

Report of the Survey of Contingent Faculty at Colorado State University- 2009

Submitted to the CSU Community by the Provost's Task Force, October 15, 2009

Steven Shulman, CLA--Chair
Sue Doe, CLA--Primary Author
Karla Gingerich, CNS
Sue Hine, COB
Torsten Eckstein, CVMBS
Karen Kaminski, CAHS

Introduction

The Provost's Task Force for Special and Temporary Faculty, which was created by Faculty Council Executive Committee Resolution in April 2006 and presented its charge by then-Provost Tony Frank in September 2006, seeks to understand the issues of the growing sector of non tenure-track faculty on the CSU campus known as Special and Temporary Faculty. The Task Force undertook a survey of contingent faculty on the Colorado State University campus in Fort Collins in May of 2009 to better understand the issues and concerns of non tenure-track faculty on the Colorado State University campus. This Special and Temporary faculty in 2008-09 numbered 499 or approximately 33% of the total faculty. The percentage of Special and Temporary faculty as a subset of the total faculty has grown significantly over the ten-year period ending in 2009 in every college except the College of Engineering and the Warner College of Natural Resources (*Fact Book* p. 212). In 2008-09 Temporary and Special Appointment faculty were responsible for 39% of lower-level credit hour production and 33% of upper-level credit hour production (*Fact Book*, p.107), a rise of 8% over the ten-year period leading up to 2007-08. Over the same period, tenure-track faculty credit hour productivity fell by 10%, standing at 43% as of 2007-08 (*Fact Book*, p. 109).

For the purposes of this survey, non tenure-track faculty were defined somewhat more broadly than only those belonging to the Special and Temporary ranks. Instead, we defined non tenure-track faculty as belonging to any one of three categories of employee as described in Sections D and E of the CSU *Faculty Manual*: 1) Special Appointment faculty 2) Temporary Faculty and 3) Joint Academic and Administrative Professional Appointments. The survey was distributed to a list of 661 CSU employees, including 150 Joint Academic and Administrative Appointments and the remainder from the Special and Temporary appointment ranks.

The Task Force recognizes the limitations of the survey sample and understands that many CSU employees, particularly those in the Administrative Professional classification, may have faculty responsibilities and yet have been missed by this non tenure-track faculty survey. The Task Force urges the Administrative Professional Council and other university entities to determine a method for identifying all Administrative Professionals who teach off the tenure-track so that they may be counted and queried with surveys like this one. The survey also did not query graduate teaching assistants who in 2008-09 were responsible for 12% of the undergraduate credit hours (*Fact Book*, p. 108). In addition, the Task Force recognizes that including some Administrative Professionals in this survey almost certainly complicates the results and their analysis.

This report mirrors the structure of the survey. The sections are as follows:

- Section 1: describes respondents to the survey
- Section 2: surveys participants on a set of job satisfaction indicators
- Section 3: obtains participant insights into hiring and evaluation
- Section 4: queries respondents about material conditions of employment and evidence of recognitions and rewards for non tenure-track faculty.
- Section 5: asks about representation to faculty governance and perceived administrative support
- Section 6: invites respondents to reply to open-ended questions about the major employment issues facing contingent faculty and respondents' ideas for improving circumstances and responding to concerns

The survey was distributed on May 13, 2009, through the Student Voice survey instrument. Initial distribution was followed by two reminder messages that were sent out at approximately one- week intervals. The survey closed on June 7, 2009. With 400 people participating, the survey had a return rate of just over 60%. This report focuses on aggregate data for the entire university. Narrative responses from several open-ended questions more briefly summarized in *Section VI Open-Ended Questions: Issues, Ideas, and Further Thoughts*. The report also includes several appendices. First, a full list of the 111 survey questions is attached as Appendix A. Aggregated survey responses, minus the open-ended responses, are attached as Appendix B. Disaggregated responses for each College are attached as Appendix C to this report. A distillation of responses to the closing open-ended questions – Questions 109, 110, and 111--is included as Appendix D.

