panel subcommittee on integration met with one focus group and conducted a survey of contingent faculty and staff to assess different degrees and dimensions of workplace isolation. The results are instructive in illuminating feelings and perceptions of integration and social connectedness among various types of contingent staff.

Drawing guidance from organizational research literature, the workplace isolation subcommittee constructed a survey instrument composed of 20 items distributed across four areas of interest: interactions with the department chair; social based interactions with department colleagues; work related interactions with department colleagues; and work relevant feelings and identity issues. Demographic information allowed the results to be analyzed for five sub-groups: part-time contingent faculty (n=98); full-time contingent faculty (n=37); graduate student teachers (n=24); full-time contingent staff (n=18); and part-time contingent staff (n=36). The results are discussed separately for teaching contingents and staff contingents in the survey summary report provided as Appendix B.

Two very broad trends appear in the data for the three groups of teaching contingents. First, all 3 groups (part-time, full-time, TAs) are similar in offering mixed reviews of their departments in respect to the issue of workplace isolation. The reviews are mixed in the following sense: while an item-by-item analysis indicates that a substantial percentage of respondents offer favorable evaluations of their departments with respect to the issues the various items addressed, those response percentages that indicate positive departmental regard are tempered by response percentages that fall within the non-favorable to neutral range. Put differently, there is sufficient response variability across items to suggest ample room for improvement in how departments manage their relationships with contingent teaching faculty. The second broad trend relates to a tendency for full-time contingent faculty to express higher levels of satisfaction with departmental life than part-time and graduate student contingent faculty. This trend notwithstanding, the data also reveal occasional divergences from the general tendency for higher levels of satisfaction to be expressed by full-time contingents. Thus attention to detail in individual units is required in any action to improve isolation of teaching contingents.

It might be expected that a similar trend would be found for contingent professional staff. Certainly it is plausible to assume that insofar as UAlbany professional employees enjoy full-time status, they are likely to be more fully participative in their departmental workflows, and this in turn might effect a greater sense of connectedness to their workplace. Surprisingly, the survey results show that this is decidedly not the case. Across all four clusters of survey items - department chair related items, department colleague (social) items, department colleague (work) items, and feelings and identity (items) - it is the *part-time* professional staff members who consistently report a more satisfying experience of their workplace than their full-time colleagues. There is only one item (#9 - *I am usually invited to departmental social functions that occur off campus*) out of the twenty items in the survey for which full-time staff offer a more affirmative response than part-time staff. For the remaining 19 items, part-time staff display responses that are the same as (item #20 only) or more strongly affirmative than (18 out of 20 items) their full-time colleagues.

The Panel calls on UAlbany to develop and encourage policies and practices designed to increase the integration of part-time and contingent faculty and staff into their departments, schools, and administrative units. The Panel believes that a more inclusive culture of academic citizenship will help to create the conditions for higher levels of job satisfaction, deeper levels of institutional commitment, and stronger incentives for emphasizing quality in job performance. There are a number of no-cost or low-cost changes that can be installed immediately to begin to pay more attention to contingent faculty and staff. For example, contingent faculty should be listed on departmental and school web-pages. Full-time contingent faculty (at least) should be included on lists of new faculty at the beginning of each academic year and included in the institution's orientation events for new faculty. Full-time contingent professional staff, who reported higher levels of isolation in the survey than part-time professional staff, could be convened from time to time in affinity groups to share information and develop useful social networks.

Duration of Appointments and Pathways to Permanence

Next to compensation and benefits, job security is a priority for an overwhelming majority of contingent faculty and staff. Uncertainty about the future beyond the present semester or year is both stressful and non-conducive to effective future planning for course preparation at the high levels of quality the University should uphold. The Panel strongly believes that establishing more predictable and secure employment situations for contingent faculty and professional staff will help to achieve even higher levels of excellence in teaching and service.

At present the majority of contingent faculty, mostly part-time lecturers, are appointed semester by semester, a practice that is costly to the institution in terms of Human Resources administrative transactions. The Panel believes that the institution has a special obligation to extend the duration of appointments for the majority of contingent lecturers who have provided three or more years of service and the roughly 1/3 who have provided ten or more years of service. While appointments of shorter duration may have been understandable in challenging fiscal periods, the University's financial condition seems stable enough now to give serious consideration to longer employment commitments for a significant number of part-time and full-time lecturers and staff. The SUNY Trustees policies currently permit appointments for up to three years, and the Panel urges the University to take full advantage of that discretion and to consider advocating for a policy change to permit even longer commitments (e.g., up to five years) under specified conditions. Some employees are already eligible for five-year employment commitments under specially negotiated titles—e.g. Appendix A (directors) B (Athletics), C (Development).

To follow up on some of the recommendations set out in the beginning of this section, the Panel adds the following more specific points of consideration.

- The Panel recommends that wherever possible, contingent faculty and professional staff be appointed to terms of not less than one year, with multi-year commitments preferable after a record of reliable, high quality performance is established.

- Where funding permits, professional staff with three or more years of satisfactory service should receive a three-year renewal appointment.
- Wherever possible, part time faculty should be appointed for not less than one year, with subsequent appointments of longer duration preferred. In addition, appointments should be at a sufficient course load (at least 2 courses or the equivalent FTE per semester) to meet the eligibility threshold for health benefits if desired. Some community professionals with full-time occupations and/or access to health care and other benefits elsewhere may continue to teach single courses as University adjunct faculty.
- Where funding permits, Full Time Non-Tenure Track (FTNTT) faculty should be appointed for three years following three years of satisfactory service.
- Wherever possible, all these appointments should permit the contingent employee to request a leave without pay for up to one year for professional or personal leave, following models at institutions such as the University of Virginia.
- Lastly, after three or more years of satisfactory service, FTNTT faculty should be eligible for consideration to have their positions converted to non-qualified rank, i.e., eligible to progress to permanence. Progress to continuing appointment should be reflected in progressive rank titles. Currently, the Instructor title is available in the SUNY Trustees' Policies. As use of available unqualified academic titles may lead to confusion about obligation and workload for teaching intensive faculty, new titles should be considered to propose to the Trustees in order to provide appropriate recognition and job security for this increasingly essential part of the academic labor force. A fuller discussion of the recommendation to convert FTNTT positions to tenure-track teaching professors is provided as Appendix C, together with a notional career ladder and proposal for a pathway to permanence as Appendix D.

