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Much public policy discussion, organizing, and contract negotiation focuses on the working conditions of contingent or adjunct faculty.¹ Now half of the national instructional workforce, and 70 percent of community college faculty, their numbers continue to grow.² These colleagues are also at the vanguard of discussions on the relationship between the working conditions of faculty and the learning conditions of students. In an academic “bait and switch” for students and faculty, for example, colleges can reassign adjunct professors or cancel their classes at the last minute. Contingents have little or no access to instructional resources and facilities that enhance their ability to engage their
students.\textsuperscript{3} To this end, they are creatively disrupting current practice and are leveraging important innovations in organizing in the new academy.\textsuperscript{4}

The chapter outlines NEA’s advocacy on behalf of contingent faculty. It then explores relevant contract provisions in NEA’s database of collective bargaining agreements, the Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS).

**NEA AND CONTINGENT FACULTY ADVOCACY**

NEA’s policy positions are based on resolutions passed by the annual Representative Assembly, the Association’s governing body. The resolution on “Contingent Faculty and Professional Staff Protection”—adopted in 2008 and amended in 2009—calls for “creating new full-time faculty positions within colleges, universities, and community colleges, and, in doing so, giving priority to contingent faculty seeking full-time positions.” “Contingent faculty and professional staff,” the resolution adds, “should be treated no differently than full-time, tenure-track, or permanent faculty or professional staff for purposes of employment conditions, including eligibility to bargain collectively.” The resolution highlights the problems created by “the excessive use of academic appointments on contingent, temporary, non-tenure track, and/or multiple-year contracts.” A lack of tenure protections, for example, “may undermine academic and intellectual freedom, [the future] opportunity for tenure, and participation in the governance structure.”

Poor working conditions, the resolution concludes, undermine student learning:

Institutions fail to fulfill their responsibility to provide adequate working conditions and educational support when contingent faculty have no office space or allowance for office hours and are forced to teach at multiple campuses, thereby undermining educational quality.\textsuperscript{5}

The teacher-student relationship is critical to academic success, especially in higher education. A 2001 study of faculty-undergraduate student interaction found that “such interactions had substantial positive effects on students’ efforts in other educationally purposeful activities, which had non-trivial effects on their estimated gains and satisfaction.” Another study of the impact of the use of contingent faculty on student outcomes reported:

High levels of exposure to part-time faculty in the first year of college are consistently found to negatively affect student retention to the second year.\textsuperscript{6}

Contingent faculty are used most heavily in introductory courses, so these findings must seriously guide public policy choices to improve student retention and completion.\textsuperscript{8} It is not a lack of ability of individual contingents that jeopardizes educational quality, NEA concludes. The harm comes from the weak institutional commitment to the classroom working conditions these qualified individuals face daily. Treating contingent faculty as institutionally supported professionals requires equitable policies and practices that, in turn, benefit students. Colleges and universities must support faculty members to carry out all three parts of professional work: teaching, research, and service. Efforts to “unbundle” the faculty role into component parts demean the professional nature of academic work and diminish the quality of the educational process.

NEA has advocated for contingent faculty for many years, though the emphasis varies among state affiliates. The Association’s “Contingent Action Plan” and subsequent documents call for an emphasis on research, organizing, collective bargaining, and political advocacy, especially relations with Congress and federal departments.\textsuperscript{9} NEA’s future work in national political advocacy will focus on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The Association is calling for an increase in tenured and
tenure-track faculty lines, and for improved working conditions for contingents through state-level incentive programs.

NEA strongly supports the Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2015, which would allow part-time faculty to participate in the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Act. Current law severely restricts the eligibility of part-time faculty for Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF). Faculty members working for only one employer must work 30 hours a week, and have their employer declare them full-time workers. Few employers are likely to do so declare, if the difficulties contingent faculty encountered when applying for coverage under the Affordable Care Act are a precedent. To qualify, part-time faculty members working for multiple employers would have to document 30-hours total work for eligible employers. Documenting 30 hours is difficult, given the restrictions the Treasury Department placed on counting contingent faculty work hours. Ideally, two hours of outside work would complement one credit hour of classroom work, so that 12 credit hours of teaching equates to 36 hours of work. But the current regulation states that one and one quarter of outside work complements one credit hour of classroom work, so that 12 credit hours of teaching equates to 27 hours of work. The Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act would allow a faculty member who teaches one course, and does not have an outside full time job, to qualify for PSLF.

