



Ihssen, B. L. & Kaurin, P. (2011). And Justice for All: Advocacy, Obligation and the Employment of Contingent Faculty. *Workplace*, 18, 25-35.

And Justice for All: Advocacy, Obligation and the Employ of Contingent Faculty

Brenda Llewellyn Ihssen & Pauline Kaurin

This article takes a narrative approach to the set of dilemmas and concerns surrounding the greater move to using Contingent Faculty (CF), often instead of Tenure Track Faculty (TTF), to meet the labor needs of the University system. This approach comes out of our experience (one author 10 years as full time contingent faculty who has now been 2 years on the tenure track and, the other author 4 years contingent at one institution), but also out of a sense that a narrative approach better captures the concerns and dilemmas surrounding this issue.

In response to an article posted June 12th, 2009 on the Chronicle for Higher Education website titled “Adjunct and Tenure-Track Professors Need One Another, Say Speakers at AAUP Meeting,”¹ the following commentary was posted:

I have taught on and off as an adjunct at a major urban Catholic university for more than 6 years. I feel like a ghost floating invisibly through the halls on my way to the office I share with four other adjuncts. No “real” faculty member in the department knows who I am—the only people who ever speak to me are my students (many of whom ask me for letters of recommendation for graduate school, overseas programs, or jobs because, they tell me, I am the only professor who knows their name). And I earn the princely sum of \$3,800 per class. All my classes are 100-level general ed. courses, and they are always

enrolled to the maximum of 40 students each. I am not permitted to teach more than two courses in a quarter, even if more are needed, because then I would be eligible for benefits. At the moment, I do not yet know whether I will teach in the fall or not. If not, the way I will find out is by checking the online schedule of classes, and seeing that all the courses I could have taught have someone else’s name attached as instructor. I have never once had the courtesy of a phone call or e-mail telling me the department has no courses for me for the next term. On the other hand, it’s very likely I will receive an e-mail from the department chair in mid-August (courses start the day after Labor Day), asking me to teach one or two courses. I will then have two or three weeks to compose my syllabus, order books, and make other preparations.²

This—and other comments like them³—continuously make the point that despite the increase in the both the number of universities in North America relying on Visiting or Contingent Faculty (VCF) and the rising percentages of VCF on university campuses, VCF find themselves in an increasingly demoralizing and isolated profession. The names alone—“Visiting,” “Contingent,” or Canada’s “Limited Term” and “sessional”—suggest a great deal of ambiguity and instability, and simultaneously highlight and lead us to the complexity of the dilemmas and concerns surrounding the greater move to using Visiting/Contingent Faculty often instead of Tenure Track or Faculty (TTF) to meet the labor needs of the University system. While statistics easily demonstrate that there is gross iniquity across the disciplines of academia,⁴ the ability to connect with an individual through narratives such as the one posted above allows us to understand nuances that exist within the individual professor and within the complex human relationships formed in academic departments and the greater university body. Narrative is the way that we give meaning to ourselves and others in the world;⁵ as well, it provides the opportunity to understand with greater depth what experiences *do* to the people who are involved,⁶ and it keeps us from forgetting that there are people involved while we try to solve their problems. Therefore, we present three distinct narratives provided by both VCF and TTF for the purpose of highlighting several important aspects to the debate and seeing with greater clarity: 1) the issues of justice involved, including the ethical obligation of TTF, especially those in departments with high use of

VCF; 2) the difficulty of VCF to advocate on their own behalf and (3) we propose to identify possible future trajectories for this discussion, while raising concerns with the dominant paradigm of treating this issue largely as a labor issue in the traditional model—labor v. owner/management—a process which ultimately pits VCF and TTF against one another. Rather than suggesting and arguing for one ‘optimal solution,’ our conclusion suggests some directions for continued discussion that looks towards solving the problems that arise in universities that rely even to a small degree on the use of contingent faculty.