Clear and Effective Communication

Given the growing reliance on contingent faculty and staff to provide essential courses and services for programs across all three UAlbany campuses, it seems advisable, indeed essential, to create a manual of best practices and avenues for supporting non-tenure-track employees. One of the biggest factors of success in the workplace is a clear understanding of one's role and the supports that are available to perform the assigned functions, together with an environment that provides guidance and encouragement for seeking out those supports. Unfortunately, along with uncertainty regarding renewal of appointments, contingent faculty and staff sometimes feel isolated, under-valued, and uninformed or unable to access needed resources that would contribute to the classroom experience for students. The Panel urges the institution to encourage and expect full-time faculty, academic officers, administrative staff, and school and department chairs and deans to communicate clearly and helpfully with contingent faculty and staff. This shift would seek to increase both the perception and reality of respect and value for contingent faculty and staff. The project would benefit from a statement of principles and best practices for raising the visibility of contingent labor; for engaging contingent faculty and staff in conversations regarding scheduling of courses; for providing guidance for accessing to benefits,

needed resources, and space; for timely administrative processing of appointments and renewals; and for improvement of general communication regarding the administrative and Human Resources aspects of these roles.

Best Practices and Guidance for Hiring and Supporting Contingent Faculty and Staff

UAlbany should develop a comprehensive handbook for the campus community (including department chairs, deans, and program directors as well as contingent faculty and staff) that provides information about the different types of contingent appointments, including but not limited to sections related to available benefits; professional development opportunities and resources; technical and classroom support; disability resources; policies on performance evaluation and general aspects of the position as well as opportunities for promotion and progression within the university system. Upon request, new employees should also be assigned a faculty/staff mentor *outside their department or division* with whom they may consult on matters related to their integration into campus life and work. The Panel recommends that responsibility for creating and updating the handbook and for coordinating the recruitment of volunteer mentors be assigned to a specific administrative office.

Performance Evaluation

Regular evaluation of contingent faculty and staff is essential for insuring the quality of the University's academic program as well as for providing appropriate support for professional development and excellence in teaching and service. Evaluation also demonstrates the value the University places on contingent faculty and staff contributions and promotes increased integration within the larger institutional community. While the University has established policies, procedures, and forms for creating performance evaluation programs for both part-time lecturers and professional contingent staff, compliance with these procedures is inconsistent, at best, and completely ignored in some units. As a result, contingent faculty and staff often do not experience formative evaluation in a timely manner, leaving little room for feedback and opportunities for progression. This hampers the professionalization of these foundational roles and limits assessment to evidence that is not comprehensive. Many part-time lecturers may be evaluated for renewal, for example, solely on the basis of student course evaluations, which are intended in large part for professional development purposes, and moreover are controversial for a variety of reasons, including low response rates for internet-administered forms.

Lack of resources to conduct a comprehensive review – including classroom observations and evaluation of course materials for faculty, and equivalent measures for staff – has been offered as an explanation for non-compliance. Rather than viewing evaluation as an optional and supplementary practice, the University must take measures to ensure departments, colleges, and administrative units are conducting comprehensive annual or semesterly reviews, including but not limited to measures such as classroom observations and evaluation of course materials for faculty and reviews of progress with supervisors and dossiers of projects for staff. Implementing

review programs including formative as well as summative evaluations, offering professional development opportunities and support, and tying successful professional growth and excellence in teaching and service to awards and recognitions (beyond simple contract renewal) will also give contingent faculty and staff greater reason to participate actively in evaluation processes and to strive for excellence.

Professional Development and Professional Leave

Initiating a targeted, inclusive, and adequately resourced program for professional development is another way the University can recognize and value part-time and contingent faculty and staff. A key feature of the professional environment centers on the supports provided for the professional development of faculty and staff, yet opportunities are currently few, not readily visible, and often ineffective at meeting the actual needs of individuals in these roles. Part-time and contingent faculty are ineligible for UAlbany's small grants program (i.e., FRAP), for example, precluding the ability to access and utilize university resources for creative research and teaching improvements. Currently, there is only one specifically targeted program in the State-wide Joint Labor Management Committee program of Individual Development Awards, which sets aside 15% of the campus's annual allocation for part-time faculty and staff; unfortunately, there are few applications to this program. In addition, departments and schools offer little in the way of conference and other training funding for contingent faculty and staff, adding to their financial burden, feelings of insecurity, and inability to progress in their field. While part-time and contingent faculty are eligible to take SUNY classes using the UUP and State-funded tuition assistance benefits and are also welcome to attend academies and workshops offered by ITLAL, these are often offered at times that conflict with the rigorous schedules that many contingent faculty and staff experience in their roles.

The Panel calls on UAlbany to develop a program of funding and resources for the professional development of contingent faculty and staff, to include both on- and off-campus opportunities, and both paid and unpaid development leave. This would include programs offering support, on an application basis, for travel to assist participation in professional conferences and workshops, at rates reflecting the true cost of both regional and national opportunities. Further, campus-based programs should be re-cast to permit consideration of applications from contingent faculty for creative research and teaching innovation. A fully formed professional development program would also include opportunities for unpaid or paid leave, perhaps coupled to career milestones and years of service, following models at the University of Virginia and the University of Oregon. The institution should also develop capacity in campus support service units for addressing the specialized professional development needs and opportunities of contingent faculty and staff.

Rewards and Recognitions

Public recognition makes people feel connected and valued. It is a successful way to encourage excellence and improve morale of faculty and staff, who contribute in fundamental and essential ways to the quality and mission of UAlbany. The contributions from contingent labor are absolutely critical to the institution, yet are currently seldom recognized or even acknowledged. In many cases, due to the impermanent nature of their positions, these faculty and staff are not eligible for University awards or work in relative isolation and are simply overlooked.

While the University offers President's Excellence awards for part-time and full-time contingent teaching and for part-time professional service, there are painfully few nominations. This indicates a two-sided problem. The first is that these awards are poorly publicized and those in supervisory roles are not taking full advantage of opportunities to recognize the contributions of their faculty and staff. Secondly, these awards do not indicate a true valuing of the labor of contingent staff and faculty. The University also used to have an Employee Recognition Program, which recognized employee longevity and special contributions with a small token of appreciation at an annual luncheon or reception. The Career Leadership and University Excellence (CLUE) Quality of Life Report of 2011 noted how the discontinuation of this program (last fully in place in 2009) was experienced as both a loss and a snub and strongly recommended its reinstatement, but this recommendation has thus far been ignored.