I. Description of the Respondents

A. General Descriptors

Of those responding, 53% were women and 47% were men. 37% of responding faculty had been employed by CSU for ten or more years as of May 2009. Slightly fewer than 75% described themselves as being the primary instructors for one or more courses at CSU, while just fewer than 20% described their positions as primarily research appointments. Based on post-survey feedback from some participants, the remaining 5% of respondents were most likely certain categories of faculty with Joint Academic and Administrative Appointments. Because the initial identifying question required the participant to self-identify as having either a “mainly teaching” or “mainly research” focus of work, and because the survey asked participants to identify the college with which they were affiliated, the needs of CSU Extension joint appointments, for instance, were inadequately met; many requested that the survey be refined in this regard for future distribution.

57% of those surveyed indicated an academic rank of “Instructor” while 27% reported “Assistant Professor,” 5.4% reported “Associate Professor,” and 4.68% reported “Full Professor.” Of those with Joint Academic and Administrative Professional Appointments, 18% reported their appointment category as Research Associate (I-IV), 18% as Research Scientist, 9% as Senior Research Scientist, and 18% said they did not know their appointment type.

As a whole, the employment categories represented in this survey and the associated percentages for those participating were as follows:

- 51% Special appointment
- 23% Temporary appointment
- 16% Administrative Professional
- 9% Uncertain of appointment type

B. College Breakdown

34% of survey respondents were from the College of Liberal Arts (CLA), while just over 20% were from the College of Applied Human Sciences (CAHS) and 15% were from the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (CVMBS). Of the remaining 31% of respondents, participants were nearly evenly divided among the Colleges of Business (COB) at just under 9%, Natural Sciences (CNS) at 8%, Natural Resources (Warner CNR) at 7%, and Agricultural Sciences (CAS) at slightly less than 6%. The College of Engineering (COE) represented the lowest percentage of respondents at 2% of the total. High percentages of survey participation, particularly from the CLA, reflect the large number of contingent faculty in this college. In 2008-09, the CSU *Fact Book* reported that the College of Liberal Arts had 150 special and temporary faculty, or twice that of the next largest group, CVMBS, at 71. CAHS, which had the second highest level of response to the survey, reported having 28 non tenure-track faculty in 2008-09. Among those with Joint Academic and Administrative Professional Appointments, it is notable that CSU Extension, which does not have a college affiliation, appears to have the largest number of these appointments.

C. Duties/Job Responsibilities—Teaching, Research, and Other Activities

41% of respondents reported that teaching constitutes 91-100% of their duties, while 25% reported that teaching accounts for 20% or less of their professional duties. Among those surveyed who reported teaching as a central responsibility, 36% teach 3-4 courses per semester, while 50% teach 1-2 courses. 36% of those responding reported having 100-499 students per semester. 10% teach courses completely online, and among those, 29% earn more teaching online than they would if teaching in a traditional classroom.

While research was not a job responsibility for fully 66% of these non tenure-track respondents, 20% reported that research accounts for up to 70% of their position duties and fully 14% of respondents reported that research accounts for 70% or more of their workload.

176 respondents, or 44% of respondents, offered narrative information about additional job responsibilities that lie outside research or teaching. One person reported that his/her grant work involves communicating at a distance with co- investigators, taking responsibility for regulatory issues, overseeing contract and grant funding, and preparing shipments and customs forms. This respondent said that the range of responsibilities is “a paperwork burden that seems to increase in load every month . . . The paperwork burden and lack of support forces me to spend a lot of nights and weekends catching up on things. I have not taken any time off for a year but still feel I have to work harder and

harder just to keep up.” Another person wrote, “I did not indicate teaching on the previous page because it is not part of my contract, but I do teach from one to three classes per year. I also advise students, provide input to national and international organizations, and do outreach to K-12.”

