

University of Mississippi

eGrove

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

---

1-1-2019

## A Study Of Contingent Faculty Representation In Governance At The University Of Mississippi

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Allushuski, Mariana Rangel, "A Study Of Contingent Faculty Representation In Governance At The University Of Mississippi" (2019). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1913.

<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/1913>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

A STUDY OF CONTINGENT FACULTY REPRESENTATION IN GOVERNANCE AT THE  
UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

A Dissertation  
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Department of Higher Education  
The University of Mississippi

by

MARIANA RANGEL ALLUSHUSKI

December 2019

Copyright Mariana Rangel Allushuski 2019

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

Contingent faculty are defined as academic professionals in part-time and full-time positions not on track towards tenure; this group now occupies the majority of faculty appointments in American institutions. Various issues affect this population, including low pay, lack of benefits, lack of job security, lack of opportunities for career growth, among others. This shift in the professoriate has forced institutions to address issues such as contingent faculty participation in governance. This case study explores the formation of a Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance at the University of Mississippi to address lack of representation in governance. More specifically, the Task Force advocated for representation and eligibility to serve in the university's Faculty Senate.

Through interviews of members of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate and of the Task Force, and in the chronological order in which events took place, the following topics were addressed: the role of contingent faculty on campus and in governance, contingent faculty experiences in their academic departments, major arguments for and against representation, Senators and Task Force members' perspectives of the Task Force initial presentation to the Senate, and the successful outcome that followed. Through the discussion, this study addresses themes such as the role of the Faculty Senate, the future of contingent faculty in governance, the work that lies ahead, and implications for contingent faculty organizing in a national context.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mom and dad. Everything I have ever accomplished is because of your love (and the occasional, necessary tough love), support, and belief that I can accomplish anything I set my mind to.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I conclude my doctoral studies and this project, I feel immense gratitude to those who encouraged me and provided guidance along the way. First, I must thank my doctoral advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Amy Wells Dolan. Of course, I could not have completed my dissertation without her expertise, but I am especially grateful for her calming guidance and kindness during the difficult parts of this journey. She may never know how much her words of reassurance and grace meant to me throughout this process. I am also incredibly grateful for my committee members: Dr. John Holleman, Dr. Neal Hutchens, and Dr. Marc Showalter - I look up to each one of you, am grateful for your guidance and hope I have made you proud.

Secondly, I am incredibly humbled and indebted to the faculty who elected to participate in my study. As one can imagine, utilizing faculty as research participants is intimidating. I am grateful that I found nothing but support, encouragement and even words of advice as I conducted interviews. I am especially grateful to Dr. Sarah Wilson, who led the Task Force and who allowed me to tell its story.

I must also thank my family (Rangel and Allushuski sides), friends and co-workers who supported me through this five-year journey – thank you for believing in me. Special thanks to my sister, Gabriela Katz, and to my past co-worker and friend, Jennifer Fos, who both earned their Ph.Ds. before me and provided invaluable advice and perspective through this process. Lastly and most importantly, thank you to my husband, Ty. I truly could not have finished this

project without your love and support. You challenged me when I needed to be challenged, and offered me grace when I needed it the most. I love you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	18
METHOD.....	50
FINDINGS.....	70
DISCUSSION.....	114
REFERENCES .....	131
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	151
VITA.....	190



## I. INTRODUCTION

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) defines contingent faculty appointments as part-time and full-time positions not on a track towards tenure (AAUP, n.d.). Tenure, a concept historically associated with the academic profession, is used to describe professional appointments that are indefinite in duration, and that can only be terminated under justified “extraordinary circumstances” (AAUP, n.d., para 1). In contrast, the term contingent is used to describe those in adjunct positions, postdoctoral researchers, teaching assistants, non-tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty, and faculty not represented in governance (AAUP, n.d.). Perhaps more descriptive of the reality of contingent faculty in college campuses in the United States, is the way the dictionary attributes meaning to the words contingent and adjunct. Merriam-Webster (n.d.) defines adjunct as “something joined or added to another thing but not essentially a part of it,” and contingent as “dependent on or conditioned by something else, likely but not certain to happen, and not logically necessary.” Evidence for the unfortunate appropriateness of the dictionary definitions above will be discussed in this study.

The AAUP estimates that non-tenure-track appointments currently make up 70% of all faculty positions (AAUP, 2017). Researchers at the Delta Cost Project at American Institutes for Research found that a 10-year span (2003 to 2013) saw increases in contingent faculty of two to eight percent across all institutional types (with the exception of public bachelor’s institutions, which saw an even greater increase at 17%). On a larger scale, Altbach (2011) estimated that as of 2011, 1.3 million faculty members were employed in contingent positions in the United

States. For perspective, on a national scale, contingent faculty account for a substantial portion of the contingent workforce in the country as a whole. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 5.9 million American workers were employed in a contingent basis in 2017 (Kosanovich, 2017), indicating that contingent faculty members represent a significant portion of this number as a whole.

The noteworthy shift in the academic workforce has been met with unease by many higher education professionals, institutions, and organizations. The AAUP, for example, has been vocal in their concern for the increase in contingent faculty assignments in the United States, affirming that institutions should decrease their reliance on this employment category for the “long-range health of higher education” (American Association of University Professors, 1993, para. 29). Tenured and tenure-track faculty have also expressed anxiety regarding whether contingent appointments pose a threat to the tenure establishment (Schneirov, 2003). Some have also shared the concern of the AAUP about the effectiveness of contingent faculty in teaching and student interactions in comparison to tenured or tenure-track faculty (Umbach, 2007).

Studies on the effectiveness of contingent faculty have produced mixed results. Nelson (2010), for example, expressed that the rise in contingency threatens teaching effectiveness because contingent faculty typically have less time for one-on-one interactions with students, and for dedicating time to staying current in their field. In addition, they have less time to spend preparing for classes and holding office hours (Nelson, 2010). In a study utilizing the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement to predict faculty effectiveness, Umbach (2007) found that, compared to tenured and tenure-track faculty, contingent faculty, particularly part-timers, were less effective in measures related to frequency of student interaction, use of collaboration, time spent in lesson preparation, and expectations of student performance.

While many studies point to contingent faculty being less effective, a study conducted at Northwestern University showed that first-term students learn more in their courses from contingent faculty than tenure or tenure-track faculty (Figlio, Schapiro, & Soter, 2015). However, the authors attribute this, in part, to the fact that the majority of contingent faculty at Northwestern are employed full-time through long-term contracts and receive benefits (Figlio et al.). Nonetheless, it appears that when contingent faculty are less effective than their tenure and tenure-track peers, it is more a product of their precarious employment conditions than of capabilities of faculty themselves.

The working conditions of contingent faculty have also been a matter of concern. A 2013 study of 1,891 contingent faculty in the U.S. determined that the average instructor earns less than \$3,000 per course, and teaches an average of five courses (Gavaskar, Boldt, Donhardt., Ghoshal, & Godstein, 2013). A recent AAUP Faculty Compensation Survey showed that the lowest average pay for part-time faculty members was \$2,925 for teaching a three-credit hour course (AAUP, 2019). A House Committee on Education and the Workforce Democratic Staff report (2014) noted that a significant number of adjunct faculty reported wages that ranged between \$15,000 and \$20,000 per year, which is close to or below the poverty-line (this classification is dependent on the number of family members). Moreover, while earning an average of less than \$30,000 a year, 83% of faculty did not have health insurance through their employers (Gavaskar et al). Even more alarming, a UC Berkley research report found that 25 % of part-time college faculty are enrolled in a public assistance program (Jacobs, Perry & MacGillvary, 2015).

Issues regarding the working conditions and effectiveness of contingent faculty are not the sole cause of concern. It is also necessary to understand how the shift in the academic labor

force is affecting higher education in its core. More specifically, little research has been conducted on how the rise of contingent positions affects two concepts that lie at the heart of the professoriate: academic freedom and shared governance. Historically, these concepts have been deeply connected to tenure. In fact, Nelson (2010) uses the term “three-legged-stool” of academia to describe tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance, demonstrating just how interconnected the three concepts are.

Contingency can affect academic freedom in a variety of ways. Hutchens and Sun (2015), for example, believe non-tenured faculty may be less likely to challenge administrative policies and more likely to lower academic expectations to receive more positive student evaluations (which are typically used in contract renewal decisions). This sentiment is magnified by Eron (2014), who stated that the rise in contingency can be seen as a “revolution against academic freedom protections” (p. 28), and that this shift in the workforce means administrators can now exercise control over the faculty. Another concern, this one expressed by the AAUP (2003), is that peer review and academic due process are not secured for contingent faculty, which in consequence means academic freedom is not truly in existence. Moreover, the essential free exchange of ideas may be threatened by their reluctance to take risks in teaching, scholarly and service work (AAUP, 2003). It is important to note that, if academic freedom is not guaranteed for the fastest growing body of academic labor, then the idea of the professoriate may look significantly differently in the near future.

The lack of proper representation and participation in shared governance is also an issue deeply affecting the growing body of contingent faculty in the United States. A comprehensive study conducted by the AAUP in 2014 determined that 75% of institutions allow full-time non-tenured faculty to participate in governance roles. However, only an estimated 25% of part-time

faculty are eligible for such positions. A more recent study of highest research activity universities found that full-time contingent faculty are eligible to participate in governance in 85% of institutions, yet part-time faculty are eligible to serve in 11% of institutions (Jones, Hutchens, Hulbert, Lewis & Brown, 2017). While these percentages may suggest equal participation of full-time contingent faculty in shared governance at most institutions, in reality this is unlikely to be true. The majority of senate leaders (participants used for the previously cited AAUP study) indicated that their organizations impose limits on the number of contingent faculty allowed to serve at any given time, and have set qualifications for contingent faculty eligible to serve (for example, teaching load) (AAUP, 2014). In addition, 67.9% of senate leaders indicated that contingent faculty are barred from certain activities and subcommittees (AAUP, 2014). Another barrier to the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance is the typical lack of compensation for senate appointments. Especially for part-time unsalaried faculty, senate appointments could mean working additional hours without compensation (AAUP, 2014).

Concerns related to the growth of contingent faculty nationally were also felt on the campus of the University of Mississippi. Data from the university's Institutional Research, Effectiveness, & Planning Office (2018) showed that as of 2018, 589 faculty were tenure-track and 516 were non-tenure-track. While lower than the national average, the number of contingent faculty at the University has seen significant growth; in 2009, 502 faculty members were tenured or tenure-track while 375 were contingent. In the School of Journalism, School of Pharmacy and School of Education, the percentage of contingent faculty is greater than the percentage of tenure-track faculty (60%, 53%, and 55% respectively) (IREP, 2018).

In 2017, a Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance Task Force was formed at the University of Mississippi to explore the needs of contingent faculty, and address a rising

concern: their lack of representation in governance. Until 2018, non-tenure-track faculty were excluded from the Faculty Senate, in both representation and eligibility to serve. While the reasoning behind the formation of this group largely aligns with the concerns found in the literature, Task Force members, who were mostly contingent faculty themselves, had unique perspectives on why they felt it was important to organize to address this matter. Their stories will be later explored in this study, along with the viewpoints of tenured and tenure-track senators serving in the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate.

As the Task Force gained members and traction on campus, they determined that their goal was to seek representation in the existing Faculty Senate, as opposed to establishing a separate body. Through meetings with the Senate's executive committee and advocacy work on campus, the Task Force achieved the majority of its initial goals. Senators and the overall faculty voted to approve changes to the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate in the fall of 2018, allowing full-time tenure-track faculty not only to be represented on the Senate, but also serve as senators for their departments. However, at this time, part-time faculty are not eligible to serve in the Senate.

The successful organization of contingent faculty and the achievements of the Task Force represent a noteworthy shift in the shared governance model at the University of Mississippi. One may wonder if this shift is a representation of the role contingent faculty play on campus today. Noting the significance of this event, this study seeks to understand, in depth, the unfolding story of shared governance for contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi, and how contingent faculty organized to effect this change. Two groups of constituents will be interviewed for this study: members of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate, and members of the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance Task Force. In addition to conducting interviews,

the researcher will analyze University documents and artifacts related to contingent faculty and the Faculty Senate as part of the data collection.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Olson (2009) described shared governance as a process in which various university constituents are consulted and involved in key decisions, and certain constituent groups are given primary responsibilities over certain areas. The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2017) further explained shared governance:

When done well, shared governance strengthens the quality of leadership and decision making at an institution, enhances its ability to achieve its vision and to meet strategic goals, and increases the odds that the very best thinking by all parties to shared governance is brought to bear on institutional challenges (p. 3).

According to the AAUP's 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, faculty should be responsible for matters related to the educational mission of the institution (American Association of University Professors, 1966). These include matters related to curriculum, instruction, research, and faculty personnel items such as promotion, dismissal, and compensation. The same document states that a governing body should be established representing "the views of the whole faculty" (American Association of University Professors, 1966, para. 32). At the University of Mississippi, the Faculty Senate represents such governing body, and as stated in its constitution, it "shall be empowered to make recommendations to the Chancellor, provost and Council of Academic Administrators on policies affecting the University and to advise on such matters as the Chancellor or Provost shall lay before it" (Constitution of the Senate of the Faculty, 2018, para. 2).

Institutions across the United States have noted the growth of contingent faculty in the professoriate, and have addressed the lack of representation of this employee group in governance. Lack of representation is concerning because contingent faculty face issues that are not often typical of their tenure and tenure-track counterparts. Previously cited examples of such issues include low pay, lack of job security, concerns over academic freedom, lack of institutional support and benefits, among others.

With more recent data demonstrating that full-time non-tenured faculty members are eligible for senate positions in 85% of doctoral institutions-highest research activity (Jones et al., 2017), the University of Mississippi was significantly behind in this issue compared to similar institutions. Prior to the 2018 vote, only tenure and tenure-track faculty were counted for representation and were eligible to serve in the Senate. Being “counted” is of importance because, in the past, departments were designated a number of senators proportionate to the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty in their department. In consequence, an academic department with a large number of contingent faculty would only be represented in proportion to the number of tenure-line faculty, leading the number of senators in the Faculty Senate to not be representative of the actual size of the department. One example of such instance is the Department of Writing and Rhetoric, one of the largest academic departments on campus, which was only represented by one senator in the Faculty Senate prior to the revisions to the bylaws.

In addition to lack of representation and ineligibility to serve, contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi were excluded from governance in other ways. For instance, the policy on University Standing Committees states that “a faculty member is defined as any full-time, tenure-track professor above the rank of Instructor” (The University of Mississippi, 2013, para. 2). Essentially, this language excludes 47% of the faculty (per 2018 IREP numbers) of providing



“recommendations for changes the committees deem necessary for the general good of the University,” the policy’s definition of standing committees (The University of Mississippi, 2013, para. 1).

It is also important to note that contingency in academia disproportionately affects women more often than men. Female faculty members are more likely to be employed in part-time or full-time non-tenure-track position than male faculty members (Curtis, 2004; AAUP, 2003; Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulder, 2009). At the University of Mississippi, the disproportion is staggering. Data from IREP showed that, as of 2018, 282 female faculty were employed in a contingent basis while 212 were tenure-track. For male faculty, on the other hand, 234 were employed in non-tenure-track positions while 377 were employed on a tenure line. The lack of gender equity in faculty positions further demonstrates the need to address issues related to contingency in academia.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to uncover in detail, the story of contingent faculty advocating and successfully earning representation in governance at the University of Mississippi. Little has been written about the process of including contingent faculty in governance at American institutions. In particular, this story is unique because it demonstrates how a group of contingent faculty were able to organize, gain allies, advocate and ultimately successfully achieve the goal of representation and eligibility to serve in the Faculty Senate. It also sheds light on the difficulties contingent faculty face and on the amount of variance in the ways academic departments see the role of contingent faculty. Through the review of University documents and artifacts, and interviews of members of the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared

Governance Task Force and of the 2017-2108 Faculty Senate, I also address the beliefs and perceptions of faculty regarding the role of adjuncts in campus governance.

In a story published by the Chronicle of Higher Education about the decision to include contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate at the University of Mississippi, Field (2018) cited other institutions that have made strides to achieve a similar goal. New York University, for example, has a separate council for contingent faculty within the faculty senate. This model has proven to be effective at their institution because as Mary Killilea, the faculty senate chair, asserted, contingent faculty face unique challenges that can be addressed by a separate body (Field, 2018). The same article cited examples of two institutions, American University and Portland State University, where despite being eligible to participate in governance, little interest has been shown by contingent faculty in serving in their senates (Field, 2018). While this article provides some guidance on contingent faculty participation in governance in American institutions, as previously mentioned, few narratives of such processes are available in current literature.

In conclusion, in thinking about the role of contingent faculty in governance, one may wonder: what does the process at the University of Mississippi tell us about how contingent faculty can organize to become a more influential portion of their college campuses? How exactly do contingent faculty organize and gain support from their tenured counterparts? What are the arguments for and against the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance? What role do contingent faculty play on campus and within their academic departments? And how does the unfolding story of the inclusion of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate relate to the current literature on contingent faculty?

## **Significance of the Study**

The steep rise in the number of contingent faculty at institutions in the United States indicates a significant shift in the academic profession. While in past decades tenured and tenure-track positions were the norm, today they represent a minority category within the professoriate. As Schneirov (2003) explained, these significant changes in the professoriate have concerned many tenured faculty, who may wonder whether professional standards of the profession and the benefits afforded by tenure are under threat.

These concerns validate the idea that a thorough understanding of the role contingent faculty play in their institutions is essential, as they make up the majority of the academic profession in today's world. The process of inclusion of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate at the University of Mississippi represents a successful case of contingent faculty organizing to advocate for the rights associated with the academic profession. The initial resistance they received from members of the Senate can also teach us about the concerns of tenured faculty in regard to their position in the university hierarchy, and the protections the tenure establishment offers them. The purpose of this study is to add to the current literature by uncovering in detail, not only the process of allowing contingent faculty to be included in governance, but also the beliefs and perceptions of faculty as they relate to the role of adjuncts on their campus.

## **Theoretical Framework**

This study is based on the theoretical framework of shared governance and its essential role in American higher education, regardless of whether participants agree or not that contingent faculty should be represented and eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate. It is important to note that shared governance does not mean that faculty should have control over all university decisions. As explained by Olson (2009), "shared" means assigning roles to all constituents,

“giving various groups of people a share in key decision-making processes, often through elected representation, and allowing certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making” (para. 10).

Because of the poor salary and working conditions of contingent faculty in the United States, one could also argue that allowing them representation in governance and proper advocacy for their rights is a social justice issue. Social justice is a much-emphasized concept in American education. As defined by NASPA, social justice is “both a process and a goal that includes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to create learning environments that foster equitable participation of all groups and seeks to address issues of oppression, privilege and power” (Eanes et al., 2015). While this definition is part of NASPA’s professional competencies professionals should display when working with students, the idea of “equitable participation for all groups” should apply to faculty as well.

As Street, Maisto, Merves, and Rhoades (2012) asserted after conducting extensive research on the realities of contingent faculty, “campus administrators have too often reached beyond the demands of flexibility to a level of arbitrariness in hiring practices unrelated to fiscal prudence, reasonable flexibility, or any real educational purpose” (p. 16). For example, they argue that providing simple measures such as offering orientation or ensuring timely library and copying and printing access, would not be costly for institutions, yet lack of resources and support is a daily reality of contingent faculty (Street et al.). Swidler (2017) expanded on this notion, expressing that, “any college or university that hires large numbers of faculty members to work under those [low pay and minimal long-term prospect] conditions also changes its relationship to justice” (para. 1).

## Research Questions

Two major research questions are used to guide this study:

1. What is the unfolding story of shared governance for contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi?
2. How did contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi organize to advocate for the inclusion and representation of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate?

In addition, through interviews of stakeholders and document analysis, the researcher will attempt to answer the following sub-questions:

1. What is the current role of the Faculty Senate at the University of Mississippi and how does its role relate to the shared governance model?
2. How did the Senate come together to allow consideration and voting on the issue?
3. What factors influenced faculty's voting decisions?
4. Why did contingent faculty rally to receive representation in the Faculty Senate as opposed to a separate and unique governing entity?
5. How does representation in the senate change the reality of contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi? What are the expectations and hopes of contingent faculty who advocated for representation?
6. What factors influenced the decision to not include part-time faculty in the vote? Were they part of the initial conversations?
7. What major concerns were brought up by contingent faculty related to non-representation?
8. What roles do contingent faculty believe to play in their academic departments?

9. What is the future of positions of leadership within the senate and contingent faculty's eligibility for them?

### **Overview of Methods**

This study was conducted at the University of Mississippi, Mississippi's flagship university and a highest research activity institution (R1) in the Carnegie Classification (About UM, n.d.). As of the 2017-2018 school year, the University of Mississippi enrolled 20,890 students and employed 1,103 faculty (Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning, 2018). Through interviews of Senators and contingent faculty, the results of this study are displayed in a qualitative, case study, chronological manner.

Participants included seven members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance and nine members of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate. Five of the 16 participants elected to waive their confidentiality and have their names published in the study. The researcher solely conducted phone interviews and transcribed them for further analysis. Participants were then given the opportunity to revise their transcripts for accuracy. Data gathered from interviews and document analysis was then analyzed and combined with University documents, as reflected in the results section.

### **Definition of Terms**

**AAUP.** The American Association of University Professors, "a nonprofit membership association of faculty and other academic professionals" (para. 1), responsible for defining professional values and standards and for advocating for the rights of those in the academic profession (AAUP, n.d.).

**Academic Freedom.** The entitlement academic professionals have to full freedom of research and publication, teaching and classroom discussions, and in speaking as private citizens without the fear of censorship or reprimand by the institutions that employ them (AAUP, 1940).

**Contingent Faculty.** Part-time or full-time academic appointments that are not on a path towards tenure. The definition applies to professionals working in colleges and universities in adjunct positions, postdoctoral researchers, teaching assistants, non-tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, part-time faculty, and non-senate faculty (AAUP, n.d.).

**Faculty Senate.** At the University of Mississippi, the Faculty Senate represents “all actively employed faculty members”, and “shall be empowered to make recommendations to the Chancellor and Academic Council on policies affecting the University and to advise on such matters as the Chancellor shall lay before it. (Constitution of the Senate of the Faculty, 2018). Representation of “all faculty members” was added after the amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate were approved in Fall 2018.

**Shared Governance.** “A delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making processes, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other” (Olson, 2009, para. 6). A model of governance for American institutions of higher learning.

**Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance.** Task force formed by members of the University of Mississippi to explore issues related to contingency and later organize for representation of contingent faculty members in the University of Mississippi’s Faculty Senate.

**Tenure.** In academia, “a tenure appointment is an indefinite appointment that can be terminated only for cause or under extraordinary circumstances such as financial exigency and program discontinuation” (AAUP, n.d., para 1).

### **Assumptions and Limitations**

While in quantitative studies, researchers must pay attention to the validity and reliability of selected instruments, in qualitative studies, “the researcher is the instrument” (Patton, 2002). Because of this, there is some potential for biases and mistakes. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016) it is important to identify biases and subjective thoughts, and monitor them as they relate to the theoretical framework guiding the research, as opposed to trying to eliminate them. Having researched the challenges associated with contingency in higher education before beginning this study, I believed in advocating for the needs of contingent faculty and their right for a role in shared governance. However, I approached participants with opposing views in an unbiased matter - in fact, their opinions helped me realize the complexity of this issue and made me consider aspects that I had not previously considered.

Moreover, findings in qualitative studies are not as easily extended to the general population as quantitative studies are (Atieno, 2009). More specifically, because this case study is bound to the University of Mississippi, other institutions will likely be unable to emulate it. A diverse combination of factors was necessary to change the bylaws of the Faculty Senate at this time, especially since the issue had been brought up previously without movement. As one participant described, this process was an example of *kairos*, “a time when conditions are right for the accomplishment of a crucial action” (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). Because of this, it is unclear whether similar efforts by contingent faculty at different institutions would emulate similar results, although this possibility is explored in chapter 5 of this study.



## **Organization of the Study**

Chapter 1 introduced the rise of contingent faculty positions in the United States and the issues faced by contingent faculty. It also addressed the formation of the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance and ultimate goal to seek representation for contingent faculty in the University of Mississippi Faculty Senate. Lastly, chapter 1 introduced this study's research questions.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the current literature including topics such as: the rise of contingent faculty, the demographics of contingent faculty, major issues associated with contingent employment, the academic profession and governance (including shared governance and academic freedom), and governance at the University of Mississippi.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the methods utilized in this study including: a rationale of the chosen methodology, the role of the researcher, ethical considerations, site and participant selection, the interview guide, and information on data interpretation. Chapter 4 then introduces the results of this study, and addresses perceptions about the role of contingent faculty on campus and in governance, the initial convening of the Task Force, the reasoning behind pursuing representation in the Faculty Senate, efforts surrounding part-time faculty, arguments for and against representation, details on the Task Force initial presentation to the Faculty Senate, the role of the administration, and the final decision.

Finally, chapter 5 concludes this study and reflects on the takeaways from the integration of the Faculty Senate by contingent faculty. Major themes include: the role of the Senate and of faculty in governance, the future of contingent faculty in governance, the work that lies ahead of contingent faculty, collective bargaining and unionization, limitations and considerations for future study.

## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **The Rise of Contingent Faculty**

Higher education researchers have recently begun dedicating resources and time to understanding contingency in the United States. However, painting an accurate and thorough picture of this population can be challenging. For instance, Hoeller (2014) reported that college administrators have attempted to conceal their increasing number of adjunct instructors from the public, especially since rankings such as the *US News and World Report* began factoring the number of contingent faculty into their ranking equation. In addition, the professoriate in the United States is large and diverse, making it difficult to generalize (Altbach, 2011). As of 2011, there were more than 1.3 million full-time and part-time (tenured and non-tenured) faculty members in the United States employed at over 4,300 institutions of higher education (Altbach, 2011).

In recent years, the number of contingent positions in college campuses has increased significantly. While in 1975 tenured and tenure-track faculty represented 45% of the academic labor force, in 2015 they represented only 30% of it. And while in 1975 full-time non-tenure-track faculty and part-time faculty represented 55% of the academic labor force, in 2015 the group represented 70 % of it (American Association of University Professors Research Office, 2017). In 1993, the AAUP set guidelines stating that non-tenure appointments should make up no more than 15% of the total instruction provided by the institution (AAUP, 1993). Given the

current environment, one could say that the recommendation is unrealistic as employment patterns indicate continuous growth in the contingent academic labor force.

Contingent faculty are employed at the highest rates in community colleges, and at the lowest rates in research institutions – in the latter, graduate teaching assistants are often responsible for teaching loads that would otherwise be given to contingent faculty (Schneirov, 2003). Nonetheless, contingent faculty in 2013 accounted for 50% of instructional faculty at public research institutions, and 46% of all faculty at public flagship institutions (seen as the most distinguished within their state’s educational system) (Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2016).

Full-time contingent appointments are more prevalent at public and private research institutions and at private bachelor’s colleges (Hurlburt, & McGarrah, 2016). Part-time positions of one year or less are the most prevalent type of contingent assignment, comprising of half of all faculty appointments at American community colleges. Nationally, part-time appointments represent around 44% of all contingent faculty (Berry, 2005). A survey conducted by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012) indicated that part-time faculty represent the fastest-growing group of postsecondary academic workforce in the United States.

According to the 1993 AAUP report on the Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, much of the growth in part-time non-tenured positions in higher education occurred between 1972 and 1977, a period in which financial security for both private and public institutions was significantly reduced (AAUP, 1993). During that period, government authorities in the United States began enacting policies and regulations that would bring universities into the marketplace (Munene, 2018). These policies were based on the sentiment that rather than relying on the state, universities were capable of generating their own revenue in an open market (Munene, 2018). At that time, contingent faculty were typically employed by community colleges on a part-time

basis and hired because of their expertise in a professional or vocational field (Kezar, 2012).

Continued financial uncertainty in the 1980s, when state appropriations were reduced and enrollment began to increase, led public institutions to begin experimenting with the use of contingent faculty (Kezar, 2012). In the 1990s, despite an increase in student tuition, institutions were still looking for ways to meet their conservative fiscal needs and began hiring full-time non-tenured faculty to teach a larger variety of courses (Kezar, 2012). Moreover, the early 1990s saw for-profit institutions driving the large increase in adjunct faculty, with the typical institution employing more than 90% of faculty in contingent positions (Magness, 2017).