The Panel calls on the University to promote and support nominations more visibly and energetically for existing awards at both the University at Albany and System (Chancellor's Award) levels. In addition, other types of awards should be considered and created (e.g., support for a Chancellor's award for full-time contingent faculty), and the University should also reinstate (or reinvent) the annual Employee Recognition Program, to provide an occasion to gather for public celebration of contributions, which would also have a community-building function.

Conclusion

"I haven't been asked about faculty meetings in years. I get a good number of e-mails, but face to face is a lot different than a bunch of e-mail." – Focus Group Participant

The Panel appreciates the opportunity to examine the current concerns of UAlbany's contingent and part-time faculty and staff and to provide recommendations to improve the working environment for these essential employees. While some of these recommendations represent bold new steps and expansion of existing programs, many aim simply to provide clarity or to install slight changes to policies and procedures that will make a positive impact on the working conditions for this part of the institution's workforce. In taking these steps, the Panel believes UAlbany will position itself as a national leader in addressing the needs of this growing group of employees within higher education. In adopting an equity and justice approach to these issues, the Panel also seeks to encourage on-going efforts to improve the professional environment for the entire campus community, making adjustments along the way when needed and when opportunities arise. In support of that effort, the Panel recommends that a task force of 8-10 individuals, with representation from the Panel, UUP, and University Senate continue to work with the Provost and senior institutional leaders as they seek to implement these recommendations. We would look forward to the prospect of progress reports as well as to further study of the needs and concerns of this important constituency.

Lastly, the Panel expresses appreciation to President Jones for his recognition of the critical importance of part-time and contingent faculty and staff to UAlbany's program and for his support of our work. We thank Provost Stellar for his leadership as Panel Chair, and we thank the many graduate student instructors and contingent and part-time faculty and staff who took the time to share their stories, perceptions, and suggestions for improvement in focus groups and our survey.

List of all recommendations:

- 1. The University should affirm a value for fair and equitable compensation for contingent faculty and staff.**
- 2. The University should affirm that improved compensation is important for recognizing the essential contributions provided by contingent faculty and staff in delivering a quality, student-centered academic program.**
- 3. The University should adopt a goal of raising the minimum per course rate for part-time lecturers to \$5,000 over the next two to three years.**
- 4. The University should establish a policy that encourages deans and department chairs, in assigning courses, to try to insure eligibility for health benefits to part-time lecturers and staff who desire them (e.g. half-time or two courses per term).**
- 5. The University should work with UUP and System Administration to improve access to health and retirement benefits for part-time faculty and staff.**
- 6. The University should compile and promulgate, in a single place, comprehensive information about eligibility and terms for all benefits available to contingent employees.**

7. **The University should develop and promulgate policies and practices to encourage increased integration of contingent faculty and professional staff in the programs and cultures of departments, schools, and colleges.**
8. **The University should promulgate a policy and framework for providing longer-term employment commitments for contingent faculty and professional staff.**
9. **The University should create career ladders and pathways for progression to permanence for contingent faculty and professional staff.**
10. **The University should establish a set of “best practices” for hiring and supporting contingent faculty and professional staff and should incorporate these practices in a handbook for deans, chairs, directors, and contingent faculty and staff.**
11. **The University should develop and install an effective (i.e., timely, multi-faceted) mechanism for evaluating the performance and contribution of contingent faculty and staff, including both formative and summative components.**
12. **The University should enhance and increase support for the professional development of contingent faculty and professional staff.**
13. **The University should promote existing opportunities and develop additional mechanisms to recognize and reward exemplars of excellence among the part-time and contingent faculty and professional staff.**
14. **The University should establish a Task Force to continue the work of the Panel primarily by assisting the administration in implementing these recommendations.**

Appendix A: Benefits

Appendix B: Summary of Isolation Survey of Contingent Faculty and Professional Staff

Appendix C: Background report on conversion of FTNTT to TT Teaching Professors

Appendix D: Pathway to Permanence: Teaching-Intensive Tenure evaluation and timeline

Appendix A

Benefits for part-time lecturers were summarized in a section of the "Guidelines for the Appointment of Part-time Faculty Members," updated in 2007. This section has been updated below.

Benefits for Part-time Faculty Members

Part-time academic employees who teach two or more semester-length courses in any one semester are eligible for health insurance, including prescription drug coverage and long-term disability insurance. The same eligibility requirements apply for dental and vision care coverage through the UUP Benefit Trust Fund. Employees who do not meet this bi-weekly salary or course load requirement may enroll in health insurance and the dental and vision care program by personally paying the full-share cost of the programs on a direct-pay basis.

Part-time faculty accrue sick leave as follows):

Those Teaching 1 course	Will Receive 1/4 day/month
2 courses	1/2 day/month
3 courses	1 day/month

Academic year employees, including part-time faculty members, are not eligible to accrue vacation or annual leave.

Part-time faculty and staff appointed on a temporary basis may elect to join either the New York State Teachers' Retirement System (TRS) or the New York State Employees' Retirement System (ERS). Individuals appointed on a term basis have the additional option of joining the Optional Retirement Program (ORP). ORP carrier choices are: VOYA, Fidelity, MetLife, TIAA-CREF and VALIC. Participation in a retirement system is optional for part-time employees, and there is no deadline for choosing any of the options. Membership in either ERS, TRS or ORP carries a mandatory employee contribution which is tiered based on salary (prior to computation of federal income tax), which continues for the duration of employment.

Part-time faculty and staff are also eligible to make contributions to tax-deferred (both federal and state income taxes) annuity programs with VOYA, Fidelity, TIAA-CREF, Valic, Metlife and the New York State Deferred Compensation Program. Contributions are subject to IRS limitations.

Like all employees, contingent faculty and staff are covered by and subject to social security withholding.

The University provides no separate life insurance program for its employees; death benefits, however, are available through membership in one of the State retirement systems. UUP provides a \$6,000 term life insurance policy, and additional life insurance can also be purchased through United University Professions.