This open-ended question about additional responsibilities suggests that non tenure-track faculty have roles in many forms of university activity. From this varied set of non-teaching, non-research duties, certain patterns emerged. Among the most frequently noted categories of non-research, non-teaching job responsibilities were the following, given in order of frequency:

- advising
- program administration/coordination
- outreach
- Extension
- committee work
- graduate committees
- grant writing
- grant administration

II. Job Satisfaction—Indicators and Their Importance

Survey participants were queried about the importance of the following 19 indicators to their overall job satisfaction. Respondents replied on a 5-point scale from Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied. (A Not Applicable response was available as well.) These factors and their relative importance to survey participants’ job satisfaction are given in ranked order below. The five factors ranked as most important (Extremely Important or Very Important) among the surveyed non tenure-track faculty are highlighted.

1. Being fairly treated
2. Intellectual stimulation
3. Feeling valued as a professional
4. Exercising academic freedom
5. Contact with students
6. Collegiality
7. Having freedom to create/deliver classes
8. Having a flexible schedule
9. Salary
10. Autonomy
11. Contact with colleagues
12. Working collaboratively
13. Obtaining professional development
14. Involvement in department activities
15. Having freedom to conduct research

16. Having excellent research opportunities
17. Having excellent research facilities
18. Being mentored
19. Participation in departmental governance

Using the same list of job satisfaction features, the survey asked: With respect to your position at CSU, how satisfied are you with these factors? Respondents replied on a 5-point scale from Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied (A Not Applicable response was available as well.) The five factors receiving the highest satisfaction scores (Very Satisfied or Moderately Satisfied) are listed below and ranked by frequency. Two of the factors ranking highest in terms of job satisfaction at CSU were items represented among the top five of job satisfaction indicators. These factors were *Contact with Students* and *Exercising Academic Freedom*. The five factors ranking highest for job satisfaction are listed here:

1. Having a flexible schedule
2. Contact with students
3. Autonomy
4. Exercising academic freedom
5. Contact with colleagues

Among the job satisfaction factors receiving lowest job satisfaction scores (Moderately Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied) were the following, in order of frequency:

1. Salary
2. Feeling valued as a professional
3. Being fairly treated

III. Application, Evaluation, and Rehire

Of the respondents, 38% reported that they must reapply annually for a position in their department, while 42% reported that they have ongoing, rolling, or multi-year appointments for which they need not reapply. Another 20% reported that they are unsure of how reappointment occurs for their positions. 54% reported that they understand the process for getting rehired or reappointed and 36% strongly or moderately agreed that the process for getting rehired/reappointed is reasonable and fair. 55% strongly or moderately agree that the job description or offer letter accurately explains job responsibilities.

54% strongly or moderately agreed that they understand their workload distribution and its evaluation. 51% said that this workload distribution accurately reflects their work responsibilities. 74% reported that they are evaluated annually, while 13% are not, and 13% are unsure when or if they are evaluated. 52% stated that the evaluation criteria applied to their position accurately reflects their responsibilities. Fully 53% said their job performance is accurately assessed in the annual evaluation.

Mirroring the fundamental differences of job description and career interests among these non tenure-track faculty respondents, 53% said they would accept a teaching-only tenure-track position if it were available, and 23% would accept a research-only tenure-track position if it were made available. Over half (51%) of respondents said they would move to a standard tenure-track position and undertake a traditional workload that was distributed among teaching, research, and service if such a position were available.

IV. Salary and Benefits, Material Support/Resources, Rewards and Recognitions

45% of respondents reported that they are paid on a per-section basis while 14% reported that their salary is negotiated as part of a research contract/award. 34% reported that they are eligible for promotion and/or merit pay increases, while 31% reported they are ineligible for either promotion or merit pay raise, and 35% reported that they are unsure whether they qualify for either. 41% stated their belief that non tenure-track faculty pay fails to keep pace with tenure-line faculty pay increases while only 18% moderately or strongly agreed that their salaries keep pace with tenure-line faculty salaries. As such, while salary did not appear among the top five satisfaction factors, non tenure-track faculty are fully aware of and concerned about salary equity.

