Faculty Senate Agenda – MINUTES January 23, 2018

Present:

Jeff Pickerd, Patrick Alexander, Nancy Wicker, Brice Noonan, Brad Jones, Zia Shariat-Madar, Brenda Prager, Randy Wadkins, Chris Mullen, Aileen Ajootian, Tossi Ikuta, Byung Jang, Lei Cao, Tom Franklin, Adam Gussow, Andrew Lynch, Jennifer Gifford, KoFan Lee, Zachary Kagan Guthrie, Vivian Ibrahim, April Holm, Evangeline Robinson, Alysia Steele, Antonia Eliason, Stacey Lantagne, Dennis Bunch, Kimberly Kaiser, Cecelia Parks, Amy Gibson, Sumali Conlon, Cesar Rego, Martial Longla, Tejas Pandya, Sarah Wellman, Thomas Peattie, Mary Roseman, Chalet Tan, Megan Rosenthal, Gary Theilman, Deborah Mower, Breese Quinn, Tim Nordstrom, Marilyn Mendolia, Chrisitan Sellar, Younghee Lim, Marcos Mendoza, Mark Ortwein, Jessica Essary, Rory Ledbetter, Michael Barnett, Derek Cowherd

Absent:

Ethel Scurlock, John Berns, Stephen Fafulas, Ana Velitchkova, Roy Thurston,

- **Call Meeting to Order**
    - Called to order at 6:00
- **Approval of December 5 2017 Minutes**
    - Approved – no opposition
- **Dr. Katrina Caldwell –Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Community Engagement**
    - Dr. Caldwell will discuss her work since arriving on campus as our first VC for Diversity & Community Engagement and provide insight into her plans for the future.
    - Wants a conversation with faculty
    - Has been here 1 yr. and 20 days
    - Only two other campuses have diversity and community engagement in one office
    - Has met with numerous people across campus to develop a list of activities that she would like to see happen on campus
        - Come up with theme areas
            - Infrastructure and branding
            - Campus climate
                - Currently getting baseline measures to determine if changes are being made
                - Opportunity to tell the campus story
                    - Asking: how do people understand their experience on campus?

- Research
  - Understanding best practices, so that we can apply them on our campus
    - Ex. Lots of campuses are doing bias response work, but there is lots of research that tells us there are good and bad ways of doing this without jeopardizes our campus climate
- Curriculum
  - Where are there opportunities to engage with faculty developing courses, understanding how different groups learn, improving retention
- Development/fundraising
  - Every year there is a decrease in pubic support, but an increase in public expectations
  - There are more and more private enterprises investing in diversity work
    - These organizations want to understand, use, and develop best practices
- Want to hire two assistant vice chancellors that work on diversity and community engagement: (1) will work in crisis and incident management, faculty and staff, CICCE (Center for Inclusion and Cross Cultural Engagement) students and (2) will work in infrastructure (community engagement), Mclean Institute and William Winter Institute) – hope to start a search for these positions in the neat future
- Questions:
  - Q: What are the two other institutions where these positions are combined?
    - A: Texas at Austin and Utah
  - Q: Will your group have resources to help recruit diverse faculty?
    - A: The plan is yes through the strategic plan. They will be investigating how, where, and with what can they support. University of Maryland has some great best practices. We wanted to develop some specific goals as it relates to diversity in faculty; how will we do that successfully – do a case study? What does the research tell us? What resources do we need to be successful?

- Q: When will those searches happen?
  - A: Funding has been approved and we just need to move it through the HR process.
- Q: What role if any will your office play in campus contextualization?
  - A: There is a contextualization ceremony committee to help finish the process of showing the plaques to the community. Moving forward based on a vote from Senate we will developing a sub-committee on the sensitivity and respect committee focused on contextualization. Will also work on a definition of diversity, annual dialogue series on challenges on campus talking to experts, a communications group will help the chancellor craft language for external communications about the campus.
- Upcoming planning events
  - Diversity plan and search update was to happen on one of the recent snow days. The goals were:
    - To figure out how we have done since I was hired
    - Data is currently being circulated for feedback
  - Diversity planning retreat
    - Strategic planning
  - Campus leadership diversity development (Feb 5)
    - Will have an outside consultant to get a sense of where we are as a campus
  - Campus wide summit (Mar 8)
- M-Partner announcement coming Mar 8
  - Multiple communities chosen
  - Want faculty engagement in the process
- Carnegie Classification designation being sought
- Questions
  - Q: What are your thoughts on outreach into the county? What kinds of conversations have you been having?
    - A: We have had lots of meetings with community members and community organizations. "Oxford" is often considered

the community, but many people in our community don't have access to the "Oxford" community resources.

- F/U: In the public schools of Oxford, MS it seems that integration was smoother than in other places in the state. I don't know if that is true, but it strikes me that it was better than we might otherwise think.
  - F/U: I am not sure I know the answer to that. But my observation is that many of the issues are more implicit and related to class and resources (access to technology $75) than explicit biases being articulated. But more investigation is certainly needed in this area.

- **Sarah Bartlett Wilson – Chair of Non-Tenure Track Representation Task Force**
  - Ms. Wilson will present a proposed modification of the UM Faculty Senate Bylaws & Constitution that would permit non-tenure-track faculty participation.
    - Anne Marie Liles and Carrie Smith co-presenters
  - Task force created about 1 year ago
  - Mission statement – to help the university to live up to its own mission – NTT faculty are the only group on campus that doesn't have access to shared governance.
  - In terms of whole person time about 50% of faculty on campus is NTT
    - Meaning that most of service responsibilities fall to half of faculty (i.e. tenure track faculty)
  - When you look at public R1's 88% include full-time NTT faculty on senate
    - Only 12% allow part time tenure track
  - Three branches of work completed to date by task-force
    - Scholarship on services and best practices
    - Looking into other institutions' language (bylaws and policy)
      - Best practices include
        - Include part-time faculty
        - Not restricting seats
    - Polling on campus
  - The proposed changes in brief:

- Departmental size is based on full-time equivalents (FTEs) not tenure lines
  - For NTT teaching faculty is 12 credit hours per teaching
  - FTEs measure teaching capacity not teaching load
- Eligibility to serve – have been on campus for 1 yr. and benefits eligible
  - Will still exclude administrators
- Include research faculty
  - Need assistance with how to define and include this group?
    - Current idea is to include them in their own units
- Based on fall 2016 data the proposed changes would result in fewer members (57 → 54)
  - But the proposal is to continue to work with the numbers to figure out the best approach.
- Website: edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance
- Questions:
  - Q: One of these biggest concerns I have is the idea of the research faculty should be included as a separate unit that is not an academic unit
    - A: The first intention was to diversify the kinds of voices heard on the faculty senate. There may be a natural home for these faculty members in Departments. But we don't know the best approach at this time.
      - F/U: Some of the things that faculty senate discusses would pertain to them.
        - F/U: Research faculty in physics, for example, have natural departmental homes that I feel that they should be counted under.
  - Q: Have you discussed with tenure faculty from departments about NTT faculty?
    - A: We have some members on our task force
      - F/U: We have done some work, but we would be curious to know what faculty concerns are and we can find some data for that.
  - Q: I agree that NTT faculty should be involved in shared governance, but in my opinion, they are already represented through the tenure track faculty rep. They bring concerns to our department meetings and I can bring them here.