As members of the UUP bargaining unit, part-time faculty and staff may enroll in one tuition-free course at any SUNY campus (excluding community colleges) each semester on a space-available basis. In addition, all part-time employees are eligible to apply to the State University Employee Waiver Program, which provides up to 50% of tuition for up to six (6) credit hours of instruction for job-related courses taken at a unit of the State University of New York (excluding a community college). These benefits are not transferable to a spouse or family dependent. UUP does, however, provide a \$500 tuition scholarship per semester for dependent children who attend a SUNY campus (excluding community colleges) and maintain a 2.0 GPA.

Part-time faculty and staff may enroll in the State's Dependent Care Advantage Account program, which allows employees to pay up to \$5,000 annually for dependent care expenses on a pre-tax basis. Qualified dependents include children under the age of 13, handicapped children of any age, and adults who live in the employee's home who are incapable of caring for themselves. Employees must enroll within the first 60 days of employment (or within 60 days of a change in family status) or wait until an annual enrollment period in the fall. A medical flexible spending account is available for employees to set aside up to \$2,550 on a pre-tax basis for medical and dental expenses not covered by health insurance.

All New York State employees are paid on a two-week lag basis. Under this system, new employees must wait up to four weeks for their first paycheck. Most new fall academic employees will receive their first paycheck during the third week of September. All employees separating from the State payroll receive their final paycheck two weeks after their appointments end, at the salary rate at the time of separation. University employees may elect to have their paychecks automatically deposited via electronic funds transfer with any financial institution that is a member of the American Automated Clearing House.

All employees in the UUP bargaining unit are required to pay union dues or an agency shop fee. The fee is paid through payroll deduction, whether or not the employee elects to be a member of the union. The fee is a percentage of the faculty member's salary.

UAlbany Contingent Faculty & Staff Survey Results

May 27, 2015

INTRODUCTION

The UAlbany Contingent Faculty & Staff Survey is designed to measure different degrees and dimensions of workplace isolation. The construction of the survey items is informed by the following research.

The Influences of Gender, Race and Ethnicity on Workplace Experiences of Institutional and Social Isolation: An Exploratory Study of University Faculty by Janice Witt Smith and Toni Calasanti. *Sociological Spectrum*, 25:307-334, 2005.

Workplace Isolation: Exploring the Construct and Its Measurement by Greg. W. Marshall, Charles E. Michaels, and Jay P. Mulki. *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 24(3): 195-223 (March 2007)

Preliminary Development Of An Alternative Measure of Isolation: The Construct of Institutional Isolation by Janice Witt Smith. *Psychological Reports*, 1988, 82, 1323-1330.

The research described in these articles suggests that workplace isolation is a two-dimensional construct. One dimension relates to a sense of social/interactional connectedness in the workplace; the other relates to a sense of institutional/organizational membership. The Contingent Faculty & Staff survey items attempt to tap into these two dimensions. Several of the survey items are taken directly (or with some modification) from the item pools reported in these studies. Other items are original, devised by members of the Workplace Isolation Sub-Committee.

There are 20 items in all. This item total is consistent with the survey lengths reported in the research above. (For example, Witt and Calasanti use a 24-item questionnaire, while Marshal, Michaels and Mulki use a 12-item questionnaire). In terms of measurement, the current survey consists of five point Likert items. The response options are (in order): strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree.

The Contingent Faculty and Staff survey also includes requests for demographic information. The demographic categories surveyed permit sub-group analyses.

RESULTS

Survey results for 5 sub-groups are reported: part-time contingent faculty (PTF), full-time contingent faculty (PTF), graduate student teachers (GRD), full-time contingent staff (FTS), and part-time contingent staff (PTS). The number of survey respondents for each group varied. The frequencies are: part-time contingent faculty (98); full-time contingent faculty (37); graduate-student teachers (24); full-time contingent staff (18); part-time contingent staff (36).

Results are presented in eight tables. Tables 1-4 report sub-group responses to individual items on a percentage basis. To briefly recapitulate, the item response options were strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. To simplify the analysis of the percentage data, the "strongly agree" and "agree" responses were collapsed into a single category designated in tables 1-4 as STRA/AGREE, and the "strongly disagree" and "disagree" responses were collapsed into a single category designated as STRD/DISAGREE.

Tables 5-8 report sub-group means for the twenty survey items. Given the numerical values assigned to the response options for each item - strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), strongly agree (5) - the higher the mean for a particular item, the higher the degree of agreement with that item.

Survey items are distributed across the eight tables according to the following organizational scheme:

Tables 1 & 5 list items describing interactions with the department chair.

Tables 2 & 6 list items describing social based interactions with department colleagues.

Tables 3 & 7 list items describing work related interactions with department colleagues.

Tables 4 & 8 list items describing work relevant feeling and identity issues.

Table 1 - Department Chair Related Item Percentages

1. My department chair treats me fairly.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	71.4	8.2	20.4
FTF	72.9	8.1	18.9
GRD	70.8	12.5	16.7
FTS	68.4	10.6	21.1
PTS	77.2	5.6	16.7

2. I feel welcome to provide feedback to my chair when he/she communicates with me about work related matters.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	61.4	20.8	17.7
FTF	73.0	18.9	8.1
GRD	41.7	33.4	25.0
FTS	57.9	26.8	15.8
PTS	80.6	13.9	5.6

3. I believe my department chair is concerned about my well-being.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	57.2	20.4	22.4
FTF	67.5	16.2	16.2
GRD	54.2	20.8	25.0
FTS	63.2	26.3	10.5
PTS	66.7	6.7	16.7

4. I have a good sense of what my chair thinks about my contributions to the department.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	50.0	29.6	20.4
FTF	48.6	16.2	35.1
GRD	37.5	20.8	41.7
FTS	57.9	31.6	10.5
PTS	72.2	19.5	8.3

5. My chair does a good job of getting information to me about departmental news.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	42.8	30.6	26.5
FTF	56.7	21.6	21.6
GRD	45.8	20.9	33.3
FTS	63.2	31.6	5.3
PTS	63.9	13.9	22.2

Table 2 - Department Colleague Related Item (SOCIAL) Percentages

6. I have at least one departmental colleague whom I regard as a friend

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	69.4	15.3	15.3
FTF	86.5	0	13.5
GRD	87.5	4.2	8.3
FTS	72.2	22.2	5.6
PTS	80.5	8.4	11.1

7. I engage in informal chats with departmental colleagues.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	70.3	18.4	20.4
FTF	75.6	8.1	16.2
GRD	87.5	12.4	0
FTS	72.2	5.6	22.2
PTS	88.8	5.6	5.6