NEA has fought to ease the rules for unemployment compensation eligibility between academic terms for contingent faculty. To be eligible for unemployment compensation, employees must not have “reasonable assurance” of a job at a specific point in the future. Primary and secondary teachers, according to Department of Labor guidance, are not eligible for unemployment compensation over the summer because they have “reasonable assurance” of a job in the fall. Colleges and universities in most states have successfully used that guidance to argue against granting unemployment compensation to contingent faculty. This refusal does not apply in California because of a court case. In Washington legislation rejects institutional claims of “reasonable assurance” if job offers are contingent on enrollment and funding. NEA agrees with this legislation. Such contingent job offers do not constitute “reasonable assurance” and should not be a basis to deny contingent faculty unemployment compensation between academic terms. The association is working to change the terms of eligibility nationally.

In 2010, the NEA Representative Assembly amended its Legislative Program to state: “NEA supports efforts to ensure contingent educational professionals the rights to unemployment benefits during breaks between academic terms.” In 2012 the Representative Assembly called for NEA’s president to ask the Department of Labor to issue a letter of clarification defining contingent faculty as people who do not have “reasonable assurance” of work and are therefore eligible to collect unemployment insurance benefits between academic terms. The following March, NEA staff met with the department undersecretary, who seemed receptive but called on the association to unite all the unions representing contingents to ensure labor consensus. Union representatives of contingent faculty and the New Faculty Majority later met with the new undersecretary, who indicated the department continues to study the request. The union coalition presses for the letter and is prepared to take the issue to the campaign trail and to the next administration.

Political advocacy promises to make important changes in the long-term outlook for contingent faculty. But organizing and collective bargaining are far more likely to effect changes in their day-to-day working conditions. Together, campus-based faculty can address job protection, salary, benefit, and work rules that improve conditions for contingent faculty. More important, the changes can improve student learning. “The working conditions of
The movement activists continually note "are the learning conditions of students."

**CONTRACT PROVISIONS FOR CONTINGENT OR ADJUNCT FACULTY**

NEA’s Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS) is a valuable resource for bargaining research and preparation for negotiations. Users can filter contracts by unit characteristics, and search for words or phrases. Staff members of NEA higher education affiliates have access to this resource, which includes archives of current and past contracts. Leaders or staff can upload new or replacement contracts for their bargaining units, or for other units on their campuses.

Our contract analysis focuses on four categories of the working conditions of adjunct faculty members—class cancellation fees, access to instructional resources, stability in appointments and assignments, and intellectual property rights.

**CLASS CANCELLATION FEES**

An analysis of HECAS contracts for faculty in part-time positions yields three conclusions. First, the majority of collective bargaining agreements lack class cancellation fee provisions. Managers have total discretion in canceling or reassigning the classes of adjunct faculty. There are no due process restrictions and no remuneration for the faculty member’s time spent preparing the class. Second, a significant number of contracts have relevant provisions. It is possible to negotiate such fees for adjunct faculty. Third, there’s much room for negotiating more and stronger class cancellation fee provisions.

Three-quarters of the collective bargaining agreements in HECAS covering part-time faculty lack class cancellation fee provisions. The one-quarter containing these provisions includes several contracts negotiated within the past year.

Language for contracts addressing these fees includes rationales for reassignment or cancellation, the notice that triggers a fee, and the size of the fee. Most rationales are vague, if they are mentioned at all. Left undefined, they accord much discretion to managers. The contract for adjunct faculty at Portland State University, Oregon, provides a deem clause for managers to invoke at their discretion, “The University reserves the right to cancel one or all of the courses listed, should enrollment, in the judgment of the University, be insufficient.”

The most common rationale provided was low enrollment, but few contracts include a specific number of students. The most recently negotiated contract for adjunct faculty at George Washington University contains an exception:

3. Cancellation of a course(s) due to under enrollment, based on a predetermined University, School or Department standard for minimum enrollment, but the impact shall be limited to the relevant course(s) taught by the Faculty member;

Contract provisions vary in the levels of notice that trigger cancellation fees. But the notice is always limited. The language in some contracts only refers to classes cancelled after the semester starts.

