



**UNIVERSITY SENATE  
Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee**

**Report and Recommendations on the Contingent Faculty Role in Shared Governance**

**1. THE CHARGE**

The charge shown below, issued to the Structure and Governance Committee, requests input from the Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee (FAPC).

*S-0701 Part-time and Full-time Non-tenure-track Faculty Role in Shared Governance: Examine, with input from the Senate's Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee, the issue of all part-time, as well as full-time non-tenure-track, faculty and their role in shared governance at all levels throughout Rutgers, particularly as it relates to the increasing academic reliance on those faculty. Research best practices and make recommendations regarding how the role and participation of those faculty in University decision-making can better reflect their teaching/research responsibilities and better inform the educational process.*

**2. SUMMARY**

The FAPC was asked to review governance issues associated with contingent faculty (part-time and full-time non-tenure track faculty) and to provide appropriate recommendations as input to the Structure and Governance Committee (SGC), to which charge S-0701 has been formally issued. Having done so, the FAPC recommends the following actions to the SGC:

- The number of senators representing the contingent faculty groups should be increased to better articulate the issues and perspectives of contingent faculty at the University Senate. The FAPC leaves it to the SGC to determine how many additional senators are sufficient to meet this need. (See section 3.I.)
- Department or unit by-laws should be revised to reflect a mechanism for bestowing and ensuring voting opportunities for faculty for whom there is rank equivalence in an effort to minimize disenfranchisement of full-time, non-tenure track faculty. (See section 3.II.a.)
- Part-time contingent faculty should have an increased “voice,” if not a vote, at the department/unit level on issues that pertain directly to their academic interests. This can be achieved through the development of “Best Practices” devised to solicit input from contingent faculty on issues of curriculum development and delivery. (See section 3.II.b.)

**3. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee met and discussed the charge during their meeting of 1/19/07 with follow-up via e-mail. In addition, a portion of this charge (voting rights at the Senate level) was previously discussed during deliberations of *Charge S-0502, Status of Full-time, Non-tenure-track, Non-clinical Faculty*.

3.I. **Senate representation:** Currently, contingent faculty (full- and part-time) comprise 49% of faculty appointments (not counting TAs and GAs) at both Rutgers New Brunswick and Rutgers Newark<sup>1</sup>, respectively (AAUP Contingent Faculty Index, 2006, Appendix I). These faculty are represented by only three senators, one from each campus. The FAPC feels that this number is insufficient to permit this community to articulate their issues and perspectives, especially since these two groups are responsible for teaching a significant portion of the undergraduate courses offered at Rutgers.

**Recommendation:** The number of senators representing the contingent faculty groups should be increased to better articulate the issues and perspectives of contingent faculty at the University Senate. The FAPC leaves it to the SGC to determine how many additional senators are sufficient to meet this need.

### 3.II. **Voting rights at the departmental/unit level.**

3.II.a. *Full-time, non-tenure track faculty.* University governance rights for full-time, non-tenure track (NTT) faculty at the department or unit level vary widely. Regulation 3.3.2 on rank equivalencies<sup>2</sup>, paraphrased, states that there is rank equivalence among instructional, research, clinical, extension and library faculty of the University. Although faculty in annual appointments are not eligible for tenure, rank equivalence means that salary, academic rights and responsibilities, standards and procedures for appointment and promotion, and guarantees of academic freedom and due process are the same for these faculty as for faculty in tenure-eligible lines.

At the department or unit level, voting rights for non tenure-eligible positions within departments are specified in department by-laws. It is apparent that voting rights for NTT faculty differ from unit to unit. For example, within the History department, there is only one representative from each project (the Thomas A. Edison Papers and the Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony) who is eligible to vote on departmental matters. In the Physics & Astronomy Department, research and teaching annuals at a rank equivalent to assistant professor or higher are voting members of the department on such things as undergraduate issues, election of members to the PEC, etc.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data from Rutgers Camden is not available.

<sup>2</sup> “A. Rank Equivalencies. There is rank equivalence among instructional, research, clinical, extension and library faculty of the University. Except that clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure, rank equivalence means equivalence in salary, equivalence in tenure, equivalence in academic rights and responsibilities, comparable standards and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion and granting of tenure, and guarantees of academic freedom and due process.”

[http://policies.rutgers.edu/PDF/Section60/60\\_5/60.5.2.pdf](http://policies.rutgers.edu/PDF/Section60/60_5/60.5.2.pdf)

**Recommendation for full-time, non-tenure track faculty:** Department or unit by-laws should be revised to reflect a mechanism for bestowing and ensuring voting opportunities for faculty for whom there is rank equivalence in an effort to minimize disenfranchisement of full-time, non-tenure track faculty.

- 3.II.b. *Part-time faculty (PTLs):* At this time, the FAPC has not investigated to what degree governance rights at the local level are enjoyed by part-time, contingent faculty at Rutgers University. During FAPC deliberations, however, concerns were raised that “voting rights” bestowed to PTLs in certain departments would overwhelm the voice of tenure-track faculty, perhaps not in the best, long-term interest of the department. In addition, the reappointment of individuals from this group of faculty depends on certain members of their unit; thus voting should take place in a way that PTLs or non-tenured faculty do not feel jeopardized by their vote.