8. I feel I can speak freely and honestly to my departmental colleagues.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	47.0	23.4	29.6
FTF	45.9	29.7	24.3
GRD	54.2	37.5	8.3
FTS	38.9	33.3	27.8
PTS	69.4	19.4	11.1

9. I am usually invited to departmental social functions that occur off campus.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	39.2	42.3	18.6
FTF	67.5	8.1	24.3
GRD	35.5	41.7	20.8
FTS	52.6	15.8	31.6
PTS	48.6	22.9	28.6

10. My departmental colleagues take a personal interest in me.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	32.6	39.8	27.6
FTF	48.6	27.0	24.3
GRD	54.2	20.9	25.0
FTS	38.9	11.2	50.0
PTS	66.8	13.9	19.4

Table 3 - Department Colleague Related Item (WORK) Percentages

11. I have departmental colleagues I can talk to about problems at work.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	64.3	16.4	19.4
FTF	78.3	13.5	8.1
GRD	87.5	16.7	4.2
FTS	50.0	22.3	27.8
PTS	77.8	16.7	5.6

12. My opinion is sought about areas in which I have experience or expertise.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	52.0	32.7	15.3
FTF	67.5	18.9	13.5
GRD	50.0	25.0	25.0
FTS	66.7	22.3	11.1
PTS	72.3	19.5	8.3

13. I feel like I am a valued member of a departmental team.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	52.0	31.7	16.3
FTF	62.1	18.9	18.9
GRD	50.0	33.3	16.7
FTS	50.0	38.9	11.1
PTS	75.0	19.4	5.6

14. My departmental colleagues recognize the work contributions I make.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	43.3	27.8	28.9
FTF	48.6	24.3	27.0
GRD	37.5	33.5	29.2
FTS	55.6	11.1	33.3
PTS	69.5	16.7	13.9

15. My departmental colleagues mostly keep to themselves.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	53.6	21.7	24.7
FTF	35.1	48.6	16.2
GRD	41.7	25.0	33.3
FTS	22.3	44.4	33.3
PTS	13.9	61.1	25.0

16. I feel welcome to participate in departmental faculty meetings.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	16.5	51.5	32.0
FTF	67.5	21.6	10.8
GRD	20.9	66.6	12.5
FTS	36.8	31.6	31.6
PTS	58.3	19.4	22.2

Table 4 - Feelings & Identity Item Percentages

17. I am proud to tell other people that I am a member of my department.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	71.4	6.1	22.4
FTF	70.2	18.9	10.8
GRD	70.9	12.5	16.7
FTS	68.4	10.6	21.1
PTS	80.5	2.8	16.7

18. I identify with the culture of my department.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	50.5	22.1	27.4
FTF	62.1	13.5	24.3
GRD	54.2	20.9	25.0
FTS	47.4	15.8	36.8
PTS	63.9	16.7	19.4

19. I feel I am invisible to my department.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	38.2	41.3	20.6
FTF	24.3	56.7	18.9
GRD	29.2	45.8	25.0
FTS	23.5	35.3	41.2
PTS	19.5	63.9	16.7

20. I often feel alone at work.

	STRA/AGREE	STRD/DISAGREE	NEUTRAL
PTF	40.2	37.1	22.7
FTF	27.0	48.6	24.3
GRD	29.1	45.8	25.0
FTS	22.2	61.1	16.7
PTS	19.4	61.1	19.4

Table 5 - Department Chair Related Item Means

1. My department chair treats me fairly.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.90
FTF	4.11
GRD	3.96
FTS	3.95
PTS	4.14

2. I feel welcome to provide feedback to my chair when he/she communicates with me about work related matters.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.54
FTF	3.68
GRD	3.17
FTS	3.32
PTS	3.92

3. I believe my department chair is concerned about my well-being.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.53
FTF	3.92
GRD	3.58
FTS	3.63
PTS	3.72

4. I have a good sense of what my chair thinks about my contributions to the department.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.19
FTF	3.51
GRD	3.17
FTS	3.21
PTS	3.72

5. My chair does a good job of getting information to me about departmental news.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.12
FTF	3.46
GRD	3.33
FTS	3.37
PTS	3.69

Table 6 - Department Colleague Related Item (SOCIAL) Means

6. I have at least one departmental colleague whom I regard as a friend

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.76
FTF	4.19
GRD	4.25
FTS	3.89
PTS	4.14

7. I engage in informal chats with departmental colleagues.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.53
FTF	4.00
GRD	3.96
FTS	3.89
PTS	4.22

8. I feel I can speak freely and honestly to my departmental colleagues.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.36
FTF	3.24
GRD	3.25
FTS	3.06
PTS	3.67

9. I am usually invited to departmental social functions that occur off campus.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	2.92
FTF	3.81
GRD	2.83
FTS	3.53
PTS	3.40

10. My departmental colleagues take a personal interest in me.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	2.90
FTF	3.24
GRD	3.42
FTS	3.33
PTS	3.67

Table 7 - Department Colleague Related Item (WORK) Means

11. I have departmental colleagues I can talk to about problems at work.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.60
FTF	3.97
GRD	3.92
FTS	3.39
PTS	4.08

12. My opinion is sought about areas in which I have experience or expertise.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.65
FTF	3.68
GRD	3.25
FTS	3.44
PTS	3.69

13. I feel like I am a valued member of a departmental team.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.24
FTF	3.70
GRD	3.25
FTS	3.22
PTS	3.72

14. My departmental colleagues recognize the work contributions I make.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.14
FTF	3.35
GRD	3.13
FTS	3.39
PTS	3.78

15. My departmental colleagues mostly keep to themselves.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.40
FTF	2.97
GRD	3.21
FTS	2.83
PTS	2.39

16. I feel welcome to participate in departmental faculty meetings.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	2.44
FTF	3.62
GRD	2.25
FTS	3.11
PTS	3.25

Table 8 - Feelings & Identity Item Means

17. I am proud to tell other people that I am a member of my department.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.95
FTF	3.78
GRD	3.71
FTS	3.79
PTS	4.11

18. I identify with the culture of my department.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	3.38
FTF	3.76
GRD	3.54
FTS	3.53
PTS	4.03

19. I feel I am invisible to my department.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	2.90
FTF	2.54
GRD	2.71
FTS	2.71
PTS	2.28

20. I often feel alone at work.

	<u>MEAN</u>
PTF	2.82
FTF	2.65
GRD	2.71
FTS	2.33
PTS	2.31

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The discussion below divides respondent sub-groups into two broad categories: *Teaching Contingents* (comprising full-time contingent faculty, part-time contingent faculty and graduate student teachers), and *Staff Contingents* (full-time professional contingent staff and part-time professional contingent staff). The discussion of these groups' item responses is based on the data reported in Tables 1-4. These tables report the relative frequency with which respondents selected different item response categories. As such they provide more information about how sub-groups evaluated different items than do the item means reported in Tables 5-8. This is not to say that item means lack analytical value. The item means in this study provide a quickly readable "snapshot" of central response tendencies per item (for each group), as well as a way of readily discerning differences between groups for the various items. Accordingly, item means are included in this report so as to afford readers an additional purchase on the survey results discussed below.