Case #1: Dr. Threshold,⁷ Permanent Liminality

Dr. Threshold (PhD Waterloo), Assistant Professor of Literature at Big Research Canadian University, maintains that the status of “Limited Term Faculty” in the Canadian university system (LTF) and its effect on the morale of the individual is connected to its general state of liminality; taking the above claim that ‘contingency’ carries with it a terrible degree of ambiguity one step further, Dr. Threshold argues that the ambiguity of one’s VCF/LTF position takes a psychological toll on the one for whom professional ambiguity exists, as VCF/LTF are caught for an extended period of time in between the states of being treated like a graduate student and being treated like full faculty. Instead of moving through a logical professional progression, VCF/LTF are caught in a “permanent liminal state,” without the benefits that a liminal state allows (primarily an *end* to liminality). This results, she claims, in a performance-based professional state in which

VCF/LTF are frantic in their desire to constantly ‘shine’ in the eyes of a department of which they are not permanent members. Taken to the extreme, individuals caught in such a system can exhibit qualities of a psychotic paranoid state, as they are consistently focused on how others view them, if what they have said is ‘smart enough,’ and what they have done is ‘good enough.’ When people do that under normal circumstances, she deftly points out, they are institutionalized. Dr. Threshold, who only just recently interviewed along with ten other people for her *own* LTF position which she has held for three years, explains it this way: “If someone is hired to tend bar, they know that if they fulfill the requirements of that job that they can keep their job, they are not required to constantly step back and analyze their circumstances and negotiate what they just said and how they said it. If they did, they would be labeled as narcissistic or paranoid, both signs of mental illness.” Currently, half of all English departments in Canada are staffed by contract workers who make a fraction of TTF salaries, and who try to “pass” as fulltime faculty due to the stigma of being LTF. Many are excluded from departmental meetings, have little to no administrative support and are unable to access basic needs such as proper office space and use of photocopying machines. Contract workers in Canada work approximately 12-16 hours per day for universities that benefit from their research while providing neither institutional funding nor support, conditions that quickly lead to burnout. One of Dr. Threshold’s colleagues at Big Research Canadian University was so significantly exhausted by the semester that she failed to put forth the exemplary effort for the

interviewing process, thus losing her own contract position that she had held for many years. She has decided, consequently, not to return to academia. In Berry and Hoffman’s article on the inclusion of VCF in governance, they maintain that the context of “near-universal second-class status” in institutions such as that which employs Dr. Threshold most frequently is internalized in such a way as to result in “fear, anger, lack of self-confidence and esteem, and general insecurity.”⁸ Such conditions, the authors note, are also those of abuse victims;⁹ and such conditions, Dr. Threshold maintains, lead to poor physical and mental health. Ultimately the legitimization of all faculty in a university creates a healthy climate with healthy workers, an environment within which outstanding research and teaching can take place.

Case #2: Dr. Jay, The Eight-Year Adjunct

Dr. Jay,¹⁰ who recently finished her dissertation and graduated with PhD in Theatre, has been an adjunct for 8 years at 7 different schools teaching a variety of courses, but predominantly writing and “First Year” courses. She expressed gratitude for the chance to gain teaching experience and to be largely autonomous, designing and teaching her own courses with little supervision or direction, but she also reflected many common themes. First and foremost was the sense that she was neither treated nor viewed as a professional. While the President of one institution gave a welcome during an orientation for VCF, she constantly had issues with informal support systems such as the acquisition of office space, lack of access to technology for research purposes and very uneven evaluation

processes. This does not even begin to touch on formal issues like pay and benefit inequities, short notice on class cancellation or addition and having a plagiarism case dismissed by an administrator.

Dr. Jay reflected the sentiment that she was always starting fresh, having to teach new topics and courses nearly every term with little or no input into curriculum issues. She also observed that she is teaching the most labor intensive courses, like writing, and First Year or other core courses that are viewed as central to the curriculum and the mission of the school, courses that are outsourced to faculty who neither have curriculum input nor are a permanent part of the faculty. In Dr. Jay's view, this reflects a lack of commitment to the faculty member, to the individual course and to the student's larger educational experience, not to mention how this relates to the rest of the curriculum, both formal and informal. Many TTF take it as a mark of progress and prestige when they no longer have to teach these courses, raising serious questions about their commitment to professional standards and student retention.