- A: I think that is fair, but that is not the same for all departments. Some NTT are not informed of department meetings and many do not feel they are allowed to attend department meetings.
- Comment: I polled all NTT in chemistry and they said that they didn't want service.
  - Response: Again, this is not the same for all departments.
  - Response 2: I think that there are lots of people who want to be involved and they should be given the chance to serve.
- Comment: The numbers you showed in terms of the number of NTT may be representative of general shift away tenure positions. Tenured faculty have protections, that NTT do not have.
- Q: Why this body? How does this impact our responsibilities on this body?
  - A: One voice of all faculty is stronger
  - F/U: It feels like there have been divergent opinions amongst NTT. Why not develop your own body and then think about coming together?
    - A: I don't think our concerns are ultimately that different.
- Q: What was the survey response rate?
  - A: There are about 600 NTT faculty on campus – we got a 22% response rate.
- Q: One of the concerns was that NTT are excluded from department meetings will this help with that?
  - A: We have talked about that and would hope that would happen. But we are not going to legislate how departments function.
- Comment: It seems to me that the only departments that will have NTT faculty are those that have multiple seats
  - Response: At the beginning we expect that will happen. But over time we expect that will change.
- Q: The other change I noticed that the language changed from Oxford campus to not UMMC?
  - A: Yes, that will change and regional campuses will also be added
    - F/U: Okay, but that could also change the numbers of people on the campus. Could you send out the table with the numbers of reps from each department (will get table to Brice)

- Q: My department will lose a seat on senate; how do I pitch that to our department?
    - A: That number changes every year. I also think it would be good to talk to NTT faculty to see about their thoughts on being directly represented on senate.
- Q: Why would including NTT improve equality and representation on campus? Why do you think that representation on faculty senate is insufficient? What do you think the work of the senate is?
    - A: You speak for us, but we are not specifically represented on campus. Why do I not count as a faculty member? Why wouldn't you want a 1200 strong faculty? I think divided is a bad idea.
    - F/U: WE don't count as member of this campus. We may talk to you outside of department, but you do not officially represent us.
- Comment: I think that you are trying to address non-representation in your department by getting representation on senate?
    - F/U: Some of us feel like we represent NTT faculty, but that is not the same across all departments.
    - Response: We would also like to help lessen tenure track work load by participating.
- Comment: You don't actually need to be on faculty senate to serve the university. The other thing that is possible is to work with departments to get representation in department meetings.
- Q: Thank you for showing and taking a lot of heat on this topic. You started with a statistic that 88% of peer institutions have NTT representation. Was that representative? Would you be willing to have non-voting members?
    - A: That 88% runs the gamete of all are welcome to serve to here are some specific seats for NTT. Non-voting members are not equal.
    - F/U: Auburn for example does not allow NTT to be on tenure track specific committees.
    - F/U: We can share data from research at other institutions.
- Q: How wide-spread is the desire to have NTT representation on campus?
    - A: This current task-force started organically. We have tried to have many conversations across campus, we have met twice per month to do the research presented here, and to collect the data.

- F/U: When we started this process, we were not sure what representation would look like.
  - Q: Thank you for all of your work on this. If you were representing both NTT and tenure track faculty shouldn't they get to vote?
    - A: That is best practices right now.
  - Q: How do we protect NTT faculty from chairs saying that they don't want to burden tenure track faculty?
    - A: The one-year requirement of being on campus was intended to address that concern.
  - Looking at my department our NTT faculty don't want to be on senate because they appreciate the breadth of work/exposure tenure track faculty have and bring to these discussions. You mention the 88% number, but that number is not all the same, how many are actually asking for full representation? I got the sense that NTT faculty aren't that engaged, so my question is do enough people want this change?
    - A: The 88% runs the gamete, but UM is not represented at all in that number. But we don't know how the representation breaks down across the 88%.
    - F/U: We have good interest – anecdotally – despite the response rate on the survey.
  - Comment: In principle I don't have a problem with NTT being represented. But I had heard that at one point only 15-20 people were showing up at meetings. I know that's better now, but it is difficult to make a change like this without having hard numbers from a larger percentage NTT faculty.
    - Response: That is a valid point, and the survey we are presenting data from was long and it was distributed at the end of the semester. I don't know what the answer would be if we asked a single question about willingness to participate on senate.
      - F/U: I think that you need to show a larger response before we can move forward with implementation of this
        - Response: I bring this back to where we started with the mission of the institution and we are currently not meeting that creed because NTT faculty are not being represented.
          - F/U: I am saying that forcing this change on a group of people that don't really want this

> to happen, will not work. Not that having NTT representation is not a good idea.

- ▪ Comment: 6-7 years ago, the senate took up this question (addition: 2012) and an AUUPE rep said that one body was best practices.
- ▪ Q: I polled everyone in my department and with the part-time inclusion this proposal would be voted down 100%. I would like to know whether or not part-time is part of the best practices?
  - • A: That's not best practices right now, but it is a growing segment of the population. But we included language in the document to ensure that part time employees had an investment in the university to allow them to participate.
- ▪ Q: What is the breakdown of who makes up the roughly 600 NTT faculty?
  - • A: We don't have the numbers specifically, but we can look into that more.
- ▪ Chair: Encourage senators to talk to NTT faculty to get a better sense of their feelings
  - • Response: Could we get a set of questions to ask all NTT faculty?
- o Recommendation to table this discussion and referring it to the executive meeting

- • **Committee Reports**
  - o Academic Instructional Affairs
    - ▪ No report
  - o Academic Conduct
    - ▪ No report
  - o Finance & Benefits
    - ▪ No report
  - o Development & Planning
    - ▪ No report
  - o Governance
    - ▪ No report
  - o Research & Creative Achievement
    - ▪ No report
  - o University Services
    - ▪ No report

- **Old Business**
- **New Business**
    - New policy governing review of promotion documents of NTT faculty
        - Was asked by Rich Forgette to speak about this change in policy and Brice replied that we don't represent NTT faculty.
        - It has been approved – but it does effect TT faculty on the tenure and promotion committee in that they just no longer see NTT faculty binders.
            - Creates a separate committee of NTT faculty would be created to review promotion documents
        - Questions:
            - Q: Typically for anything promotion wise there is a vote at the department level, are they taken out of the loop?
                - A: No, the department still votes, this new committee reviews the documents to see if institutional policies have been followed.
            - Q: Why did they decide to do this?
                - A: I think it is part because of the increased load on the T and P committee.
                - F/U: Four years ago, the task for faculty titles rights and responsibilities wanted to find ways to more readily include NTT faculty in shared governance. I felt there was something strange about not including their peers in the review of these documents.
            - Q: To me this goes towards the national trend away from TT to NTT faculty and does that set up the opportunity to get away from tenure. So why do they need their own body to review the same procedures that TT documents follow.
                - A: It goes towards sharing the load and promoting shared governance.
                - F/U: The procedures were also quite different originally.
            - Comment: If this was to do with tenure promotion decisions I would be against. But it will ease the burden of the T and P committee.
            - Chair: I would also add that I don't feel that this is taking anything away from TT faculty in terms of deciding on promotion.

- o Review of proposed new:
  - ▪ Statement of Practice: Faculty Workload Flexibility and Modified Work Assignments.
    - The intention is to provide a statement of practice to make clear to chairs and unit heads in the assignment of the workload that there is the possibility of flexibility
      - o Ex. my former chair was under the impression that everyone had to be treated the same regardless of grad student load or research plans
    - Questions:
      - o Q: But it seems like we are talking about two different things – if someone wants to do fieldwork for a semester is different from someone having a child? I would hate that this becomes something that chairs point to say that the university doesn't need good maternity leave.
        - ▪ A: The committee's intention was that this would empower faculty to have support
          - F/U: My concern is that this could be pointed to as an excuse for the university to point to for not improving maternity leave
            - o F/U: One way to take this forward would be to recommend that the committee that developed this document to continue its work and develop a parental leave program.
      - o Q: Would this document empower an "evil" chair?
        - ▪ A: The chairs already have this power
          - F/U: You make a good point in that I think that it empowers the chairs.
            - o Idea seconded
          - Response: Since the chair already has the power it isn't empowering them, but just making it more widely known
      - o Comment: Referring to Senate resolution March 2015 – re: revision/clarification of leave policies. I just had my son and had to negotiate with faculty members and my chair to teach and do office hours online. But if I have to miss a

meeting on campus I have to take this out of my sick leave, which disadvantages me in comparison to my male colleagues.