Teaching Contingents

Two very broad trends appear in the data for the three groups of teaching contingents. First, all 3 groups are similar in offering mixed reviews of their departments in respect of the issue of workplace isolation. The reviews are mixed in the following sense: while an item-by-item analysis indicates that a substantial percentage of respondents offer favorable evaluations of their departments with respect to the issues the various items address, those response percentages that indicate positive departmental regard are tempered by response percentages that fall within the non-favorable to neutral range. Put differently, there is sufficient response variability across items to suggest ample room for improvement in how departments manage their relationships with contingent teaching faculty.

The second broad trend relates to a tendency for full-time contingent faculty to express higher levels of satisfaction with departmental life than part-time and graduate student contingent faculty. This trend notwithstanding, the data also reveal occasional (and interesting) divergences from the general tendency for higher levels of satisfaction to be expressed by full-time contingents. A closer analysis of the similarities and differences in how full-time and part-time contingents responded to the survey items follows.

Department Chair Items

With the exception of one item, noticeable differences can be found between full-time contingent faculty and either or both part-time groups with respect to their department chair item evaluations. The exception is item 1 (*My department chair treats me fairly*). All three contingent groups displayed a high percentage (70.8%-72.9%) of agreement with this item, with negligible differences between the groups. The uniformly high

evaluations of all three groups with respect to perceived department chair fairness is one of the brightest spots in the teaching contingents part of the survey. While what "fairness" means is open to interpretation, it probably at least suggests that department chairs are seen by contingent teaching faculty as acting toward them in good faith, and with a lack of favoritism toward others.

The remaining four items in this cluster display much less uniformity of response. For three of the items (2, 3 & 5), there is a clear separation between the full-time contingent group on the one hand, and both part-time groups on the other. Responses to these three items indicate that full-time contingents evaluate chairs more favorably than part-time or graduate contingents with respect to chair feedback about work related matters; perceived concern about their well being; and the chair's effectiveness in delivering information about departmental issues. These three items either explicitly or implicitly speak to matters of chair-faculty communication, and the upshot of the data is that full-time contingents find the flow of that communication more satisfying than their part-time colleagues.

The final item in this cluster (#4) asks whether faculty members have a "good sense" of what their chair thinks about their contributions to the department. For full-time and part-time faculty, affirmation that they have a "good sense" of what their chair thinks comes in at 50% and 48.6% respectively; while for graduate student teachers, the level of affirmation is a weak 37.5%. Of note here is that for all 3 groups, 50% or more of the respondents do not affirm that they have a good sense of what their chair thinks of their contributions - and that the least affirming group in that regard are the graduate student teachers.

Department Colleague Items (SOCIAL)

This item cluster is interesting for the way in which it shows the most mixed pattern of results. The items in this cluster speak to matters of social connectedness with departmental colleagues. The response pattern that is most in keeping with the general tendency of full-time contingents to report the most hospitable workplace environment is that found for item 9 (*I am usually invited to departmental social functions that occur off campus*). The differences found for this item are sharp and large - 67.5% of full-time contingents report agreement with it, compared to 39.2% and 35.5 % of part-time faculty and graduate student teachers (respectively). These results show an unsurprising difference in who is seen, and not seen, as worthy of inclusion in departmental social gatherings that occur away from school.

With regard to the remaining items, what is most striking is the fact that the *graduate student teacher group* reports itself to be the *most satisfied* of the three contingent teaching groups with its level of departmental social engagement. Compared to both full-time and part-time contingent faculty, graduate student teachers are most affirming of the fact that they have a departmental friend (87.5%); that they engage in informal chats with colleagues (87.5%); that they can speak freely and honestly with colleagues (54.2%); and that departmental colleagues take a personal interest in them (54.2%). The group with whom the graduate student teachers most sharply differ are the part-time faculty, who are

the *least affirming* of the three teacher groups with respect to matters of friend availability (69.4%), chats (70.3%), and feeling colleagues take a personal interest in them (32.6%).

It is interesting to speculate as to why - item 9 excepted - these data indicate that graduate student teachers report a more positive social interactional experience of their departments than do either part-time or full-time faculty. One possibility may be the existence of more socially supportive graduate student communities across departments. Insofar as graduate student contingents count fellow graduate student teachers who are part of their degree program cohort as "departmental colleagues" - fellow students with whom they have taken courses, worked with on research or class projects, and perhaps socialized with outside of school - this may indicate a sense of membership in a familiar and friendly community of fellow students that would allow for the graduate student contingent group to respond more affirmatively to the items in this cluster than do part-time or full-time faculty contingents.

Department Colleague Items (WORK)

The six items in this cluster also deal with aspects of departmental colleague interaction, but with a focus on work specific aspects of that interaction. The response patterns tend to mirror (with one exception) those found for the Department Chair items. Specifically, full-time contingents tend to report levels of satisfaction that are notably higher than those reported by part-time or graduate student contingents (with the latter two groups being roughly equivalent in the satisfaction levels they report across various items). The work related dimensions with regard to which full-time contingents are more satisfied relate to whether they feel: their opinions are sought out (#12); they are valued members of a departmental team (#13); their work contributions are recognized (#14); they have contact with colleagues (#15); they are welcome to participate in departmental faculty meetings (#16). The consistently stronger pattern of affirmative responses to these items on the part of full-time contingents supports the view that they experience less workplace isolation along the lines indicated by these items than do part-time faculty and graduate student teachers.