10.1.4 If a course is cancelled within ten (10) working days after the quarter begins, and the University determines not to reassign the faculty member to another course, the faculty member will be paid for the portion of the quarter worked. (Central Washington University)

The timing that triggers a fee is rarely more than two weeks, and typically only one week before classes start. However, the recently negotiated Georgetown University contract calls for a fee if a class is canceled within 21 days before the semester starts.

The amount of the fee provided if an adjunct faculty member’s class is reassigned or canceled is uniformly limited varies considerably. So is the method of calculation. The fees tend
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to be somewhat smaller in community colleges. The contract for Flathead Valley Community College, a part-time only unit in Montana, states: "Employees who do not receive notification of the cancellation of a course due to low enrollment more than seven calendar days before the first class shall receive a stipend of $30.00." The fee is $100 in three other colleges. One college compensates for only one hour of work: "If any required meeting is cancelled without prior notification, where the bargaining unit employee is not the cause of the cancellation, said employee(s) shall be compensated for one hour as provided in Article 21-H-2a" (Chemeketa Community College, Oregon). The compensation, though limited, tends to be a little higher in four-year institutions. Sometimes, the fee is pro-rated as a portion of the semester or of the overall salary. Other contracts specify a flat fee, though the amount rarely exceeds $300, as at Connecticut State University:

If a class scheduled to be taught by a part-time member is cancelled within seven (7) business days prior to the beginning of the first day of classes, the part-time member shall be paid the sum of $300.

The newly negotiated contract for adjunct faculty at Tufts provides a $750 class cancellation fee.

ACCESS TO INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES

A significant proportion of adjunct faculty have limited or late access to course management systems, library resources, copying facilities, course syllabi, and basic orientation to the department or college.12 But few collective bargaining agreements contain clauses ensuring access to these basic instructional materials and resources.

Some contracts, though, include good language, including an orientation for faculty in part-time positions, and pay for faculty members attending for the first time.

The College will provide an orientation program for Part-time Status faculty near the beginning of each semester. The orientation will include information on benefits, procedures, services, and instructional resources. All Part-time Status instructors who are not adjunct will be invited to the orientation. Those Part-time instructors attending for the first time will be paid at the rate specified in Article X.H.5. (Mott Community College, Michigan)

A few contracts for four-year institutions specify in detail the resources available to part-time faculty. The detailed contract for part-time faculty unit at Rutgers includes this language, “When records of syllabi, texts, or other instructional material for courses previously taught are maintained by a department, such information will be available to PTLs for inspection.”

The contract of the New Jersey State Locals, another part-time only unit, permits access to handbooks, office space, the library, and to the email system. Though not grievable, an impressive clause establishes the key principle of parity of access to part- and full-time faculty:

E. Access to Office Equipment, Services and Supplies

The College/University shall provide adjunct faculty with access to instructional materials and services that aid in their instruction at the same level as a full time faculty teaching the same course.

The best contracts provide the most detail and specificity. The contract for the City Colleges of Chicago, a part-time only unit, identifies no fewer than 25 types of resources. These provisions exemplify a desirable level of detail:

C. College and Departmental Information for Part-time Faculty Members.

1. Part-time faculty handbooks. The College will distribute or make available to part-time
faculty either a hard or electronic copy of the College’s part-time faculty handbook. The Part-time faculty handbook will contain information pertinent to the College and the College’s policies and procedures.

2. Departmental Information. In as close proximity to the commencement of the semester or term as possible, the Department will distribute or make available to part-time faculty members the following information, either by hard copy or electronically:
   a. A departmental directory of all full-time and part-time faculty members, and administrative, professional and clerical personnel working in the Department with telephone numbers and office numbers, if any.
   b. Departmental policies and procedures with respect to textbooks, course syllabi, and other academic issues, if any.
   c. Information regarding access to available instructional material, labs and other departmental resources.

D. Office Space, Telephones, Electronic Mail Accounts, Computer Equipment and Software.
1. Each College shall provide offices for all part-time faculty members, which may be shared with other staff or part-time faculty members, the location of which shall be based upon space availability to each College. Part-time faculty members assigned office space shall be provided a key to the space at the commencement of the semester which must be returned to the appropriate College representative in accordance with College policies and procedures.
2. Each office shall have a telephone to accommodate usage anticipated by the College. Voice mail access is not guaranteed. Each office shall be equipped with a personal computer, software according to the District standard as determined by OIT, and access to a printer.
3. Part-time faculty members shall be assigned electronic mail and other internet access accounts as necessary, and shall have access to the Board’s internet and intranet consistent with the Board’s policies.