- Response: There was an update at the beginning of year that HR department will develop a FAQ sheet. But that does not address the other concerns about not having an official leave policy. FLMA is the minimum requirement, but the question of whether we can do more has not be answered.

o Q: The faculty excellence task force is a chancellor's standing committee?

- A: No. It was developed as part of the last strategic plan.

o Comment: I do think this policy does raise the issue of there possibility being too much flexibility in that if you have a good department chair vs a not good department chair.

- Response: The perspective of administration will likely be that the more rigid the policy the less flexibility
- F/U: Part of the problem is that HR is set up to deal with staff issues, not faculty issues. I do think this is something that needs to be addressed.

o Comment: My sense of this discussion is that we should have is to continue to have conversations about protecting faculty time.

o Comment: There may be value in re-stating the 2015 resolution

- Brice to follow-up
- Comment: That brings up another question about the fact that we don't have a good mechanism in place to follow-up on resolutions.

  - Response: I think that this body could chose to be more proactive in follow-up of resolutions.

- o F/U: Maybe we should develop a process for following up on resolutions.
  - Response: Perhaps it could be the responsibilities of chairs.
- o Comment: Any FMLA discussion needs to include sick leave too.
  - Policy: Counteroffers.
    - The intention it to make clear that counter offers are possible within the University.
      - o Basically, states that the chair and the dean can do something if it is possible.
    - Questions:
      - o Q: One of the things that the theatre arts department was concerned about was a letter proving the offer, but not sure to replace it with.
        - Response: Often times it is not possible until a great deal of time later (ex. from recently hired faculty member from UM)
- **Adjournment**
  - o 8:45

Proposing a More Inclusive Faculty Senate

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Senate Constitution & Bylaws
Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty & Shared Governance
Sarah Wilson (Chair), Anne Marie Liles, & Carrie V. Smith
Tuesday, January 23, 2018

Task Force Mission Statement

- The UM Mission Statement identifies a "mission to create, evaluate, share and apply knowledge in a free, open and inclusive environment of intellectual inquiry." As part of that mission, 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.
- The Task Force for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance believes every faculty member deserves a voice in shaping our university and seeks a role for non-tenure track faculty in our university's governance. 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.
- Our ultimate goal is to contribute to a stronger and more vibrant learning community through inclusion, communication, and planning.

Where We Currently Stand

Table 1 Faculty senate eligibility standards for NTTF

	Only TT faculty eligible for senate	Full-time NTTF eligible for senate	Part-time NTTF eligible for senate	Seats reserved on the senate for NTTF
All doctoral institutions-highest research activity (n = 106)	15%	85%	11%	10%
Public Institutions (n = 81)	12%	88%	12%	8%
Private Institutions (n-25)	24%	76%	8%	12%
Northeast (n = 24)	21%	79%	17%	17%
Midwest (n = 23)	17%	83%	4%	9%
South (n = 41)	12%	88%	12%	7%
West (n = 18)	11%	89%	11%	5%
Non-AAU (n = 53)	15%	85%	13%	6%
AAU (n = 53)	15%	85%	9%	13%

From: 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,* 1-15. 10.1007/s10755-017-9402-2. 2017

Summary of Changes to Constitution & Bylaws

- **Departmental Size**
  - Determined by the full-time equivalents (FTEs) of all faculty in each department or unit
- **Eligibility to Serve**
  - All faculty members who have been on faculty at the university and have been benefits-eligible for the full prior academic year
  - Some administrators still excluded
- **Research Faculty**
  - Included here as single unit

FTEs: Some Details

- Calculation: Standard, blended method across departments
  - Instructional salary budgets to contract with faculty members
  - Hiring outside individuals to teach courses on a temporary or one-off basis
- The industry definition of a 1.0 FTE teaching load is 12 credit hours per semester.
  - In most cases, this breaks down to 3 credit hours x 4 classes = 12 credits or 1.0 FTE
- FTEs measure the maximum teaching capacity of each department/unit.
  - It is to be expected (and, in fact, preferred) that the actual teaching workload assigned to the faculty will be less than the maximum capacity

Current vs Proposed Senate Numbers: 2017/18

	2017/18: T/TT-Based (Current Makeup)	2017/18: FTE-Based (Proposed Makeup)
Total Seats:	57	54
		FTE (Fall 2016)
	Institutional Mean FTE	23.25
	Standard Deviation	14.46
	(2) Seats	37.71
	(3) Seats	52.17
	(4) Seats	66.63
	(5) Seats	81.09

Conversation / Q&A

- Contact: swilson3@olemiss.edu
- Task Force Website
  - edblogs.olemiss.edu/nttfacultyandsharedgovernance

2017/18: T/TT-Based (Current Makeup)	2017/18: FTE-Based (Proposed Makeup)	FTE (Fall 2016)
Accountancy	Accountancy	20.45
African American Studies	African American Studies	5.77
Art & Art History	Art & Art History	21.62
Biology (1)	Biology	33.03
Biology (2)		
BioMolecular Sciences	BioMolecular Sciences	15.31
Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	8.06
Chemistry & Biochemistry	Chemistry & Biochemistry	24.21
Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering	9.77
Classics	Classics	5.54
Communication Sciences & Disorders	Communication Sciences & Disorders	12.6
Computer & Information Science	Computer & Information Science	14.75
Economics	Economics	17.57
Electrical Engineering	Electrical Engineering	10.56
English (1)	English (1)	48.22
English (2)	English (2)	
English (3)		
Finance	Finance	17.05
Geology	Geology	11.77
Health, Exercise Science & Recreation Mgmt	Health, Exercise Science & Recreation Mgmt	24.52
History (1)	History (1)	38.87
History (2)	History (2)	
History (3)		
Journalism (1)	Journalism (1)	38.3
Journalism (2)	Journalism (2)	
Law (1)	Law	35.13
Law (2)		
Leadership & Counselor Education	Leadership & Counselor Education	25.05
Legal Studies	Legal Studies	23.35
Library (1)	Library	23
Library (2)		
Management	Management	28
Management Information Systems	Management Information Systems	6.45
Marketing	Marketing	21.01
Mathematics	Mathematics	35.23
Mechanical Engineering	Mechanical Engineering	11.35

2017/18: T/TT-Based (Current Makeup)	2017/18: FTE-Based (Proposed Makeup)	FTE (Fall 2016)
Modern Languages (1)	Modern Languages (1)	72.62
Modern Languages (2)	Modern Languages (2)	
	Modern Languages (3)	
	Modern Languages (4)	
Music (1)	Music	35.1
Music (2)		
Nutrition & Hospitality Management	Nutrition & Hospitality Management	15.45
Pharmaceutics	Pharmaceutics	6.03
Pharmacy Administration	Pharmacy Administration	7.42
Pharmacy Practice	Pharmacy Practice	26.77
Philosophy & Religion	Philosophy & Religion	17.75
Physics & Astronomy	Physics & Astronomy	24.62
Political Science	Political Science	20.22
Psychology	Psychology	31.99
Public Policy Leadership	Public Policy Leadership	8.58
Social Work	Social Work	14.33
Sociology & Anthropology (1)	Sociology & Anthropology	28.47
Sociology & Anthropology (2)		
Teacher Education (1)	Teacher Education (1)	53.32
Teacher Education (2)	Teacher Education (2)	
Teacher Education (3)	Teacher Education (3)	
Theatre Arts	Theatre Arts	18.17
Writing & Rhetoric	Writing & Rhetoric (1)	55.57
	Writing & Rhetoric (2)	
	Writing & Rhetoric (3)	
Total Seats: 57	54	
	Higher Education	–
	Research Faculty	–
	Institutional Mean FTE	23.25
	Standard Deviation	14.46
	(2)	37.71
	(3)	52.17
	(4)	66.63
	(5)	81.09

CrossMark

Shared Governance among the new Majority: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Eligibility for Election to University Faculty Senates

Willis A. Jones [1] · **Neal H. Hutchens** [2] · **Azalea Hulbert** [3] · **Wayne D. Lewis** [4] · **David M. Brown** [5]

Abstract Non-tenure track faculty members (NTTF) constitute what has been referred to by scholars as the new faculty majority. The growing numbers of NTTF have led to debates about the role they should play in shared governance. Currently, however, an overall lack of empirical knowledge exists regarding the status of their involvement in institutional

Willis A. Jones is Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Kentucky. He received a Master's degree from the University of Arkansas and a Ph.D. from Vanderbilt University. His particular interests are intercollegiate athletics, diversity issues in higher education, and organizational behavior.

