



# Forum on the Future of Adjunct and Contingent Faculty at SUNY New Paltz

Sponsored by Faculty Governance  
John VanderLippe, Presiding Officer

Organized by the Budget, Goals and Plans Committee  
Peter D.G. Brown, Co-Chair  
and  
By the Organization Committee  
Stephan Macaluso, Co-Chair

SUNY New Paltz, Lecture Center 104, May 12, 2005, 11AM-1PM

**John VanderLippe, History:** I want to thank you all for coming to the Forum on the Future of Adjunct and Contingent Faculty here. This forum has been organized by the Budget, Goals and Plans Committee, Peter Brown is Co-Chair; and by the Organization Committee, of which Stephen Macaluso is the Co-Chair.

I'm John VanderLippe. I'm the Presiding Officer of the Faculty and Professional staff. And I'll be your host today. So, a couple of things I should note before we start here: first of all, a number of people sent us messages already saying they would like to present something at this Forum today. So what we're going to do is invite those people who've signed up to come down to the podium here to speak into the microphone. This mike and the two aisle mikes are recording here as well, and so if you have comments that you would like recorded, you can speak from the floor without having signed up; but if you'd like your comments recorded, then it's best to speak into the mike.

We're planning to keep a recording of this and get a transcription made as well. Hopefully, once we figure out how to do this, we will post the recording and the transcription to the Faculty Governance website. And, so as soon as we can get that going, it will be up and running, probably this summer.

We've got a number of people who've already said they would like to speak. If you would like to join the crowd to speak at the podium, there's a sign-up sheet here, and so please put your name on that, if you would. You don't have to sign up to be able to speak.

If you have a question for a speaker or you want to make a comment, you can do it from where you sit or from the mikes there. But if you'd like to speak from the podium, we'd ask that you sign up here.

We're going to ask that all the speakers who come to the podium limit their comments to five minutes or so, which will allow time then for questions for the speaker and comments, as well. And I would also ask that you identify yourself, just for the record, if you would. And so, that's all I think I need to say right now. Anything I've left out?

**Peter D.G. Brown, Foreign Languages:** That's it. We are also recording on a digital voice recorder, so don't say anything that you don't want transcribed and immortalized. (laughter)

**VanderLippe:** Okay. So, David Hobby, you are the first person on our list.

**David Hobby, Chair of Math:** Why are you asking me first?

**Vanderlippe:** You were the first one to respond.

**Hobby:** I have a fair amount of experience with this kind of thing. I was Adjunct Coordinator for Mathematics and Computer Science for several years. Now, I'm Chair of Mathematics, and Mathematics has a lot of adjuncts that we employ. So, I figured I should come here and give my perspective on things. I really actually wanted to be last, so I could rebut everything else. (laughter)

I'll try to make do. Mathematics probably has 15 or 20 adjuncts that we regularly employ. I was looking before I came here—actually, somebody did have a doctorate—most of them have Master's, if not, they're working on a Master's. The department *could not* run if we did not have adjuncts. The thing would just grind to a halt. But what to do? I don't know what to do. I don't think there are any easy solutions. Do you guys have any questions? (laughter)

Can I do it this way?

**Buzz Solomon, Psychology:** Hi, I'm Buzz Solomon. I'm a first-time adjunct here, but I've been a long-time adjunct at SUNY Orange, and we're wrestling with similar questions. One of the things is, the so-called mandated guideline from Middle States about the percentage of full-timers, 70% to 30%. And that's very nice in that context, but economically it works the other way. How do you all wrestle with that, and have you come up with any decent conclusion? Or do you just say: "It is a reality, and let's move on to something else."

**Hobby:** Well, if the administration would give me money, I'd be very happy to hire people as full-time lecturers, or whatever was appropriate. That's the problem, it's all economics, right?

**Solomon:** Is it a catch-22? Does the administration realize that they can rely on adjuncts as a low-cost solution, withhold full-time lines?

**Hobby:** I don't know, I mean, that is kind of my gut feeling, but you never catch anybody *saying* that.

**VanderLippe:** May I ask: when was the last time Math hired a new full-time person?

**Hobby:** We hired two people two years ago. I mean, some of this is: every time you hire someone, it's a replacement for somebody else—if you're lucky. Hired somebody *new*? Well, never.

**VanderLippe:** No new lines, but you've hired full-timers. Okay.

**Jeff Crane, Art:** I'm Jeff Crane, Co-President of the Adjunct Faculty Association. How many adjuncts are there in the Math department? And of them, how many do you think would want a full-time situation—be it lecturer, full-time, tenure track, whatever, but would want to move into something more full-time, whatever it was?

**Hobby:** A fair percentage. A lot of people, they have another job, or they have small children and can't work full-time. All they can do is part-time work. But yes, there are a few who would be very happy to be full-time, yes.

**Crane:** More than five?

**Hobby:** I can't think of more than five. But each department is different. Each department has its own pool of adjuncts, because each field is different. I don't claim to speak for other departments.

**VanderLippe:** One of our goals here today is to gather information. And these kinds of things would be helpful to find out about: variations across departments, also across the colleges, but also on different campuses within the SUNY-system. My perception is that this is a national kind of thing. And I think it's useful to think about it, in some sense, *beyond* this room and beyond specific departments.

**Stephan Macaluso, Library:** I have a two-part question for you.

**Hobby:** Okay.

**Macaluso:** The first: you mentioned you were an Adjunct Coordinator for some time. Are you still, and what did you do? And do you know of other departments that have such an individual?

**Hobby:** I know in some departments the Chair winds up doing everything. Ours is large enough, that if the Chair got stuck with all the jobs, I mean, it wouldn't work.

**Steve:** Do you mean hiring and orienting new faculty?

**Hobby:** Yes, I mean responsible for, you know, certainly doing the initial interview, for finding people... Hopefully, the Adjunct Coordinator would go sit in on a class to see how it was going. Just this kind of thing. In Math we have enough work that we have to split it up and give various people parts of the job.

**Steve:** What seems to be the average stay of an adjunct in Math?

**Hobby:** Oh, probably at least ten years. We have a lot of people who have been here a long time.

**Macaluso:** Thanks!

**VanderLippe:** Okay. Thank you David. So, Jeff Crane, we have you second on our list.

**Crane:** Hi. My name is Jeff Crane, and I'm an adjunct in the Art and Art History departments here. I was calculating it yesterday, and I think the fall is the beginning of my sixth year here, although one starts to lose track. I'm actually a little unprepared for today, because I'm really busy now—I'm teaching five courses; two here, which is the maximum, and three at Ulster County Community College, which is still a SUNY school, but, obviously, a different college—giving a lot of final exams and stuff, so I'm going to speak off the cuff and just kind of tell you a bit about my experience.

I'm angry and I'm frustrated, and I guess, as a way of prefacing that I'm the Co-President of AFA. With the help of Peter Brown and many other people, we've organized this organization to advocate for the interests of adjunct faculty. We now have about seventy paid members and friends. What we hope to achieve—well, we've prepared a statement, which I actually thought was going to be distributed here. I'll read what I've got:

In the Spring of 2004, the faculty and staff at the State University of New York at New Paltz voted overwhelmingly for a substantial increase in the base salary for adjunct faculty to \$1,000 per credit.

A year later, adjuncts are still not being paid a living wage. The over-reliance on adjunct faculty at SUNY-New Paltz is recognized as a major problem facing both the administration and the UUP. What gets lost in the rhetoric coming from both labor and management is the reality faced by the over 400 adjuncts, many of whom have devoted a significant portion of their professional lives to an institution that does almost nothing to recognize their contribution to the life of the College and the larger community. The job offers no job-security and little opportunity for advancement.

If it is true that the College contributes \$200 million annually to the economic life of the Hudson Valley, then it must also be true that this contribution can only be the result of the tremendous and un-equitable sacrifice made by adjunct faculty. It is on the backs of adjuncts that this economic engine is driven.

The AFA believes the present situation to be unfair, untenable, and unsustainable. It is deleterious to the quality of education provided by this College. It is time to end the deadlock which has perpetuated and exacerbated the situation over the past ten to fifteen years, or more. By the administration's own reckoning, adjuncts make up fifty-six percent of the faculty. The commitment to generating new full-time faculty lines, continually voiced by both the administration and the UUP, while well-meaning, ignores the economic realities facing both the College and the majority of faculty: adjuncts, who make it run. The AFA at SUNY New Paltz exists to help find ways out of this deadlock. The AFA recognizes the tremendous contribution that adjuncts make to this College, without which this College would cease to function.

Above all, the AFA demands equity for adjuncts. Equity means equal pay for equal work. Since its inception in October 2004, the AFA has grown from a handful of dedicated individuals to an organization with over seventy dues-paying members and friends. We call upon the administration to:

- 1) honor the pay-increase overwhelmingly supported by the faculty and staff to a minimum of \$1,000 per-credit;
- 2) immediately lift the two-course per-semester cap on adjuncts and freeze the hiring of new adjuncts;
- 3) create more full- and part-time lecturer positions;
- 4) create a step-system that recognizes seniority;
- 5) and fully integrate adjuncts into Campus Governance.

I had a very good conclusion to this, which I don't have on this draft with me, the essence of which is: if indeed this President of this College and the administration of this College are committed to academic excellence, it appears to me, as representative of the Adjunct Faculty Association, that the issue of adjunct faculty on this campus is, if not *the* top priority, among the top priorities that need to be addressed in order to continue to improve the educational excellence that this College has committed itself to.

**Pauline Uchmanowicz, English:** I'm Pauline Uchmanowicz of the English department. I was an adjunct and part-time instructor, contingent instructor, for ten years. So I understand your plight. I also coordinated—we didn't quite call it the adjunct program—but I did that for many years.

I have one concern about the [AFA] statement, and I don't want anyone to misunderstand me when I say this about the 3-course load: it's problematic.

First of all, I think you should be getting paid more than a \$1,000 per credit, because I know that the last time I taught as an adjunct in the early 1990s and I was getting \$3,600

per course—*then*. And when I first came to this school, it was \$1,200; that's what people were getting paid, and I was appalled. I said something to the President every time I saw him about it—a different President—and then the pay went up.

But the problematic part about going for the three-three is, then what you're saying is, "Okay, we will be full-time faculty for less than half of what a full-time instructor makes." That's not a good idea! So, I believe that what we need to do is—people who are interested in going to three-three, you're interested in being full-time. You need to advocate for being full-time, not for getting paid per-class, per three-three load.

**Crane:** Let me address that because that is an issue that we've grappled with quite a bit. The \$1,000 per-credit is the *minimum*. It's the minimum that was overwhelmingly approved by the faculty and staff last year. We are holding the administration to that. That's the minimum. When we advocate for equity, equity means equal pay for equal work. If you look at a full-time salary—and there are different ways of computing this, and I've heard different things from different department heads. How is that computed? Let's say, a full-timer makes \$40,000 a year. How is that computed?

**Uchmanowicz:** Let's say a full-time instructor versus tenure-track, which would be less.

**Crane:** Okay, which would be less. So, let's say \$30,000 a year. Based on how many courses taught and based on how much release time for research and service? So if you compute what is your release time worth, what is research worth, you come up with about \$4,000 per course. Now, if that's true and that's equitable, then there's no reason why an adjunct shouldn't teach two or three or four or however many courses they want to teach, because they are being paid equitably, according to the same scale that a full-time instructor would be.