In addition, Kezar (2012) reported that recent changes in the business sector in favor of more contingent and temporary workers have influenced hiring decisions in higher education, especially since corporate leaders typically served on college boards. The shift has been such that Hoeller (2014) has labeled the growth of contingency as “the Wal-Martization of the academe” (p. 118). According to him, just like Walmart’s known practice of favoring the hiring of part-time workers at minimum pay and no benefits over hiring full-time workers, higher education has taken notice that it is much more cost effective to hire part-time faculty (Hoeller, 2014). Berry (2005) went further to say that contingency in the professoriate is one of the only instances in the United States economy in which an entire profession has been converted from permanent status to a temporary and often part-time status.

Frye (2017) expanded on the increase in financial pressures faced by higher education in the United States. According to Frye (2017), between 1991 and 2016, state appropriations declined by 19%, leading institutions to raise tuition prices. In 2003, for example, only two institutions in the United States charged over \$40,000 dollars for tuition and additional fees. By 2009, over two hundred American colleges charge the amount (Mills, 2012). The impact has

been such that the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has deemed the period between 2008 and 2017 as “a lost decade in higher education funding,” since declining state appropriations have also led institutions to reduce faculty and student services, limit course selection and even close campuses (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2017). In the state of Mississippi, the percent change in state spending per student when adjusted for inflation between 2008 and 2017 was – 22.1% (Mitchell et al., 2017). Since July 2016, the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL), the governing board overseeing all eight public institutions in the state, lost over \$107 million in state funding (Rand, 2018).

At the University of Mississippi, state appropriations have decreased by over 13 % since 2016, all while the university has seen an increase in enrollment and operational costs (Rand, 2018). While in 1987, 47.5% of revenue at the University of Mississippi came from state support, 25 years later in 2012, only 27.7% of revenue came from this source (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2014). According to the University's latest financial summary, in FY17 14.6% of total revenue came from state appropriations (The University of Mississippi Financial Summary, 2017).

While financial pressures have certainly contributed to the rise in contingent faculty, this phenomenon can also be attributed to a shift in institutional priorities. Evidence of this are the immense disparities between the salaries of college presidents and of contingent faculty, for example. Utilizing data from the Chronicle of Higher Education on college president compensation and salaries of contingent faculty at various institutions, McKenna (2015) estimated a “president-to-adjunct” (para. 10) salary ratio for a few selected institutions. At Rensselaer Polytechnic, for example, home of the highest paid private institution president in the country in 2012, the president-to-adjunct ratio is 357 to one. At Pennsylvania State, which

employs the highest paid public university president in 2012, that ratio is 75 to one. Related to these ratios is an even more alarming statistic: institutions with the highest-paid presidents employ “low-wage faculty” (para. 1) at a faster rate than other institutions (Erwin & Wood, 2014).

The increase in contingent faculty is also seen as a product of the corporatization of higher education (Scott, 2018). The belief that universities are becoming increasingly more business-like is supported by the following perceptions: the focus on short term-thinking and on money as opposed to mission, the use of resources to promote prestige, the shift from shared governance to top-down decision-making, the focus on advertising and public recognition, and the view of students as consumers (Scott, 2018). Westheimer (2010), a professor who was denied tenure at NYU after supporting graduate students’ efforts to unionize, agrees with this phenomenon and asserts that the focus on maximizing profit, growing and being marketable is such that “the democratic mission of the university as a public good has all but vanished” (para. 2). Mills (2012) further supported the argument. According to him, the *U.S. News and World Report* “Best Colleges” guide has grown in its importance and has begun to drive policies in colleges and universities across the country who seek to achieve a higher ranking. He also argued that the focus on extravagant new amenities and spending in student services further supports the shift to a business-like model (Mills, 2012).

Another important consideration regarding the rise of contingency are recent public criticisms by administrators and public figures on tenure (Berry, 2005). As pointed out by Holbrook (2004), many academics who adhere to the traditional values of higher education (academic freedom, intellectual integrity, and scholarly values) receive labels such as “elitist” or belonging to the “ivory tower” (p. 68). Bliss (2009) a tenured faculty member himself went

further to affirm that the word tenure “connotes privilege and featherbedding” (p. 12). In an article for the Harvard Business Review, Whetherbe (2013), a faculty member, argued that tenure impacts American research productivity in science and technology fields because it pressures faculty in all fields to conduct research - meaning efforts should not be equally warranted to subject areas that are unchanging and not critical in today’s world.

The belief against tenure has led to more stringent review of tenured faculty in addition to increasing the number of contingent positions on a campus. Wayne State University, for example, recently attempted to fire five tenured professors in its medical school alleging they were abusing tenure (Koziowski, 2017). As another example, Rick Brattin, a Missouri Republican, introduced a bill in early 2017 to eliminate tenure at Missouri State, criticizing that faculty “can get away with literally everything” (para. 1) while compensated by taxpayer money (Eggington, 2018).

### **The Make-Up of Contingent Faculty**

The job market for those who graduate with a terminal degree has been increasingly scarce (McKenna, 2016). For instance, according to the American Historical Association (AHA), only 24 percent of those who earned a doctorate in the last three to fifteen years held a position in academia (Townsend & Brookins, 2016). More alarming, the number of AHA job postings recently fell below half of the number of doctoral degree graduates in History (Townsend & Brookins, 2016). According to Langing (2019), data released by the United States National Science Foundation indicates that, for the first time in history, the private sector has employed nearly as many Ph.D. graduates as the education sector.

Although the lack of tenure-track positions has contributed to contingency, not all contingent faculty members were forced to accept such positions due to limiting options. Lyons

(2007) spoke of three situations that lead one to secure a contingent faculty position. First, there are those who are employed full-time outside of teaching and enjoy the opportunity to share their experiences and network with other campus members (Lyons, 2007). There are also freelancers, who by choice, are employed at multiple part-time positions, and career enders, who are approaching the conclusion of their career lives (Lyons, 2007). Lastly, there are aspiring academics, who have recently completed their graduate education but were not able to secure a tenured position (Lyons, 2007). Nonetheless, this last category of those who did not necessarily choose to pursue a contingent position is perhaps the most concerning, and perhaps most reflective of the reality of contingent faculty in the United States today.

It is also relevant to mention that contingent employment in academia is not equally balanced among different demographics. The sections below will highlight what research tells us about how gender, age, and race and ethnicity can predict who is more likely to obtain contingent employment in institutions of higher education.

## **Gender**

Women have had a long tradition of serving in contingent positions in higher education in the United States (Steiger, 2013). Half a century ago, the vast majority of college professors were white, male and Protestant (Altbach, 2011). At that time, it was not uncommon for wives of professors to instruct a class on an adjunct basis for extra income (Steiger, 2013). Today, women still represent the majority of contingent faculty (Curtis, 2011). To preface this discussion, it is important to note that the number of women who obtain a degree cannot be used to justify this disparity. Currently, women represent the majority of individuals who graduate from college (Winslow & Davis, 2016). Moreover, according to a report by the Council of Graduate



Schools(2017), women earned the majority of doctorate degrees (52.1%) and master's degrees (57.4%) in fall 2016.

As for contingent faculty, women are represented more significantly among part-time faculty than full-time faculty (AAUP, 2003; Wolfinger et al., 2009). In 1998, 48 percent of part-time faculty were female while 36 % of full-time faculty were female (AAUP, 2003). As of the year 2000, women made up 55% of lecturers and 58% of instructors, typically non-tenured and non-tenured track positions, while they made up only 21% of full professors (tenured professionals at the highest ranking) (AAUP, 2003). A 2012 CAW survey had 61.9% of part-time faculty identify as women (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). McNaughtan, Garcia, and Nehls (2017) further affirmed what numbers have shown – men are overrepresented in full-time, tenured positions, and women are overrepresented in contingent positions in every racial category.

Disparities related to gender are even more apparent at the University of Mississippi. 2018 data from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IREP) showed that men make up slightly over 55% of the faculty. When the data is isolated by gender, male faculty are most often employed in tenure-track positions while female faculty are most often employed in non-tenure-track positions. In 2018 female faculty made up 54% of all non-tenure-track positions, and 65% of non-tenure-track lecturer positions (IREP 2018). At the University of Mississippi, lecturer positions indicate that a faculty member served for a number of years in their non-tenure-track position and has earned a promotion (but not tenure or a tenure-track position) (Faculty Titles and Ranks, 2015). In contrast, male faculty make up 64% of all tenure-track positions. More disparately, in 2018 male faculty held 125 of full professor positions, the highest-ranked faculty position on campus, while women held only 48 of those (IREP, 2018).

Researchers have certainly pondered on why women are most often represented in non-tenure-track positions in academia. Wolfinger et al. (2009) explained that contingent positions may be more attractive to married women and women with young children because of the opportunity of teaching part-time, having lighter teaching loads and the ability to move geographically more easily if necessary. This assertion is plausible, considering that the career structure of tenure-positions offers little flexibility and time out for children (Wolfinger et al., 2009). Supporting this, Patterson (2008) provided testimonials of female faculty who were advised to wait to have children until after they were up for tenure or who were told that a long maternity leave would be viewed negatively on a tenure review. Surprisingly, women have received some of this advice from older tenured women themselves (Armenti, 2004). However, as Curtis (2004) argued, the idea that some women may have chosen a contingent position to accommodate their family life is a direct reflection of “continuing structural inequality in faculty careers” (para. 11), because it implies that family life and the pursuit of tenure are incompatible.

While the path to tenure may have a negative impact on faculty’s family life, in reality, contingent faculty have shared similar concerns. As explained in a report from the Education & the Workforce Committee to the U.S. House of Representatives in 2014, institutions have preferred hiring contingent faculty in the past because of their desire to avoid paying for benefits, specifically health insurance. A contingent faculty member interviewed for the report expressed her concerns about pregnancy:

I am currently pregnant with my first child... I will receive NO time off for the birth or recovery. It is necessary I continue until the end of the semester in May in order to get

paid, something I drastically need. The only recourse I have is to revert to an online classroom for some time and do work while in the hospital and upon my return home (Education & the Workforce Committee, 2014).

## **Age**

According to the CAW survey (2012), 70% of part-time faculty were between the ages of 36 and 65, which they consider to be “prime earning years” (p. 7). The average age of both full-time contingent faculty and part-time contingent faculty is 48 years old and 36% of contingent faculty are age 55 or older (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, as cited in Monks, 2009; Yakoboski, 2015). According to Flaherty (2014), adjunct faculty may be more likely to face age discrimination than their tenured counterparts, as evidenced by recent lawsuits filed by contingent faculty who argued they were more experienced than younger professionals who were hired for tenure-track positions at their institutions. As Benderly (2014) asserted, it appears that when colleges and universities are looking to fill open tenure-track positions, they almost never consider the contingent faculty who have been working for them.

## **Race and Ethnicity**

As previously mentioned percentages of female versus male faculty demonstrate disparities; however, those disparities are even larger when race and ethnicity are considered. As of fall 2015, 35% of all full-time faculty were white females (National Center for Statistics, 2015). Racial minorities are still underrepresented among full-time faculty. In 2015, only six percent of full-time faculty were Asian/Pacific Islander males, four percent were Asian/Pacific Islander females, three percent each were African-American males and females, two percent each were Hispanic/Latino, and less than one percent were biracial/multiracial or American Indian/Alaskan natives (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015).

In 2018 at the University of Mississippi, 20% of all faculty were underrepresented minorities (IREP, 2018). Of those, 70 were tenured, 61 were tenure-eligible and 89 (40.5%) were in a contingent position. This indicates that while the university employs minority faculty at a low percentage, those who are employed are mostly in tenure-track positions.

### **Types of Positions and Settings**

Contingent faculty in the United States are employed in varied contractual capacities. In their research, Hurlburt and McGarrah (2016), considered three types of contracts: multiyear contracts, annual or less-than-one-year contracts, and without-faculty status, which encompasses faculty working at institutions with no tenure or those who are not eligible for faculty status. Part-time faculty with contracts of one year or less are the most prevalent contingent faculty, ranging from 19% at public institutions to 50% of all faculty at community colleges (Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2016). Full-time instructional faculty on a multiyear contract were employed at the lowest rate across all types of institutions (Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2016). According to Korkki (2018), typical teaching loads are three courses per semester. However, course loads for contingent faculty are difficult to predict because contingent faculty typically work in a semester-to-semester contract (Education & the Workforce Committee, 2014).

According to the CAW (2012) survey, 80% of part-time faculty have been teaching in a contingent position for the past three years. This demonstrates that these perceived temporary positions are in reality, being filled by workers on a permanent basis. The same survey showed that when asked whether they would accept a full-time tenure-track position, 51.9% of contingent faculty stated they definitely would and 21.8% said they likely would. Only 8.1% of contingent faculty stated that they definitely would not accept a full-time tenure-track position (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012).

As mentioned in the previous section, opportunities for advancement are limited for contingent faculty. One contingent faculty member described the lack of opportunity in a statement to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce Democratic Staff (2014): “It is impossible for adjuncts to earn a decent living and impossible to have any career advancement. We are shut out of regular teaching jobs and are shut out of full-time employment by our own schools...” (p. 23). While some institutions have attempted to offer opportunities for advancement by implementing promotions policies, some of them prohibit contingent faculty from being promoted into tenure-line positions. The University of Mississippi is an example of an institution with such policy.

The Policy of Promotion of Instructor and Lecturers (2013) states that full-time instructors who have served for at least five years may be eligible for promotion to lecturer if outstanding teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated. After six years of serving as a lecturer, a faculty member can be promoted to senior lecturer. The policy also outlines that instructors, lecturers, and senior lectures are not allowed to participate in decisions regarding tenure-track faculty members and in the evaluation of academic administrators. In addition, full-time contingent faculty may only participate in curriculum design, academic advising, recommendations for scholarship and graduate assistantships and search committees if the departments seeks approval from the Dean (Policy of Promotion of Instructor and Lecturers, 2013).

Street, Maisto, Merves & Rhoades (2012) described hiring practices for adjunct faculty as “just-in-time” hiring (para. 2); many contingent faculty do not receive their class assignments until two or three weeks prior to the beginning of the semester, allowing little time for necessary

preparation. When they do receive longer notice, they are not paid for the time used in preparation for the semester. As one faculty member described (Street et al., 2012, p. 8):

My contract starts the first day of classes. If you go by that, I had no time to prepare.

However, since I knew I would be hired, and what courses I would be teaching, I had all kinds of time to prepare, though, of course, I was not paid for that time.

Many contingent professors commute between multiple campuses, and work without access to an office space and the appropriate amenities (Street et al., 2012). In fact, Street et al. (2012) found that 54% of contingent faculty teach in more than one institution. More alarming is that the same survey found that 94% of respondents received no institutional or departmental orientation upon being hired, leaving faculty with little knowledge of the institution's culture, teaching expectations and curriculum guidelines (Street et al., 2012).

### **Major Issues and Concerns**

#### **Salary and Benefits**

Contingent faculty earn, depending on the institution and discipline, somewhere between \$2,000 and \$6,000 per course (Korkki, 2018), and according to the House Committee report (2014), the average annual teaching salary for contingent faculty is \$24,926. A one-semester course typically requires three hours in the classroom and an average of six hours in preparation, student meetings, grading, etc., which excludes time for preparation prior to the beginning of the semester (Berry, 2005). Because of these typical out-of-the-classroom demands, contingent faculty who have kept logs detailing time dedicated to a course have reported that they sometimes made less than ten dollars an hour (Berry, 2005).

Perhaps more telling than the annual salary of contingent faculty is the comparison with salaries of tenured faculty. According to a House Committee report, a contingent faculty member

compensated per class taught would need to instruct 17 classes to attain the average earnings of a tenure-track faculty member (Davis, 2019). This disparity in pay has resulted in many contingent faculty relying on help from family, spouse's income, and government assistance (House Committee on Education and the Work Democratic Staff, 2014). According to the UC Berkeley Labor Center, 25% of part-time contingent faculty rely on public assistance and are enrolled in at least one of the following programs: Medicaid/CHIP, TANF, EITC, or SNAP (Jacobs, Perry & MacGillvary, 2015).

Ineligibility for benefits affects particularly part-time contingent faculty – a 2018 AAUP report on the economic status of the academic profession stated that only 5% of institutions offer benefits to all part-time faculty (AAUP, 2018). Because eligibility is typically based on the number of courses taught, many faculty members find themselves ineligible when they are not able to secure a high teaching load (House Committee on Education and the Work Democratic Staff, 2014). Others have been required to limit the time they spend weekly in teaching and teaching-related activities to under 30 hours so that their employers would not be legally required by the Affordable Care Act to provide them with health benefits (Dunn, 2013). A faculty member interviewed for the House Committee report expressed this practice:

I have been told that I may be offered another [course for the spring semester]... I have also been informed that the plans are on hold until the University-level administrators work through the details. Frankly, I suspect the delay is due to them making absolutely sure that no one will become eligible for health insurance benefits as a consequence (House Committee on Education and the Work Democratic Staff, 2014).

While 74% of contingent faculty have the option to contribute to a retirement savings plan at their institution, only 19% of faculty in contingent positions reported feeling very

confident about living comfortably as they reach retirement (Yakoboski, 2015). As evidence, Berry (2005) told a story of a contingent faculty member who found after 25 years of service at multiple California community colleges that his service was not enough to make him eligible for vesting in the state's pension system, because only his contact hours in the classroom counted towards his eligibility.

### **Effectiveness and Qualifications**

Some concern has been raised over the effectiveness of contingent faculty related to student outcomes. In his study of contingent faculty effectiveness, for example, Umbach (2007) found that in comparison with tenured faculty, contingent faculty are underperforming in their instruction of undergraduate students. According to him, part-time faculty more specifically have fewer interactions with students, utilize collaborative techniques in the classroom with less frequency, spend less time in course preparations and have lower expectations for students (Umbalck, 2007). A study by Jaeger and Hinz (2008) found that as first-year students' enrollment in courses instructed by part-time faculty increased, their chances of being retained decreased. Kezar, Maxey and Badke (2014) explained, however, that contingent faculty themselves are not to blame for this phenomenon – rather, poor working conditions and lack of support faced by these professionals negatively affect their ability to maximize their effectiveness. Berry (2005) explained this sentiment by utilizing the slogan – “faculty teaching conditions are student learning conditions” (p. 15).

Contrary to some beliefs, contingent faculty are highly educated professionals. Research has shown that 94% of part-time faculty had a graduate degree: 40.2% hold a master's degree, 30.4% a doctorate degree, 16.7% a professional or other terminal degree and 7% are in all-but-dissertation (ABD) status (Coalition on the Academic Force, 2012). In his book *Reclaiming the*



*Ivory Tower: Organizing Adjuncts to Change Higher Education*, Joe Berry (2005) told a story that reflects just how qualified contingent faculty can be. He heard about a friend who had recently gotten a tenured position at a University of California campus after having served as a temporary, full-time, and part-time faculty member for over a decade. While employed in a contingent basis, this faculty member published four books (some of which were best-sellers in his field) and won a MacArthur “Genius” award. MacArthur Fellowship award recipients are selected for their “exceptional creativity,” “promise for important future advances based on a track record of significant accomplishments,” and “potential for subsequent creative work” (MacArthur Foundation, n.d.). As Berry (2005) asserted, this professional had to be “a certified genius before he could get a permanent teaching job in a college in the second-largest metropolitan area of the United States” (para. 1).

### **The Academic Profession and Governance**

While issues of pay, job instability, gender inequity, lack of institutional support and others are important to provide a frame of reference for understanding contingency in the United States, this study focuses in particular on an issue not yet discussed, but that is core to the academic profession as we understand it: shared governance. In this section, I will provide literature on the changes to the professoriate through the years, its role in American higher education and how some of the concepts core to its existence are reflected in today’s contingent workforce. This section will also provide a brief historical review of the academic profession in the United States and the emergence of important concepts such as tenure, shared governance and academic freedom.

## **The professoriate in the United States**

When the first colonial colleges were established in the United States prior to the Revolution, the country was home to very few scholars with the credentials necessary to earn the respect of the general public (Gerber, 2014, p. 13). The faculty was mostly composed of “tutors,” who were often recent alumni preparing to go into ministry (Geiger, 1995). These young men did not typically aspire for a career in teaching, but rather saw it as a temporary employment opportunity before embarking in their long-term careers. Despite being among a select and small group of educated individuals, they held little power within their institutions (Geiger, 1995). According to higher education historian John R. Thelin (2004), American college founders of the time were bothered by the “autonomy and sloth” (p. 11) of scholars in Oxford, and in consequence, implemented a system of governance for colonial colleges that relied on an external board. And in contrast with today’s system in which instructors are responsible for delivering information to students through lectures, all knowledge acquired by students was self-obtained (Chute, 1951).

College presidents of the time held significant authority over their institutions (Gerber, 2011; Lucas, 1994). According to Lucas (1994), faculty served “at the president’s pleasure” (p. 303) and could be dismissed at any point. Presidents, in turn, were closely monitored by governing boards and governors (Lucas, 1994). Governing boards of the colonial period in higher education were strict to protect the religious doctrines of the time and enforce their power; as an example, in 1654, Harvard’s first president Henry Dunster was forced to resign from his position because of his views against infant baptism (Cain, 2012; Stone, 2015). As Gerber (2014) explained, governing boards of the time were not willing to allow “typically youthful,

inexperienced, and transient teaching faculty to govern themselves or determine institutional policies” (p. 14).

While in the early decades of the eighteenth-century college teaching became a more appealing field due to declining salaries and job security in ministry, few college professors of the time had developed a sense of identity in the profession (Gerber, 2014). As Gerber (2014) pointed out, “rather than seeing themselves as experts in a particular academic field devoted to the discovery and transmission of new or specialized knowledge, most college teachers continued to view their role as cultivating character in their students” (p. 16).

Higher education in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries saw a shift towards consumerism, innovation and little government accountability (Thelin, 2004). By 1860, there were 241 institutions of higher education in the United States, a significant increase from the number in the previous era (Thelin, 2004). Faculty in the early nineteenth-century constituted two types of individuals: tutors, and regular professors. Tutors were typically recent male graduates who assumed a temporary role and had the duties of observing student recitations and overseeing students under his charge (Lucas, 1994). Professors, on the other hand, typically had some post-baccalaureate training and were appointed to their alma mater after serving for years in a nonacademic profession (Lucas, 1994).

Eventually, as Charles W. Eliot assumed the presidency at Harvard in 1869, the makeup of American faculty began to shift, and “a learned, full-time faculty replaced practitioner-teachers” (Geiger, 2011, p. 52). The appointment of more qualified professors meant they were more “capable of scholarship, research and advanced instruction” (Geiger, 2011, p. 52). Nonetheless, while in some institutions, faculty oversaw decisions regarding admissions, curricula and standards, in the majority of cases, presidents (sometimes called chancellors,

provosts, or rectors) still had absolute control over the school's management (Lucas, 1994; Gerber, 2014).

Early efforts to include faculty in college governance can be attributed to Thomas Jefferson's concept for the University of Virginia. His goal, when the institution opened its doors in 1825, was to employ experienced scholars involved in pursuing knowledge rather than those who were on the way to a career in ministry (Gerber, 2014). Another novel concept which mirrored European institutions, specifically German ones, was to allow faculty members to elect their own president on a rotating basis and give them authority over curriculum and materials chosen for their courses (Gerber, 2014).

German institutions during this time were some of the most respected in the world (O'Boyle, 1983). In fact, between 1970 and 1900, it is reported that over five thousand American scholars pursued graduate education at German institutions in various fields (Gerber, 2014). Upon returning from overseas, some of these scholars were especially influential in the implementation of the German model in the United States (Gerber, 2014; Lucas, 1994). Under the leadership of Wilhem von Humbolt, German institutions became responsible for producing research that supported the industrialization of the country, and established graduate education and doctoral degrees (Altbach, 2011). Unlike their American counterparts, German professors were allowed to exercise authority over their research and teaching and were key players in the selection of administrators (Gerber, 2014). In addition, the concepts of *Lernfreiheit*, which allowed students the freedom to learn without imposition of specific courses or attendance requirements, and *Lehrfreiheit*, which allowed scholars to pursue any research topics and draw uncensored conclusions based on its results, was especially appealing to American scholars of the time (Lucas, 1994).

Leaders of other institutions also paved the way in expanding the role of faculty in governance. Most notably were Henry Phillip Tappan of the University of Michigan, who developed a faculty of more educated scholars and utilized their input in curriculum reform, and Frederick A. P. Barnard of the University of Mississippi who was successful in convincing the governing board that faculty should exercise greater control over educational policies (Gerber, 2014).

### **The American Association of University Professors**

In the late 1800s, American professors began to take note on the philosophy adopted by the great German research institutions of the time. As Dorn (2017) explained, leading United States faculty started mirroring the German belief that institutions thrive when research is “unrestrained by political, social, and economic considerations” (p. 127). However, despite the American faculty’s desire for unrestrained research, the following decades were marked by high profile incidents regarding censorship of University professors by their fellow administrators. One incident particularly demonstrated the current environment surrounding the academic profession: the dismissal of economist Edward Ross from Stanford University in 1900 (AAUP, 2015).

During the 1896 presidential campaign, Ross expressed publicly his support for William Jennings Bryan, the democratic candidate, as well as his opinions about the use of immigrant Chinese labor in building railroads (Dorn, 2017). Jane Stanford (Leland Standord’s widow and only Stanford trustee of the time) dismissed Ross from the institution over his political views – Leland Stanford had employed Chinese immigrants for his railroad business in the past, and his widow was in support of Republican candidate William McKinley (Tiede, 2014). As an act of protest and solidarity to Edward Ross, many professors left Stanford that year (Williams, 2015).

In 1915, as a result of a joint meeting of the American Economic Association, the American Sociological Society, and the American Political Science Association to address the numerous instances of faculty reprimand and censorship, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was founded (Dorn, 2017). The development of the AAUP was a key event in developing concepts that are central to the academic profession as we understand it: academic freedom, tenure, and shared governance.

AAUP documents and opinions are cited abundantly in this dissertation. That is because, since its foundation, the AAUP has played an essential role in establishing guidelines and promoting the tenants of the academic profession. Colleges, universities and faculty often look to the AAUP to provide guidance in matters related to the professoriate. For example, its report on faculty salaries and benefits is considered a key measure for the profession (Gruberg, 2009). Another example is the AAUP's Censure List, which provides names of institutions that according to the organization, "are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure" (AAUP Censure List, n.d., para. 1). The purpose of the list is to inform members and the public that conditions at these institutions have been found to be less than satisfactory (PS: Political Science and Politics, 2015). To be removed from the list, institutions must show evidence of adopting new guidelines for administrators, protections for faculty and of restoring an environment that promotes academic freedom (Schmidt, 2017). In similar fashion, the AAUP conducts investigations and maintains a list of "sanctioned institutions" that have departed from the organization's standards of shared governance (AAUP, n.d.).

In today's environment, the AAUP's mission is to:

Advance academic freedom and shared governance; to define fundamental professional

values and standards for higher education; to promote the economic security of faculty, academic professionals, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and all those engaged in teaching and research in higher education; to help the higher education community organize to make our goals a reality; and to ensure higher education's contribution to the common good. (AAUP. n.d).

As demonstrated in their mission, the AAUP does not discriminate in advocating for faculty. While the AAUP has historically been a fierce defender of tenure, it has not ignored the rise in contingency and excluded contingent faculty from its protections. In recent years, the organization has conducted research to understand trends in the academic labor force, has published recommendations for inclusion of contingent faculty in governance and for protection against threats to academic freedom, and has even published guidelines advising contingent faculty on how to receive unemployment compensation during the summer months (AAUP, 2012; AAUP, 2016; AAUP, 2017; AAUP, 2018).

### **Academic Freedom**

A discussion of what academic freedom is and why the concept is essential to the professoriate is important to understand how the rise of contingency has affected it. Two primary documents have defined academic freedom and argued about its essential role in the academic profession: they are the AAUP's 1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Long before the concept was coined in the United States, as previously stated, German universities recognized terms similar to academic freedom – they were *Lehrfreiheit* (a professor's freedom to teach) and *Lernfreiheit* (a student's freedom to learn). (O'Neil, 2011). Meanwhile, as late as the

second decade of the twentieth century, American universities were dismissing or failing to hire faculty solely based on their views on social and economic issues (O'Neil, 2011).