Neal Hutchens , Professor of Higher Education at the University of Mississippi, has research interests that center on law and policy issues in higher education. He received a J.D. from the University of Alabama School of Law and a Ph.D. from the University of Maryland.

Azalea Hulbert is a Ph.D candidate at Pennsylvania State University; and her research interests are leadership and ethics, organizational behavior, and student development. She received an M.B.A from Samford University.

Wayne D. Lewis , Executive Director of Education Policy & Programs in the Kentucky Education and Workforce Development Cabinet and Associate Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Kentucky, has research interests in educational leadership, policy, and politics. He received a Ph.D. from North Carolina State University.

David M. Brown , Lecturer in the Department of Management at Ohio University, earned a Ph.D. in Higher Education from the University of Kentucky. His research interests include historical and contemporary issues affecting college students and the professoriate.

✉ Willis A. Jones
    willis.a.jones@uky.edu

1   Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation, 131 Taylor Education Building, Lexington, KY 40506, USA

2   Higher Education, University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS, USA

3   Pennsylvania State UniversityUniversity Park, State College, PA 16802, USA

4   University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506, USA

5   Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701, USA

🖄 Springer

governance. Using data from highest research activity doctoral universities, this study investigated current standards related to NTTF eligibility for election to institution-wide faculty senates. We also explored what these faculty governance standards and criteria reveal about the status and position of NTTF within the professoriate.

Non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) constitute the statistical majority among college faculty. While tenured and tenure-line positions accounted for about 75% of faculty positions around 40 years ago, today nearly two-thirds of the faculty at United States public and private non-profit institutions of higher education are NTTF (Kezar & Sam, 2010c). Three of every four new faculty hires are NTTF (Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, 2013). The rise of NTTF has led to several conversations within higher education, such as how to improve NTTF work conditions (Kezar, 2012) and the impact of NTTF on student learning (Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Umbach, 2007). Our study focused on an issue increasingly subject to debate, that is, the participation of NTTF in shared governance structures (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar & Sam, 2010a, 2010b). In 2013 the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) issued a report calling for the increased inclusion of NTTF at all levels of institutional governance (American Association of University Professors, 2013). In 2016 the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges issued a report calling on higher education institutions to do more to incorporate full-time NTTF and part-time faculty members into shared governance (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2016).

Even as discourse intensifies over the participation of NTTF in governance, an overall lack of empirical knowledge exists regarding the nature and status of their involvement in university level governance. As noted in one news story on this issue, "No one has good data on how many faculty members working off the tenure track are included in faculty governance" (Wilson, 2013, par. 9). Similarly, the American Association of University Professors (2013) report pointed out that no clear picture exists of the nature of institutional policies related to the shared governance rights of NTTF.

In an effort to increase knowledge of current practice, this descriptive study explored the following questions.

- In what percentage of highest research activity doctoral universities are full-time non-tenure track faculty eligible for election to the faculty senate?
- In what percentage of highest research activity doctoral universities are part-time non-tenure track faculty eligible for election to the faculty senate?
- In what percentage of highest research activity doctoral universities are faculty senate seats reserved specifically for non-tenure track faculty?
- Are university standards related to non-tenure track faculty eligibility for election to the faculty senate correlated with institutional control, location, Association of American Universities (AAU) status, or an institution's overall percentage of non-tenure-track faculty employed?

We answered these questions using data from faculty senate bylaws, constitutions, and faculty handbooks. Given the current lack of knowledge related to the inclusion of NTTF in shared governance, this study starts to fill an important void in higher education governance

research. Our descriptive analysis also presents a platform for more critical analyses of what faculty governance criteria reveal about the status of NTTF in the professoriate and the work conditions experienced by NTTF.

For purposes of this study, we use faculty senate as a general term for institutional-level governance bodies that serve as the representative organization for the faculty of an institution of higher education. These bodies are commonly referred to as faculty senates, academic senates, academic councils, faculty councils, or faculty committees.

NTTF in Higher Education

NTTF are typically defined as individuals hired by a college or university to teaching positions that are not tenure eligible. NTTF consist of two major groups; part-time faculty and full-time faculty. The majority of NTTF are part-time. Around 42% of all instructional staff positions in institutions of higher education are filled by part-time NTTF (Curtis & Thornton, 2013). Part-time NTTF are by far the fastest growing segment of the professoriate. From 1970 to 2001, the number of part-time NTTF increased by 376% (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Full-time NTTF, who sometimes receive multi-year appointments with the expectation of renewal, have increased at a slower rate. Around 15% of total instructional staff at all United States institutions of higher education are full-time NTTF (Curtis & Thornton, 2013).

The American Education Research Association (AERA) report on NTTF published in 2013 highlighted several other distinguishing characteristics of NTTF (Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, 2013). While NTTF, especially part-time NTTF, are largely concentrated in community colleges, growth trends can be seen across other higher education sectors as well. In particular, public and private research universities have seen a sizable growth in full-time NTTF. NTTF are assigned a number of different academic titles across institutions. One study found 50 titles and terms for part-time faculty alone including adjunct, seasonal, visiting, and contingency faculty (Berry, 2005). The AERA report also noted that NTTF are more likely to be employed in the academic fields of education, fine arts, and business and that NTTF are disproportionally women.

Literature Review

Though the numbers of NTTF have grown over the years, limited empirical research has addressed their involvement in institutional governance. The general consensus, however, is that NTTF are not participating in shared governance in a meaningful or significant way (American Association of University Professors, 2013; Morrison, 2008; Wilson, 2013). Morrison (2008) posited five potential explanations for the lack of representation and participation of NTTF in shared governance. NTTF either (a) do not wish to be involved in governance as they are free-riders in a system designed by and reliant on the tenure-track faculty, (b) do wish to be involved but are excluded from participation by the tenure-track faculty, (c) do wish to be involved but are excluded by institutional policies, (d) do not believe they have the time to be involved, or (e) avoid involvement due to concerns about their job security and contingent employment status (Morrison, 2008, pp. 22–24).

Some of Morrison's (2008) hypotheses related to the participation of NTTF in shared governance have been studied. Kezar et al. (2006) examined the role of biases among tenure-track faculty as a reason for the exclusion of NTTF from participation in governance. Using

case study data from a college of education within a university, the researchers found that tenure-track faculty members were concerned about the participation of NTTF in shared governance because of the perceived inability of NTTF to be critical of administration due to their lack of job security. Other tenure-track faculty members questioned whether NTTF were really faculty or had a strong faculty identity given that they had not gone through the rites of passage of earning tenure. Still others said that greater inclusion of NTTF in university governance would legitimize the college's decision to grow the ranks of NTTF, and they "resisted inclusion as capitulation, demanding that the institution make a greater investment in tenure-track positions" (Kezar et al., 2006, p. 126). For these reasons, tenure-track faculty members within this college were reluctant to give NTTF a role in governance. Though the Kezar et al. (2006) study was limited to only one institution, it demonstrates how bias and stereotypes on the part of the tenure-track faculty can be a barrier to NTTF participation in governance.