57% reported having received clear information about benefits they are eligible for and 60% stated that their benefits are equitable to those of other employees. 38% agreed that they are eligible for leave accrual for cases of illness or family leave, but fully 37% were unsure of their benefits in this regard. Hence, while a majority of responding faculty appreciate the benefits available to them, additional information about the range of their benefits is needed.

In terms of office space and resource availability, 59% of respondents strongly or moderately agreed that they have adequate office space while 72% reported that they have adequate resources, such as copies and supplies to support their work. However, narrative responses to the open-ended section of the survey suggest that among those cases where material conditions are less than satisfactory, the situation is often quite serious. One person wrote, "How can anyone have a private conversation with a student or give a make-up exam or offer student help with 13 other instructors sharing the same work space?" Another wrote: "We store expensive equipment in a raccoon-infested storage barn and have no place to work on our gear in cold, pre-field-season months."

Responding to questions about rewards and recognitions, 55% of respondents moderately or strongly agreed with the statement that their departments value their professional expertise and contributions while 26% moderately or strongly disagreed. 44% reported that their departments and colleges do not offer meaningful demonstration of belief in their value to the community. While 51% of respondents stated their belief that tenure-line colleagues respect the contributions of non tenure-track faculty, fully 25% moderately or strongly disagreed. In addition, nearly equal numbers, 25% and 24% respectively reported that research and teaching awards are/are not available to them. Another 26% reported that

they do not know if rewards and recognitions are available to them. While 39% said that their titles (instructor, assistant professor on special appointment, etc.) offer meaningful recognition for the work they do, a nearly equal number (38%) strongly do not believe that their titles offer meaningful recognition. Over a quarter (28%) reported that their college and/or department newsletters do not acknowledge their accomplishments.

V. Representation, Assessment of University Support, and Commitment

Only 11% of respondents reported belief that Faculty Council adequately represents their needs, while 34% said it does not, and 37% said they were unsure. Only slightly more than a third (36%) of respondents reported knowing who their Faculty Council representatives are.

48% of respondents reported feeling welcome at department faculty meetings, but fewer, 35%, said they believe their opinions matter at faculty meetings and 37% reported feeling included in departmental decision-making about topics that are relevant to them. While only 10% reported being compensated or rewarded in their evaluations for serving on committees or participating in forms of faculty governance, many non tenure-track faculty participate in governance efforts in spite of the absence of reward or recognition. Further, while over a quarter (27%) reported that faculty committee work and faculty governance are not relevant to them, half said they would become more involved in committees and faculty governance if 1) they were made to feel welcome, and 2) knew their efforts would be acknowledged or rewarded.

70% of respondents reported feeling comfortable bringing concerns, problems, or questions to their department chairs, but when asked whether the university administration cares about their challenges, only 26% said they believe it does, while 40% said they believe it does not and 32% said they were unsure. Two-thirds (66%) expressed concern that their jobs are threatened by current budget cuts and only 30% said they believe that university administrators are working to save their positions. In contrast, over half (53%) said they think their departments and colleges are doing everything possible to save their positions.

Despite mixed reviews of university commitment to them, most non tenure-track faculty appear to be deeply committed to CSU, with only 33% reporting that their current jobs are a stepping stone or a temporary solution. Fully 82% said they are glad to be members of the CSU faculty. One respondent wrote: "Counter the perception that we are people who have other jobs and just 'teach a class here and there' when in reality most of us are building our whole careers and lives around this." Another said, "The idea that adjunct instructors are temporary or "stepping stone" positions must be dispelled. Adjunct instructors frequently put in decades of service, usually without ever enjoying any opportunity to tackle new job responsibilities or advance professionally." Still another wrote, "I have seen very qualified professionals leave, not because of compensation issues but because they were not treated as professionals and were basically ignored by the other faculty. That is CSU's loss."