So, while I agree with you in principle—and it's been the UUP's position that the two-course cap is preventing us from being further exploited, or something like that—the reality is: I just have to go find a job somewhere else, that's not going to pay any more. So, it's very nice to have ideals. Ideals are good things to have. But one has to face realities. And the reality, for the majority of people teaching here, is that it doesn't work.

**Russell Karasik, Psychology:** Jeff, the one other thing that I wanted to add to that: I think your point is well taken, and my understanding is that since that policy has been in place with the two-cap limit, the actual percentage of adjuncts teaching here has gone up, not down. So, that policy has not worked *at all*. The only people who are being penalized by that are the adjuncts who'd like to be able to teach at one location. And it's benefiting no one in terms of additional full-time lines.

**Uchmanowicz:** Yes, what I feel is that you still should say—not you "should," you can say whatever you want—you still should advocate that anyone who teaches three-three here is full-time and should be paid full-time. Because now what you're talking about is:

ultimately, you could shift the whole fabric of the College until: “Okay, so let’s just hire everyone from now on as per course.” It could shift the whole culture of the College.

**Crane:** What I would respond to that is: that’s a *fait accompli*. It’s been done. So, how do we work our way back?

**Thomas Impola, English:** Hi, my name is Tom Impola. I’m a member of the English department and also a member of the Adjunct Faculty Association.

I think one way to address the problem is to ask questions such as: Why is the default assumption, when you come to this College as on a non-tenure track teacher, that you are made an adjunct on a per-course basis, rather than an instructor?

If you look around—I don’t know about other departments, but I know in our department, instructors are as rare as hen’s teeth. Everyone is an adjunct. Very few people are instructors. So, the instructorship almost seems to be a position that is given to reward adjuncts who are considered indispensable. It’s like being knighted or something, to actually get an instructorship. And I wonder why that is? Because really, what that says is: “We have no interest in you as a functioning member of this institution. We would prefer to keep you expendable.” That’s the ultimate message.

And just to make a very general comment: I’m a believer in following the money when we address issues like this. And I’d like to ask: who benefits from the current situation, economically, or in any other way? And I would suggest that it isn’t the students, and it isn’t the instructors or adjuncts or even the regular faculty, it isn’t the institution. I think the *only* benefit in the current situation comes in some kind of budget-balancing act that takes place in Albany. This is not only a SUNY problem, this is statewide problem, a nationwide problem. It has to do with simple economics, it has to do with: “How can we get the positions filled for the lowest possible cost?” And the only response to a situation like that is some kind of labor activity. That’s what it seems to me, anyway. Thank you.

**Yvonne Aspengren, Foreign Languages:** I’m Yvonne Aspengren. I am also working with the AFA, and I teach in the Foreign Language department. Just another way to look at that kind of number game with two-course cap questions: if, let’s say, we’re offering three courses in the German language, and I can only teach two, I’m being exploited at \$2,400 per course, per semester. Should I be exploited a *little* bit more and teach that third one? Or should we then have to go out and hire one *more* adjunct? So we’re increasing the number of adjuncts now to teach that one course, for which she or he won’t be getting health insurance, because at one course you don’t do that.

You’re always playing with the levels of exploitation, it seems. And, if I *want* to teach that course, but I’m not allowed to, there’s another question there, too. Then do I have to go somewhere else to teach a third and a fourth course? Like that one person who is coming in to teach the third course might be doing, too?

**VanderLippe:** Okay, thank you, Jeff. Let's see here. Third person on our list is Stella Turk.

**Uchmanowicz:** Can I clarify a point of Tom's? I think it's important. In our department we have five instructors. Four of those instructors were first adjuncts. All four of them were hired in a *national* search. We did a national search, so they weren't knighted for their service.

**Impola:** Okay.

**Uchmanowicz:** They were hired in a national search. And we do have a commitment in our department to someone who has worked with us for a long time, and who we really think is really good. When we do a national search, we are committed to, you know, hoping that that is the person who is going to be the best; and those four people have been the best. And I just wanted to clarify that.

**Vanderlippe:** Thank you.

**Stella Turk, Chair of Communication Disorders:** (I never turned down a microphone, so I guess I'll have to come up with something to say.) I'm Stella Turk. I'm the Chair of the department of Communication Disorders. I am also the Director of the Speech and Hearing Center.

We have typically eight to ten adjuncts in our department, and I think our situation might be a little bit unique compared to other departments, in that our adjuncts, for the most part, are our clinical supervisors. They bring a very special expertise into our center. They're Master's-level people. We often don't have that level of expertise with our Ph.D.-level people, because they are mostly involved in research and not really working on the clinical piece with our patient population. So I think our situation might be a little bit unique compared to other departments. Also, our adjuncts typically have careers, professions outside of the institution, so they don't have the pressures that other adjuncts have in other departments. So they're coming after a full day's work to support our department and work as supervisors in our clinic.

We have a problem that exists on our graduate level. Many of our elite courses are actually taught by adjuncts, and there are several reasons for this. One of the most obvious reasons is that they are bringing expertise that is not inherent in our own department. We have pressures from our accrediting organization, which really does *not* want us to be using adjuncts, especially on the graduate level. And it will present problems for our re-accreditation cycle. So not only do we have to answer to our own programming standards, but we also have to answer to the American Speech, Language and Hearing Association, which has made it perfectly clear that we should not be using adjuncts to teach most of our elite graduate courses. So, we do have a problem.

Our adjuncts have been dedicated to our program for many years. We have some people who have actually retired and come back to us to teach as adjuncts, retired from other professional careers and come back.

I wanted to make a comment about the two-course limit. I'm hoping that there may be some type of special exception. I'll tell you from a chair's point of view and planning for sabbatical leave, if I can use my current pool of adjuncts who understand my department, who've taught in my department, and I can give them an additional course, it would help me *so* much in terms of my planning. Even if it could be just done on a special exception basis, I really would think that that could be something that may be important to implement.

Also, if there could be some type of campus mentoring of adjuncts. We have done some mentoring in our department, but we are a small department, and it would be nice—it's nice now to have an adjunct organization, but also some type of mentoring, because a lot times the adjuncts, they show up in the evening, they have no connection across campus. It's a very lonely existence. Okay.

**Vanderlippe:** Questions?

**Richard Kelder, Special Programs:** Could you tell me about “special circumstances”? But that really wouldn't benefit the adjuncts. That would benefit the College. You know what I mean? You hire somebody to teach three classes while you needed them, so people can go on sabbatical, etc. And then when that need was over, they'd be back out on the street.

**Turk:** Yes, in our particular case, I think that it wouldn't affect our adjuncts in our department as much as it would affect other departments; because, again, all of my adjuncts, with the exception of one, have other professional careers. They're coming to be supportive of our program, but they certainly, obviously, are not making a living wage from us.—Other questions? Yes?

**Macaluso:** I'd just like to ask—I understand that you do have a unique situation where nearly everyone has, to say it another way, another life, aside from this one. Have adjuncts in your department expressed particular desires to get to know the campus more, to be more involved, either at the department or the campus level?

**Turk:** Well, I came here as an adjunct, and it was something that *I* wanted, that I never got. My adjuncts have not expressed it to me, but I've imposed it upon them. I have set them up with a buddy teacher, so to speak, within the department, who can help to mentor them along and muddle through the different areas within the campus. So, no, it's not been something that *they've* expressed to me, but it's something that I felt that they would want, if it was offered to them.

**Crane:** I'm struck with what you say, how different your situation is there from what I've experienced, especially in the Art department, where virtually *everyone* has a terminal degree. I don't think there's anyone, really, without a Master's of Fine Arts degree, except some of the full-time faculty, who've been there a long time before MFA's were a thing. My sense is that most of the people teaching in the Art department probably *would* want a full-time situation. And there are a lot of adjuncts there; over twenty, I believe.

I'm struck how different our situation is from that in your department. And also that, in some ways, the model that you're talking about—professionals who come here because it's neat and it's fun, and they enjoy teaching and being with students and so forth—is more the kind of model that we've heard the administration embrace as *the* model for what an adjunct is. I think it's more the exception to the rule, in my sense.

But all of that taken into account, I would simply say that people deserve to be paid an equitable wage, whatever it is that they're doing. If they're making \$300,000 at IBM and they come here to teach a class, it's nice if they want to contribute that money back to the College and donate their time, but they shouldn't have to.

**Turk:** I agree. And I do often feel that our adjuncts are donating their time. We have wonderful support, and I can see other departments do; but they do make a *lot* more money outside in the real world than they do here. And so they're coming to be supportive of us, as opposed to us being supportive of them.

**VanderLippe:** Thank you.—Just a programming note here. If you would like to come up and speak at the podium, we've been asking people to put their names on a list here, so we'll have an order there. So if you'd like to put your name on there, please do. And you are free, of course, to make comments, ask questions from the floor.

Thank you, Stella. Let's see here. Number four on my list is Judith Mohns.

**Judith Mohns, Art:** Pardon me for reading from a written statement, but unlike Stella, I'm not real good at speaking off the cuff. I'm Judith Mohns. I'm involved in the Adjunct Faculty Association. I just completed my fourth semester here at New Paltz teaching in the Fine Art Foundation, Art Department. Previously, I taught as an adjunct at Ulster County Community College for three years. I also consider myself, in addition to being an artist, a professional educator. I'm permanently certified to teach in public schools. I spent several years teaching in the Middletown and Newburgh school districts.

It's very tempting for the administration, and even among the adjuncts, to define themselves as to what they want. In fact, everyone is very unclear, it's a diverse group. Some people want to work part-time, some people have full-time jobs. Some people are desperate to have full-time jobs, while other people have their full-time jobs and just want to teach one class.

To me, as an educator, I want to be paid what I'm *worth*. I've worked very hard to learn about how to teach well. The reliance on adjuncts at New Paltz is at an absurd level. It is bordering on the *dysfunctional* level for programs, for the full-time faculty who have to pick up the responsibilities of lines that have been replaced by adjuncts, and for the students who may not even see *one* full-time instructor in a whole semester's course load.

The pay for an adjunct is insulting, exploitive, demeaning to education, and is socially irresponsible for the administration, which loves to brag about the impact that it makes on the Hudson Valley economy.

My comments today go to the damage that relying on adjuncts does to the quality of education for the students and the programs taught here at New Paltz. Don't get me wrong! I actually think many adjuncts are excellent instructors. They may even put in *more* effort into doing a good job, in the one or two classes they teach, than the full-time people actually have time to do with their [teaching] load and their other responsibilities. In that sense, the College is getting an even more extraordinary deal. But systematically and conceptually, the system of reliance on huge numbers of adjuncts is horribly flawed as a way of delivering quality education.

Ironically, as a College with undergraduate and graduate programs in Education, Educational Administration and Art Education, among others, one would think that the College would apply the basic principles of developing and supporting programming and staff that would make for a successful educational environment. Perhaps we should print up stickers that say, "No college student left behind." Because, specifically, when compared with how other educational systems work, New Paltz's seems to work *against* quality in education.