Other researchers have explored whether NTTF are interested in institutional governance. Gappa and Leslie (1993) used interview data collected from over 450 NTTF, administrators, and faculty leaders at 18 college and universities in the United States and Canada to explore the status and work conditions of part-time NTTF. They found that for the most part, NTTF want to be more actively involved in institutional governance. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) used multiple sources of data including surveys, a review of institutional documents, and 12 campus visits to examine the work experiences of full-time NTTF. They found that, while the actual involvement of NTTF in shared governance varied greatly among institutions, NTTF consistently reported wanting to be more involved in governance. Some NTTF, however, noted that the "freedom to be uninvolved" represented a perk of NTTF status (p. 59). More recent scholarship on the perceptions and desires of NTTF to participate in shared governance has unfortunately not been conducted. The aforementioned studies suggest, however, that many NTTF would indeed like to be involved in governance; and it is reasonable to assume that this sentiment has remained unchanged in the intervening years..

Institutional policy as a barrier to NTTF involvement in governance has been a subject of growing interest. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) reported that 49% of the 86 institutions of higher education they surveyed provided eligibility for service in the faculty senate to full-time NTTF. Only 46% of research universities allowed NTTF to serve on the faculty senate. Nearly a decade later Kezar and Sam (2010a) studied 183 collective-bargaining agreements and found that only 39% had any mention of NTTF participation in governance. The authors noted that this low percentage, along with the sometimes inconsistent language used in the contracts, suggested a need for union negotiators to address NTTF involvement in institutional governance. In 2007 the Center for the Education of Women (CEW) surveyed university administrators to ask about their perceptions of NTTF on their campus. The CEW report noted that 78% of survey respondents said full-time NTTF were entitled to participate in the faculty senate. Part-time NTTF, according to survey respondents, were only eligible for senate participation at 35% of institutions (Center for the Education of Women, 2007).

In 2011 the AAUP surveyed 800 faculty senate leaders in an effort to gain a greater understanding of practices regarding the participation of NTTF in governance. Specifically, the survey looked to explore NTTF "eligibility to serve, the existence of seats in institutional governance bodies reserved for such faculty, policies to ensure academic freedom, compensation for service, and recommendations about how to improve the current situation" (American Association of University Professors, 2013, p. 2). The AAUP received responses from just 125 of these senate leaders, most of whom were at either doctoral or comprehensive

institutions. Three-quarters of these survey respondents indicated that full-time NTTF are eligible to serve in governance roles at their institution. Only about 25% of survey respondents indicated that part-time NTTF were eligible for faculty governance roles. The eligibility of NTTF to serve in institutional governance, however, was often limited. Among respondents who indicated that their institution allowed some NTTF involvement in governance, 43% limited the number of NTTF allowed to serve; and 38% reported that NTTF must have minimum teaching loads or a certain type of appointment. The survey also found that at most schools NTTF are not compensated for their service and that most schools do not consider the governance service of NTTF in personnel evaluations (American Association of University Professors, 2013).

To summarize, limited research exists regarding NTTF participation in institutional governance. This is especially true as it relates to institutional policies. We found only three studies which investigated institutional policy as it relates to NTTF involvement in governance. One (Kezar & Sam, 2010a) focused on faculty collective bargaining contracts while the other two (American Association of University Professors, 2013; Center for the Education of Women, 2007) surveyed faculty senate leaders or institutional administrators. Our analysis adds to this literature by examining the language within faculty senate written policy as it relates to NTTF and institutional governance. Our study provides an important complement to the work of the American Association of University Professors (2013) because of questions regarding the extent to which faculty leaders actually know the governance policies at their own institution. The American Association of University Professors (2013) report noted that one of the most frustrating aspects of their survey was "the high number of "not sure" responses from senate leaders to questions about policies at their own institutions" (p. 2).

Conceptual Framework

The primary goal of our study was to describe the characteristics of instructional policies related to NTTF eligibility for election to the faculty senate. As noted earlier, there is currently a lack of knowledge regarding NTTF participation in institutional governance. This lack of knowledge means the higher education community cannot fully assess the role of the new faculty majority in institutional governance. We also lack information on if, how, and for whom the current state of NTTF governance policy needs to change or be improved. Therefore, it is important to increase our knowledge of institutional practices regarding NTTF involvement in shared governance.

The importance of our study was also grounded in two ideas regarding what faculty governance standards and criteria reveal about the status and position of NTTF in the professoriate. In a qualitative study of NTTF experiences within academic departments, Kezar (2013) discovered evidence of four different types of cultures as perceived by NTTF: destructive, neutral, inclusive, and learning. NTTF involvement in governance is an important characteristic of each of these cultures. In destructive cultures NTTF are shut out of governance. In neutral cultures NTTF are often not invited to participate in governance. In inclusive and learning cultures NTTF are included and encouraged to participation in institutional governance. These cultures have been shown to affect NTTF job performance. Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, and Staples (2006) and Kezar (2013) noted that work conditions and culture correlate with NTTF ability and willingness to perform their jobs in ways that enhance student learning. We use Kezar's categories of college and university cultures to help

frame this study. In particular, we frame our work as a study of an institutional practice that can serve as an important indicator of the culture experienced by NTTF.

Our study was also broadly situated within the conceptual terrain of faculty identity, status, and socialization (Kuntz, 2012; Reybold, 2003; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994), specifically in relation to what it means to belong to or to be accepted as a member of the professoriate. Birnbaum (1989) noted that faculty senates carry out a number of latent and manifest functions within institutions of higher education. We argue that one of those functions might be the legitimation and definition of the "the faculty." While we often speak of "the faculty" in higher education as a shorthand reference to tenure-line faculty, the reality at many colleges and universities is that teaching and other traditional functions of professors are increasingly being carried out by NTTF. Accordingly, a basic question has arisen on many campuses involving which individuals actually constitute "the faculty." The increased reliance on NTTF has raised important questions regarding how to define and to conceptualize what it means to be a member of the professoriate.

Faculty senate policies could provide some insight into how institutions of higher education define "the faculty." As part of their latent function, Birnbaum (1989) noted that faculty senates can provide status and recognition to individual members of the faculty. We believe faculty senates can also provide status and recognition for members of the faculty. Therefore, a descriptive analysis of faculty senate constitutions and bylaws provides one window for better understanding how institutions of higher education define and characterize exactly what it means to be a part of "the faculty."

The Study and Methods

Institutions

For our study we used descriptive statistics to catalogue institutional policies related to NTTF eligibility for election to the faculty senate. We restricted our analysis to highest research doctoral universities according to the 2016 Carnegie Classification. The Carnegie Classification defines doctoral universities as institutions which awarded at least 20 research/scholarship doctorates in 2013–2014 excluding professional practice doctoral degrees. Institutions were classified as highest research activity universities based on their level of research and development expenditures, research staff, and doctoral conferrals. A total of 115 institutions are designated by Carnegie as highest research doctoral universities.

We made the decision to focus on this category of institution for several reasons. Given the descriptive and exploratory nature of this study, we believed it would be useful to analyze the subset of institutions with the highest profile in the higher education sector. By most popular matrices (e.g., magazine rankings, membership in the American Association of Universities), the most prestigious universities in the United States are found within this category. Given the isomorphic nature of post-secondary education (Jencks & Riesman, 1968; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991), it is possible that the policies of this subgroup of institutions are somewhat representative of policies at other types institutions of higher education. We also chose to focus on to highest research doctoral universities because we found that faculty senate bylaws and constitutions from university webpages were readily available. In our preliminary attempt to explore NTTF involvement in shared governance at other doctoral level institutions, master's colleges/universities, and baccalaureate colleges, we had found that many institutions within

these classifications did not publish faculty senate information on their institutional website, making the acquisition of data difficult.