The one exception to this pattern occurs for item 11 (*I have departmental colleagues I can talk to about problems at work.*) The response pattern here is more like that described for the Department Colleague Items (Social) cluster. Graduate student teachers report the highest level of agreement with this item at 87.5%, followed by full-time faculty at 78.3% and part-time faculty at 64.3%. The strong affirmative response to this item may be explained in part by what has been heretofore proposed - that graduate student teachers see as interactionally available department colleagues who are fellow graduate students to whom they can comfortably air work related troubles or problems. It may also be the case that graduate students feel more comfortable seeking out faculty members they regard as mentors or advisers. Academic norms of advice seeking along student-teacher lines would perhaps make graduate students feel more at ease about seeking help with problems than might a full-time or part-time faculty member. Incumbents of the latter groups might feel that where problems arise, they should address those problems on their own.

Feelings & Identity Terms

The remaining four items in the survey show a blend of response patterns. The response to item 17 (*I am proud to tell other people that I am a member of my department*) is interesting for the way in which it closely mirrors the response to item 1. All 3 contingent teaching groups show strong affirmation (70.2%-71.4%) of this item, with little difference between them. As is the case for item 1, the response to this item is another bright spot in the survey.

The remaining three items display the familiar pattern of full-time faculty rating the items more favorably than either both or one of the part-time contingent groups. Thus, full-time faculty more strongly identify with department culture (#18), and feel themselves to be more visible within their departments (#19) than part-time faculty and graduate student-teachers; and they feel less alone at work (#20) than part-time faculty (but about the same as graduate student teachers on this item).

Staff Contingents

The foregoing analysis of teaching contingent survey results suggests a trend in the direction of full-time faculty reporting less workplace isolation than their part-time peers, albeit with exceptions to this trend, especially among graduate student teachers. The latter group was found for some items to report a more positive workplace experience than their full-time and part-time colleagues, perhaps because of workplace social dynamics that may uniquely apply to members of this group. While graduate student faculty are university teachers, they are at the same time students, and the latter status may provide them with peer interactional resources that potentially mitigate some of the factors that create a more isolating environment for part-time faculty.

Given the trend described above for contingent teaching faculty, it might be expected that a similar trend would be found for contingent professional staff. Certainly it is plausible to assume that insofar as UAlbany professional employees enjoy full-time status, they are likely to be more fully participative in their departmental workflows, and this in turn might effect a greater sense of connectedness to their workplace. Surprisingly, the survey results show that this is decidedly not the case. Across all four clusters of survey items - department chair related items, department colleague (social) items, department colleague (work) items, and feelings and identity (items) - it is the *part-time* professional staff members who consistently report a more satisfying experience of their workplace than their full-time colleagues. There is only one item (#9 - *I am usually invited to departmental social functions that occur off campus*) out of the twenty items in the survey for which full-time staff offer a more affirmative response than part-time staff. For the remaining 19 items, part-time faculty display responses that are the same as (item #20 only) or more strongly affirmative than (18 out of 20 items) their full-time colleagues.

With respect to the five department chair items, part-time staff show higher levels of positive regard for their chair across the board. For two of the items (*I believe my*

department chair is concerned about my well being and *My chair does a good job of getting information to me about departmental issues*) the differences in chair evaluation are relatively small. For the remaining three items in this cluster (1, 2, and 4) the differences are moderate to large. Noticeably more so than their full-time counterparts, part-time staff feel their chairs treat them fairly, welcome their work related feedback, and communicate a good sense of part-time staff members' contributions to their departments.

The next two item clusters relate to social (5 items) and work (6 items) related interactions with departmental colleagues. There is one item (#9) within these two clusters that provides the only example of full-time staff members expressing a slightly stronger indication of connectedness with colleagues. By a 4% margin (52.6 vs. 48.6 %) full-time staff more strongly agree than do their part-time counterparts that they are invited to social functions that occur off campus. For the remaining 10 items it is the part-time staff who affirm a stronger (sometimes dramatically so) degree of connectedness with their colleagues. Among the items that especially stand out in these groups are items 8 (*I feel I can speak freely and honestly to my departmental colleagues*), 10 (*My departmental colleagues take a personal interest in me*), 11 (*I have departmental colleagues I can talk to about problems at work*) and 13 (*I feel like I am a valued member of a departmental team*). The differences between part-time and full-time faculty for these items are large - greater than 25% in the direction of part-time faculty offering a more positive evaluation (i.e., feeling they can speak freely and honestly, that they feel like a valued member of a departmental team, and so forth). The story told in total by responses to items 6-16 is that part-time staff find their relations with departmental colleagues to be noticeably more satisfying than do their full-time staff counterparts.

For the remaining four "feelings and identity" items, there is one large difference (part-time staff disagree that they are "invisible" to their departments by a 63.9% to 35.3% margin). For another, there is an equivalent response percentage (61% of both full-time and part-time staff disagree that they feel alone at work). For the remaining two items (treating issues of departmental pride and identification), part-time staff show moderate degrees of difference, in terms of greater expressed pride and identification, from full-time staff.

How might one explain the fact that the staff contingent results show a response pattern that is the inverse of that found for the teaching contingents? One thought that comes to mind is that the functions performed by part-time professional staff may collectively be of a sort that make professional peer interactions not only more likely, but more necessary. Consider, for example, that the work assignments of *teaching* contingents (whether full-time or part-time) require them to prepare lectures, go to a classroom and deliver those lectures, and then return to a private space (office or home) to grade assignments, write exams, answer e-mail, and the like. None of these activities require a significant degree of involvement with colleagues. By contrast, part-time *professional* staff members - whether they are working in athletics, admissions, student success, residential life, advising, the offices of undergraduate or graduate education, to name

some possible sites of university staff employment - may be more likely to find themselves working as part of a team and/or under the supervision/guidance of a full-time professional. In short, the work of the part-time contingent may be more collaboratively and/or interactionally involving, and as such allow for the possibility of feeling connected to colleagues.

If this is possibly the case, it invites the following question: why is there not a similar response pattern for full-time professional contingents? Since both full-time and part-time professionals are working in the same kind of (presumptively) collaborative environment, should not full-time professionals express the same level of affirmation of colleague/chair relationships as that found for part-time professionals? Why are the differences between the two professional groups for many of the items so large?