VI. Open-Ended Questions: Issues, Ideas, and Further Thoughts

The final three questions of the survey invited open-ended responses to the questions that follow. 262 respondents offered narrative responses to Question 109, 242 offered responses to Question 110, and 119 offered responses to Question 111. The three open-ended questions were as follows:

- **Question 109: What are the major issues facing non tenure-track faculty?**
- **Question 110: What can be done about the major issues facing non tenure-track faculty?**
- **Questions 111: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions?**

Question 109: What are the major issues facing non tenure-track faculty? *Of the 400 survey respondents, 262 offered narrative responses to this question. More than 30 repeating themes were noted among these responses. These were reduced through content analysis to 18 major categories of concern, which were in turn reduced to five major themes, as represented here. A fuller account of these narrative responses can be viewed in Appendix D.*

Culture and Respect for Work

- Lack of respect and support from tenured faculty
- Feeling undervalued by the department/university
- University does not recognize that NTT faculty are essential to its teaching mission
- Invisibility and isolation of faculty off the tenure track
- Lack of contracts and job instability

Compensation Issues

- Poor compensation, raises, summer salary
- Extra work is expected and/or not compensated
- Having to raise own funding

Governance and Academic Freedom Issues

- No vote on departmental issues, no voice, no representation at College/Department levels
- Infringement upon academic freedom

Absence of Professional Opportunity , Recognition, and Reward

- No mechanisms for converting to a tenure-track position and inadequate mentoring for the same
- Contingent faculty make a commitment to CSU but CSU doesn't make a commitment to us

- Different colleges/departments do different things with faculty off the tenure track
- Can't get promoted, few career development opportunities
- High student contact but this isn't rewarded and it's exhausting
- Don't qualify for awards in the college
- Unclear evaluation criteria

Inadequate Material Support

- Lack of resources and office space

Question #110: How would you address these issues?

Of the 400 survey respondents, 242 offered narrative responses to this question. 32 repeating themes were noted among these responses. These were reduced through content analysis to six major categories of recommendation, given below. Detailed information and direct quotes from survey participants can be read in Appendix D:

- ***Improve job security, stability, and opportunity***
- ***Improve culture to reflect greater valuing of varied faculty appointments***
- ***Generate greater consistency and opportunity in pay/compensation***
- ***Enhance representation and opportunities for participation in governance***
- ***Increase awareness of varied job descriptions and varied forms/definitions of productivity***
- ***Provide assistance as non tenure-track faculty identify and chart new directions for work and opportunities for change.***

Q 111 Do you have any additional comments or suggestions?

Many of the respondents used this question as an opportunity to thank those conducting the survey for documenting their concerns and ideas. This observation was often followed by requests that the project of learning about non tenure-track faculty not be dropped or tabled but continue to grow.

The primary themes found in response to this question included:

1. Desire for recognition and value
2. Level of load and responsibility
3. Job stability
4. Traits of non tenure-track employees
5. Explicit benefits of being a non-tenure track employee

In general, one of the clearest messages from these responses was the lack of consistency across campus. Some contingent faculty are receiving annual evaluations and some are not. Some receive annual pay raises and some do not. These issues are closely related to the amount of respect that individuals felt they received from department heads and/or the campus as a whole. Specifically, while a few respondents indicated that they are respected within their departments, comments were clear that there was not a general respect for non tenure-track faculty across the campus.

This inconsistency continued with some respondents indicating that their loads are the same semester to semester or year to year while others indicated that their loads change each semester and they can not predict their future income. The lack of multi-year contracts (and especially for those on semester to semester contracts) results in many respondents' inability to engage in long-term planning. One survey participant stated "I am happy in what I now do, but know that at any time I could get the boot." Another said "I have no way of preparing for the future." Often respondents asked, "Why can they do it in xyz department but not in mine?"

While there appears to be frustration among contingent appointments due to lack of respect, lack of job security, and lack of consistency across units, many express a strong allegiance to CSU and a love of their work here. Respondents frequently expressed their devotion to CSU "in spite of the fact that we are adjuncts," as one person put it.