Data Collection and Analysis

To obtain data for our study, we visited the websites of all 115 highest research doctoral universities in fall 2016. We searched for documents providing the policies and election procedures of the faculty senate, typically the faculty senate constitution and bylaws or the faculty handbook. We examined each policy and created three dummy variables based on the NTTF election eligibility criteria and faculty senate composition. First we determined if full-time NTTF were eligible for election to the faculty senate. We defined full-time appointments as faculty with a .5 or higher full-time equivalent (FTE) at an institution. This definition of a full-time appointment is informed by the observations of Rhoades and Maitland (2008), who stated that "benefits are usually based on FTE, so that faculty members with .5 FTE or greater appointments often receive full or prorated benefits" (p. 72). Second, we determined if part-time NTTF were eligible for election to the faculty senate and again created a dummy variable to designate an institution's policy. Our third dummy variable was created based on whether the senate reserved seats specifically for NTTF. We chose the full-time versus part-time dimension as a focus of our analysis based on the importance of contract status on the experiences and expectations of NTTF. Kezar (2013) noted,

> We also know that contract type shapes NTTF experience and faculty that teach a course who are retired from a professional position (part-time or adjunct) have different experiences and expectations than faculty who are conducting non-tenure-track work as their full-time position and/or are working full-time. (p. 161)

Each member of the research team individually coded a different subset of highest research doctoral universities. In instances where a team member was unsure of how a school should be coded, other members of the research team were consulted. In instances where multiple members of the team could not determine how an institution should be coded, emails were sent to the institution's faculty senate president or administrative assistant requesting clarification of the policy.

To address our first three research questions, we used percentage distributions for each of the dummy variables among highest research doctoral universities. To address our fourth research question, we engaged in bivariate analysis to examine whether faculty senate policies regarding NTTF were statistically related to four institutional characteristics. The first was whether an institution was privately or publicly controlled. Given the governance and organizational differences between public and private universities, we hypothesized that there would be significant differences in the frequencies of institutional policies based on the control of the institution. The second institutional characteristic examined was location as determined by a school's Office of Business Economic region code. Given differences in collective bargaining or right to work laws in various regions of the country as well as differences in cultural work norms by region, we anticipated that policies would differ across regions. The third institutional characteristic was whether an institution was a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU). AAU institutions are often perceived to be among the top tier of research universities in the United States, so the goal was to compare policies at the most elite doctoral institutions with policies at other doctoral institutions. The final institutional characteristic examined was the overall percentage of full-time instructional staff employed as NTTF at an

institution. We hypothesized that schools with a higher percentage of NTTF would be more likely to include NTTF in shared governance. We obtained data on institutional control and the percentage of instructional staff in NTTF positions from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 2014–2015 academic year database. AAU membership information was obtained from the AAU webpage.

Limitations

The findings of this study should be interpreted with some important limitations in mind. First, we restricted our sample to only those schools classified as highest research doctoral universities. While we believe our findings have strong validity among this subset of higher education institutions, they provide little insight into NTTF governance policies at community colleges, for-profit institutions, master's colleges/universities, baccalaureate colleges, or other categories of doctoral universities.

A second limitation of this study was the exclusive use of online documents for data collection. It is possible that changes in faculty senate bylaws had occurred recently but that these documents had not yet been updated on institutional websites. Based on other information on faculty senate webpages (such as senate rosters), however, institutions for the most part appeared to keep their faculty senate sites updated.

We also acknowledge the potential existence of measurement error in our cataloging of institutional policies. The data sources used in this study (faculty senate constitutions, bylaws, and handbooks) were not designed to answer the specific research questions in this study. Therefore, the team was forced to interpret institutional policies for coding purposes. This could lead to a degree of measurement error where an institution's policy was classified in a way that differs from its *true* value. Given the relative simplicity of the classification categories used in this study, however, we do not believe that this measurement error is significant.

Findings

Of the 115 highest research doctoral universities, seven (Brown University, Tufts University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Johns Hopkins University, Yale University, Harvard University, and Boston College) were dropped from analyses because they have no formal, institution-wide faculty senate. Two other institutions (California Institute of Technology and Carnegie Mellon University) did not make faculty senate rules and policies available online. After multiple attempts to obtain data from these institutions were unsuccessful, we dropped these institutions from our analysis. Thus, the final analytic sample for this study was 106 universities.

Table 1 presents the study findings. Our first research question asked in what percentage of highest research doctoral universities are full-time non-tenure track faculty eligible for election to the faculty senate. Similar to the American Association of University Professors (2013) report, we found that the vast majority, 85%, of institutions extended faculty senate election eligibility to full-time NTTF. The remaining 15% of institutions restricted senate eligibility to tenure-track faculty only.

In many instances, the policy language used in the faculty senate bylaws discussed the role of full-time NTTF in shared governance as it related to their larger inclusion in the university faculty. For Indiana University, one reads that "academic appointees who are not tenure-track

Table 1 Faculty senate eligibility standards for NTTF

	Only TT faculty eligible for senate	Full-time NTTF eligible for senate	Part-time NTTF eligible for senate	Seats reserved on the senate for NTTF
All doctoral institutions-highest research activity (*n* = 106)	15%	85%	11%	10%
Public Institutions (*n* = 81)	12%	88%	12%	8%
Private Institutions (n-25)	24%	76%	8%	12%
Northeast (*n* = 24)	21%	79%	17%	17%
Midwest (*n* = 23)	17%	83%	4%	9%
South (*n* = 41)	12%	88%	12%	7%
West (*n* = 18)	11%	89%	11%	5%
Non-AAU (*n* = 53)	15%	85%	13%	6%
AAU (*n* = 53)	15%	85%	9%	13%

(i.e., clinical ranks; research scientist/scholar ranks; lecturer ranks) on the Bloomington campus shall be considered faculty." Georgia Tech guidelines state that,

> University faculty membership consists of full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, principal senior lecturers, senior lecturers, lecturers, clinical professors, clinical associate professors, clinical assistant professors, clinical instructors, research professors, research associate professors, research assistant professors, professors of practice, academic professionals, and instructors, who do not hold temporary, limited-term, part-time, or visiting appointments.

In both instances, it is later noted that all members of the recognized university faculty are eligible for election to the senate.

While most institutions extended senate election eligibility to full-time NTTF, part-time NTTF were largely excluded. Our second research question asked in what percentage of highest research doctoral universities are part-time NTTF eligible for election to faculty senate. We found that only 11% of our sample institutions extended eligibility rights to part-time NTTF. This percentage was lower than that reported by the American Association of University Professors (2013), which found that about 25% of their sample allowed part-time faculty eligibility to serve in governance roles.

Syracuse University and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville provide two examples of policy language used at schools which allow part-time NTTF to stand for election to the senate. The standards at Syracuse read as follows.

> The following shall be eligible to stand for election as additional members: full-time faculty who are professors of all ranks, instructors or lecturers, regular part-time faculty, currently enrolled and matriculated graduate and undergraduate students, full-time non-faculty professional staff, full-time and regular part-time secretarial, clerical and technical staff and unionized staff.

At Tennessee, senators are elected from among individuals "meeting the following criteria at the time of the election: the holding of full-time or continuing part-time appointment with the rank, or equivalent rank, of lecturer, clinical instructor, assistant professor or higher."

Our third research question asked what percentage of highest research doctoral universities reserve seats on the faculty senate specifically for non-tenure track faculty. The American Association of University Professors (2013) survey found that 63.7% of institutions did not

reserve seats in governance bodies for NTTF. Within our sample, 91% of institutions reserved no seats on the faculty senate for NTTF. Among the 10 universities which did so the number of seats was often relatively small. At Rice University, for example, the faculty senate consists of 34 members. Four of those senate seats are reserved for NTTF with a variety of appointment titles (ranging from lecturer to post-doctoral appointees and research appointments). At the University of North Texas, four of the 45 faculty senate seats are reserved for faculty at the rank of instructor or lecturer.