The contract also calls for an orientation—paid, if mandatory for part-time faculty—that provides additional resources.

JOBS SECURITY AND CAREER PATHS
The proportion of contingent and adjunct faculty continues to grow, as has the diversity of appointment categories. Many colleges and universities now diverse types of faculty positions, ranging from traditional full-time tenure-track to part-time adjuncts on single term appointments. The ranks of part-time faculty appear to be declining slightly, while the number of non-tenure track faculty members at or approaching full-time loads is increasing.13

Encouraging campuses to increase the use of tenured full-time faculty is a valuable goal, but providing greater stability for part-time and contingent faculty improves their work lives and the student experience. Some administrators argue that colleges could not improve adjunct conditions, but “where adjunct unions have forced their hands…administrators have been finding the money to offer such instructors benefits, better pay and job security.”14

Strategies for career enhancement include increases in the number of courses a contingent faculty member can teach, opportunities for renewable appointments lasting a year or longer, procedures rewarding seniority, processes for requesting and appealing assignments or their lack, and chances for part-time faculty to move into full-time positions.

Collective bargaining agreements can provide paths to more predictable and consistent course assignments for contingent faculty members. Such paths, in turn, promise a more valuable student experience. Many contracts limit adjunct faculty members to a single course, which leads to more time driving between campuses than to preparing and teaching. This limit also discourages adjuncts from remaining
at a campus, if they find two or more courses at another location. It also affects students who do not know if an adjunct professor they liked will teach during the next semester, or where to find a supportive faculty member for follow-up or letters of recommendation.

The contract for the Community College of Rhode Island states that the regular teaching load for an adjunct during a semester will not exceed six contact hours unless the department chair has attained written permission. The management rights clause in the American University contract for adjuncts specifies management’s complete control of adjunct assignments:

…the assignment would result in an employee exceeding the maximum number of courses or credit hours permitted in the fall, spring and summer semesters of the current academic year, as established by Management under its authority in Article 2 of this Agreement. [italics ours]

Bargaining agreements can increase the number of courses that adjuncts may be assigned by providing for separate part-time and full-time contingent faculty categories, each with its own cap on credits allowed. For example, the contract for Oakton Community College, in Illinois, established “affiliated adjunct positions:”

1) Appointments to Affiliated Adjunct faculty positions are one-year appointments. Appointees to an Affiliated Adjunct faculty position are expected to teach 12 LHEs in each of the fall and spring terms and 6 to 9 LHEs in the summer. These are not tenured positions and not subject to the tenure provisions of the Community College Act.

The contract for the College of DuPage (Illinois) Adjuncts Association establishes lecturer appointments, limited to 20 percent of the full-time faculty. Lecturers may teach up to 32 credit hours annually, and may be eligible for benefits including health insurance.

Many contracts now provide for longer appointment lengths and for the ability to teach two or more courses. The Keene State College (New Hampshire) contract allows for a limited number of adjuncts that can teach 12 credits in each regular academic term:

3. The College also agrees that, notwithstanding the above, it will assign a minimum of 15 bargaining unit adjunct faculty members to a course load of 12 credits for each semester (Fall/Spring).
   a. The College in its sole discretion will determine in what departments or disciplines such 12 credit assignments will be made and which faculty members will be assigned the 12 credits. Such decisions shall not be grievable.

Contracts can provide appointment enhancements for contingent faculty that successfully teach for a specified number of academic terms. The contract for Glendale Community College (California) specifies a process for evaluating new faculty that can result in earning points toward assignment preferences.

New faculty will be evaluated in one of the first two regular semesters of his/her employment. An adjunct faculty member receiving less than “exceeds standards” shall, upon his/her written request, be granted one additional evaluation during the regular six-semester cycle. However, a new faculty member receiving an “unsatisfactory” rating on their initial evaluation shall not necessarily be granted an additional evaluation.