Two possible reasons come to mind. First, insofar as full-time professionals act in a supervisory/mentoring role toward their part-time subordinates, the latter may find the availability of such professionals as sources of advice a routine feature of their workplace environments. By contrast, full-time professionals may feel that what they are able to make available to part-time professionals in the way of supportive communication is not reciprocally provided to themselves by their own superiors. Relatedly, while part-time professionals may feel they can turn to each other for support (for reasons that go back to feeling they are part of a team), full-time professionals may be asked to function in more solitary executive roles that make them less team affiliated (at least with others occupying the same job status position as themselves) than those who have similar work role definitions and thus without a supportive group to whom they can turn.

Appendix C:

Background report on conversion of FTNTT to TT Teaching Professors

Why TT Teaching Professors and not simply longer contracts or “Evergreen” contracts?

Multi-year contracts and better salaries, while an improvement over some of the conditions of shorter term contingent appointments, represent limited conceptions of academic citizenship and service, and *do not insure the academic freedom that is absolutely necessary for:*

- meaningful curricular and pedagogical innovation
- participation in shared governance
- full contribution to institutional service at department, school/college, and university levels
-

Why “Teaching Professors” not “Instructors”?

The proposed names of ranks follow models at other institutions such as the University of Colorado Denver, and offer job titles (ranks) commensurate with level and type of professional work, and allow faculty to be more recognizable in a wide variety of professional circles as being full-time, permanent (or potentially permanent), professionally credentialed and professionally reviewed.

Won't this create a two-tier system of faculty?

Yes and no. A two- (or even three-) tier system is already in place. This would stabilize it, establishing meaningful peer review, substantial job security, and academic freedom, thus insuring that students have qualified professors with appropriate professional credentials who can dedicate their attention to their classroom and student mentoring work, and not be distracted by the unease of unstable employment status. The distinction in title between Assistant/Associate *Teaching* Professor and Assistant/Associate Professor is not necessary if taking into account the appointment of University librarians as assistant/associate professors, for example, but could be used in the event that the University maintained a desire to distinguish its more research-oriented faculty from its teaching faculty.

Why require a terminal degree?

In general, students deserve to be taught by those who hold professional credentials in their fields and who earn their positions through a national, competitive application and review process. This move to requiring a terminal degree resists the de-professionalization of the academic profession. It also reinforces the separation of graduate education and professional employment; while graduate education should certainly include pedagogical training and

classroom experience, graduate students should not be lured into a cycle of contracts with heavy teaching loads that hinder progress to degree.

List of Resources:

Bérubé, Michael. "New Model of Tenure." [argument for establishing teaching-intensive tenure stream – recommended first reading], *Inside Higher Ed* 10 March 2015.

<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2015/03/10/essay-calling-new-teaching-oriented-model-tenure>

--- and Jennifer Ruth. *The Humanities, Higher Education and Academic Freedom: Three Necessary Arguments* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). [argument for establishing teaching-intensive tenure stream, including detailed appendix for carrying out conversion of existing NTT appointments] <http://www.palgrave.com/page/detail/the-humanities-higher-education-and-academic-freedom-michael-b%E9rub%E9/?K=9781137506108>

...cont'd →

Eron, Don; and Suzanne Hudson. "Frequently Asked Questions About Instructor Tenure." University of Colorado at Boulder, 2007. <http://www.cu-aaup.org/documents-3/frequently-asked-questions-about-instructor-tenure/>

Flaherty, Colleen. "New Career Path?" [on Bérubé & Ruth's book] *Inside Higher Ed* 15 May 2015. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/05/15/new-book-proposes-teaching-intensive-tenure-track-model-address-real-crisis>

Hudson, Suzanne. "Academic Freedom and Instructor Tenure: You Can't Have One Without the Other." University of Colorado at Boulder, 2007. <http://www.cu-aaup.org/documents-3/academic-freedom-and-instructor-tenure/>

Also of interest:

Beaky, Lenore B., et al. "The Inclusion in Governance of Faculty Members Holding Contingent Appointments." [AAUP committee report referred to by Bérubé & Bérubé & Ruth] *Academe*. Jul/Aug2013, Vol. 99 Issue 4, p77-89.

<http://libproxy.albany.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&AN=89862465&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Appendix D

Pathway to Permanence: Teaching-Intensive Tenure evaluation and timeline

Current FTNTT teaching-intensive positions the need for which is ongoing for the foreseeable future should be converted to tenurable positions with the new rank titles outlined below. Full-Time Lecturers should henceforth be hired competitively and be expected to hold a terminal degree in their disciplines.¹

Areas of evaluation:

1. Teaching (65%)
2. Institutional and Professional Service (15%-25%)
3. Scholarship, Creative, and Professional Achievement (10%-20%)

This establishes teaching as the clear priority; institutional service as a requirement, and some amount of ongoing intellectual/creative/professional activity as a requirement, with room for those with active research agendas to have that contribution to the program's vitality weighed somewhat more heavily within the established ranges. In consultation with the Department/Program Chair, candidates may decide on the appropriate weighting of each area within this range of weights.

A notional sequence:

For those hired on full-time lecturer contracts:

- **Annual review** based on at least 3 modes of evaluation², at least one of which is chosen by the faculty member from an agreed-upon list.
- **Pretenure review** after 3 years as FT Lecturer – potential for promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor in 4th year, with 3 –year contract and \$xxxx salary increase.

¹ Long-serving contingent faculty may be “grandfathered in,” but going forward, competitive hiring and the requirement of terminal degrees should be the norm. Graduate students would not be eligible for FT contracts; in the long run, this, along with adequate graduate funding, should encourage progress to degree, instead of luring them into a cycle that hinders it.

² Modes of evaluation will be both formative and summative, designed to encourage growth and excellence in teaching. They should include 1. SIRFs every semester, 2. Peer Observations of classroom teaching and review of course materials at least once a year, and 3. one additional mode, different each year in a 3-year sequence, to be chosen by the faculty member, from among the following: ITLAL mid-term surveys accompanied by faculty reflective narrative of actual and planned improvements to curriculum and pedagogy based thereupon; preparation of a detailed and well-illustrated Statement of Teaching Philosophy; submission of a video-recording of classroom session accompanied by self-evaluation and plan for improvement; report of significant work with an ITLAL consultant, including changes made and an evaluation of their success.

- **Tenure review** 3 years after promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor, with a minimum of 6 years FT service – if successful, permanent appointment as Associate Teaching Professor, with \$xxxx salary increase.
- **Post-Tenure Review every 3 years after promotion to ATP.**