Lack of recognition of teaching experience is a prime example. The administration might argue that a three percent raise each year is recognition; but when that works out to \$14 a paycheck, and it doesn't help keep pace with housing, gas, or heating costs in our area, it is not perceived as recognition. Similarly, when there is a salary increase given to the base, rather than across the board, the salary compression translates to us, the adjuncts, that all our years of teaching experience mean *nothing*. They have no value. A new grad teaching for the very first semester is worth the same.

I compare how public schools with strong union protection go about hiring. Everyone, regardless of their field, is hired at the same base pay. So, there's no perception of scarcity - like in the Art department, we're just the most plentiful. And even within the Art department there are certain programs that get hired at a higher rate, like if you use computers in Graphic Design. I use computers in my Foundation class, but a new grad student will often be hired at \$500 more, because they're in Graphic Design.

So you get the sense that different departments and different areas within departments are able to negotiate different salary bases. In public schools, each year of service results in a significant step increase up to, like, five to ten year plateaus. This encourages people to stay. It values educational teaching experience. We all know that we do a better job when

we've taught a class before. Every time I teach, I improve. The system now says: "You are *stupid* to stay on this job."

The reasons to stay teaching as an adjunct are getting thinner and thinner. There used to be full-time positions that occasionally came up for sabbatical replacements. No more. Colleges across the country use more and more adjuncts, so the excuse of doing it for the required job experience is becoming less and less valid. That leaves teaching for the love of teaching and the subject and the students, which is great. But it's hard to justify working so hard for love, when you can't pay your rent, heat your house or pay for daycare.

A lot of people, a lot of my good students, they have no idea who is an adjunct and who is a full-time instructor, unless you talk to them. So, I was sitting in the Library last week, meeting people, talking about the Adjunct Faculty Association. And I always get good students who come up to me and say, "I want to do what you do, when I get my Master's degree, I want to teach at the college level. So, I was telling them what the pay was. And this very good student said to me—she looked stunned—and she said, "So, the College is saying that, basically, my degree is worth *nothing*." That really struck me, and I think that is the message.

So, whatever we can do to improve the situation or change the trend... It's looking grimmer and grimmer to me. And I feel chased out. I go for full time public school jobs, not because I want to teach there, but because I am tired of feeling stupid and embarrassed about being an adjunct. Thank you.

**Vanderlippe:** Thank you. Any questions? Richard?

**Kelder:** Thank you, Judi. I want to applaud your statement, because I think it speaks directly to some of the issues, both emotional and perhaps professional, as you said, how adjuncts feel. I came here in 1983. I was an adjunct and taught five courses. I went to the administration with the argument that because I taught as an adjunct with five courses, that I should be considered full-time.

Well, that was shot down. But I didn't stop there. I went and I implored them that, if a full-time faculty member is teaching four courses and I'm teaching five, well, at least I should be entitled to something called health benefits. And so I persisted. I won that battle, and I had health benefits for three months. Then I never had health benefits again.

But what's happening here, I think, is really important, because those issues were [brought up by] a single person coming forward. So I applaud the camaraderie and the uniformity and the passion of the people who are speaking on this issue, because I think it's an important one. But I also think that, with Tom Impola's statement, that there are national trends and there are political forces that are undermining higher education per se. And there's a real division of motives, and there's State funding that's not there. It's a larger, complex picture.

By the same token, I know for a fact—because I had been in the meeting with SUNY-Central people—much of what you’re doing is going to be effective, I think, because decentralization is the name of the game within the SUNY system. In other words, you can’t point necessarily to Albany and say, “Well, they won’t let us, or we don’t have any money.” Much of what happens, happens at the local level within the State University of New York. And so: what you’re doing here, as you keep up the pressure and fight for this cause, is very, very important, because people have to respond to it, and they respond locally at the local level. I think that you have to keep going there. And I applaud you for that.

**Mohns:** Well, I’m an optimist, and I would like to think that’s true. But it’s hard to see evidence at this point.

**Kelder:** I understand.

**Mohns:** Yeah. And I have to say, I think that the more students know about the situation, that is a very powerful force; and their *parents*, frankly. I was struck, if you sit at a table, and you talk to students walking by about the adjuncts’ situation—I had at least five students pull money out of their pocket, putting it in a jar, ten dollars: “Oh, my uncle is an adjunct.” Or: “My dad’s been an adjunct for years.” Maybe it’s worth a \$75 increase in tuition to get us up to \$3,000, as Peter Brown calculated. Maybe that’s what it’s about. But right now it’s hard to hold my head up. I’m feeling like I’m doing glorified volunteer work.

**Kelder:** I think parents do know. I talk to students’ parents who do know. They will look at the representation, the number of full time versus the numbers of part time faculty. And those who are making decisions, are making decisions not to come to a State University of New York where the division is so strong.

**Gloria Ghedini, Foreign Languages:** Yeah, I can understand what you’re saying. I’m Gloria Ghedini in the Foreign Language department. I used to be a public school teacher. I’m certified in a few languages, so there is no scarcity of jobs. But since I’m certainly older than you, I didn’t do early retirement, I resigned. I had a mentoring program, as well, when I started in the public schools. I also had to come across a lot of problems with administration and with parents, which is something I don’t have here.

I’m going to speak, as Judith, about my feelings about it. But I agree with everything you’re saying. You know, you come here, the difference in salary is *incredible*. But this is a problem — least, maybe a little positive thought is: I don’t think anybody here, or very few people here, would have problems like I did with my high school administration and the parents. I’m older than you. I’ve gone through paying the bills for the family and so forth, so I understand exactly what you’re saying.

**Brown:** Sorry, we have two people who have doctor’s appointments, who have to leave by twelve, so...

**VanderLippe:** Okay. So, Henry Urbanski.

**Henry Urbanski, Director of Language Immersion Institute:** Hi. I've been teaching Russian language and Russian studies for forty years at New Paltz. I've been chair of the Foreign Language department for twelve years.

I have some figures from the Foreign Language department that [current chair] Wilma Feliciano gave me. These are figures as of the Fall 2005 semester. Of the GE courses, 74% of all the GE courses that are taught by the Foreign Language department are taught by adjuncts. *Seventy-four percent!* The GE and major courses, as of Fall 2005: 71% are taught by adjuncts and 29% by full-time faculty. And right now we still have twenty-four sections in the Foreign Language department that are *un-staffed*. These will all be taught by adjuncts, if we can find them.

I also direct the Language Immersion Institute. All of the instructors in the Institute are adjuncts. The Institute has gained a fine reputation, not only here at New Paltz, but also in the state of New York and the country.

In Foreign Languages, we totally depend on adjuncts, and they are some of our best teachers. In the Language Immersion Institute, these adjuncts often have full-time jobs, and they can teach only on weekends, or they teach in the summer for us. So, they may not be in the same situation as most of the adjuncts are here at the College. These are some the best language teachers that we can find anywhere. And if they don't... We have the luxury of only using those instructors who get the best evaluations. Since they don't have tenure, like some of our full-time, tenured faculty here at New Paltz, they have to do even *better* to stay and continue teaching. So, it is expected *more* of those adjuncts, to reach a level of mastery in their subject than some of us who have tenure and have security—we really don't need to be at our best at all times.

The Foreign Language department is one of the departments here at the College that relies most heavily on adjuncts. Those adjuncts are doing an excellent job. And obviously, they need to be paid more! I cannot say enough to support the plight that I hear here!

Now, since I've been here for so long, I have a sense of history. When I came here in 1965, we had about thirty-five full-time faculty members teaching in the Foreign Language department. We now have about twelve full-time faculty members. You can see *why* we are relying so heavily on adjuncts. Back then we had about ten people teaching French full-time; we now have one person full-time teaching French. We had six full-time people teaching German; we now have one full-time person teaching German. We had two people in Italian full-time; we have one now. We had two people in Russian; we have now one. So someone has to do that work. The number of students are the same or even bigger now than when we had thirty-five full-time people. So, the adjuncts are the people who stepped in and helped us to continue running these programs. We now have in the Foreign Language department—except for Spanish, where there are about six

or seven full-time people—we only have *one* person in each of the other languages in the Foreign Language department. Without adjuncts, we would not be able to offer the programs that we are able to offer now. We are considered one of the best foreign language departments within SUNY, and this is what we are facing at this time. Thank you.

**Vanderlippe:** Do you have time for a couple of questions?

**Urbanski:** Yes.

**Vanderlippe:** Okay.

**Macaluso:** This is similar to the question I asked before. You mentioned the Language Immersion people are usually full-time people who come back and give of their additional time. What seems to be the breakdown of people who are desirous of a full-time job, or are already working full-time, among the regular adjuncts fall and spring?

**Urbanski:** Do you mean in the Language Immersion Institute?

**Macaluso:** No, outside of there, just teaching the other courses.

**Urbanski:** We have a number of adjuncts who would like to teach more than they are allowed to teach now in the Foreign Language department. And the department would be better off being able to use these adjuncts to teach more courses, because we would then have to deal with less total numbers of adjuncts. It's very difficult here where we are to compete with other colleges like Vassar or Marist or Bard. They pay more. Vassar pays \$5,000 per course, I think. Is that true?

**Vanderlippe:** It depends on what the field is. It could be more.

**Urbanski:** So while I was chair, I was confronting that problem *a lot*. We were losing some of the best teachers, adjuncts, part-timers, because they were being paid much more by some of the neighboring colleges. So we're having a hard time attracting adjuncts, part-timers, to teach.

**Macaluso:** With that competition in mind, what seems to be the average stay of an adjunct in the Foreign Languages, and what is the turnover rate?

**Urbanski:** Well, we have some dedicated people who love teaching. I know adjuncts who have been teaching here for twenty years in Foreign Languages. Denise Springer, if you know her, had been here for twenty years and retired.

What is the percentage of—what was your question again?

**Macaluso:** The turnover rate. How much hiring do you do and how long do people stay?

**Urbanski:** We do a lot of hiring, especially in Spanish and French, and all the languages that we teach. A lot of turnover.

**Macaluso:** Every semester?

**Urbanski:** Yes.

**Macaluso:** Thank you.

**Ghedini:** However, Marist - I left Marist to come here after leaving public school. It doesn't pay more than here. Vassar definitely does, but Marist does not. I'm certainly not saying this is great here, don't get me wrong, but Vassar is much better. But then also at Vassar, you teach one semester—at least three years ago it was that way—you can't return the following semester. You have to wait at least a year. But Marist does not give health benefits.

**Urbanski:** No, but we want to look at Vassar and other colleges that pay more and bring those salaries up, so that we can not only retain, but get some of the best teachers that we need to run these programs and to continue the reputation that we have developed in foreign languages. We are one of the centers for the study of foreign languages in the Northeast, because of the reputation that we have developed in the Foreign Language department and the Language Immersion Institute. So, we need to pay these people who are contributing to that reputation a decent wage.

**VanderLippe:** Okay. Well, one more question, because we have another speaker who has to leave at twelve. So, Stella?

**Turk:** Your forty-year perspective is very interesting. You mentioned that you started out in '65 with thirty-five full-time faculty, and now you're down to twelve. How did this happen? I know how it *happened*—but how did this happen, and what's your take on it?