Faculty members that “exceed standards” receive priority in appointments after gaining seven teaching points, and additional rights to reemployment after ten teaching points. Employees in the American University adjunct bargaining unit who have taught a course for at least three semesters in three years
receive “good faith consideration” to teach that course in the next year. The contract spells out the right of management to decide on teaching assignments, and the conditions under which the university will normally reemploy faculty members for a course.

Adjunct faculty members at Keene State College, in addition to other preferences based on experience, are eligible to receive an appointment for an entire academic year with at least two courses per term after serving for 20 semesters at the college.

The contract for part-time faculty at Tufts provides for a gradual lengthening of appointments based on duration of university service. After four years, the faculty member is evaluated and reviewed for a subsequent two-year appointment. After eight years, the faculty member is reviewed and may be offered a three-year appointment with a course load based on average number of courses taught in the prior three years. Once set, that number is guaranteed for the three-year period.

Most collective bargaining agreements still assert management’s authority over appointments and specific assignments. Faculty members have little ability to file grievances under these agreements. A few contracts provide limited ability to meet and discuss administrative action, appeal, or file a grievance. Keene State College prohibits use of “arbitrary or capricious” criteria when declining to renew contacts of faculty eligible for 12-hour annual contracts:

At the end of the appointment period but no later than July 1, the Provost shall decide whether to issue another academic year appointment and shall issue a formal contract no later than July 1 after assessing the quality of the adjunct’s performance, fiscal conditions and curricular needs. If the Provost decides not to issue another academic year appointment, he/she shall state the reasons in writing. Such decisions cannot be arbitrary or capricious.

The contract provides some rights to other adjunct appointments:

If the College decides not to appoint an adjunct faculty member for reasons of performance, the Dean shall provide the particular reasons for the decision in writing to the adjunct faculty member. If the adjunct chooses, he or she may, within seven days of receipt of the written reasons, meet with the Dean to discuss the Dean’s decision. A decision not to reappoint an adjunct faculty member shall have a rational basis in fact and shall not contravene Articles 4 (Academic Freedom), Article 5 (Fair Practices) and Article 11 (Evaluation). It is understood that non-reappointment may occur after any semester and not solely following formal evaluations under Article 11.

The Tufts University contract allows faculty members in their fourth year or beyond who are not reappointed based on performance to grieve when they assert that the university acted arbitrarily or capriciously.

Mott Community College adjuncts with seniority preference in appointments also have some ability to grieve:

7. The College agrees to employ candidates in sequence so far as possible. However, any grievance over the College’s failure to employ a candidate in order of ranking may be processed only through Level Three of the grievance procedure.

Finally, adjuncts can improve their status by moving into full-time positions. Not all adjuncts want such positions, but some contracts provide such opportunities. The contract for Rogue Community College (Oregon), whose multiple categories of adjuncts begin with “benefits-eligible,” the most stable, provides:

A benefits-eligible adjunct faculty member who applies for and meets the minimum
qualifications of a full-time faculty position shall be granted an interview by the screening committee for that position.

The agreement for part-time lecturers at Tufts University requires union notification and posting of full-time lecturer positions. Qualified part-timers may apply and receive an interview and good faith consideration. Rejected applicants may not grieve, but can discuss the decision with the dean.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
Contingent faculty, who teach at multiple institutions simultaneously or in successive terms, need special protections for their intellectual property, especially distance learning or digital course materials also used on-campus. Assessing course material ownership is commonly determined by asking if the college or university provided “significant” or “substantial” support, or if the contract specified “work for hire.” In these cases, the institution claims some rights, though it may not claim actual ownership and control. Some contracts specify that some works are not subject to college ownership or control, even if seemingly related to the faculty member’s field of study. The Glendale Community College district contract—which includes full-time and part-time/adjunct employees—states:

For example, it does not cover works created primarily for purposes that are separate from a faculty member’s teaching or other duties as a faculty member, such as: novels, even if written by faculty members who teach literature; business books, even if written by faculty members who teach business; art works, even if created by faculty members who teach art; or music, even if composed by faculty who teach music.
Also, this Article does not cover works created by faculty members for their own personal use that are not intended to be distributed to others, even if created in connection with their duties, such as a faculty member’s personal lecture notes.

The copyrights to works that are not covered by this Article shall not be owned by the District under paragraph D.2.a. below, and the District is not authorized to use such works.