Further, the inconsistency across units in hiring and retention practices, assignment of load, evaluation processes, and promotion opportunities creates confusion. One of the challenges people in the contingent categories face is that some have no other responsibilities beyond a primary duty of teaching, research or extension, while others have a great deal of additional responsibility. While some prefer to keep their duties specialized, others wish for greater participation in all levels of university work. Still others are currently assigned a teaching, research, and service load similar to that of a tenure-line faculty member and their evaluations recognize the full range of their responsibilities.

Non tenure-track faculty who teach in addition to carrying administrative duties indicate that teaching can be one of the most rewarding parts of their job. One in particular indicated "It keeps me more in touch with new literature and helps build connections across campus." Another said, "My contact with the students and interaction with them makes up an important part of my non-monetary compensation." Others expressed concern about the number of meetings that they are required to attend without receiving compensation or recognition for them.

VII. Discussion and Recommendations

Discussion

As already suggested, many contingent faculty report deep loyalty to CSU. One person wrote: "I just want to be appreciated in return." At the same time, several questions revealed sharp differences among the experiences of non tenure-track faculty across the campus; nearly equal levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were reported in regard to the same measures. In particular, a clear split was noted in the satisfaction levels of faculty on the following measures:

- Contact with colleagues
- Feeling valued as a professional
- Being mentored
- Having access to professional development

- Being involved in department activities
- Being involved in department governance
- Being fairly treated

A split response was also noted in reports of requirements for reapplication with 38% saying they must reapply annually and 42% saying they have ongoing, rolling, or multi-year appointments for which they need not annually reapply. An initial analysis of this split suggests that the differences are not entirely explained by distinctions between special/temporary faculty and joint appointments.

A division was also reflected in the split responses to questions 66 and 67, which asked if the processes for getting rehired/reappointed seem reasonable and fair. For both questions, 36-37% of respondents answered yes while 23-25% answered no. A similar pattern was noted in responses to questions regarding promotion opportunities and opportunity for reward and recognition. While 34% reported being eligible for promotion and/or merit pay increases, 31% reported ineligibility; while 25% reported that awards were available to provide recognition for the work they do, 24% reported that such awards were not available. Perhaps most importantly, when asked in Question 85 if their department and/or college had developed good ways of showing that non tenure-track faculty are valued members of the university community, 30% moderately or strongly agreed while 44% moderately or strongly disagreed. This pattern emerged as well in Questions 96-99 in which respondents were asked about the level of access and welcome they felt at departmental committees and governance. Here responses were split down the middle: Half said they felt welcome and their ideas valued and the other half said they did not.

Recommendations

The Provost's Task Force wishes to express its appreciation to those who participated in this lengthy survey, especially those who offered generously ample feedback to the open-ended questions. We acknowledge that we have learned a great deal from this survey and that there is much more to learn via further analysis of this survey. We also hope that future surveys of non tenure-track faculty will improve upon this early effort. Finally, in view of the survey responses, the Provost's Task Force offers the following recommendations:

1. Engage in further analysis of the survey results

Additional analysis of this survey is needed and we encourage all units to engage in a study of the data. In particular, given the number of "split decisions" noted in the previous section, we call for further investigation into whether the differences can be accounted for by appointment type, by departmental/college location, or by some other (or combination) of factors. Also, since the general data has been disaggregated by college, we recommend that each college undertake an independent analysis of the findings relative to each context. We trust that such fresh analyses will yield new, more refined conclusions. Perhaps most importantly, we hope that departments, programs, colleges, and units will use this survey as a springboard to conversations and planning sessions both within and across units.

2. Renew and sustain efforts to improve university culture and material work conditions for all faculty, reflecting a commitment to collegiality and equitable treatment

Shifts in the cultures of departments, colleges and the university as a whole are needed to enhance the overall sense of collegiality and inclusiveness of non tenure-track faculty. Reframe the university “story” in regard to its treatment of at-will employees, demonstrating fuller appreciation for contingent faculty contributions, with credit given where credit is due. Make these appreciations concrete and material by ensuring that contingent faculty are paid equitably, are provided adequate space and resources, are supported and recognized for their work, and are provided opportunity for advancement. Respect is communicated daily, in the dozens of interactions that make up a workday; a new consciousness of the importance of these interactions is needed. An increasingly positive culture will lead to enhanced workplace productivity and effectiveness, and an already loyal contingent workforce will demonstrate even greater commitment to the mission.