To summarize, our descriptive analysis of NTTF eligibility for election to the faculty senate found that the majority of institutions provided some avenue for NTTF participation in shared governance via eligibility for faculty senate membership. Only 15% of the institutions we examined restricted eligibility to only tenure track faculty. Among the institutions that allow NTTF to serve on the faculty senate, it was often restricted to full-time NTTF. Of the 90 institutions which offered senate membership eligibility to NTTF, 86% restricted eligibility to only full-time NTTF. Part-time NTTF were largely excluded from governance participation. We also found that very few highest research doctoral universities reserved seats on the faculty senate specifically for NTTF.

Our fourth research question asked whether university standards related to NTTF eligibility for election to the faculty senate correlated with institutional control, location, AAU status, or an institution's overall percentage of non-tenure-track faculty employed. We addressed this question using bivariate statistical analyses. We first focused on how institutional status (i.e., public or private) correlated with the likelihood of an institution allowing NTTF senate eligibility. A chi-squared test showed no statistically significant correlation between being a public/private institution and full-time NTTF senate eligibility X^2 (1, 106) = 2.02, p = .16. We also found no statistically significant correlation between public/private status and part-time faculty eligibility, X^2 (1, 106) = .35, p = .55, or whether an institution reserves senate seats for NTTF, X^2 (1, 106) = .25, p = .62.

Our second institutional characteristic was location. The Office of Business Economic region code groups universities into one of nine regional areas. For our analysis, due to our limited sample size, we converted these regional areas into four groups. Schools located in New England and the Mideast were classified as *Northeast*. Schools located in the Great Lakes and Plains were classified as *Midwest*. Schools located in the Southeast and Southwest were classified as *South* while schools in the Rocky Mountains and Far West were classified as *West*. Chi-square analysis showed no statistically significant correlation between location and full-time NTTF senate eligibility X^2 (3, 106) = 1.20, p = .75, part-time NTTF senate eligibility X^2 (3, 106) = 1.82, p = .61, or seats reserved on the faculty senate for NTTF X^2 (3, 106) = 2.01, p = .57. Chi squared analyses exploring the relationship between AAU status and eligibility returned similar non-significant findings to those noted above. Being a part of the AAU did not correlate with full-time NTTF senate eligibility X^2 (1, 106) = 0, p = 1, part-time NTTF senate eligibility X^2 (1, 106) = .375, p = .54, or seats reserved on the faculty senate for NTTF X^2 (1, 106) = 1.76, p = .18.

The final institutional characteristic of interest was the overall percentage of NTTF employed at an institution. NTTF percentage was calculated by dividing the total number of teaching personnel in non-tenure earning positions by the number of full-time instructional staff at a university during the 2014–2015 academic year. The mean NTTF percentage among the 106 institutions in our dataset was 31.5% with a standard deviation of 13%. NTTF percentage was then included in a simple logit regression model predicting NTTF senate eligibility. As with the other independent variables in this study, we found that the NTTF percentage had no statistically significant relationship with full-time NTTF senate eligibility

($\beta = -1.71$, $p = .40$), part-time NTTF senate eligibility ($\beta = -.38$, $p = .87$), or seats reserved on the faculty senate for ($\beta = 3.21$, $p = .19$).

In summary, our findings for research question four suggest no clear patterns. Neither institutional control, location, AAU status, nor the percentage of NTTF at an institution was a significant predictor of eligibility standards for either full-time or part-time NTTF.

Discussion

NTTF have become the new statistical majority among the professoriate. These faculty members have valuable expertise, teach, and advise a large number of students; and they contribute to the social/academic context of a college or university (Figlio, Schapiro, & Soter, 2005; Kezar et al., 2006). As noted by one administrator "Our best new faculty are non-tenure track faculty. They are dynamic and committed, interested in professional development and institutional success" (Center for the Education of Women, 2007, p. 3). Despite their prevalence and importance within higher education, we still lack a clear understanding of the role NTTF play in college and university decision making. The goal of this study was to examine policy regulations regarding NTTF eligibility to participate in faculty governance, in the context of highest research doctoral universities. While our research was largely descriptive, several important findings come out of this study. One finding was an appreciation of the wide range of policies regarding NTTF involvement in institutional-level shared governance. In addition to finding a variety of polices, we encountered seemingly ambiguous rules in several institutional policies. We suggest that this variation and ambiguity in eligibility rules reflects a larger state of affairs in higher education in relation to NTTF, with varying titles, standards, and practices existing across and even within institutions. We believe our findings reinforce previous research, which has found broad disagreement and uncertainty regarding the status of NTTF in higher education (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Hutchens, 2011; Kezar, 2012).

The ambiguity of faculty senate rules meant that our determinations of NTTF eligibility for faculty senate membership proved surprisingly difficult for some universities even after consultation with faculty senate constitutions, bylaws, and faculty handbooks. The uncertainty that we encountered in discerning membership eligibility prompted several questions. We wondered whether such ambiguity arose unintentionally through a lack of institutional focus on issues pertinent to NTTF or whether some universities are perhaps reluctant to acknowledge explicitly in senate constitutions and bylaws the exclusion of certain NTTF from senate membership eligibility. No matter the institutional stance, we believe that transparency and unambiguousness on the issue are warranted in the name of basic openness in shared governance matters (American Association of University Professors, 2013). Given the interpretational challenges encountered in this study with multiple institutions, our findings suggest that a significant number of institutions would be well advised to review faculty senate membership criteria so as to assess their clarity and transparency for members of the campus community.

Policy differences by contract status constituted a finding that especially stood out in this study. Full-time NTTF were eligible for election to the faculty senate at most highest research doctoral universities. This finding was similar to the results from the American Association of University Professors (2013) study on NTTF involvement in shared governance. Our findings suggest that over the last 15 years more research universities are making NTTF eligible for election to the faculty senate. Only 48% of the research universities surveyed by Baldwin and

Chronister in 2001 offered election elegability to full-time NTTF. Our study using data from 2016 found that 85% of highest research activity univerisites offer election elegability to full-time NTTF. While these two studies cannot be directly compared, they do suggest a shift in university policy to be more inclusive of full-time NTTF.

Considering these findings relative to frameworks of institutional culture and faculty status discussed earlier, our study may be viewed as an indicator that full-time NTTF are, at least to some extent, experiencing inclusive and learning cultures at highest research doctoral universities. These findings also serve as an indicator that full-time NTTF are increasingly being accepted as legitimate members of the professoriate within these institutions.

In contrast to our findings regarding full-time NTTF, we found that part-time NTTF were for the most part excluded from senate eligibility at most institutions. This finding contrasts sharply with the recommendations for involving all NTTF, including part-time personnel, in governance. The American Association of University Professors (2013) contends that "faculty members who hold contingent appointments should be afforded responsibilities and opportunities in governance similar to those of their tenured and tenure-track colleagues," with part-time faculty specifically included in this call for inclusion (p. 5). We found, however, that nearly 90% of highest research doctoral universities excluded part-time NTTF from faculty senate eligibility.

This exclusion from membership as full members of the faculty may be indicative of larger institutional cultures and norms. The part-time NTTF senate eligibility policies in our study may suggest destructive or neutral institutional cultures where NTTF are excluded from institutional governance. Given that involvement in governance is only one element of institutional culture as conceptualized by Kezar (2013), however, we do not know if part-time NTTF at our sample institutions are fully experiencing destructive or neutral cultures. We do believe, however, that our study provides further evidence that many research universities are cultivating institutional cultures which fail to support part-time NTTF, which may significantly impact the willingness, capacity, and opportunity of part-time NTTF to perform their roles as teachers and department colleagues. To provide students with the highest quality educational experience, we believe that higher education institutions must create affirming work conditions for all faculty regardless of contract status.

While our study focused on faculty senate membership standards, we do not suggest that eligibility represents a special panacea in terms of issues related to NTTF, nor does eligibility automatically equate to election. Faculty senate composition comprises only one dimension related to the treatment of NTTF. As prior research has demonstrated, multiple factors, especially those at the college or department level, affect the professional experiences of NTTF (Kezar & Sam, 2010c). Thus, faculty senate eligibility should be considered alongside other institutional factors affecting NTTF. At the same time, eligibility standards provide a formal institutional determination of which individuals comprise the faculty, with potential pragmatic implications alongside more symbolic ones.