**Urbanski:** You know, in the 70s we had two retrenchments, and we lost faculty, lost programs at that time. Whenever someone retires or leaves, the administration finds "more important" programs to support. During that period of time, we have created the departments of Engineering and Business and other areas where maybe the needs are considered by the administrators more urgent or more important than those in Foreign Languages, unfortunately.

For some reason, our administrators think that it's easy to find someone to teach a foreign language, because if you can speak the language, you can teach it. When I was chair, we had a Hebrew instructor who was teaching at New Paltz, Betsy Amaru. Then she was recruited by Vassar. I went to the Dean, and I said that we need a Hebrew instructor. He

then told me that – he said, “Well, isn’t there a faculty wife somewhere who can teach Hebrew?” So...

**Turk:** What year was that? (laughter)

**Urbanski:** That was in the early 80’s. And I told him that I know how to count, but I can’t teach mathematics courses. (laughter)

**Vanderlippe:** We did prove you don’t need any qualifications to be a dean! (laughter)  
Judy Dorney.

**Judith Dorney, Chair of Educational Studies:** Hi. There will be some similarities to what Henry said. I’m the chair of the Educational Studies Department in the School of Education. There are three different units in our department: the Humanistic/Multicultural Education program, the Special Education program and the Educational Foundations unit. The Special Education program and Humanistic/Multicultural Education program are graduate programs.

We have lost five-and-a-half faculty, or five full-time faculty and one half-time faculty, in the last four years. All of those courses have had to be covered by adjuncts or lecturers. We have three lecturers, who are teaching either a five-four or a four-four course load. So they’re not teaching a three-three. So, advocating, if you wanted to teach three-three to be a lecturer, would not do it on this campus, as far as I know. I think that’s quite an impressive load for our lecturers. We’ve argued to get it lowered, but four-four is the best we’ve been able to do. We have at this point, then, about thirteen full-time faculty and about twenty-five adjuncts; and the three lecturers. The five-and-a-half people that we’ve lost, or the five-and-a-half positions that we lost, have essentially meant that we’ve had to have thirty-four courses a year covered, in addition to what we had, by adjunct faculty or by lecturer lines.

I think that’s essentially what I want to say. But to close, I feel that this conversation, or this opportunity for conversation, with adjuncts and full-time faculty, is really important. I think it has to continue. Because otherwise, I fear there’s a great danger we will be pitted against each other. I think that has begun. Chairs were recently informed by the Provost that course caps would go up across campus. And the reason we were given, was that we had to find the money for the raise in adjunct pay somewhere. And they didn’t want to cut full-time searches, and the administration didn’t want to cut sabbaticals. So the way they felt they could make up the money was to increase the class sizes, and consequently cut down on the number of courses, and consequently cut down on the number of adjuncts. So that doesn’t necessarily sit well with everyone, to have their class sizes raised. If that kind of thing can continue, I think we need to see this as a unified effort. I think it was Buzz that asked: is the hiring of more adjuncts an effort to keep down the hiring of full-time people? I don’t know, but certainly that’s what’s happening. So.... Richard?

**Kelder:** You had lost five positions, you mentioned?

**Dorney:** Five full-time and one halftime.

**Kelder:** And people—there are people who have gone on to other things, I mean...

**Dorney:** Yes.

**Kelder:** Right. But were those lines restored?

**Dorney:** No! In one, in the Humanistic/Multicultural Education program, there are a *hundred* graduate students and one full-time faculty member. All the rest of the courses being taught by Terry Murray—who is in the lecturer position there, with a four-four load and advising fifty students—and adjuncts.

**Unidentified:** Wait till NCATE comes!

**Dorney:** Pardon?

**Unidentified:** Wait till NCATE comes!

**Dorney:** Right. —Yes?

**Mohns:** I don't know if you can answer this, or if anyone here can. I know in the Art Department, one of the limits to class size is fire safety code. They look at the classroom size and they say: only eighteen people can be in this room safely. That doesn't impact anyone else? I mean, it would seem, how can they go around that, if that is how the class size limit is determined?

**Dorney:** Well, I don't know if my answer will be an adequate one, but they will place people in classrooms that can house those numbers.

**Mohns:** Okay.

**Crane:** I just think you mentioned something very important. It's that this trap that's been set, by which—pitting full-timer interests against part-time interests. It's a very dangerous one, and I don't think any of one us should fall into it. That said, there are problems. Some of them are with our own union, which in effect represents both management and labor, to the extent that faculty become management for adjuncts. So this is one of the reasons the AFA exists, but certainly not to exist in an antagonistic relationship with full-time interests. We're all in it together, but our adjunct problems are different.

**Vanderlippe:** Are there any other questions or thoughts generated by Henry Urbanski's comments?

**Kelder:** Over the years, Henry, as the numbers decreased, the decisions not to replace the lines—I mean, given the fact that there are demographics and foreign language is still an important subject, as far as I am concerned, and I'm sure is as far as you're concerned, was this decision in any way, to your knowledge, based on the fact that—I think you alluded to this—that there may have been other priorities with other presidents over the period of time, putting aside retrenchment?

**Urbanski:** Oh yes, definitely! The problem is that when a line becomes available in *any* department, it goes to a pool, a central pool. The department really doesn't have the right to keep that line. So whenever people retired or left or were retrenched, these lines slowly disappeared. And that's where we are now.

**Kelder:** So would you actually talk—do you think that the School of Engineering was created, that the creation of some lines may have been moved, you know, to other places with other priorities at that point?

**Urbanski:** I have no evidence of that, but... You know, the pie really didn't grow bigger. It was taken from somewhere.

**VanderLippe:** One thing—I have to flip the tape here. Don't say anything! (laughter) Corinne Nyquist, you had a question?

**Corinne Nyquist, Library:** I wanted to ask, I guess, Peter. Has the Budget, Goals and Plans Committee determined whether or not the percentage of money going for faculty salaries, full- and part-time, out of the total budget, has increased over the years, decreased, stayed the same, from 1965 to today?

**Brown:** We haven't made that comparison. The off-the-top-of-my-head response would be it's been roughly the same, but we haven't really run the data.

**Vanderlippe:** Okay, we'll move on in just a second. There are a couple of things that come to my mind here, and I wanted to ask if anybody knows about this. Does anybody know of any surveys or studies that have been done regarding adjunct, part-time, contingent faculty, just as a matter of getting information about how many are in each department?

**Karasik:** We did, AFA did do a survey, and I was going to present a few points from from that survey.

**Vanderlippe:** Okay, okay, great! Then if you could send us something that you could also post... [is handed a copy]. Oh, fabulous, okay! Alright. Okay, thank you very much. So, let's see, I show our next person as Ed Felton.

**Ed Felton, Art:** Greetings everyone. My name is Ed Felton. I disagree with Judith only on one point, and that is that she and Stella were excellent speakers, off the cuff and all.

I teach Fine Woodworking and Wood Design in the Art Department. I'm the other Co-President of AFA, and I'm the Interim Chair of our UUP's Part-Time Concerns Committee. I've been here for five years.

The UUP Part-Time Concerns Committee, early in my time here at SUNY New Paltz, was a real vigorous committee and had good activities around the statewide Campus Equity Week and such. But even then, we had a tough time finding people who, particularly part-timers, who would really commit time and be part of building a campaign, be a part of activities. And there was just a lot of exhaustion and a feeling that we were stuck.

So the emergence of the enthusiasm and the willingness to do concrete work and really build a campaign, that the formation of the AFA represents, was just this incredible surge, that showed results right away. I just came back—this past weekend was the UUP Delegate Assembly in Albany, and the increase in base pay for adjuncts at SUNY New Paltz was a huge victory reported to the statewide Part-Time Concerns Committee.

Our Chapter President spoke at the statewide Part-Time Concerns Committee meeting about that. And when someone asked: "How did you do it? How did you get that?"—both the increase from \$2,000 to \$2,400 per course, as well as that now base pay for adjuncts will go up across the board as a permanent increase, with each of the contractual increases. Great gains! Our Chapter President was asked: "How did you get that?" He said, "By asking." And they said, "Well, what do you mean, 'by asking'?"—"Well, by asking three hundred times. We raised the issue in every single labor-management meeting." That's true, that there is recognition of it as a priority and a commitment to raising it with administration every time they meet they meet with the administration. But what I think he left out is: What was the difference between that three-hundredth time and the other two hundred and ninety-nine?

And the difference was, largely due to the efforts of the AFA, that there was a campaign going on outside the doors of the labor-management meeting. The resolution passed by the faculty-staff assembly, the barrage of e-mails that we all remember that drew the support, vocally, of chairs and full-time faculty across the campus, was acknowledged, something different from these kinds of labor-management meetings in other settings.

Being an institution of higher education, it was interesting that the College Provost actually said, "We want to do something about this." They openly acknowledged the fact that the feeling of pressure, that there was a demand that this issue be addressed, was what actually pushed them to make that change to raise base pay.

We tried to encourage them in the Part-Time Committee labor-management meeting to communicate with the campus community. We said, "What would a budget look like that

included the increase to \$1,000 per credit? What difficult decisions would have to be made?” They went ahead and made the increase and the change in terms of how increases will be administered in the future. And that’s fantastic. But we would have liked to have actually had there be a dialogue in the campus community about it.

The issue of course-caps being raised just sort of came not only at the same time that the increase was awarded, but after the fact. There needs to be a more open dialogue about how these things are going to happen. I’m going to wrap up just by saying that I really want to address the question of what we do. What is that we *have* to do? And it really is to keep the campaign going. We need to press toward that \$3,000 mark. We recognize the fiscal constraints that exist. But you don’t ask for what you think is possible. You have to press further than that, and really keep the pressure on.

We need full-time faculty and all departments across campus to be understanding that we might do things that *some* faculty will consider irresponsible but, in fact, are beacons of professionalism. If we decide—and these are actions that haven’t even been taken—that we’re going to interrupt campus tours and say, “Hi, my name is Ed Felton. I’m an adjunct in the Art department. We’re in the midst of a campaign to raise standards for adjuncts.” It’s not irresponsible, it’s responsible. It goes along with educating students and parents about the realities that are being faced here. We’re expressing our *love* for the institution and the intent to raise its standards.

Things like that, which I’m sure would rub certain faculty the wrong way, we need full-time faculty who understand that we *have* to wage this campaign. We *have* to be pressing, keeping pressure, being publicly visible, getting press and such, in order to continue moving forward. We really need support to do that.

**VanderLippe:** Thank you. Any questions?

**Unidentified:** I’m [inaudible] from Sociology. We asked 300 times and we get one response, and the response we get is: a little bit. It said: Okay, we raised you thirty percent or whatever, twenty percent. Nothing! It’s just a little more than nothing! Now, are we supposed to keep asking?

I like these ideas that you have. But I also find, you know, when I walk around campus and I see stickers about “Equity for Adjuncts”? I kind of don’t like seeing them stuck on doors and things like that, because it kind of makes it ugly. But what else can we do? Like, is striking a possibility, or interrupting these tours? What do the full-timers think about this? Cause we need their support. Well, asking isn’t getting us things, we can ask 299 more times before we get any response. And that would be what, 2030?