The 1915 Declaration of Principles was developed to explain why academic freedom is directly tied to the primary goals of education. In the declaration, the AAUP asserted that institutions should be prepared to tolerate a wide range of ideas and beliefs, and institutions who sought to censor these were not worthy of respect by the academic community (O'Neil, 2011). Moreover, as explained by Stone and Stone (2018), the declaration expressed that academic freedom is best achieved through faculty governance, and that the voice of all faculty must be heard in decision-making processes without fear of censorship.

The Declaration of Principles (1915) also argued that academic freedom dignifies the academic profession:

If education is the cornerstone of the structure of society, and if progress in scientific knowledge is essential to civilization, few things can be more important than to enhance the dignity of the scholar's profession, with a view to attracting into its ranks men of the highest ability, of sound learning, and of strong and independent character" (AAUP, 1915, p. 294).

In 1940, the AAUP expanded on the 1915 Declaration of Principles by releasing the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This document helped further promote the concept as it provided a list of over 250 scholarly organizations that endorsed academic freedom. The statement also included guidelines for tenure, such as the establishment of a clear contract between the institution and the faculty member, a limit of seven years to a pre-tenure probationary period, the right to full academic freedom during the probationary period, as



well as guidelines for faculty termination, which still guide institutions of higher learning today (AAUP, 1940).

Because academic freedom is so closely tied to tenure, especially after the 1940 statement, there is concern about how the concept applies to contingent faculty today. In their discussion of the considerations of academic freedom for contingent faculty, Clausen and Swidler (2013) asserted that academic freedom goes beyond the mere ability of each faculty member to provide instruction, conduct research, and publish results without fear of censorship. They believe those efforts are insignificant if faculty cannot exercise collective freedom by “guiding the pedagogical and intellectual life of educational institutions” (p. 4).

Nelson (2010) shared a similar sentiment. He believes the decrease in faculty control over the curriculum gives more power to administrators who do not share the knowledge and expertise of faculty. In addition, contingency makes faculty vulnerable to political pressure and less likely to practice controversial speech in the classroom (Nelson, 2010). Lastly, as Fredrickson (2015) asserted, because of the lack of job security and institutional support, contingent faculty may lack the status and autonomy needed to challenge students, critique ideas that are most accepted and present unpopular opinions. Stone and Stone (2018) went further:

Protecting the freedom of the faculty results in protecting the common good, the greater good of a democratic society. Integrity implies honesty, truth and wholeness. Integrity would not be possible or whole if it was only allocated to a select few faculty. Integrity of higher education resides in the integrity of all faculty within the profession.

This perceived lack of academic freedom may have prevented contingent faculty to speak out about the precarity of their positions. In 2009, *Academe* published an anonymous article titled *The Unhappy Experience of Contingent Faculty*, which specifically discussed the situation

at Boston University. Perhaps more telling than the article itself, was the explanation from *Academe* (2009) on bending its rules for publication:

It is not *Academe*'s policy to publish anonymous articles. However, it is an unfortunate commentary on the job insecurity and the limits on the academic freedom of contingent faculty in American higher education that the editor received several separate inquiries about the possibility of keeping the identity of contingent authors confidential in order to avoid potential retaliation... [the editor] decided, in this particular case, to make an exception the magazine's editorial policy of not publishing anonymous articles (p.22).

### **Shared Governance**

Like with academic freedom, the AAUP has been instrumental in defining the role of and advocating for shared governance in American institutions. In 1920, the first document composed by the AAUP regarding shared governance addressed the importance of including faculty in decisions about hiring, selection of leadership, finances, and policies (AAUP, n.d.). In subsequent years, the AAUP refined its beliefs on shared governance and organized them into the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. This document is still regarded as the AAUP's "central policy" (para. 2) on academic governance, and it specifies appropriate roles for different campus constituents (governing boards, president, and faculty) (AAUP, n.d.).

According to the AAUP (1966), governing boards should serve as the final authority of the institution and ensure that the university stays close to its mission and its "chief community" (para. 22). The 1966 Statement also addressed that board members should understand that administrative officers (president and deans) should be entrusted with administrative issues and that the faculty should be entrusted with issues pertaining to teaching and research (AAUP.

1966). College and university presidents should share responsibility for defining and reaching goals, taking administrative actions, and for maintaining the lines of communication open to include the academic community (AAUP, 1966). In addition, presidents should work to ensure policies and procedures established by the board are properly utilized and in turn, ensure that faculty opinions and suggestions are presented to the board (AAUP, 1966).

The role of the faculty, as stated in the 1966 Statement is to have primary responsibility over matters related to instruction, research, status of faculty and student life as it relates to the educational process (AAUP, 1966). Faculty should also be responsible for degree requirements and for authorizing the granting of degrees. In addition, faculty should have authority over matters related to faculty status (tenure, promotions, dismissals, salary increases etc.) and over the selection of a department chair. (AAUP, 1966). Lastly, in regard to a governing body, the 1966 Statement asserted that “an agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty” (AAUP, 1966, para. 37).

While shared governance has been a key component of the academic profession, recent shifts in culture have led to changes in faculty’s role in governance. An increase in measures of accountability by the states and the public has contributed to this shift. While in the past the public was significantly removed from institutions of higher education, citizens now understand that their lives are influenced by colleges and universities economically, socially and culturally (Schmidlein & Berdahl, 2011).

As the nature of the professoriate has changed and contingent positions have begun to replace tenured ones, the AAUP decided to address contingent faculty’s role in governance in a recent report, which was written as a joint effort between the Committee on Contingency and the Profession, and the Committee on College and University Governance (AAUP, 2014). Research

conducted by the committees found that 75% of survey respondents indicated that full-time contingent faculty are eligible for participation in governance (AAUP, 2014). While this number seems promising, unfortunately 88 percent of participants reported that contingent faculty serving in governing roles at their institution are not compensated for it (AAUP, 2014).

One of the AAUP's greatest concerns surrounding this issue is that not allowing equal participation in governance essentially cuts faculty members off from an integral role in the academic profession (AAUP, 2014). This is especially problematic because when a large majority of faculty does not participate in governance, the role of the faculty trends toward being "unbundled" (AAUP, 2014). An example of this change can be seen in some online or for-profit colleges, where one employee is paid to develop curricula that must be followed closely by part-time faculty (AAUP, 2014). In addition, when faculty governance no longer represents the majority of the faculty, faculty input becomes weaker in their institutions (AAUP, 2014).

The AAUP's most recent recommendations for the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance are as follows: eliminate ambiguity in the definitions of faculty and include all levels of appointments which include teaching and or research; allow faculty of all statuses (including part-time faculty) to vote and hold office in faculty governance; allow contingent faculty to participate in the evaluation of other contingent faculty; ensure academic freedom protections for contingent faculty serving in roles in governance, advocate for compensation for contingent faculty who serve in governance roles; and include participation in governance as a positive component in the evaluation of contingent faculty (AAUP, 2014).

Despite these recommendations, a great number of contingent faculty find themselves detached from government processes. One of the most recent studies on contingent faculty participation in government came from Jones, Hutchens, Hulbert, Lewis and Brown (2017). The

researchers surveyed 115 institutions (106 were included in the results) designated by the Carnegie Foundation as having the highest research activity in regard to their policies concerning eligibility of contingent faculty to participate in governance (Jones et al., 2017). The great majority of institutions, 85%, allowed full-time non-tenured and non-tenured track faculty to be elected into their faculty senate. However, part-time faculty were eligible for senate positions in only 11% of highest research activity institutions (Jones et al., 2017).

Another finding was that 91% of institutions surveyed did not reserve special seats for contingent faculty in the senate. For the few universities which reserved seats for contingent faculty, the number of seats was, in reality, very small (Jones et al., 2017). Lastly, the researchers determined that institutional control, regional location, American Association of Universities status or percentage of contingent faculty at the institutions were predictors of whether the institution allowed participation in governance (Jones et al., 2017).

### **Governance at the University of Mississippi**

**Shared governance policy.** The University of Mississippi has a policy that addresses the role of faculty in shared governance. In it, the University acknowledges support for the 1966 AAUP Statement and “endorses a process of consultation to assure that academic decisions are made through a joint effort of the faculty and administrators (Role of the Faculty in the Administration of Academic Affairs, 2015, para. 1). The policy not only recognizes the role of the faculty in matters related to curriculum, research, instruction and educational policies, but also its role in a broader sense. According to it, “the University recognizes the faculty’s necessary participation in shared governance regarding long-range plans for the institution, the allocation and use of physical resources, budgets, compensation, and selection of academic officers” (Role of the Faculty in the Administration of Academic Affairs, 2015, para. 2).

**The Faculty Senate.** As mentioned previously, Frederick A. P. Barnard was the pioneer proponent of shared governance at the University of Mississippi. Exactly 100 years after Barnard left the University of Mississippi in 1861, faculty began organizing to establish what we know today as the Faculty Senate. The first documentation on the establishment of a senate came from the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on Committees on June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 1961. During that meeting, a separate committee was appointed to study the institution of a Faculty Senate. The goal was to present the tentative Senate proposal at the September general faculty meeting. The following faculty members were named to the Faculty Senate Study Committee: Barrett, Cabaniss, Carrier, Currie, R. H. Price, L. Roy, Sam, J. E. Savage, and Van de Vate. The committee had representatives from all colleges, and Professor Barrett was recommended to chair it (JD Williams Collection, 1961).

On September 14, 1961, a communication was sent to Dr. J.D. Williams, who served as Chancellor from 1947 until 1968, from Russell H. Barrett, chair of the Special Senate Study Committee (JD Williams Collection, 1961). In it, he explains to the Chancellor that the committee worked during the summer to study the “composition, structure and functions of a Faculty Senate” and planned to distribute a proposed constitution during the September faculty meeting as faculty exit the doors (JD Williams Collection, 1961).

On September 28, 1961 an Interdepartmental Communication document between then chancellor, J.D. Williams and then provost, Charles F. Haywood addressed the establishment of the Faculty Senate at the University of Mississippi. In this communication, Chancellor Williams expressed support for the organization of the Senate but uncertainty about its makeup, which he described “a vague concept” (JD Williams Collection, 1961). At the time, he also asserted that

while the first members of the senate would likely convene to formalize its organizational function, chief administrative officers should not leave the process entirely up to the faculty.

In this document, Chancellor Williams also explained that the first Senate constitution stated that “only full-time faculty members of professional rank engaged in full time teaching or research shall be eligible for election to the Senate.” (JD Williams Collection, 1961, para. 3). The following section addressed that the Chancellor, Provost, academic deans, and faculty with administrative duties should be excluded from serving in the Senate (he expressed doubts about the eligibility of departmental chairs). Because of this statement, it appears that the original intention of the eligibility statement was not to exclude part-time faculty as we understand them today, but to ensure the Senate was made up of professionals whose primary job focus is teaching and research (JD Williams Collection, 1961).

An additional recommendation made by Chancellor Williams was that the Chancellor and “division heads” (para. 6) do not attend Senate gatherings, even when invited to do so (JD Williams Collection, 1961). He expressed concern about being coerced into a decision by the Senate without appropriate deliberation. In addition, there was also concern about expressing disagreeing opinions between department heads in the presence of the Senate, which could lead some to believe there is not unity in decisions made by the leaders (JD Williams Collection, 1961).

The initial constitution of the Faculty Senate first addressed its purpose: “The Senate shall be empowered to make recommendations to the Chancellor, after suitable deliberation, on policies affecting the University, and to advise with the Chancellor on such matters as he shall lay before it”. (Faculty Minutes and Committees Collection, 1963). Nine additional sections of the constitution addressed senate eligibility, term limits, timeline of nominations, voting

procedures, Senate governance, and meeting frequency (Faculty Minutes and Committees Collection, 1963).

Most relevant to this research is the wording on the eligibility section, which stated: Only full-time faculty members of professorial rank engaged in full time teaching or research shall be eligible for election to the Senate. Each faculty member with professorial rank shall have the right to vote in Senate elections, without regard to the portion of time devoted to teaching (Faculty Minutes and Committees Collection, 1963).

In regard to eligibility to serve, the makeup of the Faculty Senate did not go through significant changes for the majority of its existence. Until 2018, contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi were not eligible to serve in the Senate, despite the fact that contingent faculty were able to participate in governance in the majority of institutions in the United States. According to Brice Noonan, chair of the Faculty Senate, the issue of representation of contingent faculty had been addressed by the Senate twice since 2009, but without an advocate to organize support and develop a formalized proposal, the issue failed to gain traction (Field, 2018). Sarah Wilson, a writing instructor took note on the issue and expressed concern over the fact that contingent faculty were unable to weigh in on important campus decisions (Field, 2018). Shortly after, the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance was developed to advocate for changes in the Faculty Senate bylaws (Field, 2018). This study will examine this process in detail.

### **Conclusion**

Colleges and universities across the United States have increasingly relied on contingent positions to fill faculty jobs. According to the AAUP Research Office (2017), contingent faculty now represent 70% of the academic workforce. This shift can be attributed to various factors



including financial insecurity, decrease in state appropriations, the corporatization of higher education, and a shift in institutional priorities (AAUP, 1993; Kezar, 2012, Scott, 2018; McKenna, 2015, Erwin & Wood, 2014) .

Demographically, contingent faculty members are more likely to be female (AAUP, 2003; Wolfinger et al., 2009), and low pay and lack of benefits (Korkki, 2018, House Committee on Education and the Work Democratic Staff, 2014; AAUP. 2018) disproportionately affects this population. Contingent faculty also face scrutiny over their effectiveness and qualifications, even though 94% of part-time faculty (the perhaps most vulnerable segment of contingent faculty) has a graduate degree (Coalition on the Academic Force, 2012).

The American Association of University Professors, which pioneered the concepts of academic freedom and shared governance in the professoriate, has addressed the rise in contingent faculty, and has made recommendations for their participation in University governance (AAUP. 2014). Nevertheless, contingent faculty are still vulnerable to threats to academic freedom and are not guaranteed a role in shared governance. (Nelson, 2010; Fredrickson, 2015; Jones et al., 2017).

### **III. METHOD**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study is to develop an in-depth understanding about the evolving story of how contingent faculty became involved in governance at the University of Mississippi, and the perceptions of stakeholders about the role of contingent faculty in shared governance. More specifically, this study attempted to uncover how contingent faculty were able to organize and gain support from their tenured and tenure-track counterparts to achieve representation in the Faculty Senate. Through interviews of members of the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance Task Force and of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate, this study also addresses the realities of contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi, the perception of tenured and tenure-track members about contingent faculty members, the role they play in their academic departments, and the role faculty, in general, play in governance at the university.

#### **Research Questions**

As previously addressed in the introductory chapter, this study attempts to answer two major research questions:

1. What is the unfolding story of shared governance for contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi?
2. How did contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi organize to advocate for the inclusion and representation of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate?

In addition, through interviews of stakeholders and document analysis, the researcher attempted to answer the following sub-questions:

1. What is the current role of the Faculty Senate at the University of Mississippi and how does its role relate to the shared governance model?
2. How did the Senate come together to allow consideration and voting on the issue?
3. What factors influenced faculty's voting decisions?
4. Why did contingent faculty rally to receive representation in the Faculty Senate as opposed to a separate and unique governing entity?
5. How does representation in the senate change the reality of contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi? What are the expectations and hopes of contingent faculty who advocated for representation?
6. What factors influenced the decision to not include part-time faculty in the vote? Were they part of the initial conversations?
7. What major concerns were brought up by contingent faculty related to non-representation?
8. What roles do contingent faculty believe to play in their academic departments?
9. What is the future of positions of leadership within the senate and contingent faculty's eligibility for them?

## **Methodology**

**Qualitative research.** The methodological approach chosen for this study is qualitative. The goal of qualitative research is to utilize the “perspective of research participants” to gain comprehension of “social setting or activity” (Gay and Airasian, 2003, p. 169). Taylor, Bogdan and Devault (2016) described qualitative research as one concerned with “the meaning people

attach to things in their lives” (p. 18), and qualitative researchers as those who believe “there is something to be learned in all settings and groups” (p. 20). According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), research questions that can be answered through better understanding experiences are best suited for a qualitative design.

Glesne (2016) further addressed the use of qualitative research to answer questions from an interpretivism research paradigm. In her words, she described the role of the qualitative researcher in this paradigm as “accessing others’ interpretations of some social phenomenon and of interpreting, themselves, others’ actions or intentions” (Glesne, 2016, p. 9). Because the intent of this research is to deeply explore the process of inclusion of contingent faculty in governance at the University of Mississippi, and because the researcher hopes to utilize the beliefs of different stakeholders to gain this understanding, a qualitative approach is most appropriate.

**Case study.** The specific type of qualitative design used in this research is a case study. According to Saldana (2011), case studies focus “on a single unit for analysis” and permit “in – depth examination” (p.8). In this study, the single unit of analysis pertains to an event (the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance) that took place at the University of Mississippi. Yin (1994) asserted that case studies are best utilized for research questions that focus on the “hows” and “whys,” and for studies that cannot be controlled or manipulated by the researcher. In addition, case studies are most appropriate for studying recent events because of the possibility of gathering data through direct observation and interviews (Yin, 1994). In addition, data in case studies should include in-depth and all information the researcher has about the case (Patton, 2002).

Moreover, Hancock and Algozzine (2017) explained that in case studies, “researchers hope to gain in-depth understanding of situations and meaning for those involved” (p 10). The

idea of gaining understanding of participants' meaning-making is a pivotal component of this study. The goal here is to not only uncover in detail the process of allowing contingent faculty representation in the Faculty Senate, but also to understand the beliefs of stakeholders involved in this decision. This is relevant because, if we understand how contingent, tenure-track and tenured faculty contextualized this particular event, we can better understand how faculty understand their role in overall university governance, and how faculty can mobilize to bring about change.

It is also relevant to note that in this study, facts and opinions are presented in a chronological way, so that the events that led to the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance can help explain how this was made possible. As explained by Mills, Duperos, and Wiebe (2010), consideration for the chronological order of events in a case study can be used to organize presentation of data. In addition, they explain that analyzing data in a chronological manner is advantageous when multiple accounts of events are gathered (as they are in this study). Lastly, chronological order can help contextualize events "from which meaning(s) can be derived depending on other events that occurred before, simultaneously, or after the event in question (Mill et al, 2010).

### **Role of the Researcher**

Differently from quantitative research, in qualitative research, the researcher is an instrument through which research is conducted (Sanjari, Bahramnezhad, Fomani, Shoghi, & Cheraghu, 2014). Because of this, it is important that, as a researcher, I am aware of my beliefs about the topic and any personal biases that may arise. In this section, I will briefly explain how my professional experiences shaped my interest in issues related to faculty governance.

I have worked in higher education as a graduate student and professional for the past eight years in different capacities, one of those including serving as an instructor for first-year experience courses. Part of my role as a first-year experience instructor was to provide a safe space for students to discuss issues related to their college experience. Because of the nature of the class, students at times brought up controversial matters related to the University for discussion (for example, the decision to not fly the Mississippi state flag on campus). Often, these topics would be brought up as a response to something they read in the student newspaper or a rumor they heard around campus.

As students began to bring up those issues in class, I started to wonder - as a non-tenure-track faculty, working in a predominant staff role, what protections do I have? Could I be reprimanded for addressing some of these issues? Does academic freedom apply to me as well? Because of these concerns, I became more interested in studying issues related to shared governance and academic freedom in my doctoral program. While working at the University of Mississippi, I followed closely, without becoming involved, the process of allowing for contingent faculty representation in the Faculty Senate.

While I came into this study in favor of the inclusion of contingent faculty in shared governance, I have attempted to remain open minded about some of the arguments against it. In fact, two of the participants that, as described in the “Results” section, were against representation of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate, brought up sound arguments that I had not previously considered. Those arguments gave me a greater appreciation for just how complex issues related to the academic profession and faculty governance can be. In this paper, results are reported in an unbiased way, based on themes and ideas derived by interview transcripts and university data.

## **Data Collection**

**Site Selection.** The study was conducted at the University of Mississippi, a public, four-year institution in the state of Mississippi which currently enrolls over 24,000 students and contains 15 academic divisions (The University of Mississippi, n.d.). According to data gathered from the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning (IREP) for the 2017-2018 school year, 47% of teaching faculty at the University of Mississippi have contingent status, and 40.3% of those are part-time employees. The oldest report available on IREP's website showed that in 2003 only 12% of faculty were not tenured or tenure-eligible, which demonstrates that the University of Mississippi has followed the national trend of hiring an increasing number of contingent faculty in recent years.

While a few recent articles quantify contingent faculty representation in faculty governance, this study provides an in-depth exploration of how this process took place in an institution that previously did not allow this group to participate. More specifically, it provides an account of contingent faculty organized to advocate for representation and eligibility to serve in the Faculty Senate. The uniqueness and recency of this event provided the researcher with the opportunity to interview constituents who were directly responsible for this process. Through this process, it became evident that opinions were still strong and emotions were still fresh. All of those factors, summed with my experience and knowledge of this institution, explain why the University of Mississippi was selected for this study.

**Selection of Participants.** To understand how contingent faculty were able to organize and establish the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance, it was imperative to interview members of the committee who were directly responsible and involved in this process. Moreover, because the objective of this study was to gain a deep understanding

of the entire process of including contingent faculty in governance at the University of Mississippi, it was also necessary to hear from members of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate.

**Identifying Participants.** The initial goal was to contact all members of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance and of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate as potential participants. Names of potential participants from the Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance were obtained from a public blog created by the Task Force. This blog was utilized to provide research on contingent faculty participation in governance across similar institutions, to outline the mission of the Task Force, and to provide stakeholders with updates throughout the process. The blog also listed names, titles, and departments of all members of the task force and of two *ex officio* members who were contacted and considered Task Force members for the purposes of this research. I then found all email addresses for each participant through the University of Mississippi website.

Names for potential participants from the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate were obtained from the January 2018 minutes published by the Faculty Senate website. This was the selected method for two reasons: (1) the Faculty Senate does not include general membership information for past years in its website, (2) Archives and Special Collections in the university's J.D. Williams Library does not keep such records. After learning that the library could not provide these records, I consulted with my committee chair, who then advised me to utilize the Faculty Senate minutes to identify participants as they list senators who were both present and absent at the senate session. The January meeting was targeted for its importance in the process of allowing for contingent faculty representation in governance. Again, I then found all email addresses for the participants listed in the minutes through the University of Mississippi website.



**Contacting Participants.** Fourteen potential participants from the Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance were contacted, including two *ex officio* members. The original Task Force was composed of sixteen members (including the two *ex officio* members); however, as previously mentioned, one member was deceased and one was no longer employed at the University of Mississippi. Fifty-four potential participants were contacted from the list of 2017-2018 Faculty Senators included in the January 2018 Faculty Senate minutes - all were still tied to the University.

Potential participants from both groups received an initial email (See Appendices G and H) detailing the intent of the study and calling for participation. Attached in the email were the Initial Study Information Sheet (See Appendix C) and the Release of Written Words document (See Appendix E). Initial emails were sent out in April, a traditionally busy time for faculty members who are preparing for the end of the academic year. After sending out the initial email, the researcher received a few responses from participants who expressed interest in participating after the semester concluded. At that point, I submitted an Institutional Review Board amendment (See Appendix M) with a request to submit a second email clarifying that the researcher would be available for interviews during the summer months.

After receiving approval from the IRB, the second email (See Appendices I and J) was sent individually to all potential participants. As participants responded expressing their desire to participate, the researcher sent a follow-up email with further instructions (See Appendix K). To facilitate the scheduling of interviews, the researcher utilized *You Can Book Me*, an appointment software that allowed participants to schedule a time for an interview and to indicate the appropriate phone number at which they would like to be contacted. *You Can Book Me* only allows the schedule owner (in this case, me) to view appointment information - therefore

participants could not see who else had scheduled an interview. In this same email, participants were asked to sign and scan the Release of Words document so that the researcher could record the interview.

In addition to communication for possible participation, the researcher contacted selective participants via email in a couple of occasions - some participants who expressed interest in participating were sent follow-up emails when they failed to schedule a time for an interview and some participants were emailed prior to the interview with reminders about the release forms. In addition, one participant requested and was granted a preliminary phone conversation to clarify the intent of the researcher and ask questions prior to the interview.

**Number of participants.** In qualitative research, it is difficult to establish clear guidelines on the necessary number of participants for a study (Rijnsoever, 2017). As Patton (2002) humorously asserted in his discussion of sample size for qualitative studies, “qualitative inquiry seems to work best for people with a high tolerance for ambiguity” (p. 242). One guideline is to first consider whether sub-populations exist within the research participants, which Rijnsoever (2017) called “sub-populations.” In this study, there are two sub-populations: members of the Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance and of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate.

First, I sought out to interview all participants who were interested and followed through with the consent documentation process. Once interviews began, the goal was to continue seeking out participants until saturation was achieved with both groups. In qualitative research, data saturation occurs when similar themes and opinions begin to emerge amongst participants of the same sub-group and the researcher finds there is little additional information to gain from interviewing more participants (Gay & Airasian, 2003).

I found saturation more quickly with members of the Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance after interviewing two participants who were involved from the process from the very beginning and who presented to the Faculty Senate. These participants provided a very comprehensive account of how the process came to be. While this will be further discussed in subsequent sections of this paper, it is important to point out now that both of these participants (Dr. Sarah Wilson and Dr. Carrie Smith) requested to waive their confidentiality for this study, in case the reader is concerned after reading the very specific previous statement. After reaching saturation with Task Force members, I interviewed remaining participants from the Task Force who expressed interest and had followed through with making an interview appointment. In total, seven Task Force members were interviewed for this study.

Saturation from members of the Faculty Senate happened at around eight participants - at that point, I had obtained different points of views from senators who were in support of and against the inclusion of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate, and within those categories, very similar patterns had emerged. Regardless of saturation, an additional faculty member who had previously scheduled an interview was interviewed. Participants who had not yet scheduled an interview at the point of saturation but had previously expressed interest were emailed one last time and given a deadline for scheduling an interview, but did not follow through. In total, nine Faculty Senate members were interviewed for this study.

**Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality of Participants.** As explained by Kaiser (2009), confidentiality should be especially concerning to qualitative researchers since participants are often described in an in-depth manner. This study is bound to a particular institution and particular event, and participants names could be identifiable as names of members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance and of the

Faculty Senate are easily accessible online. Because of this and of the delicate nature of this topic, it was of utmost importance to take measures to protect the privacy of research participants who chose to remain anonymous.

With these concerns in mind, after interviewing three participants, I received an email from a potential participant with the following request: “I don’t want to be anonymous in your dissertation. I was the Chair of the Task Force, and I am proud of my/our work. I would like credit for that” (S. Wilson, personal communication, April 22, 2009). While I was initially surprised, this type of request is not unheard of in qualitative research. Patton (2002) actually addressed similar scenarios, which demonstrate the shifting norms of confidentiality and the tensions “between the important ethic of protecting people’s privacy and, in some cases, their desire to own their story” (p. 412).

Upon receiving this email and consulting with my committee chair, I filled out a second IRB amendment (See Appendix N) proposing changes to the Study Information Sheet (See Appendix D) and the addition of a Release of Confidentiality form (See Appendix F). In the Study Information Sheet, I listed the following statement: If the participant would like to not remain anonymous and therefore be named in the dissertation, they will be required to sign an additional release form, stating that they would like to be named, that they understand that their interview answers would be attributed to them personally, and that they will do so at their own risk. This amendment was approved by the IRB, granting me permission and the proper documentation to name participants who desired to waive their confidentiality in this study.

After receiving IRB approval, I contacted participants who had already been interviewed, explained the IRB amendments, and informed them that they had the option to go on record if they chose to do so. All three participants responded similarly: they all declined the offer and

chose to remain anonymous. Of the sixteen participants in this study, five opted to go on record: Dr. Sarah Wilson, Dr. Aileen Ajootian, Dr. Robert Cummings, Dr. Meagan Rosenthal, and Dr. Carrie Smith. Further information on these participants can be found in the Results section of this study. All other eleven participants opted to remain anonymous.