Although departments can bestow certain rights to faculty through their by-laws, a “Best Practice” can be drafted as a way to give PTLs a voice in issues that pertain directly to their academic interests. For example, the committee recommends the development of an undergraduate program faculty similar to that which already exists in the graduate program. All faculty participating in such an undergraduate program, including PTLs, would have a voice on issues that pertain directly to their academic interests. This would apply to specific courses as well as to larger issues not tied to specific curricula.

**Recommendation for PTLs:** Part-time contingent faculty should have an increased “voice,” if not a vote, at the department/unit level on issues that pertain directly to their academic interests. This can be achieved through the development of “Best Practices” devised to solicit input from contingent faculty on issues of curriculum development and delivery.

**Faculty Affairs and Personnel Committee, 2006-2007**

*Gould, Ann, Cook (F), Co-Chair, Executive Committee Liaison*

*Panayotatos, Paul, GS-NB (F), Co-Chair*

*Alley, Winston, Pharmacy (S)*

*Barbarese, Joseph, GS-C (F)*

*Boylan, Edward, FAS-N (F)*

*Carbone, Kristin, GSAPP (S)*

*Coit, David, Engineering (F)*

*Covey, Lori, FAS-NB (F)*

*Dennis, Roger, Camden Provost (A)*

*Deutsch, Stuart, Law-Newark Dean (A)*

*Finegold, David, SMLR Dean (A) - Administrative Liaison*

*Gonzalez-Palmer, Barbara, MGSA (F)*

*Hart, Joseph, MGSA (F)*

*Hyman, Ronald, GSE (F)*  
*Leath, Paul, At-Large NB (F)*  
*Lehne, Richard, FAS-NB (F)*  
*Lipman, Jarrett, MGSA (S)*  
*Markert, Joseph, PTL-NB (F)*  
*Puniello, Francoise, Douglass (F)*  
*Rabinowitz, Samuel, SB-C (F)*  
*Schein, Louisa, FAS-NB (F)*  
*Schock, Kurt, NCAS (F)*  
*Simmons, Peter, Law-N (F)*  
*Thompson, Karen, PTL-NB (F)*  
*Wagner, Mary, Pharmacy (F)*

## APPENDIX I: Relevant Documents

AAUP Contingent Faculty Index, 2006. Consequences: An increasingly contingent faculty.

<http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/F05FF88E-B2A8-4052-8373-AF0FDAE060AC/0/ConsequencesAnIncreasinglyContingentFaculty.pdf>

- P. 6      **The Nature of Contingent Faculty Appointments:** Contingent faculty as discussed here include several categories of university teachers and researchers: part-time faculty; full-time term faculty outside tenure lines; graduate student employees; and post-doctoral fellows. The central problem of contingent academics is not the people who fill these positions, as they are most often able teachers and scholars forced into these positions by the structure of academic employment. The problem lies in the nature of contingent work, its lack of support structures and the constraints on academic freedom for faculty in these positions.
- P. 9      Part-time faculty also find themselves generally excluded from participation in broader departmental or institutional governance. They do not have a say in hiring or promotion decisions regarding faculty colleagues, they do not participate in decision-making on academic issues, and they are not represented in institutional decision-making bodies. The few institutions that include part-time faculty in governance—most often unionized campuses—represent the exception. That part-time faculty do not participate in governance—not even in basic discussions about curriculum—clearly represents a substantial limitation on their functioning as faculty. However, given that part-time faculty do not have real academic freedom, as will be discussed in the following paragraph, there remains a question of whether they could participate effectively in governance even if given that opportunity.
- P. 28-29    Refer also to statistics in Appendix I. Doctoral and Research Universities  
<http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/A379B47F-C94E-432D-9C29-F1476AFBD2B5/0/ContingentAppendix1.pdf>
- AAUP. 2006. Contingent appointments and the academic profession. AAUP Policy Tenth Ed.  
<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/conting-stmt.htm>
- P. 106     **Shared Governance:** Curricular and other academic decisions benefit from the participation of all faculty, especially those who teach core courses. Governance responsibilities should be shared among all faculty at an institution, including those appointed to less-than-full-time positions. Although part-time faculty have proportionately less time available for governance responsibilities, their appointments should provide for appropriate participation and compensation. Faculty and administrators in each institution, program, or department should together determine the appropriate modes and levels of participation in governance for part-time faculty, considering issues such as voting rights, representation, and inclusion in committees and governance bodies, with the primary aim of obtaining the best wisdom and cooperation of all colleagues in the governance of their institutions. Participation in shared governance requires vigilant support of academic freedom and the protections

of due process. In order to protect the right and the responsibility of nontenured as well as tenured faculty to participate freely and effectively in faculty governance, it is incumbent on all faculty to protect the exercise of academic freedom by their colleagues in faculty governance processes.

Schuster, J. H., and Finkelstein, M. J. 2006. On the Brink: Assessing the status of the American faculty. 2006. THE NEA HIGHER EDUCATION JOURNAL, Fall issue.

<http://www2.nea.org/he/heta06/images/2006pg51.pdf>

P. 56      That role encapsulation is reinforced by a related trend: the decline in the proportion of time that most faculty, but especially the contingent faculty, spend on administration and governance. That is, institutional administration and participation in governance are shrinking spheres of faculty work, responsibility, and involvement (perhaps because of the increase in the number of administrative staff to do administrative work). Accordingly, the familiar triumvirate of teaching, research, and service has largely morphed for the contingent faculty into a single-function role—teaching or research (for those less numerous research-only faculty appointments and post-docs).