**Felton:** Right, there was feedback on the stickers, and I don’t think we’re distributing them anymore. It resonated with me, the feeling people had. Its effectiveness, as a visibility, as a tactic wasn’t really worth the annoyance to other staff and faculty who had to remove them, and what certain people’s response to it might be.

There are a lot of activities. I certainly encourage adjuncts to join the AFA and to get involved in the UUP Part-Time Concerns Committee. We have, hopefully before the summer ends, another meeting with the administration. So we will continue to ask, but there *has* to be a campaign going on outside the door.

The Part-Time Concerns Committee intends to have an open meeting, really getting the word out across campus to pull people in, to come up with a campaign plan for next year. To really come up with concrete activities to educate students and parents about the presence of adjuncts, to celebrate the contribution they make, and to do things that serve the same purpose, but tip the scale into being actually action that's going to keep the pressure on the administration.

**Vanderlippe:** Steve?

**Macaluso:** Ed, I want to switch focus a little bit here. I'm glad to hear that you're describing AFA and this UUP committee as vigorous, as showing love for the institution. That really sounds like it's a good pool to draw on. I want to talk about that in terms of governance. One of the statements Jeff made from the AFA is about the incorporation of adjuncts into campus governance. Aside from greater visibility regarding the course cap and other issues of treatment of wages, what are the benefits of incorporating adjuncts, if at all, in a greater way into campus governance? And can the committees you're on achieve the same ends?

**Felton:** I think maybe Peter or others who were involved in actually taking concrete steps to make that happen could respond better along certain lines. I would say, you can look back in the 1950s and 1960s and you'll find that adjuncts were actually used in the idea of what adjunct means: extra faculty to cover courses when faculty leaves, to cover an area of specialization that's not covered by present full-time faculty. It's just no longer the case. They're *core* faculty. So, I think the benefit of incorporating their voice into the governance of the campus community is just a recognition of what adjuncts have become, as a *pillar* of the teaching faculty in the institution.

**Kelder:** Yes, I think it's dependent on how departments treat adjuncts, personally. You know, to whether or not adjunct voices are heard or what have you. Across the board there may be some differences in the departments. I was at the Delegate Assembly, too, last weekend, and we were in the same forum together. One of the things that Bill Scheuerman—you may have different opinions on this, but Bill Scheuerman did acknowledge that this year the full force of UUP will be on creating the Year of the Adjunct.

Now, what that means is dependent, I think, on the activities that people take. I think it's an opportune time for those with a political drive, such as AFA, to really use a UUP, use the political power of UUP in a statewide forum where everyone can win. Where there's going to be activity on all kinds of political forums and agendas and legislative agendas. If you ride that wave, so to speak, and try to take advantage statewide of the UUP effort, I think we all could benefit from that. But, that's my opinion...

**Felton:** Yes, I'm committed to really focusing on using the utility of the union committee for those reasons. Bill Scheuerman, the statewide President of UUP, acknowledged that. He said, he's been hearing in Delegate Assemblies over the last several years from a lot of Part-Timers Committees. They feel that the UUP has fallen short, hasn't really done what needs to be done statewide to wage the campaign, to address the issue of over-reliance on adjuncts. He said, "We've rested on our laurels." Yes, we have one of the best benefit packages for adjuncts in the country...

**Kelder:** That's right!

**Felton:** ...but you can't live on benefits alone. He openly said, "We have fallen short. We need to recommit to..."

**Kelder:** Exactly!

**Felton:** "...basic issues like compensation statewide." And on the legislative level, too, that was a big part of his commitment.

**Ghedini:** I just want to add a little something in addition to the action taken. I wanted to commend Peter Brown, because he's had a few letters published in the Poughkeepsie Journal and elsewhere. That could be a form of action, as well, making aware.

**Felton:** Yes, we need to always juxtapose the grandeur of the institution with the reality of adjuncts. The College President is out, and justifiably so—it's important to let the region know of the importance of SUNY as an institution, as the largest employer in the county, other than the county itself. But, I'm not being facetious when I say this, the administration—we see the evidence of their work. They are *exemplary* professionals. They get money to advance this institution, whether it be building renovations or new construction. We can't be restricted by our feeling that there is a fiscal crisis, and that even if we fight we're not going to get anything. We just need to press on with the campaign for adjuncts, knowing that if the pressure is on, they will find a way to make it happen.

**Kelder:** That's right!

**VanderLippe:** How about one more question? So, Jeff, I saw your hand.

**Crane:** Not so much a question, but a way of addressing the question: what can we do? In response to what Richard was saying about—which I didn't know—that Scheuerman had said that next year will be the Year of the Adjunct, which we at AFA had been asking him to do. One of the things that has come up in the AFA meetings, and it's thanks mostly to Peter's research, is the simple fact there is X amount of money, and it must be distributed one way or the other.

And also examples from other states, where adjuncts have pushed for statewide legislation, calling for equity, basically: equal pay for equal work. This would be a mandate, something not unlike, I think, what happened with the New York City schools recently. So, using the power of the UUP to push for statewide legislation SUNY-wide, that would mandate paying adjuncts equitably. So that's probably, I think, where we really need to focus AFA's energies.

**Vanderlippe:** Okay, thank you. Thank you, Ed. Let's see here, I have number seven, Jan Hammond.

**Jan Hammond, Chair of Educational Administration:** Hi. I'm Jan Hammond, the chair of Ed Admin, and it's always great to go at this time, because everybody has already said everything!

First of all, it's been great to see the groundswell that's been happening, and being part of it. I think, the fact that there are so many people here, at this time, at the end of the semester, and hearing the stories, is a way to keep all of us connected in a positive way and see how we can go forward in this. I applaud everybody for being here.

I'm going to just walk you through some of the points, just to tell you my story of what I see from being a Chair. Then, perhaps through these stories, someone is going to figure out what the thread is and weave it correctly. In our particular department, we have five programs. Going back to how Judy Dorney had mentioned that originally we had six faculty members, we've actually added a faculty member. We've actually added a program. We're now three full-time faculty, and one faculty who is two-thirds in our department and one-third in the School of Education; and then one faculty member has a part-time lecturer position. I feel very strongly that our Dean has done what he could do with the numbers he has in front of him, to try to go forward with that, to try to support our department. But it's certainly...as a Chair, it leaves you with a lot left on your plate.

We have a list of approximately twenty adjunct faculty that we use on a frequent basis, approximately eight to ten of them I will use in one semester. It's been difficult for us, because we have gone through this process that you've probably heard of called NCATE. And for any of you who've been accredited, it's important. Our department has been written up on the NCATE website as exemplary. So we did a little bit of magic, I guess, behind the scenes. One of the things we did do is: the core courses were so important, and because our students are now going to have to, when they graduate, for Ed Admin, are going to have to now take a state test. So, we've been very careful not to allow the adjuncts to teach the core courses *without* being seriously trained before they are allowed to teach them. Which is different than how it was previously.

What that means to my time is that I'm often sitting down with adjuncts and actually training them, now allowing them to teach the courses that we've held so closely to our vest, to make sure, but out of necessity, to be able to accommodate all the areas that we cover. We actually had cohorts in Sullivan County; on campus, of course, we work, as well as in Rockland and in White Plains. And then we have off-site campuses in

Orange/Ulster BOCES and in Kingston Business, and then also in Middletown. So we're kind of out there in many areas, and it's impossible for our [full-time] faculty to get in all those particular places.

With the adjunct faculty out there, what I think that it's important to realize is that there are some quiet costs behind the scenes that we need to be aware of. Because *my* time, where I could have been doing perhaps PR or some other quality things, I'm actually training faculty. So I think that's one piece.

The other piece, which I think you might find very interesting, to say the least: my adjunct faculty care very much about that one piece called health insurance. They're willing to do anything, as long as they can get in that health insurance mode. And I say that we need to be understanding of that. Because, if I understand this right, if I hire them for two semesters, and I continually do that for ten years, my question would be: Does that allow them to have retirement, if ever? Or would it be four years? How long do they have to work—twenty years?—for them to get permanent health insurance? And then could that be a possibility, and could that be an extra cost to our organization? So somebody should be working out those numbers.

My adjunct faculty are typically superintendents of schools, district superintendents, all of whom easily make *well* over \$100,000 a year. Many of them make over \$200,000 a year. I have attorneys who also work for us, school attorneys, and they're probably double that amount. So when you say, "Congratulations, you got an increase from \$2,000 to \$2,400," that is not typically what's making them say, "Wow!" So I may be a little bit more pulled away from what your concerns are.

What they do appreciate, because they work for SED, for the State Education Department, which puts them really into the same retirement we that have. They're very thrilled at the fact that that \$2,400, or double that amount if they teach a couple times during the year, goes on their final average salary. So consequently, I have a lot of superintendents who are calling *me*, asking me, because for them it's an amount of money that's going to stay with them as they retire. They'll get a certain percentage of that. So that's been a bonus for us.

The other thing: I always tell them is that this job is rest and recuperation. So, that becomes a time in their life, when it's for them to give back to the field. And they appreciate that. Certainly our students appreciate the diversity of perspective. They have the key people that are right there in the trenches doing the work. And, typically, we have people who are hired right out of our classrooms, because it's a superintendent of schools teaching, saying: "I want you." And they get the first line in the pick, since they're out recruiting for their own school district. So, they're happy to also be there. These are the perks for them.

**VanderLippe:** Can I ask you to make just one final point? Time for questions.

**Hammond:** Sure. The last thing I want to bring to you is what was asked of me also, was on the curriculum piece of this. Do we, and how do we, include our adjuncts? Are they part of us? What do we do to make sure they're included in our group? We did do a survey, and we did include them in the process. It's *crucial* to have their information. So we have done quite a bit with them. And particularly, we seem to be very pleased with people who have been *retired* as school leaders. They have had the time to come in and really help shape our program and make sure that what we're doing *today* in fits what is needed in the field today and tomorrow.

**VanderLippe:** Thank you. Any questions for Jan? Corinne?

**Nyquist:** Why would school superintendents need health benefits?

**Hammond:** Need what?

**Brown:** Health benefits.

**Vanderlippe:** Why would school superintendents need health benefits?

**Hammond:** I was not referring to school superintendents as much at that particular moment. Good question. There are reasons why a school superintendent could want health insurance. It depends what is in their contract and how, if and when they retire, or if and when they leave their contract. They may find themselves in the position where they leave that school district, and they're not in a retirement mode yet. So they would be hanging out there. But I can tell you...I'm afraid if I say, it would be too much pointing to certain individuals. So, I'm going to talk to you privately. (laughter)

**VanderLippe:** Thanks, Jan. Okay, I have Yvonne Aspengren next.

**Aspengren:** I'm Yvonne Aspengren, and I teach German in the Foreign Language department. I've been an adjunct teaching two courses last semester, three courses every other semester for three years now. I am also serving as the Secretary of the Adjunct Faculty Association.

We have included also non-tenure track people, so lecturers are also really part of this whole group of provisional faculty. I wanted to maybe look at the survey a little bit, because a lot of questions have come up that our survey, that Russ [Karasik] developed and analyzed, could really address. Also, give a little bit of just a rundown of exactly what the AFA is, because not everybody really knows exactly who we are and what we're doing. And some of things, like the stickers maybe, or some of the articles that you've read, or letters to the editor are what stays in your mind. And I'll mention some of the main points; and maybe a personal note on what some of my concerns as an adjunct faculty are.