For the eleven participants who chose to remain anonymous, I first planned to assign pseudonyms to describe their responses as a whole. However, after analyzing interview transcripts, I was concerned that utilizing pseudonyms may confuse the reader as to who was utilizing their legal name and who was a pseudonym of an anonymous participant. I then decided to utilize codes to describe the responses of anonymous participants (for example, 03TF or 01FS). Numbers were given based on the order they were interviewed. TF stands for Task Force member and FS stands for Faculty Senate member.

Finally, I considered two other aspects as they related to participant confidentiality: pronouns and academic department. When referring to anonymous participants, I always utilized the pronouns “they/their/theirs” as opposed to “she/her/hers” or “he/his/his.” This was important, especially because the Task Force was a relatively small group, comprised mostly of women. I was cognizant of the fact that utilizing a specific pronoun could potentially make a participant identifiable.

Another concern was sharing participants’ academic department. Even though many anonymous participants went on record and spoke openly about their specific department, I did not include this information in this study to further protect their anonymity. However, because academic areas were relevant to this study (more on this in the “Results” section) I utilized two general areas to group participant departments into: humanities and social sciences and science

and technology. As an exception, departments of participants who opted to go on record for this study were identified.

**Instruments and Design.** The primary instrument utilized in this study was a general interview guide approach. According to Patton (2002), this approach requires researchers to develop a set of questions that will be asked of all participants in some way, but is also “free to explore, probe, and ask questions that will elucidate and illuminate” what is being studied (p. 343). While, for the most part, I stuck with the interview guide detailed below, I asked follow-up questions for clarity and further elaboration in many instances. This interview approach allowed for this type of flexibility.

In addition, I conducted an analysis of pertinent University documents. These included minutes of the Faculty Senate, email communication sent to contingent faculty by the Task Force, newspaper articles, public calls for support, and data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning (IREP). As Patton (2002) explained, these types of records “can provide a behind-the-scenes look at program processes and how they came into being” (p.294).

***The Interview Guide.*** Two interview guides were utilized in this study: one for members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance, and one for members of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate. Questions varied based on whether participants were in the Senate or in the Task Force. For Task Force members, interview questions focused on how they are perceived in their academic departments, their reasoning in deciding to join the Task Force and Task Force-specific questions to better understand how the Task Force was organized. For Senate members, there were questions about the role of the Senate, their role as Senators, their

beliefs about contingent faculty and conversations between themselves and their departments about the Task Force. The questions below were asked of members of the Task Force:

1. Can you confirm that you have reviewed the Study Information Sheet and signed the Release of Words document sent to you via email?
2. By completing this interview, you are consenting to participate in this study. Do I receive your verbal consent to proceed?
3. Can you confirm that you are over the age of 18?
4. Tell me about your professional role at the University and how long you have been in that role. (No identifying information will be utilized by the researcher).
5. How does your department utilize contingent faculty? Are there large or small numbers of such positions? Which courses do contingent faculty typically instruct?
6. What role do contingent faculty play in decision making in your department?
7. What were your beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in governance prior to the convening of the Task Force?
8. What professional experiences have shaped your beliefs about the importance of including contingent faculty in governance?
9. What do you perceive to be the role of the Faculty Senate in governance at the University of Mississippi?
10. Why was inclusion in the Faculty Senate specifically important to you?
11. When did you first hear about the desire to organize as a group to address contingent faculty participation in the Faculty Senate?
12. What was your involvement in the creation of the Task Force?

13. Walk me through your decision-making process when deciding to join the Task Force.  
Were there any hesitations? Did you consult with anyone before joining the group?
14. What can you tell me about the first time the group convened?
15. What was the original goal of the Task Force? Did that objective change overtime?
16. What discussions were had in regards to the role of part-time faculty in governance?
17. When did the group first approach the Faculty Senate and what was the initial response?
18. As the group began to spread the word about this issue on campus, what types of responses from the community were received?
19. As you remember it/view it, how did this process play out once the issue was received by the senate?
20. What issues/hesitations were raised by the Faculty Senate in regards to allowing for participation?
21. How was the administration of the University involved in this matter?
22. How important do you perceive the role of the Task Force to have been in a favorable vote by the Senate?
23. What events have taken place since the decision was made by the Faculty Senate?
24. How do you believe the participation of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate will affect the daily lives of contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi?
25. What do you anticipate to be the future of contingent faculty serving in the Faculty Senate? What will it look like? Any potential challenges?
26. Is there anything else you can tell me that would help me tell the story of how contingent faculty became involved in governance at the University of Mississippi?

The questions below were asked of members of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate:



1. Can you confirm that you have reviewed the Study Information Sheet and signed the Release of Words document sent to you via email?
2. By completing this interview, you are consenting to participate in this study. Do I receive your verbal consent to proceed?
3. Can you confirm that you are over the age of 18?
4. Tell me about your professional role at the University and how long you have been in that role. (No identifying information will be utilized by the researcher).
5. How does your department utilize contingent faculty? Are there large or small numbers of such positions? Which courses do contingent faculty typically instruct?
6. What role do contingent faculty play in decision making in your department?
7. As a tenured/tenure-track faculty member, how do you see your professional role on campus in comparison to the role of contingent faculty?
8. What are your beliefs regarding the types of issues faced by contingent faculty at the UM campus? Are they similar to all faculty or are there distinct issues faced by different groups?
9. What were your beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in governance prior to the convening of the Task Force?
10. What professional experiences have shaped your beliefs about the importance of including contingent faculty in governance?
11. What do you perceive to be the role of the Faculty Senate in governance at the University of Mississippi?
12. What do you perceive to be your role in the Faculty Senate as a representative of your department?

13. When did you first hear about the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance?
14. What was the climate in the Senate upon hearing about the possible inclusion of contingent faculty? What initial conversations were had between members?
15. Once the issue was officially brought into the senate for discussion, what were some of the arguments for and against the inclusion of contingent faculty in the senate?
16. What information was needed by the Senate so that officers were comfortable enough to position themselves through their vote?
17. Did you have any conversations about this with colleagues in your academic department who were not members of the Faculty Senate? What concerns were brought up by them?
18. Were you surprised about the voting results in the senate? If yes or no, how so?
19. What are your thoughts regarding the 323-66 result of the overall faculty vote?
20. How does this decision change faculty governance at the University of Mississippi?
21. Is there anything else you can tell me that would help me tell the story of how contingent faculty became involved in governance at the University of Mississippi?

***Recording and Transcription.*** Interviews were conducted via Google Voice. Google Voice is a website that allows users with a Google account to make phone calls (Google Voice, n.d.). Utilizing this avenue was advantageous for two reasons. First, this allowed me to call participants from my computer, which meant I could utilize my iPhone as a recording device. Secondly, it avoided having to utilize a personal phone number to contact participants.

At the time scheduled for the interview, participants were called through Google Voice, in the number they provided when they made the interview appointment. Participants were then told that I was contacting them from Google Voice which provided an alternative phone number

- if they had any follow-up questions and concerns, they should contact me via email. Two recording devices were utilized: my personal iPhone and a handheld recording device as a back-up method. Recordings were then uploaded into my personal laptop, which is password protected. Unless participants elected to waive their confidentiality for this study, audio file titles did not contain names of participants.

The researcher then transcribed all interviews (no transcription device was utilized or additional help solicited). During their interviews, two participants made off-the-record remarks and requested those not be included in this dissertation. While those remarks were recorded in the audio file (participants were aware of this), which only I have access to, they were not included in the interview transcriptions. After all interviews had been transcribed, those files were emailed to all participants so those could be verified for accuracy (see appendices O and P). Ten of the sixteen participants responded to the email and offered comments and corrections. One participant asked that a specific portion of the transcription be removed for confidentiality concerns, which I, of course, honored.

## **Data Analysis**

### **Case Study Data**

**Interview analysis.** Once interviews were conducted, transcribed and analyzed, common themes began to emerge. I then began writing down major themes and organizing them categorically or in order in which they happened during the process. This process was similar to creating a case record, as described by Patton (2002). This process consists of a process of editing information, sorting out redundancies, and organizing the case study chronologically and topically so information can be accessed with ease (Patton, 2002). In the findings section, information was organized in accordance with events that took place, and the beliefs constituents

had prior to the creation of the Task Force and after contingent faculty were allowed into the Senate - themes were then presented in chronological order. Because some of the data pertained to beliefs and not only events, themes began to emerge among and between sub-groups.

At times, themes were common amongst both participant sub-groups (Task Force and Faculty Senate), and at other times themes were specific to a sub-group. For example, when reporting major arguments for representation and against representation, I combined responses for both sub-groups based on major themes. In this particular section, many participants also reported on what they heard from others and not just on their personal opinions, so it did not make sense to create two separate sections to report those results. In contrast, when reporting participant's initial reactions to the initial presentation of the Task Force to the Faculty Senate, I felt that it was important to organize responses based on sub-group membership, as they experienced the event from different perspectives. In a third type of instance, while some beliefs were shared despite sub-group membership, results were displayed separately to help with clarity and organization. For example, beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in governance are separated by two major headings: Task Force beliefs and Faculty Senate beliefs, even though many, although not all, senators reported that they believed Task Force contributed equally to the University's mission and should play an equal role in governance.

**Triangulation.** Gay and Airasian (2003) describe triangulation as a process of corroborating data based on utilizing diverse sources to confirm accuracy. As explained in a previous section, interviews were not the only method utilized in this study. More specifically data such as the following was utilized to confirm different facts and opinions mentioned by participants: data from IREP on different aspects related to contingent faculty on campus, Minutes of the Faculty Senate, the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (both current and as of 2017-

2018), the Constitution of the Faculty Senate (both current and as of 2017-2018), news stories published about the movement as it gained traction on campus and data from the university blog published by the Task Force, which included the research presented to the Faculty Senate

### **Summary**

In review, this chapter discussed the methods utilized in this qualitative case study, and the role of the researcher in data collection. In addition, specifics on data collection were provided such as a rationale for the selection of the research site (the University of Mississippi), the selection, identification and contacting of participants, the Institutional Review Board approval process (including additional amendments), and ethical considerations and confidentiality of participants. Lastly, I outlined the interview guide, and the process of transcription and theme analysis. The next chapter will summarize the findings of this study.

## **IV. FINDINGS**

### **Participant Characteristics**

Participants in this study belonged to two major groups: members of the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance Task Force and members of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate. In the Faculty Senate group, five participants were assistant professors on a tenure-track, and four participants had earned tenure. Within this group, two were full professors, two were associate professors, and four were assistant professors. Task Force participants ranged from instructors to tenure-line faculty. Because the pool of participants (the Task Force) is small, specifics on the number of participants with each title is not listed to protect the confidentiality of participants. In addition, as explained in the methods section, broad areas of study were used to categorize participants who chose to remain anonymous as opposed to academic department, again, to protect participant confidentiality. Table 1 provides a general breakdown of this information.

Table 1. Participants and general departmental areas

---

<b>Faculty Senate Participant</b>	<b>Departmental area or academic department</b>
Dr. Aileen Ajootian	Department of Classics and Department of Art & Art History
Faculty Senator 02 (FS02)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Faculty Senator 03 (FS03)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Faculty Senator 04 (FS04)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Faculty Senator 05 (FS05)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Dr. Meagan Rosenthal	Department of Pharmacy Administration
Faculty Senator 07 (FS07)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Faculty Senator 08 (FS08)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Faculty Senator 09 (FS09)	Humanities and Social Sciences

---

<b>Task Force Participant</b>	<b>Departmental area or academic department</b>
Dr. Sarah Wilson	Department of Writing and Rhetoric
Task Force Member 02 (TF02)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Task Force Member 03 (TF03)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Task Force Member 04 (TF04)	Humanities and Social Sciences
Dr. Carrie Smith	Department of Psychology
Dr. Robert Cummings	Department of Writing and Rhetoric
Task Force Member 07 (TF07)	Humanities and Social Sciences

I included information on academic areas because previous to conducting interviews, I wondered whether subject areas that most often address issues related to social justice, government, diversity and inclusion, would be more inclined to advocate for contingent faculty participation in governance (in the Senate and within their own departments). Minutes from Faculty Senate meetings from Spring 2018, when the Task Force efforts were brought into the Senate, did not contain the names of Senators providing questions and arguments. From the initial meeting when the Task Force delivered a presentation, only one departmental-specific comment exists: “I polled all NTT [Non-Tenure-Track] faculty in Chemistry and they said they did not want service” (Faculty Senate, 2018, p. 9). Data from this study, however, did not support the hypothesis that departments in the humanities and social science subject areas were more supportive of contingent faculty participation in governance.

The table makes evident that Senators and Task Force members who participated in the study were more heavily represented in academic areas related to the humanities and social sciences. However, this was not uncharacteristic of the Task Force as a whole. To demonstrate this, Appendix P contains all members of the Task Force (as publicly listed in a blog published by the group) and their academic departments (Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance, 2017).

### **Departmental Experiences**

Inquiry about the role of contingent faculty on campus yielded a variety of responses, demonstrating that contingent faculty have diverse experiences depending, for the most part, on their academic home. In their initial presentation to the Faculty Senate, the Task Force presented survey results showing that, for example, 72% of contingent faculty are notified of departmental meetings, and 50% are allowed to vote in “some departmental matters” (C. Smith, 2018). While



survey results provide a fairly optimistic representation of the role of contingent faculty in their departments, it is important to remember that the Department of Writing and Rhetoric (DWR) employs a significant number of contingent faculty on campus. Given the fact that DWR fosters an egalitarian culture for contingent faculty (more on this in the next section), the survey may be skewed towards more positive results.

### **The Department of Writing and Rhetoric**

As previously noted, a large number of Task Force members belonged to the Department of Writing and Rhetoric. This is not surprising, considering that freshman and sophomore-level courses such as “writing, Math, languages, and the introductory social sciences” have particularly been affected by the rise in contingent faculty (Schell, 2017, p. x). Even though research participants were housed in a variety of departments, it is important to take a deeper look at the Department of Writing and Rhetoric because without it, the successful outcome of the Task Force may not have been possible. As one senator, who was initially against the inclusion of contingent faculty in the senate, asserted:

I think it [the decision to include contingent faculty] is partially due to the creation of ... DWR... This group of very talented and respectful people came in and were all together, not in a second-class citizenship in the English department, which is what it usually is. They were running their own department, so the administration accidentally created a strong body that could speak for itself, that they robbed of positions. Those positions should have been tenure-lines with regular tenure-track pay. So, they put a bunch of smart people together, isolated them and let them work together and be successful. What do you expect? That they would just sit there and take this? (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019).

In the 2017-2018 academic year, two faculty members were tenure-eligible, one was tenured, 33 were full-time contingent, and 18 were part-time contingent (IREP, 2018). According to Dr. Cummings, former chair, the department was formed as a result of the 2009 Quality Enhancement Plan, which focused on improving undergraduate writing outcomes at the University of Mississippi. The goal at the time was to create a Center that was independent of the Department of English, where Writing and Rhetoric were being instructed previously (R. Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019). After the establishment of the Center in 2009, the University began dedicating resources to build full-time non-tenure-track positions; the Center could not grant tenure prior to becoming an academic department (R. Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019).

Considering Dr. Cummings was the only tenured faculty member in the Center, which later became a department in 2014, contingent faculty became involved in decision-making from the very beginning. As Dr. Cummings himself explained, the department created committees for each of its courses, WRIT 100, WRIT 101, WRIT 102, and LIBA 102, which were led by core contingent faculty teaching those courses (R. Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019). According to Dr. Wilson, chair of the Task Force, “from the beginning, non-tenure-track faculty have been completely involved in decisions and day-to-day running of the department because otherwise the department would not function” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

Dr. Wilson further explained the role of contingent faculty in decision making by stating that the current assistant chair is a non-tenure-track faculty member, which demonstrates that the department has no reservations with contingent faculty “serving in leadership roles and helping make significant decisions both at the department level and in terms of curriculum” (S. Wilson,

personal communication, May 14, 2019). Furthermore, contingent faculty in DWR have “full-equality” during faculty meetings and have the same “voting privileges” as non-tenure track faculty (07TF, personal communication, May 20, 2019). As Dr. Wilson described, “it is not a partial vote, you are a human in the room and you get a full vote” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

### **Other Academic Departments**

Responses about the role of contingent faculty in their academic departments varied across participants (senators and Task Force members). Some Faculty Senate participants asserted that their department does not employ contingent faculty. For the majority of participants whose departments do employ this group, contingent faculty are invited, but not mandated, to come to departmental meetings. However, they are often ineligible to vote on issues. One participant asserted that, in their department, contingent faculty are actively invited but have “not yet decided to come” (02FS, personal communication, May 31, 2019). Another participant from a different department was unsure whether adjuncts (typically part-time faculty) were invited to come to departmental meetings, but instructional faculty members not only attend departmental meetings, they also vote and have “an active role in governance within the department” (08FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

Contributions during meetings vary. For one anonymous participant, “faculty joined many faculty meetings on-site, yet, they did not tend to join discussion during the meetings” (09FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019). For Dr. Rosenthal, an assistant professor in the School of Pharmacy who elected to go on record for this study, contingent faculty (mostly full-time researchers) are invited to department meetings and to contribute their expertise equally. However, there are “some rules and policies within the department that prevent them from voting

on certain matters” (M. Rosenthal, personal communication, May 5, 2019). One participant, who answered that they are “sometimes” invited to departmental meetings, explained the role in governance is very limited and that contingent faculty “do not have much of a say in terms of curriculum, or anything of that nature” (04TF, personal communication, April 25, 2019).

One important thing to note is that participation itself in the Task Force may indicate greater departmental support than experienced by many contingent faculty. One anonymous participant whose department does not typically include contingent faculty in decision-making expressed some hesitation in joining the group. This particular participant stated:

I didn’t speak to anyone in my department [about joining the Task Force] because I got the sense that it would not be well-received. So, you know, I was hesitant in joining because I did not know if there would be a backlash on me personally. (04TF, personal communication, April 25, 2019).

Dr. Carrie Smith, a now assistant professor and Task Force member from the Department of Psychology who opted to go on record, expressed that she felt safe joining the committee because of the friendliness of her department and colleagues, and because of the support of Dr. Cummings, who by the time the Task Force presented to the Senate, had joined the Office of the Provost (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). Dr. Cummings acknowledged his tenure status put him at an advantage when deciding to join the Task Force in an *ex officio* capacity. During his interview, he stated on this matter: “I did not have any vulnerability. I would earn the ire of some folks, but... it does not bother me. I was in a position of privilege and so, I did not have much to lose” (R. Cummings, May 13, 2019).

Because some Task Force members mentioned departmental support as a factor in their decision to join the group, it is possible that some faculty members did not join due to fear of

possible repercussions. As Dr. Sarah Wilson explained, when the group first convened, they held open sessions to hear stories of contingent faculty members (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). As she described, there were “horror stories about the experiences other non-tenure-track faculty were having in their departments,” which was upsetting considering her experience in DWR was opposite of what others were experiencing. She further expanded (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019):

I was really lucky. And I think [the Task Force] needed to come from our department like ours that was really democratic in nature... The work is a little dangerous, I get it. And yet, I feel supported by my direct supervisors. There may be some pushback, but my chair is going to protect me.

### **The Role of Contingent Faculty Versus Tenure-Track Faculty on Campus**

Members of the Faculty Senate were asked how they differentiate their role as tenured and non-tenure-track faculty. Six of the nine participants alluded to contingent faculty having similar, if not the same, role as tenure-track faculty because both groups contribute to the general mission of the university: teaching, research and service. As one participant explained, the “role is the same as their role, which is to teach, to mentor students and contribute service to the University” (08FS, personal communication, April 26, 2019). The same participant acknowledged that contingent faculty in many instances are as research-productive as their tenure-track counterparts. Dr. Carrie Smith, who at the time the Task Force became active was an instructional associate professor in Psychology, spoke of her research productivity (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019):

As a psychologist, I am a scientist. It’s hard to imagine doing my job as a professor of science while not also doing some science. So, I continued to research. When I got to the

University of Mississippi... my research took off, I was in a really supportive environment and was getting a lot of things done.

One participant spoke of the variety of professional roles within non-tenure-track faculty, something they admitted learning through the work of the Task Force. They explained (07FS, personal communication, May 7, 2019):

Non-tenure-track-faculty range from research professors in research centers with a specific task conducting research, to purely teaching personnel, to a mix of the two. And an interesting thing that I learned from the non-tenure-track faculty members is that, especially those who have a professional track, from lecturer to senior lecturer, also have certain components of research and service in their job description.

Two participants felt strongly that the role of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the UM campus was very different from the role of contingent faculty. For one participant, tenure-track faculty are more in tune with the interests and needs of the University, while contingent faculty are often not given information about such matters (09FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019). For another participant, the roles are distinct because the tenure-track role is “stable and respected” (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019). This senator further explained: “obviously the administration has no respect for people that they under-pay and over work. With respect comes greater ability to make change” (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019).

### **Beliefs about Contingent Faculty in Governance**

#### **Task Force Beliefs**

Task Force members interviewed believe contingent faculty should be actively involved in governance, inside and outside of their academic departments. Participants, however, had diverse experiences that led them to this belief. Some had not considered this issue until they

stumbled upon barriers to participation in governance. One participant, who elected to remain anonymous, explained that they had not given the issue consideration until an email was sent to the department with a call for a new Faculty Senator. Upon volunteering for the position, they were told they were not eligible. The participant recalled the feelings related to the experience: “To me, that’s a slap in the face. [It is saying], we believe in you enough to come teach and be part of our faculty, but we do not have enough confidence in you to be part of this representative body of the faculty” (04TF, personal communication, April 25, 2019).

Dr. Carrie Smith had a similar experience. She recalled that the first time she became aware of the barriers to participation in governance was when she volunteered to serve on a University-wide committee and was informed by her chair that she was ineligible (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). This was especially surprising to her because of previous experiences at a different institution: “at the University of Delaware, you are expected to come to faculty meetings because you are faculty” (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). Dr. Smith also mentioned that she encountered some uncertainty from faculty about teaching a class for the university’s Honors College (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). Dr. Sarah Wilson’s previous professional experiences also shaped her beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in governance. In her previous role at a small liberal arts college, “everyone who was full-time was involved [in governance] at the university level... If you are a faculty member, you get a vote” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

Similarly, one anonymous participant recalled another pivotal moment in realizing they did not have a voice on campus. In 2015, the Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) elected to not renew the contract of Chancellor Dan Jones. The unpopular action led 2,500 university

community members to demonstrate in the “I Stand With Dan” movement (McLaughlin & Gallman, 2015). They explained:

When Chancellor Jones was not renewed and the I Stand With Dan movement happened, you had all the aforementioned entities [Associated Student Body, Faculty Senate and Staff Council] having petitions signed and statements read and published, and there was nowhere for me to go but a “Change.org” petition... there is no one that managed that particular sizeable, very sizeable body of faculty (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019).

For other Task Force members, the belief was based on principle. As one participant put simply: “In my mind, I had a much broader definition of faculty then the one that had been institutionalized at the university” (07TF, personal communication, May 20, 2019). For Dr. Robert Cummings, excluding contingent faculty from governance meant depriving the university of valuable perspective. He explained (R. Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019):

My main feeling was that, if you are going to have a culture of governance where faculty have input that is meaningful, why would you exclude the majority of the faculty on your campus? You are taking your most valuable asset as a university, which is the creativity, experience, commitment, and wisdom of the people that teach. And if you are opening that channel of input on decision-making and yet, you are excluding the majority of them, then you are really hampering the diversity, depth and quality of input.

Another Task Force member had a similar belief about the waste of resources when barring contingent from participation in governance:

My interest in being in the committee was because there were wasted resources... I was



not concerned so much that the Senate was separate and could not represent me in decisions regarding affairs of the University... My concern was the exclusionary mentality when new ideas were being developed. First pass always went to the tenure-track [faculty]... So, a lot of ideas, a lot of expertise, because very often adjuncts and instructor-level faculty are here as a practicing scholar more than they are a primary source of profession or income. So, there is a lot of expertise on campus that is wasted because of their life situation, their choices that they made as far as taking a job to better accommodate a schedule, or a family, or needs (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019).

Finally, a last Task Force member took a more practical approach for the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance. One of the arguments from the Senate against the matter (more on this later) was that perhaps contingent faculty were not as invested at the University. While this same argument cannot be made for part-time faculty, this anonymous participant stated that full-time contingent faculty have the investment of the University if they receive benefits and retirement. They explained: “you can make an argument against the university allowing into the governance process people the university is not invested in, but you cannot make an argument excluding from the governance process people that the university is invested in” (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

### **Faculty Senate Beliefs**

Many participants from this group admitted to not having thought much about the role of contingent faculty in governance prior to the Task Force. One participant recalled being surprised when they learned there was no representation (03FS, personal communication, May

30, 2019). Another admitted assuming that some type of representation was already in place (04FS, personal communication, April 26, 2019). As another participant described:

When the presentations were made... I immediately recognized how obvious it was.

These were issues we should have recognized a long time ago. But I was a junior faculty member just trying to figure out my way on how the system works here. So, it never really crossed my mind that it was a major issue. (08FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

Other participants were well aware of the issue prior to the efforts of the Task Force. One Senator recalled having been involved in the process for “a very long time” because of a professional colleague who was non-tenure-track. They expanded: “I knew one person there, and this person allowed me pretty closely in their struggle to gain recognition” (07FS, personal communication, May 7, 2019). Dr. Aileen Ajootian, who elected to go on record for this study, had been part of the process of creating a promotion ladder for contingent faculty and had previously “had conversations about the tenuous situation of these faculty” (A. Ajootian, personal communication, May 13, 2019).

Two participants expressed being opposed to contingent faculty having a role in University governance. For one of them, there was a conflict between logical and personal beliefs. Personally, they believed that earning tenure demonstrates expertise and a “distinct role in the university and in society.” and if you have not done so, then you should belong to a different body of governance (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019). This is an interesting belief because assistant professors, those who have not yet earned tenure but are in a tenure-track position, are allowed to serve in the Faculty Senate. However, this participant was

persuaded by a colleague to vote otherwise. They explained (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019):

I was honest with my argument with a millennial colleague, and she made some rebuttals I thought were really good points... It is a different playing field than when I came in [to the profession]. There are not as many [tenure-track] faculty jobs as when I started. And there are all these people that the university is “robbing.” It is not their fault that they are available to work at half-pay.

Another participant spoke of the status of earning tenure and the influence it has on campus. They compared earning tenure to earning a degree - someone with a Ph.D. has earned that and “by and large, have earned their right to a particular professional status” (09FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019). This participant asserted that earning tenure means earning “the right to speak,” and that allowing others to be actively involved in governance may cause the voice of the faculty to be “multidirectional and confusing.” They explained:

As a tenure-track faculty member, we might suspect more of an invested interest in the long-term stability of the university... These are the researchers that bring in publicity, students, and money. They can levy a voice that might rally the administration and the press, if needed. They understand the politics of the university. These are the members who shape history - we cannot pretend that is not the case. Although it is kind, perhaps it is not strategic to invite everyone to have a vote on faculty senate. Behind the scenes, politically speaking, no matter what happens, these are the people who are going to influence decision-making (09FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

## **Contingent Faculty Organize**

### **Initial Meetings and Goals**

Dr. Sarah Wilson was responsible for mobilizing a group of faculty who later became the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance. Her ideas about governance, however, began to be formed long before her time at the University. Before arriving in Mississippi, Dr. Wilson resided in Washington, DC. She explained how living in DC shaped her views on governance (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019):

Part of the experience of living in the District of Columbia is you get to pay federal taxes and you do not get any representation in Congress. So that is a really interesting thing to live through. When you get your license plate, it says, “no taxation without representation,” and it is something that has always bothered me. And it is a fight I want to fight but that is a huge fight. It would take a constitutional amendment, and there are groups I support, and things I can do, but it is not a fight I can personally take on in my own life. But it is something that has always bothered me. So, when I came to UM and saw that this was happening . . . I saw that it is not the same, but it is quite analogous.