On the interpersonal level—the level of “relational justice”¹¹— Dr. Jay sees clearly how being known as an impermanent part of the faculty puts her at a visible disadvantage in terms of garnering respect from students, other faculty and staff, and describes herself as a ‘step-child’ of the university. Since she is not included in faculty development workshops, faculty meetings, department discussions, curriculum work or other shared tasks within the university there are ramifications on both the personal and professional level. Professionally, there is the consistent sense that other

faculty know ‘what is going on’ – whether in terms of the curriculum, larger campus discussions, interpersonal connections and informal networking and faculty culture, as well as an exclusion of her own qualified perspective on the courses that she teaches. Personally, it is lonely. On one hand, Dr. Jay observes that the part-time nature of her work has been beneficial in her current situation, as she has been able to finish and defend her dissertation while teaching and parenting a child under the age of two; nevertheless, that she neither sees herself nor is treated by her peers as a professional, has a profound psychological and personal impact. “At best, this job might get you a reference” she observes, but VCF are certainly in no position to bargain to better their position. Dr. Jay observes that because of the nature of the VCF lifestyle, it is rare that she sees or interacts with other VCF, which results in little sense of solidarity with others in her circumstances, and she likens herself to that of a woman in a misogynistic society; one expects that one is simply *not* going to get fair treatment. Finally, although she views her VCF as a temporary situation, she is acutely aware of the perceived danger for TTF job searches of having the ‘contingent faculty’ black mark that produces the obvious question: “Why did you adjunct for so long?”

Case #3: The TTF with Guilt

While most of our discussion has been on the impact on VCF morale, this issue has an effect on the morale of TTF as well, and here we present one scenario. VCF Dr. Visitor¹² went through New Faculty Orientation with TTF Dr. Tenure-Track,¹³ as they arrived at the same university in the same year.

Dr. Visitor is a good teacher, active in scholarship and a good colleague, and so Dr. Tenure-Track is surprised that after several years Dr. Visitor is still a VCF member and has not been able to get a tenure track appointment in his highly competitive field. Whenever Dr. Tenure-Track sees Dr. Visitor, she remarks on this fact. Dr. Visitor sees how Dr. Tenure-Track is progressing on the tenure line, is being given greater responsibility and input into department, division and university decisions and has access to benefits and opportunities that Dr. Visitor does not have, such as accruing time towards sabbatical. On one hand, Dr. Tenure-Track sees the injustice of this vis-à-vis Dr. Visitor, and has told Dr. Visitor that when she has tenure she “will have a few things to say about it.” On the other hand, Dr. Tenure-Track is fully aware that her institution hires and keeps faculty members like Dr. Visitor because it can hire several “Dr. Visitors” for the price of only one “Dr. Tenure-Track,” which allows greater flexibility in scheduling and frees up more money for other things – the travel course that Dr. Tenure-Track wants to propose, for example, or a course release for participating in faculty development opportunities that Dr. Visitor does not have access to as a VCF. Dr. Tenure-Track’s guilt and increasing sense of the injustice and exploitation of the situation are making their relationship very awkward, and sometimes it is just easier not to seek out Dr. Visitor, or to go out of her way to say “Hi” when she runs across him on campus. Dr. Visitor, embarrassed by the awkwardness of the situation, is relieved when they begin avoiding each other.