I think one thing that's interesting about the survey, which got a response of 75 people out of about 280 that we sent out. And if we say that 300 people are teaching as adjuncts, then it's about a 25% return, which is really good. It was well developed and a great survey. A lot of hard work went into it. I think the results maybe aren't real clear. They haven't been publicized to the extent that they should have been or should be now.

One of the things that we found was that it looks like about half the adjunct faculty has been teaching between three and nine years at SUNY. That answers: how long do adjuncts stay? Of course, from department to department, it's really different. About 64% of the people who answered *would* prefer to work full-time at this campus, leaving 36% not interested in anything more they already have. It seems like about 75% percent either have a doctorate or ABD or hold a terminal degree already. 75% already!

The other thing I thought was interesting, with the questions about: How satisfied and how dissatisfied are you on different aspects of your job? The question that got people most dissatisfied, of course, was salary. And then the second one was union representation: how satisfied are you with the union representation?

The AFA was formed at the end of October, when Peter Brown called for a meeting for all adjuncts to get together. A Provisional Steering Committee got together at the end of October, came up with this name, Adjunct Faculty Association, and started pretty much immediately trying to survey: who are we, answer those questions, and also establish some sort of structures for communications. So have a listserv. Jeff did a lot of press at that time. We had some radio interviews, newspaper articles.

We went up and met with Bill Scheuerman. He actually called us up pretty much *immediately*. Four of us went up to Albany and met with the UUP state President. We worked closely with the Part-Time Concerns Committee, with Ed Felton and with Larry Carr, sort of as a bridge between this "renegade" group and the UUP. We opened a bank account, created a charter, became official, defined our concerns after collecting the surveys and reading the results.

Then in April we had a membership drive. We are up to about 75 dues-paying members and friends. Most recently we also ran a slate for the UUP elections. We called it the Reform Slate. I don't think we got anybody on, but there will be a tie-off for one position. There's a problem with one of the positions, the VP for Academics. So there was a little bit of a change there. And it seems that our main concerns are: the base-salary, of course, the \$3,000 per course, \$1,000 per credit, continuing to press for that.

Looking at who we are and what kind of step positions maybe we could create: some kind of variation of positions within departments that would really reflect what we're doing, that would also *lead* to something. The lack of a future is a really big problem, the lack of job security from year to year. We need to address those concerns and also just to know who we are, and to have more structures in place, so that we can contact each other, so that we can organize. Because the group is so diverse, it's notoriously difficult to organize adjuncts on any campus.

Just from the stories that we've heard, it's a really different job from department to department and also within a department. I teach up to twenty-seven students in a language class. In a language class you need to give homework every single day, a couple of pages per person. They need to be practicing, they need support. You have to be developing new materials, making it relevant and personal. That takes a *lot* of time. And, on a personal note, one of the things that's difficult in this position for me is that the more work I put into it, the more satisfying it is—and the less I make. So the more I feel like a fool at the same time! That's it.

**VanderLippe:** Thank you. Any questions for Yvonne? Steve?

**Macaluso:** Similar to the governance questions that I asked before. I'm curious to know—certainly you're considering more organization, there are elections going on, should we expect the Adjunct Faculty Association to look like, let's say, the Professional Staff Caucus, where there are by-laws and where there are representatives to the rest of the faculty and to the administration?

**Aspengren:** Ideally, I think so. The problem is that there aren't enough of us. There is such a small core, that we can't stretch ourselves to that point. But, I think, ideally, as a goal. Do you want to say something?

**Crane:** I would just say, first we had a membership drive so that we have members. Then we have elections, and that's a priority for next semester, going forward, is to have elections. But, as Yvonne said, the problem is getting people to devote the time. A lot of people commute. I've commuted from New York City twice a week for the three years. A lot of people do that. So, getting people who are here and able to commit to do that, absolutely. We were voted into existence democratically, we operate democratically and we should do all that stuff.

**Macaluso:** We've certainly seen ads and flyers and things like that. But what are the means you use to communicate with each other to try and find other adjunct faculty, like-minded or otherwise?

**Aspengren:** We have been meeting every two weeks since October. We have our own listserv, and we've put stuff out. We talk to people within our departments. We don't have a structure of representatives in each department yet, but that's something we've talked about doing, too. We've put so much out, and it's hard to get enough back.

I think one of the effective things that we did in April were those tables that we had, because there was real time, and it wasn't electronic. People came by and had really interesting conversations with all of us at different times. That was really effective. We're having a party on Sunday, I don't know... (laughter)

**Crane:** To be more specific, also with the UUP slate that we ran, we put those slates in every single mailbox ourselves. Our membership drive, we sent that out via the adjuncts' listserv and went by hand and put them in mailboxes. So, it's really boots on the ground, as they say.

**Vanderlippe:** Thank you. Okay, let's see here. Gloria Ghedini is next.

**Ghedini:** I'm Gloria Ghedini. I teach two courses of Italian. I'm finishing my third year here. I'm a member also of AFA. So much has been said already, that I'm not going to repeat. I agree with almost everything. It's not that we want to be pitted against the full-timers or want to be in competition, that is not it. I just feel that I'm worth more than what I'm being paid. That's what I'm standing for.

In addition to the adjectives used, I'm also really saddened by the priorities that are not being given to education. We talk about the beautiful buildings, and when you think that our Interim Superintendent is getting \$340,000 a year, and that doesn't even include his housing. I'm thinking there's something really quite wrong here!

Something that not been mentioned: I attended a meeting where the Provost – Poskanzer attended, as well – and a number of the full-time faculty in all the languages were talking about how some of them have over *ninety* advisees. They said they really don't have the time, in addition to their teaching and, in some cases, research. I wonder if something could be arranged? I even spoke to one of the full-timers. Could maybe the adjuncts be helping out with this? Of, course, being paid working on it, because they're so tired. I have some students who come to me saying: we really don't get answers back, we need advice for something. I'm not there to be mentioning names. But over ninety, that's an awful lot! So this is also something that I don't have the answer to, but I wonder if it could be addressed, or if anybody has any answers or any thoughts about that. Yes?

**Unidentified:** If you talk to Ann Minnick, the Dean of Advising, she has asked a number of adjuncts to take on additional advising for pay - minimal, but not tons of advisees also. And I've taken that on two semesters, to see what it was like. And it seems manageable, although low pay. So that is something that one can explore within your own department.

**Ghedini:** Thanks.

**Vanderlippe:** Thank you. Let's see here, Russell Karasik.

**Karasik:** I just wanted to say a few things. Some of the things have been said in different ways. I'm Russell Karasik. I've been an adjunct here. Next fall I'll begin my seventeenth consecutive year teaching in the department of Psychology. During that time, I've worked for seven different department chairs and, starting next semester, I will have taught nine different courses here. I've tried to be extremely cooperative in what I teach. One of the things that, I think, needs to be said from my perspective is that I feel very

dedicated to New Paltz. I feel like I'm frequently an ambassador for the College. I love the students. I love teaching here. In a lot of ways, I consider it a privilege. I think I've seen the quality of students improve over the years. I receive a tremendous amount of personal satisfaction from what I do. I feel like it keeps me sharp in my field as a psychologist, and so it's very rewarding.

I'm also a member of AFA. Just because I feel that it is rewarding to teach here doesn't mean that every aspect of teaching here is satisfactory. There are certainly some problems. And I think that's why I became involved in AFA, because of those concerns. One of the things that I did participate in, as Yvonne mentioned, was the survey. I didn't know how many people would be here today, so I made just twenty copies, which isn't going to be enough, clearly. But I did at least want to submit at least one copy for the record. If people would like to have copies of the results, you're welcome to have that.

A few of the things that we found in the survey—and I'm not going to go over the whole thing—but there are just a couple of things that I thought are particularly interesting. Although some people have talked about adjuncts who have other full-time employment in their particular departments, the results of our survey, which I think are reasonably representative since there are 25% of the adjuncts responding, 79% of the people who are adjuncts do *not* have full-time employment in another location. For 19%, or 1 in 5, adjuncting here is their *only* employment. So it tells you that the income that they make here is very important to them. I think that that's often overlooked. I averaged out the overall average length of stay for an adjunct and, in our survey, the average stay is 5.6 years. So people do clearly have some commitment to the University, and they like to come back.

One of the big issues is the lack of *consistent* employment. Notice in the survey, 52% of the people responding in the survey say that they are dependent, either for themselves or for their family, on the health insurance. One of the tremendous difficulties is that if in one semester you are asked to teach three courses, you are then eligible for health insurance; but if in the following semester you teach one course, you're not eligible for health insurance. This presents an enormous difficulty for those people. And in one of our meetings—I don't remember who said it, I don't remember if it was someone who is here today—they mentioned that, "If my son breaks his arm, it better be on a semester when I'm teaching two courses!" That really struck a point with me, because it's a huge issue.

Another issue that is dear to me: I am a dual State employee. I work full-time for another State agency. According to our survey, 14% of the adjuncts are in that position. There are certain unique aspects of that, which are problematic. For one, we are not allowed to be members of the union, of UUP, because we are members of other unions, and you cannot be a dual union member. So, 14% of us are prevented from full participation and representation.

What that also means is that those 14%, like myself, since we are not covered by UUP, are not entitled to *any* of the contractual increases that are offered to other adjuncts automatically. So, I've found myself, over my sixteen, seventeen years here...I have to

go in and individually argue for the raises that everybody else got. Sometimes I've been successful, sometimes I haven't.

Over the years, and I guess in recognition of the fact that I have been here a long time, my salary had actually crept up a little bit, I guess through my vigorous assertion, and I actually was making \$798 a credit, when we started last semester. So, my raise is \$6 under the new contract. That's what the \$2,400 got me. How do I feel about that? I can understand that the desire to increase the base-salary to \$2,400 addressed an issue that department chairs were complaining about: we can't hire people to be adjuncts. So, raising it to \$2,400, they hoped, would make it a little easier for department chairs to be able to hire adjuncts.

But it ignored people like myself, with an average length of stay of 5.6 years. It really ignored *huge* numbers of other adjuncts who have been here, and really, it's kind of a slap in the face! When I think that I've been here as long as I have, and now my salary is the same as if I just walked in the door—I'm not happy about it, I think it's an insult! I would hope that in my time here that I have picked up at least a little expertise in seventeen years, that makes me maybe worth a little bit more than a first-time teacher.

The other thing is: for many of us who've taught a lot of different courses, some *recognition* for that, some flexibility. I think we each know that every time you take on the responsibility to teach a new course, it's an *enormous* amount of work. I know that a lot of faculty resist taking on lots of new courses, because of how much work is involved in doing it. So, I think there needs to be some recognition of the effort that's put in. If I counted my salary here, my pay rate in terms of the hours that I put in, I think each of us would probably discover that we'd do just as well at McDonald's or some place like that, because you put in an enormous amount of time. So those are most of my points.