When Dr. Sarah Wilson arrived at the University of Mississippi, along with her husband who was hired on a tenure-track position, she began to see problems with the way contingent faculty were regarded on campus right at onboarding. She recalled attending her first Fall Faculty meeting, where new faculty are introduced to the academic community, and receiving no introduction along with her other non-tenure-track colleagues (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). In Dr. Wilson’s words (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019):

And even worse than that, personally, was this part of my story: my husband kept asking me if I had completed that “thing” for my introduction. And I had no idea what he was talking about. I did not get that email, and we finally figured out it was just tenure-line faculty. And his first introduction sentence included my name and how excited we were to come join the University, and it got cut. It was a literal silencing, like I do not exist.

Later in 2016, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Dr. Sarah Wilson recalled, published the CCCC Statement on Working Conditions for Non-Tenure-Track Writing Faculty. At the time, Dr. Wilson took the statement to the then chair of DWR, Dr. Robert Cummings (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Both acknowledged there were things in the guidelines that were already in place, especially in DWR. However, as Dr. Wilson recalled, goals were not being met regarding salary, course loads, student loans, and others. Dr. Cummings then pointed to the first paragraph of the statement, which indicated that access to shared governance was paramount (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Even though, according to Dr. Wilson, DWR had shared governance, there was much work to be done on the university-level. Dr. Cummings then suggested the formation of a working group to address the lack of shared governance for contingent faculty (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

In the fall of 2016, Dr. Sarah Wilson brought the idea to the first departmental meeting of the school year, and asked if any faculty were interested in joining the working group. She also wanted faculty to reach outside of DWR to see if others would be interested (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Dr. Carrie Smith was one of the faculty members who heard from a colleague about the group and decided to join (C. Smith, personal communication, May 5, 2019). Another Task Force member, who joined during the early stages, provided support and

strategy to the group, as well as record-keeping to preserve what the group was doing (03TF, personal communications, May 17, 2019).

In the early stages, the goal of the Task Force was to explore representation options for contingent faculty (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). One participant spoke to the Task Force being about more than just shared governance - “it was mainly to get on equal footing between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty” (04TF, personal communication, April 25, 2019). During those initial meetings, it was also important to have transparency about the goals of the group. As Dr. Carrie Smith explained, “one of the things we [the Task Force] were concerned about is... that [it did not look like] we were doing anything shady. We were not hiding in dark spaces. We felt it was important that it did not have that look to it” (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). She also mentioned an email that was sent to the Office of the Provost in 2016 informing them of the formation of the Task Force to, again, further highlight the group’s focus on transparency about their intentions (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019).

For Dr. Sarah Wilson, it became apparent from the beginning that it was important to approach the efforts of the group “through good scholarship” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). By the end of their first semester together, the group had developed a mission statement and detailed their guiding principles. The Task Force used the University of Mississippi’s mission statement to point out discrepancies from the way contingent faculty were being treated in the UM campus. That specific portion of the Task Force’s Mission Statement reads:

[In its mission statement], the university identifies several core values, including promoting “inclusiveness in its student body, faculty, and staff,” fostering “a civil

community of shared governance,” and honoring “the dignity of all employees.”

However, our system of shared governance currently includes only tenure-line faculty members. It specifically excludes all non-tenure track faculty, who make up approximately half of our academic personnel (Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance, n.d.).

The Task Force’s mission statement also details how the group planned to achieve the goal of including contingent faculty in shared governance. In this particular section they stated:

We desire to strengthen the university as a whole by: *exploring* how both tenure-line and non-tenure track faculty serve unique, connected, and essential roles on the campus; *communicating* our needs, aspirations, and talents more openly and effectively with tenure-line faculty and administration, and *establishing* effective pathways for voicing concerns and shaping policy (Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance, n.d, para 2 and 3.).

In addition to the Mission Statement, the Task Force’s Guiding Principles outlined that all faculty members should be included in the faculty’s governing body, that all faculty should be informed about “matters affecting the university that might impact faculty positions”, that all faculty should be allowed to provide input for the courses they teach, that the university should utilize “the talents and abilities of all faculty members,” and finally that shared and “effective governance [are] fundamental academic responsibilities” (Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance, n.d., para. 5).

### **Why the Faculty Senate**

In the beginning stages of the Task Force, there was consideration of contingent faculty organizing its own governing body, separate from the Faculty Senate (S. Wilson, personal

communication, May 14, 2019). As the group continued to research this matter, they ran across Adrianna Kezar, a renowned scholar who has contributed significantly to the literature on contingent faculty, and is cited throughout this dissertation. Dr. Wilson then decided to reach out to Kezar, informing her about the creation of the Task Force and requesting advice on the steps forward. At the time and via email communication, Kezar strongly advised against pursuing a separate body (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

For one Task Force member, advocating for representation on the Faculty Senate was not the path forward. They believed that this pursuit was more reflective of the “desire to be considered equal... within the academy,” and to speak to the credentials of contingent faculty (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019). For this participant, the motivation to organize came from the desire to contribute to “work and ideas” to move the University forward, and a separate body may be more adequate for that purpose (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019). Nonetheless, the Task Force concluded, with the agreement of most members, that it was important to have representation in the Faculty Senate. For one Task Force member, the issue came down to the definition of faculty. “For me, the word faculty is broader than just tenure-track, so it made no sense at all to have a Faculty Senate that did not include non-tenure-track faculty,” they stated (07TF, personal communication, May 20, 2019). For Dr. Cummings, it was “patronizing” to create “a governance system which pretend to have their [contingent faculty] input (R. Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019).

Finally, Dr. Smith brought about the concern of splitting the vote of the faculty by creating a separate body. She used the example of the recent discussion to move the Confederate Monument from the center of campus to explain that, if the vote were to be split (because of separate governing bodies), the voice of the faculty would be weakened on campus. She also



noted - “why split the vote of the faculty? What are the things that we do not have? ... We could definitely see ourselves being othered [by pursuing a separate governing body]” (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019).

### **Representation and Eligibility to Serve**

Two major issues needed to be addressed regarding the Faculty Senate: lack of representation of contingent faculty and ineligibility to serve. Prior to being updated in 2018, the constitution of the Faculty Senate read:

The Senate membership shall be limited to faculty who qualify as Eligible Faculty. Eligible Faculty as used in this Constitution shall mean budget-listed, full-time, tenured or tenure-track employees of the University of Mississippi (Oxford campus) who hold the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor, except for assistant or associate deans, deans, assistant or associate Provosts, the Provost, vice chancellors, the Chancellor, or those holding other administrative positions outside of the academic departments or the libraries. Eligible Faculty must have been on the faculty at the University of Mississippi for the full current academic year (Constitution of the Senate of the Faculty, 2016, p. 1).

The statement above provided a detailed description of “Eligible Faculty.” As evident, only eligible faculty were permitted to serve in the Faculty Senate. However, the “Eligible Faculty” category was also used to determine the number of senators each department had. This specific section of the bylaws read:

Senate representation will be based on a census of Eligible Faculty (listed by departmental affiliation) prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and submitted to the Executive Committee of the Senate by March 1 of each year. Using this data to

derive the statistical mean for department size and the standard deviation from this mean, the Executive Committee will determine Senate representation by department (or other electing unit) for the following academic year, and by April 1 will notify each department (or other electing unit) of the number of Senate seats allotted to that department or unit for the following year (Bylaws of the Senate of the Faculty, 2016, p. 1).

This is an important distinction because changing the description of Eligible Faculty in the Faculty Senate would shift the number of senators in some departments. And because the calculation is based on standard deviation, some academic departments would lose senators because of this change. In anticipation for the first presentation at the January 2018 Faculty Senate meeting, the Task Force developed a written version of what Section 1 and Section 2 would consist of if changes were made. Through those revised versions, the Task Force proposed two major changes: “departmental size should be determined by the full-time equivalents (FTEs) of all faculty in each department or unit,” and “faculty eligible to serve on the Senate should be any faculty members (still excepting some administrators) who have been on faculty at the university and have been benefits-eligible for the prior academic year” (Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance, 2017, para 2).

### **Part-Time Faculty**

As the Task Force established that they would pursue representation and eligibility to serve in the Faculty Senate, they also considered the role of part-time faculty in their efforts. As a reminder, there were two separate issues that needed to be addressed in the Senate: lack of representation, which meant contingent faculty were not counted in the determination of how many seats each department had in the senate, and eligibility to serve, which at the time was only granted to tenure-track and tenured faculty. As indicated on the review of the literature, the 2016

Bylaws of the Faculty Senate indicated that representation in the Senate was determined by a census of eligible faculty, only (Bylaws of the Senate of the Faculty of the University of Mississippi, 2016).

According to Dr. Wilson, the Task Force wanted to advocate for part-time faculty because most of the members had been in an adjunct position at some point in their careers (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). However, as one participant pointed out, while the group agreed with the idea “in spirit,” they were aware that “it would present additional challenges and may not be a viable solution” (07TF, personal communication, May 20, 2019). This sentiment was also mentioned by another Task Force member, who tried to manage the expectations of the group and “warned” Dr. Wilson that the Task Force would not get representation for part-time/adjunct faculty, despite feeling that “they ought to be there” (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

One Task Force member who participated in the study expressed uncertainty about the role of part-time faculty in governance. They wondered, “how do you make the distinction on your part-time faculty?”, since some may only teach a course one semester per year and some may teach multiple courses (04TF, personal communication, April 25, 2019). They then posed the question of what would happen if a part-time faculty member in the senate was not asked back to teach the following semester (04TF, personal communication, April 25, 2019).

While part-time faculty ultimately became part of the census (more on this in a subsequent section detailing the changes to the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate), the Task Force quickly realized that the Senate would not support allowing this group to hold office. As described by Dr. Wilson, the Task Force put a pause on their efforts to advocate for part-time faculty serving in the Senate early in the process, when they were met with much

resistance by the Faculty Senate during their first presentation in January 2018 (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Comments from senators in the minutes of that meeting represent this sentiment. For instance, one senator warned, after polling their department, that the proposal would be voted down unanimously if it included part-time faculty were allowed to serve in the Senate (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, January 23, 2018).

Another argument told by Dr. Smith is that some senators believed that part-time faculty were not equally “invested” in the University. To her, this argument was flawed because a first-year tenure-track faculty member could serve in the Senate while an adjunct faculty member who has been serving in his role for many years was not eligible (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3). Similarly, Dr. Smith described that senators thought part-time faculty would be particularly vulnerable in the Senate because they lacked the protections afforded by tenure. Again, she rebutted this argument by pointing to tenure-track faculty who were eligible to serve.

Ultimately, letting go of this pursuit was difficult for some Task Force members. Reflecting on this aspect of the decision, Dr. Wilson claimed it was her “one regret about this whole thing” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). She does hope, however, that, in a few years, as the changes to the make-up of the senate take place, part-time faculty are allowed to serve in the Senate. As described by another Task Force member, “to extend representation beyond what we have, we will have to work from within the senate” (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

### **The Initial Senate Meeting**

The December 2017 minutes of the Faculty Senate indicated that the Senate had received a draft from the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance Task Force. The then chair of the Faculty Senate, Brice Noonan, informed Senators that the proposal would be reviewed by

the executive committee and would be brought to the senate floor in January of the following year (Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, December 5, 2017). It is important to note the role of the then chair of the Faculty Senate, Brice Noonan, in bringing the proposal to the Senate. As described by one participant, he “played a key role in calmly leading the senate through the consideration of the proposal” (07TF, personal communication, May 20, 2019).

According to Dr. Wilson, the addition of the Task Force concerns to the Senate agenda was made possible because one Task Force member brought up the issue to a friend who was in the executive committee of the Senate. The friend then reached out to the chair of the Senate, and the four of them met informally at a local coffee shop for a discussion. After a few informal gatherings, Dr. Noonan asked Dr. Wilson to solidify what the Task Force wanted to accomplish to then bring their desires to the Senate. She was then told they had been added to the January agenda (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

As promised in December 2017, on January 23, 2018, Sarah Wilson, Ann Marie Liles and Carrie Smith delivered a presentation to the Faculty Senate proposing the modification of the senate’s bylaws to include contingent faculty as “eligible faculty”. The presentation, which can be found on the Task Force’s blog, contained the group’s mission, research on where the University of Mississippi stood on the matter in comparison to other institutions, and the recalculated number of seats for each department if the changes were implemented (Wilson, Lyles, & Smith, 2018). As described by various participants, this was a contentious, yet pivotal moment in the trajectory of the Task Force. The next session will highlight details of this meeting, as well as perceptions of Senators and Task Force members.

## **Major Arguments and Perceptions**

Members of the Task Force and of the Faculty Senate were asked about arguments for and against the inclusion of contingent faculty. This section contains a mixture between beliefs expressed by participants themselves and arguments they heard from other senators throughout the process.

### **Arguments Against Representation**

**Contingent faculty as a separate body.** Some Senators expressed the belief that contingent faculty should create their own body. The Minutes of the January meeting contain statements related to this. One senator said: “it feels like there have been divergent opinions among NTTF [non-tenure-track faculty]. Why not develop their own body and then come together?”. As explained earlier, this sentiment was also expressed by one Senator and one Task Force member interviewed for this study (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019; 05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019).

**We speak for them.** The idea that Senators speak for contingent faculty was brought up by several participants who were interviewed (whether they agreed with this or not). In the minutes of the Senate, one Senator states that while agreeing with the need for governance, contingent faculty are already represented through their tenured or tenure-track Senator, and are welcome to bring their concerns in departmental meetings. This argument was countered by the presenters, who expressed that not all contingent faculty members are invited to attend such meetings (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, January 23, 2018).

In fact, as pointed out by Dr. Cummings, some senators felt insulted as they believed that contingent faculty simply needed to reach out to senators with their concerns. In his words, “the fact that we were arguing that it wasn’t a good system, they saw as a personal attack on the work

they had done. They felt that we were saying that they hadn't done a good job representing their non-tenure-track neighbors" (Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019).

A few participants utilized the analogy of women's rights in the Women's Suffrage movement, which took place in the 19th century. This was actually utilized as argument to confront the "we represent you" argument, and as explained by Dr. Wilson, the Task Force brought up the point that before women were allowed to vote, their fathers and husbands believed they represented them in democracy (Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Another participant, this time a Senator, expressed a similar read of the situation, and stating that "it was horrendous to hear" some of the comments of their colleagues about speaking for contingent faculty (07FS, personal communication, May 7, 2019).

**Threats to the academy and academic hierarchy.** Nine senators were interviewed for this study; two of them expressed being strongly against representation of contingent faculty in the senate. In both cases, their argument was predominantly based on honoring the hierarchy of academics as defined by tenure.

For one participant, it was difficult to deny the pull that tenured faculty have on campus as they believe that full professors especially have the power to enact change and rally the press, if needed. (09 FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019). The second participant similarly spoke of the perceived lack of power contingent faculty have on campus by stating that "with respect comes greater ability to make change" (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019). This participant also spoke of the grueling process of earning a Ph.D. and earning tenure, which in turn gives one an elevated status in the academic world (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019).

Another argument raised during the January meeting was that "contingent faculty were

not as invested” (Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). As explained by Dr. Wilson, some faculty came across as believing they were more experienced and had “more scholarly research interests” as contingent faculty, which justified their eligibility to serve in the Senate (Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). A senator interviewed highlighted this belief, and stated that because tenure-track faculty earn retirement benefits and are the “most active researchers on campus,” their voice is more likely to be heard on campus (09FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

Another side of this, is that contingent faculty often report that they did not elect to go into contingent positions. One Task Force member stated that academic achievement may be fueled by privileges not enjoyed by all who complete graduate school. For instance, many departments do not provide funding for graduate students and new faculty to attend and present at professional conferences, a component that can certainly influence hiring and promotion decisions (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019). This idea was also expressed by a participant who was a member of the Senate, acknowledging their own privilege and the idea that the Ph.D. and tenure process often leaves behind people of color and of lower socio-economic backgrounds (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019).

Lastly, as pointed out by Dr. Wilson, some tenure-track faculty believed that allowing contingent faculty to be represented and serve in the Senate meant they were sending a signal to the administration that they were conforming to the diminishing number of tenure lines on campus (Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). One Task Force member compared this sentiment to the residency process in physicians’ training. They stated:

The very nature of academia is much like a residency, to an extent, in a hospital - where



you are working long hours, you are doing lots of research, you are being productive and once you get past that - that's when you are making all the money. That's how doctors feel and that's, to a certain extent, how the academic process is until you get that first leg over into tenure. You're just sort of pissed off most of the time. And once you get to the other side, once you get past and you get promoted and there's a little breathing room, some people carry that memory with them. And it weighs heavy on them. The bitterness of the process doesn't go away. It's a bit of a trauma... They see tenure as earned, and there are certain privileges that come with going through the rigorous process. (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019).

**Contingency as a barrier.** One senator reported a “logical” argument, as they viewed it, brought up by senators - contingent faculty would not be compensated fairly for out-of-department service as their tenure-track counterparts. In addition, there was fear that this would be “a way for contingent faculty to get dumped on with stuff that tenured faculty don't want to do” (04FS, personal communication, April, 26, 2019). Another participant spoke of the argument that contingent faculty were likely not interested in participating in governance. Dr. Carrie Smith explained that, when given the statistics that 35% of polled contingent faculty would serve in the Senate if given the opportunity to do so, some Senators expressed that they were not interested (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). This was curious to her because, in her experience, likely less than 35% of tenure-track faculty would express interest in serving in the Senate (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019).

Another potential barrier, as told by a member of the Faculty Senate, was whether contingent faculty would freely speak up in the Senate, especially as it addresses controversial matters, given the precarity of their position (03FS, personal communication, May 20, 2019).

Curiously, as pointed out by another senator, a similar concern had been recently raised concerning whether assistant professors should be able to serve considering the more vulnerable nature of their position (08FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019). This particular participant found both arguments to be “very paternalistic” (08FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

### **Arguments for Representation**

**Acknowledging lack of representation.** One of the most important points raised by the Task Force was that contingent faculty were the only group on campus not participating in shared governance. Students are represented through the Associated Student Body; graduate students are represented through the Graduate Student Council; staff are represented through the Staff Council; and tenured and tenure-faculty, as interpreted by many study participants were represented by the Faculty Senate. And while some senators argued that the Faculty Senate did represent contingent faculty through the tenure-track and tenured senators elected in their department, representation in the Senate was determined by a census of eligible faculty only (those who were also eligible to serve) (Bylaws of the Senate of the Faculty, 2016). For Dr. Rosenthal, this was the major argument for inclusion. She stated that there was “a recognition at that moment in time, they didn’t have any representation on campus... and that was an issue that needed to be rectified” (Rosenthal, personal communication, May 2, 2019).

**Contributions to the mission.** Many of the participants spoke of how both contingent faculty and tenure-track faculty contribute to the mission of the University, in either equal or similar ways, as an argument for representation. Dr. Carrie Smith, who elected to go on record for this study, spoke of the heavier teaching expectations for contingent faculty, which are offset by the research responsibilities of tenure-track faculty. She explained: “I’m doing a wide share of

the teaching and the tenure-line faculty are not only teaching, but also researching. We are all contributing to the mission” (Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019).

**Unifying the faculty.** In response to the argument proposing that contingent faculty form their own body, Dr. Wilson responded that the body representing contingent faculty would be larger, or eventually larger, than the Faculty Senate because of the number of contingent positions on campus. This, she warned, would give the administration more power if the two bodies were ever in disagreement on a particular issue (Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

### **A note on Gender and Privilege**

As noted, some participants compared the resistance of some Senators to the proposal of the Task Force to the Women’s Suffrage movement. Dr. Wilson recalls being taken by surprise by this resistance. She expanded (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019):

I can tell you that from our experience, the push back that we got at that January meeting was heavily, heavily male... The three of us [who presented to the Senate] met the night before to go over everything, and we actually had a conversation about how it was probably important that those of us in the room giving the presentation would be women, given the sort of climate we were in, with all the “Me Too” stuff going on at the time. We honestly didn’t actually expect much push back. Because of the rhetoric and the dynamic of the moment, we didn’t expect much, and what we got was surprising to say the least. The level of vitriol that was in the room? It was shocking to me. Although I think ultimately, it was helpful.

Even when well-intentioned, the argument that tenure-track faculty speak for contingent faculty is flawed, and especially detrimental to women. Kahn (2017) addressed the idea of

tenured and tenure-track faculty “speaking for adjuncts” when engaged in “adjunct-equity activism” (p. 259). Tenured and tenure-track faculty should ideally advocate with, and not just for, contingent faculty. And in doing so, certain guidelines must be followed (Kahn, 2017). For instance, Kahn (2017) explained that tenure-track faculty must be careful in identifying with the issues of contingent faculty, because tenure-track faculty are in a position of privilege over contingent faculty.

Gender inequality is not only experienced by female contingent faculty. Much has been written about the experiences of women in academia. According to Marcus (2018), female faculty are paid less and received fewer promotions and honors than male faculty. In addition, female faculty have reported higher rates of burnout (Cassidy-Vu, Beck, & Moore, 2016). Moreover, as a reminder, female faculty make up 54% of all non-tenure-track faculty at the University of Mississippi (IREP, 2018).

### **Perceptions of Senators**

The initial presentation by the Task Force to the Faculty Senate was described in different ways by senators. Some participants interviewed for the study framed the initial meeting in an objective way. One participant interpreted a consensus on the belief that contingent faculty should be represented in the Senate; however, there were disagreements about “the logistics of how, when and what that process would look like” (03FS, personal communication, May 30, 2019).

Not all senators interviewed believed the Task Force presenters were treated unfairly. One participant believed that the presenters did not go in with the right arguments and were not prepared to work with the Senate. For example, they felt insulted when presenters implied that tenured faculty members do not like committee work. For this particular participant, the push-

back was justified. They expanded: “you have to go through the same sort of spanking machine... as you did to get your Ph.D., to get a tenure-track job, to get tenure, and then to get into the Senate... you are going before the firing squad... it’s football for faculty” (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019). Another participant (who did not support the inclusion of contingent faculty in the Senate) believed the climate at that time was “rather supportive” as reflected by the leadership of the Senate bringing forth a motion that would potentially change its constitution.

Nonetheless, many participants spoke of the tense nature of the debate. One participant explained that a small number of senators who had been part of similar discussions in past years were opposed to the idea, or skeptical that it would gain traction. They further explained: “those debates were at times a bit tense, I suppose. Some people in my mind were inexplicably opposed to the idea for various rationales, which I found pretty unpersuasive” (02FS, personal communication, May 31, 2019). Dr. Ajootian, who elected to go on record for this study, also described the climate as divided: “some people were definitely supportive of untenured faculty in general, other people had concerns, which I still don’t really understand” (Ajootian, personal communication, May 13, 2019).

Dr. Rosenthal, who also elected to go on record for this study, spoke of the “trepidations” faced by the Task Force presenters, and interpreted the numerous questions and concerns imposed on them as “fear of the change process itself” (Rosenthal, personal communication, May 2, 2019). Another senator spoke of this sentiment, stating that when changes are brought up to the Faculty Senate, senators tend to react “very strongly and negatively,” especially if there is a perceived limitation to their academic freedom (07FS, personal communication, May 7, 2019). They also expressed concern about the treatment of Task Force presenters, describing some of

the tense discussions as “horrendous” and “extremely ugly.” A third senator reported hearing “strange” arguments and surprising objections; they expanded by saying it appeared that opposing senators were speaking from a self-aggrandizing perspective (02FS, personal communication, May 31, 2019).

A fourth senator had stronger feelings about treatment of Task Force members during the initial meeting:

Over my four years on the Faculty Senate, I don’t think I have seen a group of people be treated more severely or more harshly than the representatives of the Task Force were treated. It was unbelievable to me the kind of elitism that some of my colleagues displayed and their kind of paternalistic, patronizing attitudes and the lines of questions that they took with the representatives of the Task Force. It was absolutely embarrassing; I was extremely frustrated after that meeting (08FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

### **Perceptions of Task Force Members**

According to Dr. Wilson, the three Task Force members delivered their presentation to the Senate in fifteen minutes, yet received a “blow-back” for the next hour and fifteen minutes. What was most surprising to her was that the push back happened immediately after remarks about diversity were delivered by the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Community Engagement, to which, in her view, all were supportive of (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). The “blow-back” was also surprising to Dr. Smith, who assumed the group’s diligent research and objective presentation of the facts would be received more favorably by senators. As she described, the presenters “didn’t just go in there and say we should have representation because it is the fair thing... [they knew that they] were presenting to a room of

academics and academics want to be convinced with reason, logic, and facts” (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). She was certain that one particular slide, which was nicknamed the “Slide of Shame” by Task Force members and contained data demonstrating that 88% of public institutions had representation for contingent faculty (Jones et al., 2017) would particularly sway senators in their favor. Instead, as Dr. Smith described, some Senators expressed interest in the 12% who did not allow for representation and service (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019).

As described by Dr. Wilson, her “read of the situation is that people who were in that room were mostly horrified by what happened” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). One Task Force member spoke to academics’ resistance to change, especially if those changes are perceived to have a negative impact on tenure. “Any sort of grab for power by a lesser group of colleagues would threaten the structures and their positions,” they stated (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

While the treatment of the Task Force presenters was unfortunate at best, it may have curiously helped push the agenda of the group forward. Dr. Wilson expanded on this: “I think the really ugly flashpoints ultimately ended up with people in that room saying, ‘we can’t be this, this is not who we are’. And I think that actually got the momentum on our side... which was not what I expected to happen at all.” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Another Task Force member recounted the event with optimism, citing the collegiality of The University of Mississippi as a factor that helped the Task Force reach its goal: “At private institutions, I know the push back would have been hard. Ole Miss is probably the most collegial university I have ever worked at... you can no longer pretend that non-tenure-track faculty are not second-class citizens” (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

## **The Role of the Administration**

Members of the Task Force who participated in this study were asked about their perceptions about the role of the University administration in their efforts to include contingent faculty in governance. The general consensus was that the administration remained removed in this matter. While Dr. Smith acknowledged that more overt support would have helped the cause (Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019), participants agreed with the approach. As one participant described it, “the administration did a smart thing and stayed out of it... it is a Faculty Senate matter and it is not their place to make a decision about the composition of the senate” (07TF, personal communication, May 20). In fact, Dr. Wilson, chair of the Task Force, believed that the proposal would not have been received well if it had been imposed on the Senate as a “top-down” initiative (Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

## **The Work Continues**

There were no motions put forth at the conclusion of the Task Force’s presentation to the Faculty Senate. The January 2018 Minutes indicate that, Dr. Brice Noonan, then Chair of the Faculty Senate, asked senators to “talk to NTT faculty to get a better sense of their feelings” (Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, January 23, 2018). After the conclusion of the Senate session, many senators returned to their academic department to further poll faculty on their feelings about the topic. In the meantime, Task Force members continued their efforts to raise awareness about contingent faculty and governance on campus.

**Task Force efforts.** The initial presentation to the Faculty Senate led the Task Force to increase their outreach efforts to more heavily recruit allies on campus (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Concurrently, a group of faculty had formed to explore the formation of a labor union on campus (the now United Campus Workers of Mississippi) (S.



Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019; Richmond, 2018). Dr. Wilson joined this group, and at the time, updated them on the efforts of the Task Force. This collaboration resulted in a statement that was authored by Dr. Wilson and two tenure-line faculty members who were a part of the union discussion group, which called for signatures in support of contingent faculty representation in the Faculty Senate (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

The statement, which can be found on the Task Force blog, called for signatures of support, especially from tenured and tenure-track faculty. This is reflected in the statement's opening paragraph:

We are calling on tenured and tenure-track faculty (T/TTF) at the University of Mississippi to use their relative positions of power to actively support their non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) colleagues who are advocating for full representation in the Faculty Senate. To do so means listening to, collaborating with, and amplifying the voices of NTTF faculty in our own departments and across campus, including the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance (formed in September 2016) (Wilson, 2018, para. 1).

In addition to calls for support, the statement provided information on the number of contingent faculty on campus, an explanation on how Faculty Senate seats were determined at the time, and national statistics on the role of contingent faculty in governance. The statement also described the “overwhelmingly negative” response of select senators during the January meeting, and criticized the Senate's desire to remove part-time faculty from consideration (Wilson, 2018). The concluding statement reads as follows: “A step towards improving NTTF [non-tenure-track faculty] working conditions is a step towards living up to our highest principles.” (Wilson, 2018, para. 8).