Reflection on the Narratives: Issues of Justice for the Institution, Faculty, Students and Morale

Narratives that are told by and about contingent faculty often *begin* with concerns about formal or procedural justice; however, at a deeper level, these narratives reflect concerns over relational justice: first, while the narratives reflect concerns of justice seen in terms of community membership and integrity, this emerges in opposition to the second or even third class citizenship that is the day-to-day experience of many VCF; second, the enduring feeling that one is always “starting over” emerges against the satisfaction of having earned one’s place in the structure on the basis of work done and commitment showed; finally, there is the sense that one never really makes any true progress in their career, which is contrasted by the visibly supported and mentored progress of TTF counterparts. In addition, this focus on community and belonging reflects even more substantial and potentially harmful issues of trust, involving both relationships with TTF and TF as well as with administrators. A quick look at the mini narratives one finds on discussion boards reflect a pervasive feeling that VCF cannot trust that these other groups will take into account (or even acknowledge) their interests, but also the much deeper concern that VCF feel at the mercy of these groups because they cannot speak for and advocate for themselves.¹⁴ In what follows, we take a deeper look at these areas of justice in terms of the institution, for faculty of all types and for students, and find that there is consistent and deep cohesion and overlap between these arenas in terms of the relational justice issues introduced.

One way of thinking about this issue in a more cohesive manner is to think about how it affects the morale of all of these groups. For VCF, it is right to question exactly how much effort should they put into their time at a given institution and still maintain healthy personal and professional boundaries, given the professional rewards and recognition they are likely *not* to get. Here Jill Carroll's entrepreneurial model of VCF starts to make some sense; if what the university *really* wants is for VCF to cheaply teach sections of courses (and nothing else), then it seems that VCF should specialize in that and that alone and maximize their earning potential, while jettisoning other tasks or parts of the professional personae such as scholarship and service to the institution and profession, that do not figure into the compensation model.¹⁵ What would the ramifications be of adoption of such a model, and how do those ramifications reflect deeper ethical and personal issues that the narrative approach brings to light? Clearly something would be lost, something that Carroll's own colleagues acknowledge, for "[w]e are paying her as an adjunct and getting the quality of a first-rate professor."¹⁶

For TTF, if they alone bear the weight of the work of faculty governance, formal advising, supervision of research and other professional activities, and if the trend is more and more toward VCF use and the elimination of tenure, then it follows there will be fewer and fewer TTF faculty to do this work and the ones who do it cannot help but have *their* morale plummet in addition to potential resentment of both VCF—as they rise in numbers—and administration, which has already been noted: "If an administration

can make these groups see each other as rivals and play them off against each other, the consequences can be serious for all faculty."¹⁷ As faculty find the current systems of faculty governance unsustainable, there is more and more pressure to move to administrative control rather than faculty governance systems; such a move would have, as many concerned with the future of faculty governance observe, serious ramifications for academic freedom, curriculum and standards within the profession.

For the institution, taking credit for and benefiting by scholarly and service contributions of VCF without providing necessary financial and institutional support necessary for these achievements further reduces VCF morale and maintains the exploitative environment. In other contexts this is called "stealing"—although the authors prefer "academic apartheid." The 'big question' here is: are VCF members of the professional community or are they not? If they are it stands to reason that they be treated as such by the institution; if they are not, then they should not be required to meet the same requirements of those who benefit from institutional and economic support.

The most obvious justice concerns for faculty are inequities around salary, access to resources for professional development,¹⁸ mentoring opportunities and support,¹⁹ training and social interaction or fellowship that build bonds of trust and provide an informal but critical support system and knowledge base of institutional identities and values. For TTF, while they may and often do sympathize with the plight of VCF colleagues, they are naturally and rightly concerned with their own careers and many believe that standing

in opposition to the administration on behalf of VCF would endanger their own careers.²⁰ In conversations about this issue with TTF, it is clear that some—such as Dr. Tenure-Track above—recognize the ethical concerns, but TTF also benefit from the system and see the extensive use of VCF as necessary, even as a necessary evil. Given this sympathy, one would expect that as TTF acquire tenure and move up in rank, position and power within the university that they would act on earlier judgments. Sadly, it is not clear that such advocacy from TTF is emerging, which suggests a system that co-opts the very people who acknowledge its ethically problematic nature. Other TTF simply view VCF as ungrateful and demanding. This perspective, found regularly on online and on list-serve discussions, reflects resentment around the perception that VCF merely teach and leave, sharing none of the same sense of professional commitment, or do not engage in research and publication or service to the institution. As John Hess notes, the recent Adjunct Advocate sought to find out why VCF engage in research or publish in their respective fields; in response, he addresses what he refers to as an ‘odd, insulting question’ with the following:

[S]tudies show that the percentages who do research are about the same for tenured faculty...We are intellectuals. We like ideas. We like to read and study... We did not go to graduate school to become contingent faculty; we went because we wanted to become collage professors. That that hasn’t happened yet, doesn’t mean we give up the urge to read, write, learn, and teach and the pleasures we gain from it.”²¹

While there is documentation on the impacts of use of VCF in terms of student learning, there are deeper relational-justice concerns for students. Narrative evidence reveals that many VCF identify with students over and against TTF and the administration,²² a phenomenon that speaks to how students see faculty members as professionals and how students relate to different kinds of faculty members.²³ There is also disruption and uncertainty for students in terms of the mentoring and advising processes, getting recommendations for jobs, graduate school, student-faculty research and other outside learning opportunities that require a consistent and stable presence to accomplish effectively.

Finally, while many faculty and administrators regularly complain about the student ‘consumer’ mentality, the authors question how the University is really a different kind of place when what students experience with respect to faculty reinforces and is driven by precisely the consumer, market mentality?²⁴ Students see the same hierarchies at the same time that they are exhorted by faculty and staff alike to view and engage in the college experience as a different kind of community, one committed to the eradication of injustice.

Conclusion: Future Trajectories for the Discussion

Much of the current conversation focuses on two conceptual frameworks: 1) VCF issue as an issue of formal/procedural justice and 2) as a labor issue. Even if there were formal and procedural equity, that would not solve the deeper relational justice issues highlighted above. We argue that the current focus of the debate is to a certain

extent counter-productive in terms of advancing discussions within a given institution and generating local solutions. Framing this as a labor issue where the solutions are largely collectively bargaining and other traditional labor mechanisms for extracting concessions from management puts TTF and VCF at odds with one another. This triangulation is not only counter-productive in the short term, but does long-term damage to morale, institutional integrity, community and effectively undermines future bargaining ability.²⁵ Framing the issue in this way also fails to get at relational and a trust issues involved in the academic community, and also fails to see this as an issue of professionalism and professional judgment.

Possibilities for how the conversation might proceed begin by building trust and alliances between VCF and TTF colleagues who clearly share common professional identity. First, TTF need to make the case that the contributions of both TTF and VCF are essential and should be treated as such; they need to resist staffing moves that result in TTF and VCF being pitted against one another. In addition, there must be recognition that TTF have the capacity and responsibility to support and advocate for VCF. With respect to ethical obligations of TTF towards those in VCF positions, we begin by maintaining that silence is never the answer. Pretending that VCF and TTF are 'equal' does not mean that they are. Whether one is taking about poverty, violence, slavery, abuse or inequality, the measure of a system is determined by how it looks to the needs of the most vulnerable members of its organization. Thus, the first and most difficult ethical obligation is to acknowledge and own

the exploitation one sees right across the table.

This does, we note, carry with it its own special set of complications, such as who determines what is ethical; what is ethical and just for one person might very well be considered oppressive for someone else. However, certain 'starting points' exist, and we suggest the following: first, recognition and acknowledgement by TTF of the existence and nature of the exploitation; second, that it is the responsibility of universities to provide mentoring of VCF in an intentional and consistent way, so that senior members of the university might function as advocates on behalf of VCF in circumstances where they are explicitly excluded from departmental and/or university participation appropriate to their position, or when VCF are concerned that their participation in certain departmental or university situations might be inappropriate. Third, we maintain that there are problems when Faculty Handbooks do not reflect the current situation in the university, when the roles of VCF are interpreted inconsistently by different Departments, Chairs or Deans, and Handbooks which do not include VCF voice in their construction. Committees composed of administrators, TTF and VCF should be formed to address the ambiguous use of VCF within the specific institutions;²⁶ "What does it mean to be a VCF at 'Big Research U'?" is a different question and requires a different response from "What does it mean to be a VCF at 'Small Liberal Arts University'?" and VCF who teach at those different institutions need to speak to their own experiences at those places in the process of a construction of individual professional

identities, formed within a state of contingency.