A range of forces impact the experiences of NTTF and influence factors to be considered when designing institutional policies and procedures affecting these faculty members. As such, we suggest assessment of faculty senate eligibility standards should ideally occur from a holistic perspective, ostensibly as part of a larger institutional review of standards and practices related to NTTF. In an example that received national press attention, The University of Denver undertook an institution-wide review of its titling and appointment standards for NTTF (Flaherty, 2015). The review included issues related to shared governance and resulted in the creation of a revised appointment and promotion structure for faculty members in non-tenure

line positions. Rather than an isolated matter, faculty senate eligibility interconnects with multiple issues affecting NTTF.

In relation to shared governance and faculty senate eligibility, a key area of concern involves the level of professional independence and autonomy possessed by NTTF. These faculty members, even if in full-time positions, are subject to varying appointment types, with some full-time NTTF employed on yearly contracts, while others are on multi-year appointments, which can also be on a rolling basis that provides an additional layer of economic security (Hutchens, 2011). Additionally, mechanisms of re-appointment differ, such as through a committee process or left primarily to a single administrator. Questions related to professional independence are likely even more pronounced for NTTF faculty with part-time appointments.

That a faculty member should possess the requisite professional autonomy to participate in shared governance in an independent manner represents a reasonable senate membership prerequisite. In revising its overall policies for NTTF, for example, the University of Denver also amended policy language dealing with issues of faculty autonomy and independence in shared governance matters, in addition to issues involving academic freedom (Flaherty, 2015). A decision at New York University to exclude NTTF from college-level shared governance structures rested in part on concerns over their lack of sufficient professional independence (Wilson, 2013). While pre-tenure faculty could be characterized as subject to similar forces, these forces are limited to the probationary period. Additionally, annual evaluation systems and reliance on the peer review process in tenure decisions arguably provide a level of protection unavailable to many NTTF. Thus, we recommend that a review of faculty senate eligibility standards should not occur in isolation from how other campus policies and procedures affect the professional independence of NTTF.

A minority of institutions in our sample (10%) reserved a seat or seats for NTTF on the faculty senate. The American Association of University Professors (2013) noted that reserving seats for NTTF on a faculty senate may be appropriate to ensure representation, but general voting and service eligibility should be the institutional goal. Designating seats may help to create campus norms regarding participation by NTTF in governance (Kezar & Sam, 2014). At the same time, such seats serving only as tokens will likely do little to help promote a campus environment truly conducive to meaningful participation by NTTF in shared governance. Kezar and Sam (2014), looking to Birnbaum (1991), discussed how shared governance can play an important role in institutional well-being. The authors suggested that "involving NTTFs in governance can provide a vehicle for relationship building" and a means to build trust and understanding that can help lead to institutional policy changes (Kezar & Sam, 2014, p. 430).

The findings of this study raise multiple questions for additional inquiry. Does ambiguity in language describing eligibility standards reflect tension in or inattention to the role of NTTF in governance? Given the small number of institutions in our sample extending some type of senate eligibility to part-time NTTF, what were the institutional dynamics at play on these campuses? Has senate eligibility resulted in meaningful benefits for NTTF in relation to their treatment and status within the institution? Are the policies found at highest research doctoral universities similar to those at other types of college and universities? How do cultural environments influence policy decisions regarding the inclusion or exclusion of NTTF in shared governance? A more interpretive qualitative look at faculty senate bylaws would be valuable as well. What does the language/discourse used in shared governance documents convey about the position of NTTF within the academy? We believe the descriptive analysis in our study can serve as a starting point for addressing each of these questions. Rather than an

end point, our findings suggest the need for scholarship that continues to examine the issues relevant to NTTF.

Conclusion

Our descriptive snapshot of highest research doctoral universities policies related to NTTF eligibility for election to the faculty senate has four main conclusions. First, full-time NTTF at most institutions are eligible for election to the faculty senate. Second, part-time NTTF at most institutions are ineligible for election to the faculty. Third, only a few institutions reserve special seats on the faculty senate for NTTF. Fourth, there are no statistically significant differences in NTTF eligibility for election policies based on institution control, location, AAU status, or the percentage of NTTF at an institution. We encourage institutions to examine where they stand in these areas and to determine if faculty senate policies are in line with the goals and values of the institution. Over the next several years, colleges and universities must consider how shared governance policies represent the interests and concerns of full- and part-time NTTF, both for reasons of equity and social justice and to elicit the views and opinions of a faculty constituency which has become the new faculty majority.

References

American Association of University Professors (2013). *The inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/report/governance-inclusion

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2016). *Shared governance: Is ok good enough?* Retrieved from https://www.agb.org/reports/2016/shared-governance-is-ok-good-enough

Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berry, J. (2005). *Reclaiming the ivory tower: Organizing adjuncts to change higher education*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1989). The latent organizational functions of the academic senate: Why senates do not work but will not go away. *The Journal of Higher Education, 60*, 423–443. doi:10.2307/1982064. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.uky.edu/stable/1982064

Birnbaum, R. (1991). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*, 89–123. doi:10.1353/jhe.2006.0002

Center for the Education of Women (2007). *Making the best of both worlds: Findings from a national institution-level survey on non-tenure track faculty*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women. Retrieved from http://www.cew.umich.edu/research/pubs/hepubs/contingent

Cross, J. G., & Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). *Off-track profs: Nontenured teachers in higher education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2013). *The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2012–2013*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/report/heres-news-annual-report-economic-status-profession-2012-13

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *Journal of Human Resources 40*, 647–659. doi:10.3368/jhr.XL.3.647

Figlio, D. N., Schapiro, M. O., & Soter, K. B. (2015). Are tenure track professors better teachers? *Review of Economics and Statistics, 97*, 715–724. doi:10.1162/REST_a_00529

Flaherty, C. (2015, Febuary 17). More than adjuncts. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/02/17/new-faculty-model-u-denver-could-be-prototype-reform

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchens, N. H. (2011). Using a legal lens to better understand and frame issues shaping the employment environment of non-tenure track faculty members. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1443–1460. doi:10.1177/0002764211409192

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Kezar, A. (2013). Departmental cultures and non-tenure-track faculty: Willingness, capacity, and opportunity to perform at four-year institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 84*, 153–188. doi:10.1353/jhe.2013.0011

Kezar, A. (Ed.). (2012). *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kezar, A., Lester, J., & Anderson, G. (2006). Challenging stereotypes that interfere with effective governance. *Thought and Action, Fall, 2016*, 121–134. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/home/1821.htm

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010a). Beyond contracts: Non-tenure track faculty and campus governance. *The NEA Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010b). *Non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Theories and tensions*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010c). *Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experiences, and plans of action*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2014). Governance as a catalyst for policy change creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy, 28*, 425–462. doi:10.1177/0895904812465112

Kuntz, A. M. (2012). Reconsidering the workplace: Faculty perceptions of their work and working environments. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*, 769–782. doi:10.1080/03075079.2010.541556

Morrison, J. D. (2008). Faculty governance and nontenure-track appointments. *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 21–27. doi:10.1002/he.309

Powell, W., & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.). (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Reybold, L. E. (2003). Pathways to the professorate: The development of faculty identity in education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 235–252. doi:10.1023/A:1024024430041

Rhoades, G., & Maitland, C. (2008). *Bargaining for full-time, non-tenure track faculty: Best practices*. Washington, DC: National Educaton Association.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (2013). *Non-tenure-track faculty in U.S. Universities: AERA statement and background report*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/Education_Research_and_Research_Policy/NonTenTrackFaculty_R4.pdf

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*, 91–123. doi:10.1353/rhe.2006.0080

Wilson, R. (2013, March 18). The new faculty minority. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/The-New-Faculty-Minority/137945/