Once signatures were submitted through a Google Form, the statement along with names of faculty in support were published in the Daily Mississippian on February 23, 2018, and in the Oxford Eagle on February 25, 2018. According to the Daily Mississippian story, at the time of publication, the Task Force had received 144 signatures in support; the majority of those were from tenured and tenured-track faculty, at 56% (Members of UM Faculty, 2018). As Dr. Wilson described, these signatures were especially important. She explained: “it was a way to garner visible and public support, but also a list of people we needed to talk to get on our side” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

The success of petition was made possible in great part due to conversations between Task Force members and their tenured and tenure-track counterparts. Dr. Carrie Smith recounted a humorous interaction with a faculty member which ultimately led to a signature in support. Through this conversation, the faculty member disclosed not knowing that Dr. Smith was not, at the time, on a tenure-track. She recalled: “you and I have lunch every week and we talk about research! You just never asked me about this HR designation” (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). This conversation, along with others, gave her the opportunity to explain why representation was important for contingent faculty, and helped some tenured and tenured-track faculty no longer see contingent faculty as the “other” (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019).

The Task Force co-sponsored two open lectures in March 2018 in partnership with the Sarah Isom Center for Women and Gender Studies. These lectures explored the relationship between feminism and shared governance, and issues related to the working conditions of contingent faculty in the United States. These lectures, in conjunction with the petition and its signatures, contributed to the expansion of the conversation across campus. As one participant

described it, the decision would not have moved forward without the “steadiness of the pressure” put forth by the Task Force (07TF, May 20, 2019). Lastly, Dr. Wilson sent out calls to non-tenure-track faculty on campus asking them to attend Faculty Senate meetings and wear white to make their presence known (S. Wilson, personal communication, April 6, 2018).

**Conversations between Senators and Constituents.** The February 2018 Minutes of the Faculty Senate note that there was follow-up discussion regarding the proposed changes to the Bylaws and Constitution of the Faculty Senate to allow for representation of contingent faculty. During that meeting, it was requested that senators seek feedback from their departments and report those to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, February 13, 2018). In addition, it was shared with senators that, at that time, support for representation was in the majority, and that it was important for senators to gage consensus before the vote was sent to the entire faculty (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, February 13, 2018). During the March meeting, this matter was only briefly addressed, when the Faculty Senate Chair informed senators that the Executive Committee was still working through the details of a potential resolution.

Senators who participated in this study were polled on whether they sought opinions from their constituents about this matter. Overall, departmental support was a common theme, even for the two participants who expressed being against representation of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate. Senators gathered constituent opinions either through informal conversations or more formal methods. One senator reported sending out a questionnaire to their department with four-five questions which addressed the different aspects of the Task Force proposal. While one faculty member expressed concern about whether contingent faculty would have the appropriate protections in place to speak out in the Senate floor, the questionnaire gathered nearly unanimous

support from their academic department. Dr. Rosenthal, who elected to go on record for this study, reported receiving full support from her department, although some questions were raised about the part-time and full-time faculty discussion (M. Rosenthal, personal communication, May 2, 2019).

Another senator encountered some initial resistance in their academic department, stemming from the belief that contingent faculty may not be as “good” as faculty eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate as they were not able to secure a tenure-track position. However, after some debate, that department settled on unanimous support for the resolution (04FS, personal communication, April 26, 2019). This seemed to be a common thread among many units on campus - initial hesitation followed by unanimous support, even though some faculty members were still against representation for contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate. As one senator interviewed described it: “I have what I secretly believe and what I logically support” (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019).

## **The Decision**

### **Vote of the Senate**

In the February 2018 Faculty Senate meeting, it was expressed that it was important to put forth a motion during that same semester, because the majority of the Senate (66%) would be newly elected in the following fall (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, February 13, 2018). After a quick update on the issue during the March meeting, the revisions to the Bylaws and Constitution were officially included in the April 10, 2018 Faculty Senate agenda.

The minutes of the April 10, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting show that a motion to approve the proposed revisions to the bylaws and constitution was moved by the Faculty Senate chair and seconded by one of the Senators (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, April 10, 2018). The motion

then led to a detailed discussion and vote on many line items. In the proposed changes, part-time faculty were written as not eligible to serve in the Senate (S. Wilson, personal communication, April 6, 2019).

Early in the meeting, a motion to strike part-time faculty from those who were ineligible to serve was moved and discussed (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, April 10, 2018). According to the minutes, some Senators argued that it should be up to individual departments to choose who can serve in the Faculty Senate, and that those who were not engaged (a concern about part-time faculty that was expressed during the meeting), would likely be vetted through the nomination process within their departments (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, April 10, 2018). Nonetheless, there was a point made that departments look to the Faculty Senate for guidance in these matters, and ultimately 25 over 13 Senators were opposed to striking the clause about the ineligibility of part-time faculty (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, April 10, 2018).

Next, the motion was moved to discussion and vote on replacing “eligible faculty” to “census representation based on full-time equivalents (FTEs)” (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, April 10, 2018). This would ensure that all faculty members were counted when determining the number of Senate seats for each department. This amendment was approved 38 to 2. The discussion then turned to revisions of the Constitution. All were in favor of making changes to the constitution to reflect on the census changes to the Bylaws (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, April 10, 2018). In a subsequent meeting, on May 8, 2018, the Faculty Senate voted to “approve all changes made to the bylaws,” which would come into effect once the constitution amendments are approved through a vote from the faculty (Minutes of the Faculty Senate, May 8, 2018, p.9). This vote passed 43 to one.

Senators interviewed for this study were asked about their reactions to the resolution passing in the Senate. Many of them expressed being surprised by the outcome, given the contentious nature of the issue's presentation to the Senate, only a few months prior. One senator expressed that, if the vote had been brought onto the floor on the evening of the January meeting, it likely would not have passed (08 FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019). Another Senator described feeling surprised considering that this discussion had been unsuccessfully brought up in previous years (02FS, personal communication, May 31, 2019). Dr. Cummings, who elected to go on record for this study believed there would be more resistance given "the vigor" of the initial discussions within the Senate (R. Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019).

Other senators did not express feeling surprised, and reported being aware that the majority of senators were in favor of the resolution. As Dr. Rosenthal described, it is likely that senators who vocally expressed concerns and disagreements during the first meeting were likely in the minority. She believed that many senators were silent, not because they did not approve, but because they needed time to ponder on the proposal and what it would like in practice (M. Rosenthal, personal communication, May 2, 2019). A second senator hypothesized about the vocal dissenters during the initial meeting, and believed they likely went back to their departments and learned that most were in favor of the resolution (04FS, personal communication, April 26, 2019).

Lastly, one Senator framed the vote as an example of "groupthink" (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019). This participant believed Senators were possibly "scared" to vote against the resolution, partially for fear of being associated with the "terrible things" that

were said about contingent faculty during the January meeting (05FS, personal communication, April 30, 2019).

### **Vote of the Faculty**

The statement below is an excerpt of the 2016 Constitution of the Senate of the Faculty, whose version was utilized by the Senate prior to the 2018 resolution:

This Constitution may be amended by a majority of those voting at a meeting of the Faculty. Amendments may be submitted by a vote of the Senate or by petition of any ten faculty members of professorial rank, and they must be circulated to the faculty at least one week prior to the meeting at which they are to be considered (Constitution of the Senate of the Faculty, 2016).

As indicated on the Constitution, the amendments would need to gain the support of the overall faculty before they could be implemented. On August 20, 2018, Dr. Sarah Wilson emailed all contingent faculty informing them that the vote would take place at the August 24th Fall Faculty Meeting. In this communication, she urged contingent faculty to attend the meeting, wear white in “visible support of NTT faculty,” and reach out to tenured and tenure-track colleagues to encourage them to vote in favor of the resolution (S. Wilson, personal communication, August 20, 2018). She also stated that the amendments in consideration were “an enormous step forward in recognizing the presence, labor, and campus contributions of non-tenure-track faculty members at the University of Mississippi” (S. Wilson, personal communication, August 20, 2018).

Following the Fall Faculty Meeting, on August 25, 2018, then Faculty Senate Chair Brice Noonan emailed all faculty informing them that electronic ballots had been distributed to tenured-track and tenured faculty, and that the results of the faculty vote would be shortly

reported (B. Noonan, personal communication, August 25, 2018). In that communication, the Chair of the Senate acknowledged the work of the Task Force and expressed gratitude to their “diligence and patience” (B. Noonan, personal communication, August 25, 2018).

### **A Senate for All**

As promised, on August 29, 2018, the Chair of the Faculty Senate emailed faculty with the outcome of the vote: 323 faculty members voted in favor of the resolution and 66 voted against. As a result, the constitution amendments were approved; the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance achieved its goal. The email had a celebratory tone and stated:

From this day forward, the Faculty Senate of the University of Mississippi will represent all faculty on our campus. This is a momentous occasion for the University of Mississippi and I thank all who have contributed to the discussion and process that allowed us to reach this point (B. Noonan, personal communication, August 29, 2018).

When asked about the conclusion of the Task Force efforts, Dr. Wilson stated:

Personally, this whole thing has not exactly been a fun experience, but I feel very validated by it. I didn't do it alone. I definitely led it... but I was definitely not alone. I'm not going to be here to see how it plays out, but I feel like I have left quite a legacy. Five years from now, no one is going to know my name, and that is fine, it is not about that. But there have been substantial changes to make things better, and I was a key part of that. And I am proud of that (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

### **Conclusion**

Through interviews of members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance and of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate and review of University documents,



this chapter explored several ideas. Those include departmental experiences of contingent faculty, the role of contingent faculty on campus, beliefs about contingent faculty's role in governance, the formation and organization of the Task Force, the arguments for and against representation and the ultimate successful outcome of representation in the Senate.

## **V. DISCUSSION**

Through the review of University documents and interviews of Task Members and 2017-2018 members of the UM Faculty Senate, the previous chapter explored the following: how a group of contingent faculty organized to form the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance Task Force, how shared governance for contingent faculty was brought into the Faculty Senate, how various campus constituents were involved, and how senators perceived the Task Force efforts. More broadly, chapter 2 of this study addressed the changing environment for faculty in higher education and the challenges faced by contingent faculty. With this in mind, one may wonder - what can we learn from what happened at the University of Mississippi? What does the future look like for contingent faculty on campus? What does their ability to successfully organize to advocate for their needs teach us about university governance? And why does faculty governance matter? This chapter will explore these questions.

### **Faculty Governance**

One major argument for representation of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate is that the senate would be a stronger body if it represented all faculty, and not just those in tenured and tenure-track positions. Sarah Wilson, for example, stated in her interview that allowing contingent faculty to serve in the Senate will bring richness to the Senate discussions. She was especially critical of the lack of pushback she noticed from attending Faculty Senate meetings when the Provost and the Chancellor visited (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). In her mind, the Faculty Senate will be strengthened by doubling the number of faculty

members it represents and by having a “more diverse set of voices in the room” (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

In order to understand the appeal of a strengthened faculty voice, one must first understand the role of the Faculty Senate as perceived by its members and constituents, as well as the role of faculty in governance in general. With the latter question, one must also question whether the shifting of faculty positions towards contingency has affected the way colleges and universities are governed. The sections below will address these questions.

### **Role of the Senate**

Many senators interviewed for this project spoke candidly about what they perceived to be the role of the Senate on campus. As mentioned previously, in writing, the role of the Senate is to “make recommendations to the Chancellor and Academic Council on policies affecting the University and to advise on such matters as the Chancellor shall lay before it” (Faculty Senate Constitution, 2018). Most senators spoke of this role in their interview. For one senator, it was important to note that the Faculty Senate serves as a “consultation body” for the administration, with the Faculty Senate chair gathering the opinions of the faculty to then present those to the administration (07FS, personal communication, May 7, 2019). Similarly, for another senator, “[the role of the senate] is to represent the beliefs and needs of the faculty in my department and to communicate changes and policies and things that occur at the university either through faculty senate or that the senate becomes aware of” (03FS, personal communication, May 30, 2019).

While in theory the Senate should have should have influence over major decisions made by the administration, many spoke of its limitations as well. As one senator put it, “[the Faculty Senate] offers the administration a very good channel to listen to what employees and an

important part of the university community wants. However, the administration is also free to make decisions (07FS, personal communication, May 7, 2019). Another senator spoke of wishing the Faculty Senate had “more actual power” because in reality, the role is “mostly advisory” (04FS, personal communication, April 26, 2019). A third senator reflected this sentiment by stating: “I would like to have more of a role, I’m not sure how much of a role it has been able to play. I think a lot of decisions are made by the administration but... I certainly think it’s important, but I wish it were more important (02FS, personal communication, May 31, 2019). Finally, a fourth senator spoke candidly about the limitations of the Faculty Senate:

So, the FS is political theatre. The FS has no real power, and I think that some people recognize that, and other people take great pleasure in the pomp and circumstance surrounding the FS, passing resolutions. But if you are in FS long enough and if you follow the administration and some of the practices long enough, I think you recognize that the FS is kind of like a dog barking - it can growl a little bit and it can bark really loud sometimes but ultimately the administration - they are the masters of the university and they can decide whether to listen to the FS or not. (08FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

One thing that is notable about the role of the Senate in the University of Mississippi campus is that some participants spoke of the unusual vigor of the discussion surrounding contingent faculty joining the Senate in comparison to previous discussions. As one Senator put it, “there is not much that gets debated in Faculty Senate that is actually debatable” (02FS, personal communication, May 31, 2019). This Senator spoke about the recent resolutions to move the confederate monument and remove the state flag from campus as less debated than the changes proposed by the Task Force. They expanded: “the years that I have been on, I can’t

think of too much where there has been profound disagreement on whether or not to do something” (02FS, personal communication, May 31, 2019). Another participant, this time a Task Force member, mentioned the resolution about the state flag, criticizing the Faculty Senate for following the Associated Student Body as opposed to taking the lead on the issue. They stated that “there are long-term concerns about the community on campus that the Faculty Senate should be taking the lead on rather than following. Ideally the Senate would be a very strong governing body, but in practice... it is relatively weak” (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

The idea that the Faculty Senate does not leverage as much power as its members would prefer is not unique to the University of Mississippi. Chan (2017), for example, wrote of a “vicious cycle” that affects faculty senates across the country (para. 11). When Senates have as members faculty who are not fully engaged and willing to raise their voice, the Senate can be perceived as powerless and ineffective. In turn, once a Senate earns that reputation, engaged faculty members may be less likely to serve, and the administration less likely to respect its concerns and resolutions (Chan, 2017). In addition, as pointed out by Stephen Einsenman who served as president of the Faculty Senate at Northwestern, not all departments take the same approach as to who is appointed to the Faculty Senate (Chan, 2017).

This lack of uniformity in how departments approach who is appointed to serve in the Senate is consistent with the findings of this study. One senator described that the process of including contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate “exposed some problems with senate elections,” because not every department conducts them. According to the senator, some chairs hand-select a representative because no other faculty members are interested (04FS, personal communication, April 26, 2019). The lack of interest in serving in the Faculty Senate may vary

well be, in part, because of the growing expectations of research productivity faced by faculty, especially those on a tenure-track. As Miller (2010) explained, especially as tenure positions continue to decline, tenure-track faculty have often been “advised to focus on research, do a reasonable job of teaching, and avoid service” (para. 7).

It is also important to note that while teaching, research and service are widely known tenets of faculty life, little research has been conducted on the third. Acknowledging this, Neumann and Terosky (2007) referred to service as “unacknowledged in faculty work lives” while “necessary for institutional welfare” (p. 284). Another interesting observation is that there is inequity in the way faculty approach service. In a study utilizing data from 140 institutions, Guarino and Borden (2017) found that female faculty engage in service significantly more than male faculty. In terms of committee work, Porter (2007) found that women at doctoral institutions serve, on average, on one half more committees than their male counterparts.

With this in mind, it is clear that participation and engagement in the Faculty Senate is more complex than simply having the desire to represent one’s department and have a role in governance. Perhaps then, the lack of influence reported by a few senators should not be seen as a representation of the members of the Senate, but of the complicated factors surrounding faculty service. In addition, it is important to address the shifting role of faculty governance in today’s climate. The next section will address this matter.

### **The Fragility of Faculty Governance**

While there are questions about the influence of the Faculty Senate on campus decisions, it is important to remember that concepts such as academic freedom and shared governance were first coined by the AAUP because faculty members were being reprimanded by expressing disagreeing beliefs with administrators and governing boards (Dorm, 2017; Tiede, 2014). And

while faculty authority has traditionally been limited to matters involved faculty hiring and promotion and academic standards, faculty must remember of their ability to have an influential, collective voice on campus in matters pertaining to an institutions' "core principles" (Bowen & Tobin, 2015, p. 145).

The influence of faculty in governance has not only been challenged by the aspects related to service detailed earlier - it has also been challenged because of systemic changes to higher education. The corporatization of higher education, for example, has led to shifting more power to administrations and governing boards, and at times to creating conflict between the senate and those entities (Austin & Jones, 2016). Recently, after interviews were concluded and while this chapter was being written, the University of Mississippi Faculty Senate passed a vote of no confidence in the Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) process of selecting the University's 18th chancellor (Neal, 2019). What is especially relevant about this resolution is that it directly addresses shared governance (or the lack thereof) through the following statement: "it is therefore essential that any search for a new Chancellor be focused on seeking out and selecting the most highly-qualified candidate from among a broad pool of competitive applicants" (A Resolution of the Faculty Senate, 2019, as cited in Neal, 2019).

It is appropriate to point out, at this time, that IHL board members are appointed for 9-year terms by the state's governor (IHL Board of Trustees Policies & Bylaws, 2019). One may wonder then, whether the board is susceptible to the political agenda of state leaders. The University of South Carolina, for example, found itself amidst controversy in 2019 when its board, in a split vote, selected Lieutenant General Robert Caslen as its new president, an unpopular candidate amongst students and faculty (Hazelrigg, 2019). What is curious about this situation is that Henry McMaster, the state's Republican governor, personally contacted the

Board of Trustees to request they vote on the candidate after the board had decided to extend the search (Gluckman, 2019). As one trustee accounted for the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, in his eight years on the board, he had never received “a call from the governor about university business” (Gluckman, 2019, para. 1). Recently, Mississippi’s IHL Board which formally approves requests for tenure from its public institutions, singled out an assistant professor from the University of Mississippi for deliberation based on a controversial political tweet (Guizerix, 2019). In the end, his tenure was approved “with dissent,” demonstrating an unusual weigh in by the IHL in a matter that has historically been determined by the faculty, not the board.

In addition to shifts in governing roles, colleges and universities are being questioned by politicians and the public on the value of what they provide for students. A recent Pew Research Center study found that only half of Americans believe public universities have a positive effect on the United States (Parker, 2019). In today’s politically polarized environment, it is important to address the fear and criticism surrounding a perceived lack of diversity in political thought amongst faculty. A simple Google search yields numerous articles with titles such as “colleges have way too many liberal professors,” “how liberal professors are ruining college,” and “liberal professors are bad...” (Sustein, 2018; Sweeney, 2016; Cooley, 2018). The same Pew study found that partisanship can predict one’s negative attitude towards public higher education. In 2019, 59 percent of Republicans perceived colleges and universities as having a negative effect on the U.S. while only 18 percent of Democrats shared those beliefs (Parker, 2019). This mistrust of colleges and universities, and especially of faculty, makes them more vulnerable to the loss of influence in decision-making.



## **The Future of Contingent Faculty in Governance at the University of Mississippi**

Participants were inquired about their predictions for contingent faculty serving in the Faculty Senate. For one participant, the decision is in symbolic in paper, but it has not been felt day-to-day on campus. This same participant is concerned that contingent faculty who are elected into the Senate will likely be more cautious and less vocal because of their more vulnerable employment positions. They expanded: “I think it is a daunting and intimidating environment and if you are part of the system, you have the power to be hurt by the system” (02TF, personal communication, May 31, 2019).

A senator who participated in this study and who is in an assistant professor role shared a similar sentiment. They stated that they are “less inclined to talk” because they have not yet earned tenure and are interested in seeing how the dynamics will play out in the Senate given that many of those who were vocally opposed during the January meeting are still serving (04FS, personal communication, April 26, 2019). While there is concern about a possible power differential within the Senate, for another senator, it is important to have this diversity of “social capital” and power represented, because this is the reality of the body of the faculty as a whole (08FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

Among many of the Task Force participants, there was a consensus that the impact of contingent faculty representation in the Senate may not be felt immediately. For Dr. Wilson, changes will likely happen slowly and will need to be paid close attention to in order to be noticed (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Dr. Smith spoke similarly, comparing the process to the slowly increasing number of women in the United States government (C. Smith, personal communication, May 3, 2019). Nonetheless, many of the

participants reported that for contingent faculty, the idea that their voices are eligible to be heard is already encouraging.

Dr. Wilson believes that non-tenure-track faculty already feel more welcome, as a whole, and that in the future, a more diverse senate will lead to more interdisciplinary collaboration and diverse ideas (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). Another participant from the Task Force shared similar feelings. To them, it is not expected that this decision will “change the world”, but they feel “better because [they] are listened to.” They expanded:

I have a very good friend who is going to be my senator for the next three years and if there’s something I think the senate needs to know about, I can tell her and she will mention it. Now whether or not something ever happens, it doesn’t matter. It will be in the senate, it will get in the senate minutes. This issue was raised. And that’s the least I can hope for (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

It is important to note that not all participants saw the future of contingent faculty in governance in a positive light. For one participant, allowing contingent faculty to be represented in the Senate undermined their position as a tenure-track faculty member. They explained:

I want to feel that I am at a university where I am working towards a tenure-track position that actually means I will take on responsibility for the future of the university. Whenever I realized I would become a tenure-track member that would have a very limited voice and very limited benefits, I was dissuaded [from working at the University] (09FS, personal communication, May 24, 2019).

At the time interviews were conducted for this study (summer of 2019), the Faculty Senate had operated for a complete school year after the amendments to the Bylaws and Constitution. When amendments were approved in Fall 2018, senators had already been

appointed in the previous spring. According to Dr. Rosenthal, who now serves as the Chair of the Faculty Senate, there were no non-tenure-track senators in the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate roster because of the election cycle (Rosenthal, personal communication, October 21, 2019). When this chapter was written, however, the 2019-2020 Faculty Senators had begun their service - fourteen of the senators are non-tenure-track faculty, indicating that contingent faculty have integrated the senate at greater numbers. Dr. Rosenthal proudly pointed out via a recent email communication that 3 of the 10 members of the Senate's executive committee are non-tenure-track faculty (Rosenthal, personal communication, October 21, 2019). This demonstrates that the Senate perhaps has shifted more quickly than participants expected when they were interviewed before the beginning of the school year.

Even though there has been some question on the influence of the Faculty Senate and of faculty in general at the University of Mississippi, it is important to remember that prior to the Task Force's efforts and the decision to allow them to serve and be represented in the Senate, there was a large and ever-growing number of faculty who felt that they had no voice on campus. And, as cited in the University's Role of Faculty in Academic Affairs policy (2015), the faculty has "primary responsibility" over issues regarding "faculty status" (para. 1). Prior to the 2018 changes to the bylaws and constitution of the Faculty Senate, issues related to pay, benefits, workload and working conditions of contingent faculty had not been seriously addressed by the Senate. And while there are certainly larger questions surrounding the future of faculty governance in higher education, it is important to remember that, with a new set of senators and a more representative body, these issues now have the chance of being discussed and brought before the administration for consideration.

## **The Larger Context of Contingent Faculty in Governance**

While discussions about the role of the Senate and of faculty governance are relevant to this study, it is important to analyze what took place at the University of Mississippi in the larger context of contingent faculty and shared governance. In a national context, this is a story about contingent faculty organizing, gaining allies, advocating for their professional rights and gaining representation in shared governance. The key moments, players and allies in this story can inform how professional groups in higher education can successfully organize to pursue an agenda.

First, it is important to address issues related to employment laws and regulations. Mississippi is a “Right to Work” state, meaning labor union membership cannot be a condition of employment (Miss. Const. art 7, §A). However, as noted by Shermer (2018), right-to-work laws make it more difficult for employees to form unions, participate in collective bargaining, and gain enough membership to be recognized on a federal level. While the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) prohibits most tenure-line faculty to participate in collective bargaining, for public institutions, this matter is addressed through state law (Hutchens & Kezar, 2011). Mississippi does not have a statute on collective bargaining or wage negotiation, and public employees are prohibited from striking (Sanes & Schmitt, 2014). And, as previously mentioned, prior to 2018, there were no labor unions at the University of Mississippi (Richmond, 2018). Moreover, the newly formed United Campus Workers of Mississippi does not engage in collective bargaining with the University. Understanding this information helps us contextualize the need for representation in shared governance.

In recent years, contingent faculty have increased efforts towards unionization and collective bargaining across the country (Herbert, 2016). To demonstrate the effect of these

efforts on contingent faculty working conditions, Edwards and Tolley (2018) analyzed bargaining agreements at 35 institutions. They found that contingent faculty saw increases in salary in all institutions that participated in the study. According to them, “unionized faculty have negotiated steady increases that are significantly higher, and some of the steepest gains have come from unions formed within the last few years” (Edwards & Tolley, 2018). Because no such agreements have taken place for contingent faculty (or any faculty) at the University of Mississippi, and because Mississippi provides little protection to public employees, the vulnerability of this employee group is magnified. However, organizing to advocate for a role in faculty governance is certainly a start in improving their working conditions.

In addition to reflecting on how labor protections play into contingent roles in academia, other important aspects of this story relate to concepts such as coalition building, policy entrepreneurs and policy windows, which are typically found in the management and policy fields. These concepts help frame the necessity for the Task Force to be strategic in its efforts in order to gain representation. One example of this was the decision to no longer pursue representation for part-time faculty, as explained in chapter 4. As one participant who played an important role in strategizing for the Task Force stated that it was important for the process to stay “grounded” and for the committee’s expectations to remain “realistic” (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019).

One particular strategy implemented can be described as coalition building. This concept pertains to the act of forming allies, who are often nontraditional, to achieve a common goal (The AMA Dictionary of Business and Management, 2013). As explained in chapter four, after the initial Task Force presentation to the Senate, it was important for the Task Force to gain allies on campus. Dr. Wilson explained that, especially through requesting signatures of tenured and

tenure-track faculty in support of representation of contingent faculty, the group needed public support once the issue became more visible on campus (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). In addition, the Task Force itself can be seen as a form of coalition. An urgent need became apparent on campus, and a group convened to research it and propose solutions to the larger community. Contingent faculty looking to advocate for better working conditions would benefit from forming partnerships and seeking to gain visible support from other groups on campus.

What happened at the University of Mississippi can also be analyzed through the lens of policy, and more specifically through the concepts of policy entrepreneurship and policy windows. According to Luetjens (2017), policy entrepreneurs are “energetic people who work with others around policymaking venues to promote significant policy change.” Luetjens (2017) also cites coalition building as a source of strength for policy entrepreneurs and a necessary effort in policy change, and highlights the importance of “building momentum” so that change can happen on a larger scale. One could state that the leaders of the efforts of the Task Force, Dr. Sarah Wilson especially, displayed characteristics that can bring about policy change; she was persistent in the face of opposition, and was able to rally a group and gather support of tenured and tenure-track faculty, ultimately leading to a favorable outcome.

The momentum gaining aspect is also an important part of this story. What is particularly interesting about what happened at the University of Mississippi is that the intense pushback of the initial meeting of the Task Force with the Senate could have turned into lost momentum. Instead, it gave Task Force members the perspective that gaining allies on campus was necessary, and there was an opportunity for this to happen because the conversation had spread throughout campus. In addition, as explained by Dr. Wilson, the scrutiny received by the

presenters seems to have helped the Task Force since many Senators were displeased with the treatment (S. Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019).

This last idea leads to the concept of policy windows, which states policy changes happen when windows of opportunity become available (Kingdon, 1995, as cited in Figueroa et al, 2018). As evidenced in chapter four, many aspects of this story made it possible for contingent faculty to be represented in governance - a Senate executive committee that was supportive of contingent faculty, a faculty member who was willing to lead the charge and who was from a department with an egalitarian culture towards contingent faculty, a national climate that is more aware of the obstacles encountered by women in the workplace, and others. And, again, while case studies cannot be easily replicated, understanding how what happened at the University of Mississippi is tied to well-researched phenomenon and concepts can help contingent faculty become stronger advocates for equity in their roles.