We maintain that there be explicit recognition of shared professionalism and shared concerns as one ‘Faculty;’ this includes not only recognition but also empathetic understanding that the exploitative and justice issues that VCF face are merely another form of the danger that all faculty face; thus, the concerns of VCF should be recognized as the concern of TTF and TF as well. It is essential that faculty and administration develop and encourage mechanisms for support amongst VCF and also between VCF and TTF, so that TTF can understand from a VCF perspective the challenges faced and also begin the process of consensus building via dialogue. While it might be argued that saying TTF have obligations to advocate or stand up for VCF is paternalistic, we maintain that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible for VCF to advocate on their own behalf. The latter might develop from the conversation currently emerging on the essential—but problematic—role of the inclusion of VCF in governance and unionized activity on college campuses in the United States and Canada. Looking at the narratives and experiences collected, it is clear that it is difficult for VCF to effectively advocate on their own behalf and that when they try to, it can be counter-productive, resulting in suspicion and animosity not

only by administration and TTF colleagues, but also by VCF colleagues, even if these colleagues are sympathetic to the issues that pushed the VCF member to advocacy.²⁷

Second, there needs to be systematic discussion at both local and national levels of the long term consequences and costs of the current ways of engaging in the “business” of the University system. Narrative evidence clearly indicates that procedural and relational exploitation is both pervasive and difficult to tackle because of the level of invisibility of real, live VCF bodies in discussions that concern them as well as the invisibility of even their concerns and perspectives. Whether it is the lack of discussion and visibility for VCF on issues of salary and compensation/benefits equity, lack of VCF participation in faculty governance or lack of VCF representation as the public face of the institution, the key issue *is* invisibility. VCF voices and stories need to be heard in a systematic way so that VCF can begin to advocate on their own behalf, educate and build common ground with those who can advocate on their behalf but do not, and so that VCF and TTF can recognize and congregate around collective concerns with teaching, faculty culture, professionalism, academic freedom and the nature and future of local and national higher education.

Endnotes

¹ Audrey Williams June, “Adjunct and Tenure-Track Professors Need One Another, Say Speakers at AAUP Meeting,” <http://chronicle.com/article/AdjunctTenure-Track/47741>.

² Anonymous comments posted by “Reluctant adjunct” on June 14, 2009, at 10:35 AM ;

³ See: www.adjunctnation.com on any given day or time.

⁴ John Hess notes “I have to admit I am tired of the incessant statistical approach to the situation of contingent faculty. I know the percentages and the numbers.” John Hess, “The Entrepreneurial Adjunct,” *Academe*, Vol. 90, No. 1. Accessed from: <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/delivery?vid=12&hid=12&sid=0d9>.

⁵ Leonard Webster and Patricie Mertova, *Using Narrative Inquiry as a Research Method: An Introduction to using critical event narrative analysis in research on learning and teaching* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007): 7.

⁶ Webster and Mertova, *Using Narrative Inquiry as a Research Method*, 20.

⁷ Not her real name.

⁸ Joe Berry and Elizabeth Hoffman, “Including Contingent Faculty in Governance: More Effective Inclusion in Union and Institutional Governance Requires More Job Security,” in *Academe Online*, <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/ND/Feat/berr.htm?PF=1>.