Defining “substantial” support, and its implications for faculty rights, varies significantly across contracts. The Glendale Community College contract allows the faculty member to retain ownership by limiting “substantial” support to such things as computer programming or web site design—support beyond that normally given to faculty, such as released time or extra pay. Ordinary clerical support, office supplies, computers, and phones are not “substantial support.”

Some recent contracts specify that faculty who develop courses—especially online courses—retain the right of first refusal to teach that course in subsequent terms or to retain the license for the course. The adjunct contract for American University states:

Employees who have taught at American University for at least two (2) consecutive semesters may propose new courses to be taught, and offer the design of and syllabus for the course with the proposal. If the Department or equivalent academic unit decides to offer the course as designed by the employee, the employee will be: (1) given the right of first refusal to teach the course the first time that it is offered; or (2) paid a minimum course development fee of $1500.00, at Management’s discretion. Management may request an employee develop a new course independent of length of service. In such cases, the employee will be given the right of first refusal or be paid the minimum course development fee. Nothing in this Section 6.1 (C) shall preclude Management from having others, whether full time faculty or employees, teach the course.
The contract for Oakton Community College contains standard language on ownership, but adds that the college loses its automatic license to use adjunct-created materials if it fails to provide support for revising the materials.

5.4 Renewal of the license shall be contingent on the college providing adequate support for updating the material. If such support takes the form of additional LHE assignment or stipend, the work involved becomes partially a work for hire as specified under Section 5.2 above. As such, the faculty member and the college will negotiate an agreement of such ownership in good faith.

The Elgin Community College (Illinois) contract contains standard language covering ownership agreements for distance-learning materials when the college provided significant support. But the contract limits the ability of the college to market online and hybrid instructional material—selling the materials to another college, for example:

The College will provide any necessary technical training for faculty teaching Online Learning courses at no expense to the faculty member. The faculty member shall own any online course materials they develop, but the College shall have the continuing right to use materials developed with College resources. Also see Article IX Intellectual Property. The College shall not have the right to market the work or any derivative work unless explicitly granted by the owner.

CONCLUSION

Unions are aggressively organizing contingent faculty, in combined and in separate bargaining units. NEA political advocacy supports greater due process rights for these colleagues. Its HECAS database provides a key resource for newly formed and existing faculty organizations to use during negotiations.

Contract language providing due process rights for adjunct faculty is achievable. Most contracts lack the types of provisions detailed here, and many unions can strengthen existing provisions. We possess numerous examples of successfully negotiated language covering due process rights that may serve as a baseline for future negotiations. Negotiating stronger provisions is especially important in combined units of full- and part-time faculty. These units are less likely to have class cancellation fee provisions than exclusive units for adjunct faculty.

Unions must discourage course cancellation by negotiating contract language that includes higher fees, specific, measurable rationales for reassignment or cancellation, and longer notice to trigger the fee. Specificity is also important when negotiating access to instructional resources. Most important, bargaining teams should negotiate links between faculty working conditions—especially sufficient instructional resources—to quality student learning. The closest analogue in many existing contracts links faculty training and support for using technology in online and hybrid courses to enhanced quality. But even here, contracts should protect adjunct and full-time faculty rights to current, high quality materials.

Unions can provide greater job security for adjunct and contingent faculty. Such provisions stabilize and enhance the academic environment for students (and for tenure track faculty). One key goal: allowing for a continuum of career paths, including ways for adjuncts to move toward full-time status.

NOTES

1 Descriptions of faculty off the tenure track vary widely. NEA uses the term “contingent,” though many individuals recognize the category more readily as “adjunct,” and different locals and contracts use particular terms. When describing the generic category, this essay uses “contingent,” but it employs other terms when describing specific situations.

2 Rhoades, 2014; Rhoades and Frye, 2015.

3 Street et al., 2012.
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5 All quotations are from National Education Association, 2014.
7 Jaeger, and Eagan, 2011.
8 These studies do not focus on individual characteristics of contingent teachers.
9 A New Business Item at the 2004 Representative Assembly called for the plan. The Higher Education Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Membership compiled a draft adopted by the NEA Executive Committee.
10 U.S. Senate, 2015.
12 Street et al., 2012.
13 Schmidt, 2015a.
14 Schmidt, 2015b.
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