### **The Work that Lies Ahead**

As previously mentioned, contingent faculty representation in the Faculty Senate will likely allow for issues related to contingency on campus to be brought before the Senate. And while Dr. Wilson has since left the University, past members of the Task Force hope to keep the conversation about contingent faculty alive on campus. As one participant put it: “there are a couple of issues that we are holding close to our vests still that we want to fuss about” (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019). One of those issues addresses lack of benefits for adjuncts, especially since the University offers health insurance for graduate students and many of those are hired as adjuncts upon completing their dissertations (03TF, personal communication, May 17, 2019). For Dr. Cummings, increased participation of contingent faculty

in the senate will likely eventually lead to a discussion over workload and compensation for service (R. Cummings, personal communication, May 13, 2019).

Dr. Wilson also addressed another issue that is likely to be eventually brought into the Senate. She mentioned that it will be interesting to see how the decision affects University policies that are set by the administration; for instance, who is eligible to vote in faculty meetings (Wilson, personal communication, May 14, 2019). As pointed out by Dr. Wilson, many university policies still exclude contingent faculty. For instance, the recently updated Policy on University Standing Committees (2019) still defines faculty as “any full-time, tenure-track professor above the rank of Instructor” (para.1). For the Elsie M. Hood Awards, the most prestigious teaching award at the University, eligible faculty are still only “assistant, associate, and full professors” (Elsie M. Hood Outstanding Teacher Award, n.d., para. 3). Moreover, the Faculty Titles and Ranks policy (2015) still lists contingent faculty as “support faculty” (para. 2).

Universities across the country have begun addressing some of these issues, acknowledging that while the rise in contingency is a complicated issue to tackle, measures can be put in place to improve the professional lives of non-tenure-track faculty. Recently, Penn State has been praised for their efforts in improving the conditions of contingent faculty - what is most notable about these changes is that they were made possible because of its Faculty Senate advocacy efforts (Tugend, 2019). One major change was the implementation of a three-tiered promotion system that refers to non-tenure-track faculty as “teaching professors.” The promotion ladder also takes into consideration non-tenure-track faculty who possess terminal degrees in their field; those start out as assistant teaching professors, as opposed to lecturers or instructors (AC21 Definition of Academic Ranks, 2019). Lastly, according to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Faculty Senates across the country have started to elect non-tenure-track faculty to



lead them - this has been the case at the University of Southern California, American University, and Texas A&M (Jerde, 2014).

### **Consideration for Future Study**

Now that contingent faculty are allowed to serve and are represented in the Faculty Senate, a logical next question would be - what is next? Future studies should focus on the ramifications of participation of contingent faculty in governance. First, one could look at how contingent faculty are perceived within the Senate, whether they are holding positions of leadership, whether they feel comfortable raising issues and whether there is any differential treatment when compared to their tenured and tenure-track counterparts. In addition, it will be interesting to see whether issues related to non-tenure-track faculty will be brought for consideration in the Senate; for example, issues related to pay, benefits, and job security. Secondly, will having contingent faculty represented in the Senate bring about institutional change, especially as it relates to policies that restrict the role of contingent faculty on campus?

Secondly, this study was limited to the perceptions of Senators, who were directly involved with the efforts of the Task Force (whether they were in favor or in disagreement) and Task Force members. Therefore, it did not explore the thoughts and opinions of overall faculty, many who voted for the final resolution. One area of consideration is whether individual environments, such as departments, or interpersonal relationships, such as a tenured professor who are colleagues of contingent faculty, affected the final vote of faculty members.

Two additional research ideas must be considered. The first surrounds whether the Faculty Senate is strengthened by representing the entirety of the Faculty. Will there be any repercussions for shared governance at the University of Mississippi? Will the Senate be more influential in decision-making and will faculty have a stronger voice? Secondly, given that the

Task Force found that many contingent faculty feel somewhat “othered” in their department, including some participants in this study, will there be changes to their professional lives? Will this decision force departments to be more inclusive of contingent faculty? Lastly, will part-time faculty now be “othered” considering they are not eligible to serve in the Senate? My suggestion would be to look at these questions in five years, once the novelty of the decision has settled and systemic changes could be more accurately measured.

### **Conclusion**

This was an in-depth case study of the formation of the Task Force for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Shared Governance and its efforts to become represented and eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate of the University of Mississippi. More specifically, it addressed the role of contingent faculty on campus and within their academic departments (as perceived by contingent faculty and by tenured and tenure-track faculty), the contentious process of bringing the issues before the Senate, and senators’ perspectives for and against representation, and the advocacy efforts that ultimately led to a successful vote of the Senate and the overall faculty.

The discussion portion of this study addressed the state of faculty governance at the University of Mississippi and across American colleges and universities, as well as the future of contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi. Future studies could be conducted on the ramifications of the decision to allow contingent faculty to be represented and to serve in the Faculty Senate, including institutional changes surrounding policy, pay, benefits, as well as changes surrounding departmental culture.

## List of References

Adjunct (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*. Retrieved from

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/adjunct>

Altbach, P. G. (2011). Harsh realities: The professoriate in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In Altbach, P. G.,

Gumport, P. J., Berdahl, R. O. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd. ed.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Altbach, P. G. (2011). Patterns of higher education development. In Altbach, P. G.,

Gumport, P. J., Berdahl, R. O. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd. ed.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press

American Association of University Professors (1915). *1915 Declaration of principles on academic freedom and tenure*. Retrieved from

<https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/A6520A9D-0A9A-47B3-B550-C006B5B224E7/0/1915Declaration.pdf>

American Association of University Professors (1940). *1940 Statement of principles on*

*academic freedom and tenure*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure>

American Association of University Professors (1966). *Statement on Government of Colleges*

*and Universities*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

American Association of University Professors (1993). *The status of non-tenure track faculty*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/nontenuretrack.htm#2>

American Association of University Professors (2014). *Contingent appointments and the academic profession*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/report/contingent-appointments-and-academic-profession>

American Association of University Professors (2014). *The inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/report/inclusion-governance-faculty-members-holding-contingent-appointments>

American Association of University Professors (2019). *2018-2019 Faculty compensation results*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/2018-19-faculty-compensation-survey-results>.

American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *About*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/about/mission-1>

American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *Background facts on contingent faculty positions*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts>

American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *Censure list*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/academic-freedom/censure-list>

American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *Shared governance*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/shared-governance>

American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *Tenure*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure>

American Association of University Professors (n.d.). *Timeline of the first 100 years*. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/about/history/timeline-first-100-years>

- American Association of University Professors Research Office (2017). *Trends in the academic labor force, 1975-2015*. Retrieved from [https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Academic\\_Labor\\_Force\\_Trends\\_1975-2015.pdf](https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Academic_Labor_Force_Trends_1975-2015.pdf)
- American Political Science Association (2015). Censure list from the AAUP. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 48(4), 685.
- Anonymous. (2009). The unhappy experience of contingent faculty. *Academe*, 95(6), 22-25.
- Armenti, C. (2004). Women faculty seeking tenure and parenthood: Lessons from previous generations. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34(1), 65-83.
- Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2017). *Shared governance: Changing with the times*, Retrieved from [https://agb.org/sites/default/files/report\\_2017\\_shared\\_governance.pdf](https://agb.org/sites/default/files/report_2017_shared_governance.pdf)
- Atieno, O. P. (2009). An analysis of the strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. *Problems of Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, 13, 13-18.
- Autin, I., & Jones, G. A (2016). *Governance of higher education: Global perspectives, theories, and practices*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Berry, J. (2005). *Reclaiming the ivory tower: Organizing adjuncts to change higher education*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Bowen, W. G. & Tobin, E. M. (2015). *Locus of authority: The evolution of faculty roles in the governance of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bylaws of the Senate of the Faculty of the University of Mississippi (2016). Retrieved from [https://olemiss.edu/faculty\\_senate/archives/bylaws\\_20160500.pdf](https://olemiss.edu/faculty_senate/archives/bylaws_20160500.pdf)
- Bylaws of the Senate of the Faculty of the University of Mississippi (2018). Retrieved from [https://olemiss.edu/faculty\\_senate/bylaws.html](https://olemiss.edu/faculty_senate/bylaws.html)

- Cain, T. R. (2012). *Establishing academic freedom: Politics, principles, and the development of core values*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cassidy-Vu, L., Beck, K., & Moore, J. B. (2017). Burnout in female faculty members. *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health*, 8(2), 97.
- Chan, C. (July 06, 2017). A common plea of professors: Why can't my faculty senate pull more weight? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www-chronicle-com.umiss.idm.oclc.org/article/A-Common-Plea-of-Professors-/240552>
- Chute, W. J. (1951). *The life of Frederick A. P. Barnard to his election as president of Columbia College in 1864*.
- Clausen, J. & Swidler, E. M. (2013). Academic freedom from below: Toward an adjunct-centered struggle. *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom*, 4. Retrieved from [https://www.aaup.org/JAF4/academic-freedom-below-toward-adjunct-centered-struggle#.V-ksa\\_krJQI](https://www.aaup.org/JAF4/academic-freedom-below-toward-adjunct-centered-struggle#.V-ksa_krJQI)
- Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012). *A portrait of part-time faculty members*. Retrieved from [http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW\\_portrait\\_2012.pdf](http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf)
- Contingent (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/contingent>
- Cooley, L. (2018, October 19). Liberal professors are bad - college administrators are even worse. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/red-alert-politics/liberal-professors-are-bad-college-administrators-are-even-worse>
- Curtis, J. W. (2004). Balancing work and family for faculty: Why it's important. *Academe*, 90(6), 21-23.
- Curtis, J. W. (2011). Persistent inequity: Gender and academic employment. *New Voices in Pay*

- Equity*. Retrieved from [https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/08E023AB-E6D8-4DBD-99A0-24E5EB73A760/0/persistent\\_inequity.pdf](https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/08E023AB-E6D8-4DBD-99A0-24E5EB73A760/0/persistent_inequity.pdf)
- Davis, D. (August 28, 2019). A contingent faculty compromise. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2019/08/28/we-need-new-approach-contingent-faculty-pay-opinion>
- Dreyfuss, S., & Ryan, M. (2016). Academic freedom: The continuing challenge. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 16(1), 1.
- Dorn, C. (2017). *For the common good: A new history of higher education in America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Eanes, B. J., Perillo, P. A., Fechter, T. F., Gordon, S. A., Harper, S., Havice, P., Hoffman, J., Willoughby, C. (2015). *Professional competency areas for student affairs educators*. ACPA & NASPA. Retrieved from [https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ACPA\\_NASPA\\_Professional\\_Competencies\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/ACPA_NASPA_Professional_Competencies_FINAL.pdf)
- Eggington, W. (2018). The left-wing case against tenure. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www-chronicle-com.umiss.idm.oclc.org/article/The-Left-Wing-Case-Against/244672>
- Eron, D. (2014). The case for instructor tenure: Solving contingency and protecting academic freedom in Colorado. In Hoeller, K. (Ed.). *Equality for contingent faculty: Overcoming the two-tier system*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Erwin, A. & Wood, M. (2014). The one percent at State U: How public university presidents profit from rising student debt and low-wage faculty labor. *Institute for Policy Studies*. Retrieved from [https://ips-dc.org/one\\_percent\\_universities/](https://ips-dc.org/one_percent_universities/)



- Field, A. T. (September 18, 2018). 'We are the most at-risk people on campus'. Non-tenured instructors can now serve in U. of Mississippi's faculty senate. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/We-Are-the-Most-At-Risk/244557>
- Figlio, D. N., Schapiro, M. O., & Soter, K. B. (2015). Are tenure track professors better teachers? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(4).
- Figueroa, C., Castillo, E., Norquist, G., Wells, K., Griffith, K., Kadkhoda, F., ... Bromley, E. (2018). A window of opportunity: Visions and strategies for behavioral health policy innovation. *Ethnicity and Disease*, 28(Suppl 2), 407–416.
- Frye, J. R. (2017). Organizational pressures driving the growth of contingent faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2017(176), 27-39.
- Gavaskar, V., Boldt, J., Donhardt, T., Ghoshal, S., & Godstein, D. (2013). FORUM: Issues about part-time and contingent faculty. *College Composition and Communication*, 65(1), A1-A16.
- Gay, L. R., & Araisian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (3rd. ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Geiger, R. L. (2011). The ten generations of American higher education. In Altbach, P. G., Gumport, P. J., Berdahl, R. O. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd. ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gerber, L. G. (2014). *The rise and decline of faculty governance: Professionalization and the modern American University*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (5th edition). Boston, MA:

Pearson.

Gluckman, N. (July 11, 2019). At the U. of South Carolina trustees paused a controversial presidential search. Then the governor stepped in. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/At-the-U-of-South-Carolina/246660>

Google Voice (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://voice.google.com/u/0/about>

Griffin, N. (October 17, 2019). Faculty Senate votes no confidence in IHL, chancellor selection process. *The Daily Mississippian*. Retrieved from <https://thedmonline.com/faculty-senate-votes-no-confidence-in-ihl-chancellor-selection-process/>

Gruberg, M. (2009). American Association of University Professors. *Encyclopedia of the First Amendment, 1*, pp 79-80.

Guarino, C. M. & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education* (58)6, 672-694).

Hancock, D. R., Algozzine, R.(2017). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers* (3rd edition). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hazelrigg, N. (July 22, 2019). Politics and a new president in South Carolina. *Inside Higher Ed*.

Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/07/22/many-point-highly-politicized-process-selecting-new-south-carolina-president>

Hebert, W. A. (2016). The winds of changes shift: An analysis of recent growth in bargaining units and representation efforts in higher education. *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy* 8(1), 1-24.

Hoeller, K. (2014). The academic labor system of faculty apartheid. In Hoeller, K. (Ed.).

*Equality for contingent faculty: Overcoming the two-tier system*. Nashville, TN:

Vanderbilt University Press.

- Holbrook, M. B. (2004). Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 24(1), 68-74.
- House Committee on Education and the Workforce Democratic Staff (2014). The just-in-time professor: A staff report summarizing eForum responses on the working conditions of contingent faculty in higher education. *U.S. House of Representatives*. Retrieved from <https://edlabor.house.gov/imo/media/doc/1.24.14-AdjunctEforumReport.pdf>
- Hulburt, S. & McGarrah, M. (2016). The shifting academic workforce: Where are the contingent faculty? *The TIAA Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Shifting-Academic-Workforce-November-2016.pdf>
- Hunt, E. (2010). The rights and responsibilities implied by academic freedom. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(4), 264-271.
- Hutchens, N., & Kezar, A. (2011). Using a Legal Lens to Better Understand and Frame Issues Shaping the Employment Environment of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1443–1460
- Hutchens, N. H., & Sun, J. C. (2015). Faculty expressions and legal implications. In Fossey, R., & Eckes, S. (Eds.). *Contemporary issues in higher education law*. Cleveland: Education Law Association.
- Jacobs, K., Perry, I., & MacGillvary, J. (2015). The high public cost of low wages: Poverty-level wages cost U.S. Taxpayers \$152.8 billion each year in public support for working families. *UC Berkley Center for Labor Research and Education*. Retrieved from <http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/pdf/2015/the-high-public-cost-of-low-wages.pdf>

- Jaeger, A., & Hinz, D. (2008). The effects of part-time faculty on first semester freshmen retention: A predictive model using logistic regression. *Journal of College Student Retention, 10*(3), 265-286.
- Jerde, S. (2014, June 02). Off the tenure track and at the helm: Adjuncts now lead some faculty senates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Off-the-Tenure-Trackat/146889?cid=rclink>
- Jones, W. A., Hutchens, N. H., Hulbert, A., Lewis, W. D., & Brown, D. M. (2017). Shared governance among the new majority: Non-tenure track faculty eligibility for election to university faculty senates. *Innovative Higher Education, 42* (5-5), 505-519.
- Kahn, S. (2017). The problem of speaking for adjuncts. In Kahn, S., Lalicker, W., & Lynch-Binieck, A. (Eds.). *Contingency, exploitation and solidarity: Labor and action in english composition*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/contingency/>
- Kairos (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/kairos>
- Kaiser K. (2009). Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research. *Qualitative health research, 19*(11), 1632–1641.
- Kezar, A. (2012). Preface. In Kezar, A. (Ed.). *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kosanovich, K. (2018). A look at contingent workers. *United States Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2018/contingent-workers/home.htm>
- Kurian, G. T. (2013). *The AMA dictionary of business and management*. New York, NY:

- AMACOM, Publishing Division of the American Management Association.
- Langing, K. (2019). In a first, U.S. private sector employs nearly as many Ph.Ds as schools do. *Science*. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2019/03/first-us-private-sector-employs-nearly-many-phds-schools-do>
- Laws and Regulations of the University of Mississippi (1850-71). Holly Springs, MS: "Miss. Times" Cheap Book and Job Office, Print, Department of Archives and Special Collections, University of Mississippi.
- Lucas, C. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Luetjens, J. (2017). A primer on policy entrepreneurs. *Integration and Implementation Designs*. Retrieved from <https://i2insights.org/2017/04/18/policy-entrepreneurs-primer/>
- Lyons, R. E. (2007). Deeping our understanding of adjunct faculty. In Lyons, R. E. (Ed.). In *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- MacArthur Foundation (n.d.) *About MacArthur Fellows Program*. Retrieved from <https://www.macfound.org/programs/fellows/strategy/>
- Magness, P. W. (2017). Are full-time faculty being adjunctified? Recent data show otherwise. *The James G. Martin Center for Academic Renewal*. Retrieved from <https://www.jamesgmartin.center/2017/05/full-time-faculty-adjunctified-recent-data-show-otherwise/>
- Marcus, S. (2018). We're not even close: If the situation were reversed, men would revolt. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/the-awakening>

- Members of the UM Faculty (February 23, 2018). UM faculty members release statement calling for 'full representation' of non-tenure-track faculty on Senate. *Daily Mississippian*. Retrieved from <https://thedmonline.com/um-faculty-members-release-statement-calling-full-representation-non-tenure-track-faculty-senate/>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- McNaughtan, J., García, H. A., & Nehls, K. (2017). Understanding the growth of contingent faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2017(176), 9-26.
- Miller, M. A. (August 10, 2010). More pressure on faculty members, from every direction. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www-chronicle-com.umiss.idm.oclc.org/article/The-Profession-More-Pressure/123918>
- Mills, A., Duperos, G. & Wiebe, E (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study research*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Mills, N. (2012). The corporatization of higher education. *Dissent*. Retrieved from <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/the-corporatization-of-higher-education>
- Mitchel, M., Leachman, M., & Masterson, K. (2017). A lost decade in higher education funding. *Center of Budget and Policy Priorities*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/a-lost-decade-in-higher-education-funding>
- McLaughlin, E. C., & Gallman, S. (March 26, 2015). Donors, alums rebel against vote to ax Ole Miss chancellor. *CNN*. Retrieved from

<https://www.cnn.com/2015/03/25/us/university-mississippi-ole-miss-dan-jones-ouster/index.html>

McKenna, L. (September 21, 2015). The college president-to-adjunct pay ratio. *The Atlantic*.

Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/09/income-inequality-in-higher-education-the-college-president-to-adjunct-pay-ratio/407029/>

McKenna, L. (April 21, 2016). The ever tightening job market for Ph.Ds: Why do so many people continue to pursue doctorates? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from

<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/04/bad-job-market-phds/479205/>

Mississippi Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning (2019). *Policies and bylaws*.

Retrieved from <http://www.mississippi.edu/board/downloads/policiesandbylaws.pdf>

Miss. Const., art 7, §A.

National Center for Education Statistics (n.d.). *Fast Facts*. Retrieved from

<https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>

Nelson, Cary (2010, December 21). Defining academic freedom. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved

from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/12/21/defining-academic-freedom>

Nelson, C. (2010). *No university is an island: Saving academic freedom*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 282-310.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance (December 6, 2017). *Faculty Senate Proposal*.

- [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/2017/12/06/faculty-senate-proposal/>
- O'Boyle, L. (1983). Learning for its own sake: The German university as nineteenth-century model. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 25(1), 3-25.
- O'Neil (2011). Academic freedom: Past, present, and future. In Altbach, P. G., Gumport, P. J., Berdahl, R. O. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd. ed.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Olson, G. A. (2009, July 23). Exactly what is 'shared governance'? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065>
- Oxford Eagle Contributors (February 25, 2018). A statement on non-tenure-track faculty and shared governance. *The Oxford Eagle*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordeagle.com/2018/02/25/statement-non-tenure-track-faculty-shared-governance>
- Parker, K. (2019). A growing partisan divide in views of higher education. *Pew Research Center Social & Demographic Trends*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/essay/the-growing-partisan-divide-in-views-of-higher-education/>
- Patterson, G. A. (2008). Managing motherhood and tenure. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 25(20), 16-18.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage



Publications, Inc.

Penn State (2019). *Definition of academic ranks*. Retrieved from

<https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ac21#E>

Porter, S. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 523–541.

Post, R. C. (2008). Academic Freedom. *Bulletin of the American Academic of Arts and Sciences*. 61 (2), 21-22.

Quintana, C. (2017, June 28). Under fire, these professors were criticized by their colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

<http://www.chronicle.com.umiss.idm.oclc.org/article/Under-Fire-These-Professors/240457>

Quintana, C., & Thomason, A. (2017, May 15) The states where campus free-speech bills are being born: A rundown. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

<http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-States-Where-Campus/240073>

Raud, S. (2018, February 19). University lobbies statue legislature for additional funding. *The Daily Mississippian*. Retrieved from <http://thedmonline.com/university-lobbies-state-legislature-additional-funding/>

Richmond, M. (November 29, 2018). University employees organize first labor union on campus history. *Daily Mississippian*. Retrieved from

<https://thedmonline.com/university-employees-organize-first-labor-union-in-campus-history/>

Rijnsoever, F. J. V. (2017). (I can't get no) saturation: A simulation and guidelines for sample sizes in qualitative research. *PLoS One*, 12(7).

- Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sanjari, M., Bahramnezhad, F., Fomani, F. K., Shoghi, M., & Cheraghi, M. A. (2014). Ethical challenges of researchers in qualitative studies: The necessity to develop a specific guideline. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, 7, 14.
- Schmidt, P. (2017). Is academic freedom's watchdog losing its bite? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www-chronicle-com.umiss.idm.oclc.org/article/Is-Academic-Freedom-s/240761>.
- Scott, R. A. (2018, April 23). The business model of higher education. *Higher Ed Jobs*. Retrieved from <https://www.higheredjobs.com/blog/postDisplay.cfm?post=1607&blog=22>
- Smith, C. V. (2018, January 26). *Understanding non-tenure track faculty at the University of Mississippi: Fall 2017 survey results* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from <https://edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/2018/02/10/nttf-fall-2017-census-survey-data/>
- Stone, B. A., & Stone, S. J. (2018). Democracy, shared governance, and academic freedom for all faculty. In Munene, I. I. (Ed.), *Contextualizing and organizing contingent faculty*. Lanham, MD: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group Inc.
- Street, S., Maisto, M., Merves, E., & Rhoades, G. (2012). Who is professor "staff" and how can this person teach so many classes? *Center for the Future of Higher Education Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.nfmfoundation.org/ProfStaffFinal.pdf>
- Schell, E. (2017). Foreword: The new faculty majority in writing programs: organizing for

- change. In Kahn, S., Lalicker, W., & Lynch-Binieck, A. (Eds.). *Contingency, exploitation and solidarity: Labor and action in English composition*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado. Retrieved from <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/contingency/>
- Schmidtlein, F. A., & Berdahl, R. O. (2011). Autonomy and accountability. In Altbach, P. G., Gumpert, P. J., Berdahl, R. O. (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd. ed.). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schmitt, J. & Sanes, M. (2014). Regulation of public sector collective bargaining in states. *Center for Economic and Policy Research*. Retrieved from <http://cepr.net/documents/state-public-cb-2014-03.pdf>
- Schneirov, R. (2003). Contingent faculty: A new social movement takes place. *Working USA*, 6(4), 38-48.
- Shermer E. T. (April 24). The right to work really means the right to work for less. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/made-by-history/wp/2018/04/24/the-right-to-work-really-means-the-right-to-work-for-less/>
- Steiger, K. (2013). The pink collar workforce of academia. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <https://www.thenation.com/article/academias-pink-collar-workforce/>
- Smith, S., Lyles, A. M., & Smith, C. (2018). *Proposing a more inclusive Faculty Senate: Proposed amendments to the Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws [Powerpoint slides]*. Retrieved from <https://edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/2018/01/30/faculty-senate-presentation/>.

- Sustein, C. R. (September 24, 2018). The problem with all those liberal professors. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from <https://www.chicagotribune.com/opinion/commentary/ct-perspec-professors-liberal-teaching-students-colleges-universities-0925-story.html>
- Sweeney, C. (2016, December 20). How liberal professors are ruining college. *Boston*. Retrieved from <https://www.bostonmagazine.com/news/2016/12/20/liberal-professors/>
- Swidler, E. (2017, October 30). The pernicious silencing of the adjunct faculty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www-chronicle-com.umiss.idm.oclc.org/article/The-Pernicious-Silencing-of/241601>
- Taylor, S. J., Bogdan, R., & DeVault, M. L. (2015). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education (2014). *25 years of declining state support for public colleges*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/statesupport>
- The University of Mississippi. (n.d.). *About UM*. Retrieved from <http://olemiss.edu/aboutum/>  
<https://irep.olemiss.edu/fall-2017-2018-enrollment/>
- The University of Mississippi (2013). *Policy: Standing committees*. Retrieved from <https://policies.olemiss.edu/ShowDetails.jsp?istatPara=1&policyObjidPara=10649612>
- The University of Mississippi (2017). *Financial summary*. Retrieved from <https://adminfinance.wp.olemiss.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/74/2018/05/Financial-Summary-2017-reduced.pdf>
- The University of Mississippi (2013). *Policy on promotion of instructors and lecturers*. Retrieved from <https://policies.olemiss.edu/ShowDetails.jsp?istatPara=1&policyObjidPara=1064701>

- The University of Mississippi Faculty Senate (2018). *Constitution of the Senate of the Faculty*. Retrieved from [https://www.olemiss.edu/faculty\\_senate/constitution.html](https://www.olemiss.edu/faculty_senate/constitution.html)
- The University of Mississippi Faculty Senate (2018, January 23). *Faculty Senate Agenda - MINUTES*. Retrieved from [https://olemiss.edu/faculty\\_senate/archives/minutes\\_20180123.pdf](https://olemiss.edu/faculty_senate/archives/minutes_20180123.pdf)
- The University of Mississippi (2019). *Standing committees*. Retrieved from <https://policies.olemiss.edu/ShowHistory.jsp?policyObjidPara=10649612&istatPara=1>
- The University of Mississippi Institutional Research, Effectiveness, & Planning (2018). *Head Count of Faculty by Tenure and Academic Rank*. Retrieved from [https://tableau.olemiss.edu/#/views/FacultyandStaffCharacteristics\\_0/FacultybyTenureandAcademicRank?:iid=1](https://tableau.olemiss.edu/#/views/FacultyandStaffCharacteristics_0/FacultybyTenureandAcademicRank?:iid=1)
- The University of Mississippi (2015). *Faculty titles and ranks*. Retrieved from <https://policies.olemiss.edu/ShowDetails.jsp?istatPara=1&policyObjidPara=11883237>
- The University of Mississippi (2015). *Role of faculty in academic affairs*. Retrieved from <https://policies.olemiss.edu/ShowDetails.jsp?istatPara=1&policyObjidPara=11066216>
- Theelin, J. T. (2011). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Thomas, N. L. (2010). The politics of academic freedom. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2010(152), 83-90.
- Tiede, J. (2014). The Ross case. *Academe Blog*. Retrieved from <https://academeblog.org/2014/04/24/the-ross-case/>
- Townsend, R. B. & Brookins, J. (2016). The troubled academic job market for history.