⁹ “SIGNS OF AN ABUSIVE RELATIONSHIP: Do you: Feel afraid of your partner much of the time? Avoid certain topics out of fear of angering your partner? Feel that you can’t do anything right for your partner? Believe that you deserve to be hurt or mistreated? Wonder if you’re the one who is crazy? Feel emotionally numb or helpless?” http://www.helpguide.org/mental/domestic_violence_abuse_types_signs_causes_effects.htm. If that is not sufficient, Cary Nelson writes that “Casualized labor in the academy...destroys lives and breaks the human spirit, as the ruthless, long term exploitation of contingent faculty exacts a huge cost, most dramatically for those lacking union representation.” Cary Nelson, “From the President: Manifesto Against Contingency,” *Academe Online*, <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2007/JA/Col/ftp.htm?PF=1>.

¹⁰ Not her real name.

¹¹ *Relational Justice* is shaped through the cooperative and supportive behavior of those with whom one lives and/or works, and helps to shape the distinctions that people learn to make between choices and obligations. See Jonathan Burnside and Nicola Baker, eds., *Relational Justice: Repairing the Breach* (Waterside Press, 2004): 19.

¹² Not his real name.

¹³ Not her real name.

¹⁴ See for example www.adjunctnation.com.

¹⁵ Hess, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/delivery?vid=12&hid=12&sid=0d9>.

¹⁶ Hess, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/delivery?vid=12&hid=12&sid=0d9>.

¹⁷ Jane Kerlinger and Scott Sibary, “Protecting Common Interests of Full- and Part-Time Faculty,” *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, Vol. XIV no 2 (Fall 1998), 91ff

¹⁸ At a nationally known center for professional development, nine of the eleven workshops stipulate that the faculty member must be “pre-tenure” and only one explicitly states that those who are in any “other continuing position” may apply. When a VCF asked one of the directors why VCF were not allowed to apply, the director claimed that at this center their workshops address things that are “of interest and importance for TTF and TF.” When the VCF faculty person asked the representative “Why do you think that VCF are not interested in the same issues?” the director seemed genuinely puzzled by the question, as if it had *never* occurred that VCF would have the same concerns as TT or T faculty.

¹⁹ This can be disproportionate among departments; while some Chairs will welcome and hold orientation sessions with new VCF even concurrently with TTF, others will assume that VCF do not care or need to know about department business.

²⁰ If the authors only had a dime for every well-meaning statement such as: “When I get tenure, then I’m going to have something to say about this visiting business...” which suggests that TTF understand that this situation is particularly problematic enough to the degree that they feel they must have the considerable “clout” that tenure carries before they can broach the subject.

²¹ The same holds true for service to the university, profession and community. In addition to their scholarship, VCF are active as advisors of student clubs, they serve as panelists, moderators of events and guest speakers; in short, they serve in the same ways that TTF do, with the sole exception at most universities of faculty governance.

²² Writing teacher Mario Hernandez (State University of New York College) observes that he identifies less with his tenured peers than with the students, especially marginalized ones, “with whom I share a reality in common.” Steve Street, “Don’t Pit Tenure against Contingent Faculty Rights” *Academe* 94.3.

²³ Street, “Don’t Pit Tenure against Contingent Faculty Rights,” 35.

²⁴ This suggests that the University—like the local Wal-Mart—will buy shoddy products for a low price and sell them for a high price.

²⁵ See: Thedwall, Kate. “Nontenure-track faculty: Rising numbers, lost opportunities.” *New Directions for Higher Education* (Fall 2008): 11-19. See also the York University November 2008 strike nightmare; <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/toronto/story/2009/01/29/york-strike.html>.

²⁶ A useful suggestion found in Gina L. Sheeks and Philo A. Hutcheson, “How Departments Support Part-Time Faculty,” *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, Vol.XIV no 2 (Fall 1998), 89.

²⁷ This goes against the Jill Carroll entrepreneurial model: “Don’t complain, do business,” and reflects the research of Kerlinger and Sibary, who note that “[m]any lecturers never venture to speak about their concerns, fearing that involvement will lead to a decision not to reappoint them.” Kerlinger, Jane and Sibary, Scott, “Protecting Common Interests if Full and Part-time Faculty” *NEA Higher Education Journal* Vol.XIV no 2 (Fall 1998), p. 91ff.