The only other thing that I'd like to mention by comparison, since I do work for another State agency, and I look at people with degrees similar to what adjuncts here have—many have Master's degrees and Ph.D.s—in my agency someone with a Master's degree in psychology earns between \$54,000 and \$74,000 a year. With a Ph.D. in psychology, it could range from \$54,000 to about \$100,000 a year. People with Bachelor's degrees earn around \$40,000 to \$52,000 a year. So when you look at that in terms of—and they're another State agency—in terms of what the University as a State agency is reimbursing us, it's *really unacceptable*. That's all I have to say.

**VanderLippe:** Thank you, Russell. Any questions?

**Felton:** Just on the question of UUP membership. You had raised that once before. I inquired about it, and according to the UUP, all you need to do is fill out a card and you would become a member. If there is some legal mechanism preventing it, it's *certainly* not imposed by the union.

**Karasik:** There *is*. It's imposed by the State of New York, that prevents it. You're not allowed to be a member of two bargaining units.

**Felton:** I wonder how they enforce that? Because if, in fact, if you did fill out a card, you would be regarded by UUP as a member, and you would be able to vote in elections, etc.

**Karasik:** You may allow me to vote in your elections, but when they're sitting up in Payroll, calculating salaries or raises, I'm not entitled to them.

**Felton:** That's the other thing I wanted to point out. As an agency fee payer, whether you can't become a member or you just choose not to, UUP cannot *not* represent you. You're entitled to every single term of the contract. Adjunct pay itself is determined by the administration. It's not part of the contract.

**Russell:** All I can say is this, that I have had numerous conversations with Glenn McNitt on this subject. The resolution was that: no, I could not. So, if there's some way to do it, I'd love to know that. But this has been an issue for *all* seventeen years that I've been here.

**Vanderlippe:** Jan?

**Hammond:** I just want to bring up one point, which kind of piggy-backs on this theme. When we hire people who are in a State organization or somehow already connected to the State, recent legislation that has come out has stated, once you retire... Supposing you wanted to come here now full-time, from that organization, from that unit... It used to be that you could get a waiver. Now they're making it much more difficult. If you had worked for a State agency, and then you got on top of it paid by our public institution, those people are now being *not* afforded a waiver form. This is something to look into, because I think that's important. Versus: if you retire from a State agency, and you walk over to Marist, and you work full-time, no problem.

**Karasik:** That's not an issue in my agency, because we're so short-staffed. We have a lot of people who retire and then come back to work part-time. They will not allow you to work full-time, but they will allow you to work. There's a limit, there's a cap. After you retire, I think you're allowed to earn up to \$32,000 a year.

**Hammond:** Given what you have said, having a full-time job, why would you come here to work?

**Karasik:** Excuse me?

**Hammond:** Why would you take a job at SUNY New Paltz, given what you have said, having a full-time position and working under these conditions?

**Russell:** Because, I think... My opening statement was the key part. I *love* to teach here. I feel like I derive a lot of personal benefit from doing it. I really enjoy it, and that's why

I do it. But that still doesn't mean that I don't want to be treated fairly, which I don't think I have been. It's the administration that's not treating me fairly, but I feel very committed to the students, and so that's why I do it. Yes?

**Melissa Signor, Psychology:** Hi, I just wanted to kind of add on and address your question, too. I have been an adjunct here in the Psychology department for eighteen years. I have taught two courses every semester for eighteen years, until this last year, because I was looking into a business venture on the side. I work full-time. I'm employed by a private school for special-needs children. I took that job, and I've been there seventeen years with the anticipation of finishing my dissertation and coming in here with a Ph.D. and, hopefully, being hired. Life events happened, things happened, I didn't get that dissertation done. So, I have been here, as Dr. Karasik has been for all these years, filling positions, filling spots that were helpful.

I'm here because I *love* this school! I finished my undergraduate degree here. I have strong respect for the Psychology department and the full-time faculty there, the people who taught me, who mentored me. And I have a strong commitment to the students here. I believe my full-time position in the field of developmental disabilities, my expertise in developmental psychology, has contributed significantly to what I bring to the students. And I *love* teaching! I would be here, you know... I'm looking for a full-time teaching position right now, somewhere, anywhere, because I love teaching. I make a decent salary at my full-time job, but my passion is teaching. I *love* teaching, I *love* connecting with students, I *love* empowering them and seeing them move forward.

It would really be wonderful to be compensated and then have the opportunity to do that full-time. I think when Henry Urbanski was speaking about the richness and quality of experience that adjuncts can bring to the campus... The real world experience is something that perhaps is not valued as much sometimes as research. Or being good teachers, connecting with students, impacting their lives, not only in helping them reach a degree, but mentoring them, guiding them. I don't know that it's always held up or valued as much.

It would be nice to see that opportunity for people like myself, who really could give a lot in a full-time position. We are here because we love it, because we love the students. I love this institution. I've taught at Marist, I've taught at Fordham University in the City, and this is home to me. I think a lot of people feel that way, and that's why we stay.

**Vanderlippe:** Thank you.

**Brown:** I think we have two people left on our lists, and we'll go on as long as people want to talk. So, we'll run on a little past one o'clock.

**Vanderlippe:** Amy is our next person.

**Brown:** And then Terry Murray.

**VanderLippe:** Okay, Amy Kesselman.

**Amy Kesselman, Women's Studies:** Hi, I'm Amy Kesselman from the Women's Studies program. I'm the *one* full-time faculty member in the Woman's Studies program. I came here in 1981. Before that I pieced together a living as an adjunct, by teaching in three different colleges in the Portland, Oregon, area. Because there was a cap on how many credits one could teach, I had to go across the city several times. I have been full-time since 1981.

Our program has grown enormously in the last twenty years, from three majors to around sixty. We serve about a thousand students a semester. We offer courses from the Woman's Studies program, and we also cross-list courses that are taught out of departments. Of the Woman's Studies-based courses, two-thirds of them are taught by adjunct instructors. They are, like many of the people who have spoken here, very dedicated people, who love their work and love the students, and have made our program what it is. It is a very strong and vigorous and lively program. We couldn't run our program *at all* without our part-timers. They develop new courses, they teach writing-intensive courses, they teach General Education courses, they spend many hours meeting with students. We have tried in various ways to get recognition or compensation for the extra work that they do. We have never been successful.

One of the most distressing things to me are the scheduling changes that have occurred in the last couple of years. They have had a *very* negative effect on our adjuncts. I'll give you one example. Our core course, "Women: Images and Reality," is the introduction to Woman's Studies, is a core course for our majors and minors, and it's also a General Education course. Four to five of the six sections are usually taught by part-timers. We have, for about twenty years, taught this course twice a week, two hours a crack. In the last couple of years, the administration has insisted on changing that to three times a week. When we said that that could mean losing a couple of our most dedicated part-timers, they said, "Find others, there are many part-timers out there." To me, that epitomized the lack of respect and exploitative treatment of adjuncts, which I hope is going to come to an end, now that there is organizing.

I want to say just one other thing about an issue that has come up a couple of times in this discussion, which is the relationship between the interests of full-timers and part-timers. As Judi said, it's very important for us not to allow ourselves to be pitted against each other. Since I study the history of working women, I want to just say that the same kinds of issues have always occurred in the history of the labor movement. When women started to organize, male workers said: these women will threaten *our* positions. But many people have made the argument that *all* workers are served by raising the wages and improving the working conditions of *all* groups of workers. Everybody is pulled down when there is an exploited class of workers.

We need to challenge this hydraulic view of the budget, that if we improve the compensation of part-timers, that will mean that there won't be as many full-timers. In fact, the opposite is true. If we stop depending on an exploited class of part-timers,

therefore they will be less appealing as exploited workers and more full-time positions will get created. So it's important for us to see our interests as closely connected. That's it.

**Vanderlippe:** Okay. Any questions for Amy? Steve.

**Macaluso:** I have a question about... You mentioned two-thirds, fully, of the classes are taught by part-timers. We've heard a lot of statements alluding to the idea that part-time faculty are doing *more* than just the classroom work. They are, of course, doing paper grading and things on the side, perhaps they're doing departmental things, perhaps they're doing some advising. Is there sort of a core, or how do you involve the part-timers? Or do they want to be involved in steering the Woman's Studies program? Or is it just whatever one-third that's left that does this?

**Kesselman:** I think there's a problem, because we want to involve part-timers. On the other hand, I am hesitant to ask of people who are paid as little as part-timers are paid to do more work in the program. There's a line between dedication and exploitation. We don't require anybody to participate in governance, but we certainly ask, and are delighted when part-timers serve on our cCurriculum, Personnel Committees and our Steering Committee, and some of them do.

**Impola:** In terms of something you said about the common interests of part-time and full-time faculty. Because part-time faculty, a lot of people, are here and there, they're not present on campus throughout, they're very disenfranchised on the campus, as a whole. As the number of them increases, that kind of dilutes the overall effectiveness of the faculty as a bloc.

**Kesselman:** Absolutely!

**Impola:** It weakens faculty as a voice in campus affairs, basically. It's going against the trend, especially with public universities, it's going against the trend which would essentially like to see campuses where virtually *everyone* is an adjunct, where it's some kind of pseudo free-market model, where everybody negotiates their own interests separately and the bottom line wins, basically. That's what it's going against.

**Kesselman:** Right, I absolutely agree. And it has meant there are more and more, a larger and larger body of voiceless faculty. Any other questions?

**VanderLippe:** My understanding is that in Florida, actually, they have created some new campuses that have no tenured or tenure-track faculty at all. And I think there's another one where basically *all* of them are part-time people. Don't quote me on that, because I don't know which ones they are.

**Kesselman:** It would be interesting to...

**VanderLippe:** I have another question about the two-day a week versus the three-day a week: is that from the Dean's office or the Provost's office?

**Kesselman:** I'm not sure...I think it's the Dean's office. No, Dan says it's the Provost.

**Vanderlippe:** It's the Provost? Okay.

**Kesselman:** Thank you.

**Mohns:** Just by comparison: SUNY Purchase, about an hour down the road, they pay adjuncts, within the SUNY system, between \$4,000 and \$5,000 per course, for a *one-day* commitment. They teach their studio classes six hours in just one shot. So part of the problem is there's a lot of inequity even between SUNY's. If we could work as adjuncts all over the State to better the situation... If you follow the administration's line that so many people have full-time jobs outside of this, you'd think they'd create an environment that is conducive for people to adjunct. But they haven't necessarily.

**Vanderlippe:** Okay, thank you very much, Amy. One more speaker, Terry Murray.

**Terry Murray, Educational Studies:** Thanks for hanging in there. I didn't come today intending to talk, but as I realized my own experience with this issue and hearing people talk, I realized that I really needed to. It's good to know there are some other people who have been around a long time as adjuncts, too.

I've taught as an adjunct for thirteen years, but I've also done two years of leave-replacement. I'm in my third year of a temporary lecturer position in our program. While I've been in that, I did manage to finish my doctorate. So I've got that going despite a four-four load that they had me teaching this year.

And I thought back: why? A lot of you have asked, why teach as an adjunct, especially that long? Initially, it was entrée to teaching. I was intrigued with college-level teaching, and it was a great way to break into that. I'd come out of a public school teaching and YMCA camping background and wanted to make that transition. Then when I left the Y, for about ten years, I was self-employed. I did training and consulting. The adjunct work was a nice complement to that. There was a credibility that came with being part of a college. But I also realized that I was subsidizing that part of my work, that the other work had to make up for what I wasn't making as an adjunct. So there's a price for me, but also a price for my family, given the time I was putting in working, I wasn't making what I needed to be making to help me keep the family going.