3. Improve job security, stability, and opportunity

New job classifications, such as rolling, long-term, or renewable non tenure-track appointments are needed and should become a top-level priority at the highest levels. In general, both revenue streams and state statutes should be vigorously addressed so that responsible commitments to valued faculty employees are possible. In addition, changes to the re-appointment/reapplication processes are needed so that there is greater consistency among rehire strategies. The need for many non tenure-track faculty to reapply year in and year out erodes faculty morale and expends large amounts of time and energy by faculty and supervisors that might be better spent in other ways. In addition, non tenure-track faculty should be mentored and supported as they seek ongoing professional development.

4. Generate greater consistency and opportunity in pay/compensation

All full-time faculty should be assured a living wage, yet many non tenure-track full-time faculty are functioning at or near subsistence-level wages. At the earliest opportunity, the university should commit to moving beyond incremental pay increases for non tenure-track faculty, particularly since these regular pay increases apply only to the base. Regular pay raises should parallel those of tenure-track faculty and should reflect a well considered salary schedule that takes into account such factors as possession of the terminal degree, industry experience, value to the department, overall experience, length of service, participation in professional culture (i.e., conferences, etc.), and a proven track record as demonstrated through completion of grants, outstanding teaching evaluations, or other measures of productivity that reflect varied job descriptions. Additionally, greater consistency across units regarding the awarding of pay raises is needed; best practices might be discussed and published. This topic should become the subject of immediate discussions at the department, college, and university levels.

5. Show awareness of, respect for, and support of the varied work of non tenure-track faculty by providing opportunities for promotion

In some locations, recognition of the contributions of non tenure-track faculty to the overall enterprise of CSU is not reflected in current policy and practice. Promotion systems should be available not just in

some departments and colleges but in all. Promotion systems should reflect the job description/scope of duties of non tenure-track faculty rather than artifacts of current tenure-line faculty promotion criteria. Professional development opportunities and mentoring that is consistent with the job description of the non tenure-track faculty member should be provided, encouraged, and valued by the institution.

6. Develop and support new career paths

While the disparity in desire for and actual assignment of job responsibilities may make creating consistency across campus seem an insurmountable task, it should be possible to define different types of appointments, establish a consistent, cross-campus process for evaluation and potential for promotion for each of the categories, and thereby alleviate many of the feelings of unfair treatment.

7. Enhance representation opportunities and participation in governance

Improve representation of non tenure-track faculty at the department, college, and university levels, providing mechanisms for growing participation in governance and curriculum development.

8. Conduct a separate, full survey of Administrative Professionals. Identify all Administrative Professionals who teach off the tenure-track and survey them.

This survey, or one like it, should be amended and distributed to all Administrative Professionals, providing an opportunity for additional at-will employees to register their interests and concerns. The Provost's Task Force urges the Administrative Professional Council to refine and redistribute this survey for its constituency.

9. For survey and policy purposes, disaggregate non tenure-track faculty groups. Refine and repeat this survey of non tenure-track faculty on a regular basis to obtain information about changes.

While doing a thorough survey of at-will faculty as a whole offers important insights, it is also important to disaggregate the varied concerns of the applicable faculty groups. Specifically, while Administrative Professionals and Special/Temporary Faculty share at-will status, many of their concerns appear to be distinct from one another. For instance, rehiring and reappointment issues are far more important to special and temporary faculty than to many administrative professionals.

The report continues with the following Appendices:

Appendix A: The Survey Questions

Appendix B: The Survey in Aggregate Form, Narrative Responses Removed

Appendix C: The Disaggregated Survey Results, by College

Appendix D: Excerpted Responses to Open-Ended Questions 109 and 110