- Perspectives on History*. Retrieved from <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/february-2016/the-troubled-academic-job-market-for-history>
- Tugend, A. (2019, October 30). How Penn State improved the conditions for adjuncts. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Penn-State-Improved/247453>
- Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty in undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 91 – 123.
- Wetherbe, J. C. (2013, March 13). *It's time for tenure to lose tenure*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/03/its-time-for-tenure-to-lose-te>
- Westheimer, J. (2010). *Higher education or education for hire? Corporatization and the threat to democratic thinking*. Retrieved from <https://academicmatters.ca/2010/04/higher-education-or-education-for-hire-corporatization-and-the-threat-to-democratic-thinking/>
- Williams, J. (2015). The academy's first freedom fighters. *Spiked*. Retrieved from <http://www.spiked-online.com/newsite/article/the-academys-first-freedom-fighters/16422#.Vh2ufOtH3jB>
- Wilson, S. (2017, September 2017). *Fall 2017 information sessions* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/2017/09/27/information-sessions/>
- Wilson, S. (2017, December 2017). *Faculty senate proposal* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/2017/12/06/faculty-senate-proposal/>
- Wilson, S., Liles, A. M., & Smith, C. V. (2018, January 23). *Proposing a more inclusive faculty*

*senate* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from

<https://edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/page/2/>

Wilson, S. (2018). *Statement on non-tenure-track faculty and shared governance*. [Blog post].

Retrieved from

<https://edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance/2018/02/22/signed-statement/>

Winslow, S., & Davis, S. N. (2016). Gender inequality across the academic life course. *Sociology Compass*, 10(5), 404-416.

Wolfinger, N. H., Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2009). Stay in the game: Gender, family formation and alternative trajectories in the academic life course. *Social Forces*, 87(3), 1591-1621.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research. Design and methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

## LIST OF APPENDICES



## Appendix: A

## Appendix A

Script:

Hi, (faculty member). Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. Before I begin, I want to review some information about this study with you. The purpose of this study is to uncover in detail, the process of allowing contingent faculty to be included in governance at the University of Mississippi, and the beliefs and perceptions of stakeholders regarding the role of adjuncts in campus governance. I will be collecting data through interviews of members of the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance Task Force and the Faculty Senate. Your identity will be kept confidential and a pseudonym will be used when I describe you. The data generated from the recording of our interview will be maintained confidential. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions and to withdraw your participation at any point.

The questions below will be asked of members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance:

1. Can you confirm that you have reviewed the Study Information Sheet and signed the Release of Words document sent to you via email?
2. By completing this interview, you are consenting to participating in this study. Do I receive your verbal consent to proceed?
3. Can you confirm that you are over the age of 18?

4. Tell me about your professional role at the University and how long you have been in that role. (No identifying information will be utilized by the researcher).
5. How does your department utilize contingent faculty? Are there large or small numbers of such positions? Which courses do contingent faculty typically instruct?
6. What role do contingent faculty play in decision making in your department?
7. What were your beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in governance prior to the convening of the Task Force?
8. What professional experiences have shaped your beliefs about the importance of including contingent faculty in governance?
9. What do you perceive to be the role of the Faculty Senate in governance at the University of Mississippi?
10. Why was inclusion in the Faculty Senate specifically important to you?
11. When did you first hear about the desire to organize as a group to address contingent faculty participation in the Faculty Senate?
12. What was your involvement in the creation of the Task Force?
13. Walk me through your decision-making process when deciding to join the Task Force. Were there any hesitations? Did you consult with anyone before joining the group?
14. What can you tell me about the first time the group convened?
15. What was the original goal of the Task Force? Did that objective change overtime?
16. What discussions were had in regards to the role of part-time faculty in governance?
17. When did the group first approach the Faculty Senate and what was the initial response?
18. As the group began to spread the word about this issue on campus, what types of responses from the community were received?

19. As you remember it/view it, how did this process play out once the issue was received by the senate?
20. What issues/hesitations were raised by the Faculty Senate in regards to allowing for participation?
21. How was the administration of the University involved in this matter?
22. How important do you perceive the role of the Task Force to have been in the favorable vote by the Senate?
23. What events have taken place since the decision was made by the Faculty Senate?
24. How do you believe the participation of contingent faculty in the Faculty Senate will affect the daily lives of contingent faculty at the University of Mississippi?
25. What do you anticipate to be the future of contingent faculty serving in the Faculty Senate? What will it look like? Any potential challenges?
26. Is there anything else you can tell me that would help me tell the story of how contingent faculty became involved in governance at the University of Mississippi?

The questions below will be asked of members of the Faculty Senate:

1. Can you confirm that you have reviewed the Study Information Sheet and signed the Release of Words document sent to you via email?
2. By completing this interview, you are consenting to participating in this study. Do I receive your verbal consent to proceed?
3. Can you confirm that you are over the age of 18?
4. Tell me about your professional role at the University and how long you have been in that role. (No identifying information will be utilized by the researcher).

5. How does your department utilize contingent faculty? Are there large or small numbers of such positions? Which courses do contingent faculty typically instruct?
6. What role do contingent faculty play in decision making in your department?
7. As a tenured/tenure-track faculty member, how do you see your professional role on campus in comparison to the role of contingent faculty?
8. What are your beliefs regarding the types of issues faced by contingent faculty at the UM campus? Are they similar to all faculty or are there distinct issues faced by different groups?
9. What were your beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in governance prior to the convening of the Task Force?
10. What professional experiences have shaped your beliefs about the importance of including contingent faculty in governance?
11. What do you perceive to be the role of the Faculty Senate in governance at the University of Mississippi?
12. What do you perceive to be your role in the Faculty Senate as a representative of your department?
13. When did you first hear about the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance?
14. What was the climate in the Senate upon hearing about the possible inclusion of contingent faculty? What initial conversations were had between members?
15. Once the issue was officially brought into the senate for discussion, what were some of the arguments for and against the inclusion of contingent faculty in the senate?

16. What information was needed by the Senate so that officers were comfortable enough to position themselves through their vote?
17. Did you have any conversations about this with colleagues in your academic department who were not members of the Faculty Senate? What concerns were brought up by them?
18. Were you surprised about the voting results in the senate? If yes or no, how so?
19. What are your thoughts regarding the 323-66 result of the overall faculty vote?
20. How does this decision change faculty governance at the University of Mississippi?
21. Is there anything else you can tell me that would help me tell the story of how contingent faculty became involved in governance at the University of Mississippi?

## Appendix: B

## Appendix B

### IRB Approval

PI:

This is to inform you that your application to conduct research with human participants, "A Study of Contingent Faculty Representation in Governance at the University of Mississippi" (Protocol #19x-262), has been approved as Exempt under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(#2).

Please remember that all of The University of Mississippi's human participant research activities, regardless of whether the research is subject to federal regulations, must be guided by the ethical principles in The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research.

It is especially important for you to keep these points in mind:

- You must protect the rights and welfare of human research participants.
- Any changes to your approved protocol must be reviewed and approved before initiating those changes.
- You must report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others.
- If research is to be conducted during class, the PI must email the instructor and ask if they wish to see the protocol materials (surveys, interview questions, etc.) prior to research beginning. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the IRB at [irb@olemiss.edu](mailto:irb@olemiss.edu).



## Appendix: C

## Appendix C

### Original Information Sheet

# STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

**Title:** A Study of Contingent Faculty Representation in Governance at the University of Mississippi

**Investigator**

Mariana Rangel Allushuski, M.Ed..  
Department of Higher Education  
The University of Mississippi

**Advisor**

Amy Wells Dolan, Ph.D.  
Department of Higher Education  
219 Guyton Hall  
The University of Mississippi

*By checking this box I certify that I am 18 years of age or older.*

**Description**

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to uncover in detail, the process of allowing contingent faculty to be included in governance at the University of Mississippi, and the beliefs and perceptions of stakeholders regarding the role of adjuncts in campus governance. The researcher will collect data through interviews and review of University historical documents and artifacts. Faculty interviewed will fall in diverse employment categories: part-time contingent, full-time contingent, tenured and tenure-track. Targeted participants were affiliated with the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance Task Force and the Faculty Senate in the 2017-2018 academic year. With permission from participants, the researcher will record interviews (voice only) for later review. The identity of participants will be kept confidential, and the researcher will use pseudonyms when describing participants. Data generated from interview recordings will be stored via password protection and maintained confidential. There is no compensation for participation in this study.

**Risks and Benefits**

You may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions as they relate to your professional experience at the University of Mississippi. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions and to withdraw your participation at any point in the interview process.

**Compensation**

You will not receive any type of compensation for participating in this study.

**Confidentiality**

Your name, academic department and other identifying information will not be reported by the researcher. As you answer interview questions, be mindful not to disclose any identifying information that you are not comfortable disclosing. All data and research materials will be stored electronically with password protection. The primary researcher is the only person with access to research materials.

**Right to Withdraw**

You do not have to take part in this study and you may stop participation at any time. If you start the study and decide that you do not want to finish, simply tell the researcher (Mariana Rangel Allushuski) in person, by letter, or by telephone (contact information listed above). You may skip any questions you prefer not to answer. The decision to or not to participate will not be reported to anyone. Furthermore, participation or lack of participation will not affect your employment or benefits at the University of Mississippi.

**IRB Approval**

This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi's Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a participant of research, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482 or [irb@olemiss.edu](mailto:irb@olemiss.edu).

**Questions**

Should you have questions about this study, please contact me, Mariana Rangel Allushuski, or my advisor, Dr. Amy Wells Dolan. Our contact information is located at the top of this information sheet.

**Statement of Consent**

I have read and understand the above information. By completing the interview, I consent to participate in the study.

## Appendix: D

## Appendix D

### Updated Study Information Sheet

# STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

**Title:** A Study of Contingent Faculty Representation in Governance at the University of Mississippi

**Investigator**

Mariana Rangel Allushuski, M.Ed..  
Department of Higher Education  
The University of Mississippi

**Advisor**

Amy Wells Dolan, Ph.D.  
Department of Higher Education  
219 Guyton Hall  
The University of Mississippi

*By checking this box I certify that I am 18 years of age or older.*

**Description**

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to uncover in detail, the process of allowing contingent faculty to be included in governance at the University of Mississippi, and the beliefs and perceptions of stakeholders regarding the role of adjuncts in campus governance. The researcher will collect data through interviews and review of University historical documents and artifacts. Faculty interviewed will fall in diverse employment categories: part-time contingent, full-time contingent, tenured and tenure-track. Targeted participants were affiliated with the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty & Shared Governance Task Force and the Faculty Senate in the 2017-2018 academic year. With permission from participants, the researcher will record interviews (voice only) for later review. The identity of participants will be kept confidential, and the researcher will use pseudonyms when describing participants. Data generated from interview recordings will be stored via password protection and maintained confidential. If the participant would like to not remain anonymous and therefore be named in the dissertation, they will be required to sign an additional release form, stating that they would like to be named, that they understand that their interview answers would be attributed to them personally, and that they will do so at their own risk.

There is no compensation for participation in this study.

**Risks and Benefits**

You may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions as they relate to your professional

experience at the University of Mississippi. You have the right to refuse to answer any questions and to withdraw your participation at any point in the interview process.

**Compensation**

You will not receive any type of compensation for participating in this study.

**Confidentiality**

Your name, academic department and other identifying information will not be reported by the researcher. As you answer interview questions, be mindful not to disclose any identifying information that you are not comfortable disclosing. All data and research materials will be stored electronically with password protection. The primary researcher is the only person with access to research materials.

**Right to Withdraw**

You do not have to take part in this study and you may stop participation at any time. If you start the study and decide that you do not want to finish, simply tell the researcher (Mariana Rangel Allushuski) in person, by letter, or by telephone (contact information listed above). You may skip any questions you prefer not to answer. The decision to or not to participate will not be reported to anyone. Furthermore, participation or lack of participation will not affect your employment or benefits at the University of Mississippi.

**IRB Approval**

This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi's Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a participant of research, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482 or [irb@olemiss.edu](mailto:irb@olemiss.edu).

**Questions**

Should you have questions about this study, please contact me, Mariana Rangel Allushuski, or my advisor, Dr. Amy Wells Dolan. Our contact information is located at the top of this information sheet.

**Statement of Consent**

I have read and understand the above information. By completing the interview, I consent to participate in the study.

## Appendix: E

Appendix E

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI**

**RELEASE OF RIGHTS TO WRITTEN AND RECORDED INFORMATION**

For valuable consideration, I do hereby authorize the University of Mississippi, its assignees, agents, employees, designees, and those acting pursuant to its authority (“UM”) to:

- a. Record my participation and appearance on audio tape and written record.
- b. Exhibit, copy, reproduce, perform, display or distribute such recordings and written words (and to create derivative works from them) in whole or in part without restrictions or limitation in any format or medium for any purpose in which the University of Mississippi, and those acting pursuant to its authority, deem appropriate.
- c. I release the University of Mississippi from any and all claims and demands arising out of or in connection with such recordings and written record including any claims for defamation, invasion of privacy, rights of publicity, or copyright.

I agree that I will not receive any royalty payments for the use of my words. I also understand that participation in this study is voluntary and can be withdrawn at any time.

Name:

Date:

Address:

Phone Number:

Signature:



## Appendix: F

Appendix F

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI**

**CONFIDENTIALITY RELEASE**

For valuable consideration, I do hereby authorize The University of Mississippi, its assignees, agents, employees, designees, and those acting pursuant to its authority (“UM”) to:

a. Record my participation and appearance on video tape, audio tape, film, photograph or any other medium (“Recordings”). b. Use my name, likeness, voice and biographical material in connection with these recordings. c. Exhibit, copy, reproduce, perform, display or distribute such Recordings (and to create derivative works from them) in whole or in part without restrictions or limitation in any format or medium for any purpose which The University of Mississippi, and those acting pursuant to its authority, deem appropriate. d. I release UM and the researcher from any and all claims and demands arising out of or in connection with the use of such Recordings and written information, including any claims for defamation, invasion of privacy, rights of publicity, or copyright.

By signing this release, I agree that I have elected to be named in this study, to have my name published, and to have my quotes and opinions attributed to my name. I do not wish for my identity to remain confidential in this study and in works that may derive from this study.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Parent/Guardian Signature (if under 18): \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix: G

## Appendix G

Email to members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty & Shared Governance

Subject: Study on NTTF & Governance

Dear faculty member,

My name is Mariana Rangel Allushuski and I am pursuing a Ph.D. in Higher Education at the University of Mississippi. My dissertation is an in-depth case study of the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance at the University of Mississippi. You are receiving this email because you were a member of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty & Shared Governance and have been identified as potential participant.

Attached is a document containing more information on this study, and a Release of Words document. Should you be interested in participating, the researcher will contact you directly to schedule a time for a phone interview. The interview should take 45-90 minutes, and questions will focus on the efforts of the Task Force and your beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in the UM campus.

If you wish to participate, simply reply to this email to confirm your interest.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

## Appendix: H

## Appendix H

Email to members of the Faculty Senate,

Subject: Study on NTTF & Governance

Dear faculty member,

My name is Mariana Rangel Allushuski and I am pursuing a Ph.D. in Higher Education at the University of Mississippi. My dissertation is an in-depth case study of the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance at the University of Mississippi. You are receiving this email because you were a member of the Faculty Senate in the 2017-2018 academic year and have been identified as potential participant.

Attached is a document containing more information on this study, and a Release of Words document. Should you be interested in participating, the researcher will contact you directly to schedule a time for a phone interview. The interview should take 45-90 minutes, and questions will focus on the involvement of members of the faculty senate and your beliefs about the role of contingent faculty in the UM campus.

If you wish to participate, simply reply to this email to confirm your interest.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

## Appendix: I

## Appendix I

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

On (date), all members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty & Shared Governance were contacted as potential participants for an in-depth case study of inclusion of contingent faculty in governance at the University of Mississippi.

If you wish to participate, please indicate your interest by replying to (email). Acknowledging that the end of the semester is a particularly busy time for faculty members, please know that the researcher will be available for interviews after the semester concludes and during the summer months.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mariana Rangel Allushuski



## Appendix: J

## Appendix J

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

On (date), all members of the 2017 - 2018 Faculty Senate were contacted as potential participants for an in-depth case study of inclusion of contingent faculty in governance at the University of Mississippi.

If you wish to participate, please indicate your interest by replying to (email). Acknowledging that the end of the semester is a particularly busy time for faculty members, please know that the researcher will be available for interviews after the semester concludes and during the summer months.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

## Appendix: K

## Appendix K

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Thank you for your willingness to participate! To facilitate this process, I have created a link with available times through a schedule software. You can choose a time, and enter your information. At the time of the interview, I will call you on the number you have indicated.

I have also attached the Study Information Sheet and a Release of Words document. Per IRB guidelines, I will need the Release of Words document signed, scanned, and returned via email to (email). I sincerely apologize for this inconvenience, but this is a necessary step since I will be recording our conversation.

As noted on the Information Sheet, you may decide to not remain anonymous in this study. If you wish to have your participation be attributed to you, please let me know and I will send you the Release of Confidentiality form. If that is not your wish, you will remain anonymous and a pseudonym will be used to describe you.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Again, I sincerely appreciate your willingness to participate.

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

Appendix: L

## Appendix L

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Thank you again for participating in the NTTF & Governance study. I have an update I want to make you aware of. One participant requested to waive their confidentiality and be named in the dissertation. Upon that request, I submitted an IRB amendment so that participants have the option to either remain anonymous or not.

If it is your wish to have your words attributed to your name, I can send you a Release of Confidentiality form at this time. If not, your participation will remain anonymous and a pseudonym will be used to describe you as previously agreed upon.

This is truly a matter of personal preference - your participation in the study is equally valuable whether you remain anonymous or not. I just wanted to make sure to give you this option since the amendment was approved after our interview.

Thank you for your time,

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

Appendix: M

## Appendix M



The University of Mississippi  
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs  
Division of Research Integrity and Compliance – Institutional Review Board  
100 Barr Hall, University MS 38677  
[irb@olemiss.edu](mailto:irb@olemiss.edu)

### Request to Amend an IRB Protocol

TITLE: **A Study of Contingent Faculty Representation in Governance at the University of Mississippi**

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S): **Mariana Rangel Allushuski**

PROTOCOL NUMBER: **19x-262**

ORIGINAL APPROVAL DATE:  
**04/09/2019**

1. **Amendment type\* (check all that apply):**

- Revision to currently approved *protocol* – Attach protocol with incorporated changes
- Revision to currently approved *consent form* – Attach consent form with incorporated changes
- Revision to/Addition of survey or other instrument – Attach survey/instrument
- Add study site – Attach relevant documents
- Other (e.g., advertisement) – Attach relevant documents

\*For personnel additions/deletions, please use the [personnel amendment form](#)

2. **Effect on risks (check one):**

- This amendment *does not* increase risks to participants enrolled in the study.
- This amendment *does* increase risks to participants enrolled in the study (provide Department Chair's email for cc of approval notice:)

3. **Identify amendment request(s) and justification(s) by item or page number:**

**Additional recruitment email will be sent individually to each potential participant (all members of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty & Shared Governance and of the 2017 - 2018 Faculty Senate). The email also explains that summer interviews are acceptable given that the end of the semester is a particularly busy time for faculty.**

4. **Is the PI a student?**

- No
- Yes (provide Advisor's email for cc of approval notice: [aewells@olemiss.edu](mailto:aewells@olemiss.edu))

By checking this box, I certify that the information provided in the amendment is complete and correct. As Principal Investigator, I have the responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of the human participants, conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. DATE: **04/15/2019**

**The amendment form, revised protocol, consent form, and/or other documents with changes incorporated and listed above (and highlighted where possible) should be sent via email only to [irb@olemiss.edu](mailto:irb@olemiss.edu). Include the protocol number in the subject line of your email.**



For IRB office use *only*:

APPROVED: This signifies notification of IRB APPROVAL of the amendment described above.

Appendix: N

Appendix N



The University of Mississippi  
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs  
Division of Research Integrity and Compliance – Institutional Review Board  
100 Barr Hall, University MS 38677  
[irb@olemiss.edu](mailto:irb@olemiss.edu)

**Request to Amend an IRB Protocol**

**TITLE:** A Study of Contingent Faculty Representation in Governance at the University of Mississippi

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S):**

**PROTOCOL NUMBER:** 19x-262

**ORIGINAL APPROVAL DATE:**  
04/09/2019

**1. Amendment type\* (check all that apply):**

- Revision to currently approved *protocol* – Attach protocol with incorporated changes
- Revision to currently approved *consent form* – Attach consent form with incorporated changes
- Revision to/Addition of survey or other instrument – Attach survey/instrument
- Add study site – Attach relevant documents
- Other (e.g., advertisement) – Attach relevant documents

\*For personnel additions/deletions, please use the [personnel amendment form](#)

**2. Effect on risks (check one):**

- This amendment *does not* increase risks to participants enrolled in the study.
- This amendment *does* increase risks to participants enrolled in the study (provide Department Chair's email for cc of approval notice: \_\_\_\_\_ )

**3. Identify amendment request(s) and justification(s) by item or page number:**

**Upon contacting participants, one potential participant stated that they would only participate if they were named in the study. They do not wish to remain confidential and want their words to be attributed to them. The updated Information Sheet and additional Confidentiality Release agreement ensure that other participants are aware of this option and protects the researcher.**

**4. Is the PI a student?**

- No
- Yes (provide Advisor's email for cc of approval notice: [awells@olemiss.edu](mailto:awells@olemiss.edu))

By checking this box, I certify that the information provided in the amendment is complete and correct. As Principal Investigator, I have the responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of the human participants, conduct of the research, and the ethical performance of the project. **DATE:**  
04/29/2019

The amendment form, *revised* protocol, consent form, and/or other documents *with changes incorporated and listed above (and highlighted where possible)* should be sent via email only to [irb@olemiss.edu](mailto:irb@olemiss.edu). Include the protocol number in the subject line of your email.

For IRB office use *only*:

APPROVED:      This signifies notification of IRB APPROVAL of the amendment described above.

IRB REVIEWER

DATE

AMENDMENT

Appendix: O

## Appendix O

I have attached the transcript of our conversation in case you would like to check it for accuracy.

As a reminder, you have elected to waive your confidentiality and have your name published in this study.

If you would like to provide any comments prior to publication of the findings, please do so via email by no later than **Monday, 06/24**.

Again, I sincerely thank you for your participation!

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

I have attached the transcript of our conversation in case you would like to check it for accuracy.

If you would like to provide any comments prior to publication of the findings, I ask that you please do so via email by no later than **Tuesday, 06/25**.

Thank you again for your participation! Hope all is well.

Mariana Rangel Allushuski

## VITA

### Mariana Rangel Allushuski

#### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

##### **First Year Advising**, Oakland University, Rochester, MI

*Academic Coach*, December 2018 – present

- Design, implement, lead and evaluate academic support programs that align with the university's retention goals, including academic success workshops and classroom visits.
- Serve as an academic coach in both one-on-one and group settings for students seeking academic support. Develop individualized action plans with students related to the attainment of academic success skills.
- Coordinate and administer an outreach strategy to students, staff and faculty related to academic success initiatives and tutoring/Supplemental Instruction.
- Collaborate with student service partners to enhance academic support opportunities for students.
- Deliver workshops and trainings to tutors and SI Leaders on topics related to academic success.

##### **Center for Student Success and First-Year Experience**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Academic Advisor & First-Year Experience Instructor*, August 2012 – July 2018

- Provided academic advising and individual support to 300-350 freshman students in diverse majors.
- Guided students in the major selection process and in navigating the University environment.
- Taught two sections of EDHE 105, EDHE 106 and/or EDHE 305 every semester, including summer.
- Actively engaged in the University's retention efforts by tracking student's grades, absences and registration.
- Assisted the Associate Director with coordination of first-year experience programs.
- Developed content for the Center's website and served as webmaster: <https://cssfye.olemiss.edu/>.
- Coordinated registration for EDHE 105/305 special cohorts.
- Served as the MBTI, iStartStrong and VIA Character Strengths administrator for EDHE 105 and 305.
- Assisted with training of first-year experience faculty.

##### **Office of the Provost**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Fellowship Doctoral Student*, January 2017 – May 2017

- Conducted research on scholar's programs across the country and provided guidance for improvements to the Provost Scholars program (recruitment and student engagement).
- Assessed the needs of upperclassmen who fail to persist and provided recommendations for University programs and policies.
- Assisted with the development of Faculty Family Advocate positions and led efforts to gather resources for the initiative.
- Created website for the Provost's Office Career-Life Balance initiative: <http://careerlife.olemiss.edu/>

**Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS  
*Counselor/ Teaching Assistant*, Fall 2011 - Spring 2012

- Provided psychotherapy to groups and individual students.
- Facilitated the readmission of students on academic suspension by providing them with skills to succeed academically.

**Academic Support Center**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Orientation Lab Assistant*, Summer 2011

- Assisted incoming freshmen with course registration.
- Positively interacted with students to help ease the orientation process.

*Graduate Assistant*, Spring 2011

- Assisted instructors and served as a mentor to students on academic probation.
- Planned classroom lessons to help students develop academic skills for college.

## **TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

**COM 1100, Collegiate Communication**, Oakland University, Rochester, MI.

Instructor, FALL 2019 – present

**EDHE 105, Freshman Year Experience**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Instructor*, Fall 2011 – Summer 2018

**EDHE 106, Advancing the First-Year Experience**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Instructor*, Spring 2018

**EDHE 305, Transfer Year Experience**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Instructor*, Spring 2015 and Spring 2016

**EDHE 101, Academic Skills for College**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Instructor*, Spring 2011 (Graduate Assistant) Spring 2012, Spring 2013 and Spring 2014

**EDHE 202, Fundamentals of Active Learning**, The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

*Instructor*, Fall 2011, Spring 2012

## **EDUCATION**

The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

***Doctor of Philosophy***

Major: Higher Education

Graduation: December 2019

*Phi Kappa Phi*



The University of Mississippi, University, MS.

**Master of Education**

Major: Counselor Education, Community Counseling emphasis - CACREP accredited program

Graduation: August 2012

*Chi Sigma Iota* (Chapter Secretary)

Lipscomb University, Nashville, TN.

**Bachelor of Science**

Major: Psychology

Graduation: May 2010

*Cum laude, Psy Chi*

**PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATIONS**

National Certified Counselor (Certificate Number: 302238)

Strong Interest Inventory Administration Certification

**PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS**

**Rangel, M.** & Durham, R. (2018). *Growth mindset in student affairs*. Presented at the 2018 Student Affairs Professional Development Conference at the University of Mississippi, University, MS.

**Rangel, M.** (2017). *Teaching students about academic advising*. Presented at the 2017 Edhe 105 and 305 Faculty Development Training at the University of Mississippi, University, MS.

Ellis, K., **Rangel, M.**, & Henry, J. (2016). *Developing a successful first-year experience course for transfer students*. Presented at the 2016 National Students in Transition Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Hester, B., Phillips, K, **Rangel, M.**, & Whittington, B. (2013). *Digging deeper: A guide to facilitating personal conversation and self-disclosure with at-risk students*. Presented at the 2013 NACADA Region 4 Conference, Biloxi, MS.

**Rangel, M.**, Killian, T. & Presley, E. (2012). *Using technology in the treatment of addictions*. Presented at F.E. Woodall Spring Conference for Helping Professions, Cleveland, MS

Young, T., Amason, C., & **Rangel, M.**, Killian, T. (2011). *Motivational interviewing: Paving the way for change*. Presented at the Mississippi Counseling Association Conference, Biloxi, MS.

**Rangel, M.**, Jackson-Hudson, E., & Killian, T. (2011) *Applying reality therapy/choice theory in group work*. Presented at the Mississippi Counseling Association Conference, Biloxi, MS.

Hudspeth, F., Waites, S., & **Rangel, M.** (2011). *New frontiers in addiction Work: Understanding the medication-counseling synergy*. Presented at F.E. Woodall Spring Conference for Helping Professions, Cleveland, MS.

## PUBLICATIONS

**Rangel, M.** & Ellis, K. (2018). Academic advisors as first-year experience instructors. *NACADA Academic Advising Today*.

Allushuski, T. G. & **Rangel, M. S.** (2016). Blackboard (Bb). In Banahan, L. (Ed.), *The Ole Miss Experience* (pp. 94-97). Oxford, MS: The Nautilus Publishing Company.

Bennett, J. P., Ellis, K. C., Hitchcock, J.T., **Rangel, M. S.** & Whittington, M.B. (2016). Academic Advising at Ole Miss. In Banahan, L. (Ed.), *The Ole Miss Experience* (pp. 249-261). Oxford, MS: The Nautilus Publishing Company.