More recently, as I worked toward my doctorate, I had this hope that I was on a track that I could get out of that adjunct cycle; that I would be able to, as lines opened up, be competitive and ready to apply for those. The freeze on hiring a few years ago really hurt that. Judy [Dorney] referred to our department. We're a two-and-a-half line department,

we're down a line-and-a-half. As those two people left, neither of them were replaced. I'm covering one of those lines on a temporary basis.

I stayed there, like many of you, because I'm: A) committed to the program, the Humanistic/Multicultural Education program is really unique, and I believe in it really strongly. Also, I did my undergraduate work here and my graduate work here. I really have strong ties to New Paltz.

I also recognize, given all the things I've done in my life, I'm a teacher. That's what I do best, that's what I love, and that's where my passion is. And I'm realizing that part of the dichotomy here is, I think that administrative systems take advantage of that. They take advantage and they equate the love of wanting to do something and needing to do it; and therefore you're willing to do it at any price; that you don't need to get compensated for doing that. Like many of you, I recognize the costs of this. I realize, because I'm kind of straddling a fence, as a lecturer in a small program, I've taken on a lot of the responsibilities of a full-time, tenure-track faculty member.

As an adjunct, we've talked about the economic cost. A quick example that reinforces that: one of our adjuncts, who has been with us for six years, she's taught a course in our program, taught a course in Elementary Education, teaches courses at Dutchess, trying to cobble together a living. And she said, just a couple of weeks ago, that's she's going to have to go into public school teaching, because she can't afford to stay in this work. She can't make that breakthrough into full-time teaching.

I also am really sensitive to the professional identity, the impact on our own professional identity. If you're an adjunct for a time, you have to be pretty *tough*, tough-skinned, not to start to believe some of the things that become associated with being an adjunct. It's almost perceived as being a second-class citizen, whether it's meant to or not. That starts to rub off on you as an individual. You have to be pretty tough to stay and continue to be an effective teacher under those circumstances. Because you *do* start to feel consumable; that if you can't teach, "Well, you know, we'll find somebody, because there are plenty of people out there who want to work as adjuncts." It's a vicious cycle.

I also recognize, being on the other side of the fence, the impact on the full-time staff that's still here, that has to pick up the additional advising, the committee work, the scheduling, the programming. Two of us in our department, as Judy said, are managing a hundred students. We're each advising fifty students. The trade-off from a five-five load to a four-four load was that I was going to be doing the advising and some of the committee work. I also recognize how much harder it is for the full-time faculty that are *left* to work with all these adjuncts. You know, you're frustrated, you're embarrassed that you've got colleagues working alongside you, who are working as hard as you are and being compensated so little; but also, the coordinating, the training goes on, when you have an increase in the number of adjuncts.

I jotted down, before a couple of people had mentioned—I really believe that there's a wedge between full-time and adjunct faculty that should *not* be there, because both are

necessary. I think they're really complementary parts of the teaching faculty. As I've taught, my students have always appreciated the practical knowledge you bring when you've been out in field. If you're teaching full-time, you may not have that experience. My wife and I both work as adjuncts, she's a special ed teacher. You bring in the stories from the front lines. The students recognize that you know your stuff, that you know not only the theory, but you know what goes on day-to-day in their work setting. Part of the challenge for us is to work beyond, which can be a really conscious strategy to keep us separated as full-time and part-time faculty, and find that connection.

A lot of people have talked about the need for economic equity. I think there are some other things that are more in our control within our departments, and that is support and recognition. Yesterday, I was at the University of Albany for an Awards and Recognition Ceremony, put on by the School of Education. The *first* thing on the agenda: they recognized four part-time faculty. They've honored and recognized the great contributions of these folks as they come in.

I've been fortunate to be a part of a department and a program, where they've invited us to be a part of the decision-making, the planning, on a voluntary basis, and made us feel like we are included. There are things that we can do internally, while we're also working on these bigger issues, that will help make the life of adjuncts a lot more positive, and will be a win-win for the College and the individuals. Thanks.

**VanderLippe:** Okay. Any questions or comments? Glenn.

**Glenn Geher, Psychology:** I have a comment that piggy-backs on Terry's most recent point. I'm Glenn Geher. I'm a full-time member of the Psychology department. You talked a little bit about—in your particular department—adjuncts are somewhat empowered to be part of the decision-making. One of the things that I've seen, and I know I've e-mailed Peter Brown about this issue, is the degree to which adjuncts of included as members of the department seems to vary department by department.

You're Melissa, I'm assuming? Okay. Melissa and I have both taught alongside each other in the Psychology department for five years. This is the first time I've ever laid eyes on her. Russell is someone that I just happen to know, but I've never seen him at a department meeting. I've never seen his name on the website for the Psychology department. It seems to me that some departments do a better job of incorporating adjunct faculty as members of the department, and there are other departments where there seems to be something of a class system.

Peter Brown brought to the full faculty a motion to—it was generic in some ways, but it was ultimately to incorporate the adjunct faculty into the faculty as a whole, into the University, more so than is being done. I think it was unanimously approved, does that sound about right? That's something I'm personally interested in seeing happen. I would like to see the adjunct members be more accessible, be invited to department meetings. It almost seems like something at the University-wide level, that might be an initiative that the AFA could take on in conjunction with the motion that Peter put forward.

You all are doing an important job for us and for our students. I think the degree to which we know who you are, and that we're working together, and that you have the opportunity to contribute to the decision-making—you know, not forced to. I think that would be beneficial for everyone.

**VanderLippe:** Yes?

**Murray:** Just a point to piggy-back off of that. Those of us who have been here five, ten, fifteen and more years, most of us are not included in the campus directory. Now, I think that's certainly a slap in the face for adjuncts who have been here *every* single semester for over five, ten, fifteen years, that we're not even listed as part of this...in the phone directory. Some of us are now advising, and some people are *desperate* to get a hold of us. And they can't, because we don't *exist*. And I think that's something that needs to be addressed. Again, *including* people into the campus community—adjuncts and lecturers—would be a great help.

**Felton:** Along the lines of what you were suggesting: at first, the idea of inviting adjunct faculty to participate in governance like that, begs the question of compensation, if they're already spreading themselves thin. I don't think that that's a bad thing. I think it's a good thing, if the faculty and staff express the will that we want to incorporate adjuncts more fully into the institution. That's going to strengthen our case in terms of really focusing on the principle of equity and equal pay for equal work. If there is really an intent to have a more full integrated role for adjuncts, then that's going to make our case much stronger.

\*\*\*\*\*

[The digital recording ends here. The Forum continued for a few more minutes, which were not recorded. Total recording length is 2:14:24.]

Forum proceedings transcribed by Joseph Walker and Peter D.G. Brown

## Written Statements submitted to the Forum

### A. Elizabeth Brotheron, Chair, Art History

Reasons why the recently-set policy limiting adjuncts to only two courses per semester is damaging and counterproductive:

- 1) From students' point of view: limited to two courses, an adjunct instructor is more likely to find teaching jobs elsewhere to augment one's job at New Paltz. Staying on campus only as long as it takes to teach one's courses, the adjunct deprives

students of the contact time that one would be more able and likely to give them were one teaching all of one's courses at New Paltz;

- 2) From Dept. Chairs' point of view: forced to hire a different adjunct for every two adjunct-taught courses, Chairs expend a great deal of added time and energy that could be more productively used. This is especially harmful in departments such as Foreign Language and Math, which are dependent on a large number of adjuncts;
- 3) From adjuncts' point of view: unable to teach more than two courses on campus, adjunct instructors are forced to take multiple teaching jobs on different campuses, creating hectic schedules and often resulting in huge amounts of time, money, and energy given over to transportation and logistics;
- 4) From the College's point of view: unwilling to offer its adjunct instructors more than two courses per semester, the College squanders the opportunity to cultivate talented and loyal adjunct instructors who, feeling that they have some small stake in New Paltz, are more likely to see themselves as members of the community;
- 5) From the faculty's point of view: the alleged reason for the two-course policy, that an adjunct instructor teaching a three- or four-course load is teaching a full schedule and is therefore entitled to the same remuneration as is regular faculty, is offensive to full-time faculty members, whose full-time job is far from exhausted by a three- or four-course load. Adjuncts normally do not advise students, or do transfer advising; they rarely attend Department meetings; they do not have to serve on School or Central committees; and their research and publications do not play defining roles in their position here. They do not have to be Department Chairs, or take on other administrative duties and miscellaneous obligations that fall to regular faculty members. However many courses an adjunct instructor teaches in one semester, his job cannot be likened to that of a permanently-appointed faculty member.

The ultimate objective, to lessen the number of courses taught by adjuncts, is admirable; but the present policy increases the number of adjuncts on campus while diminishing their effectiveness as College employees. As long as we hire adjuncts we need to make the most of what they can contribute to the College.

Elizabeth Brotherton  
Chair, Department of Art History  
SUNY, New Paltz

## **B. Vinnie Martucci, Music**

My name is Vinnie Martucci, and I am a full time lecturer in the Music department. I want to congratulate this committee and all of you for gathering to discuss the adjunct issue at SUNY. This is an employment situation that has needed an open and full discussion for years; and for many adjuncts, who have been caught in the adjunct employment cycle for years, it can be a frustrating, financially risky cycle that continues; often with no end in sight.

I began teaching at New Paltz in 1990 as an applied Jazz piano teacher and continued as an adjunct for 14 years before becoming full-time. My experience at the College has always been very rewarding in terms of my interactions with colleagues and students. From my perspective, the Music department has always had a need for adjuncts, especially in the applied instrument studies area. There is just no other way to provide music students the option to study the wide range of instruments that any accredited music program ought to be offering. Adjuncts are important because they provide this diversity, and it is foolish to think that full time faculty would be able to teach every instrument needed if there were no adjuncts. This may not be true of some other departments, so any policy discussion on the future of adjuncts has to take into account that some departments historically have always needed to employ adjuncts—and fiscal considerations aside, always will.

What's at issue here is that a policy implemented at SUNY decades ago to fill in teaching gaps here and there has turned into an easy solution for SUNY and the State of New York to pay out less and less in salary, benefits, and professional commitments to an increasingly larger proportion of its faculty. This proportion of employed faculty has become so large that the University has become a very distinct 2 caste system. One with security, advancement options, higher salary and benefits; the other with no security, limited advancement options, and benefits. Adjunct status is a form of indentured servitude in every sense of the term, and like any economic system dependent on indentured labor; it is going to be a tough struggle for SUNY and the State to relinquish the free ride it has been getting from its adjunct employees. The differences between tenured and adjunct faculty are reinforced in many ways:

1) Adjunct contracts are generally renewed on a yearly basis. In my case, I never considered relying on anything SUNY had to offer me either financially, or in terms of benefits, because I was never certain my employment status would continue year to year. This was a particular nightmare with health insurance that would keep turning off and on from semester to semester. The result was that I was never able to seriously consider the retirement system each year when I renewed my contract. I lost my one-time opportunity to become vested in the system because a) I was never sure I would be around next year and b) the pay was so low I needed to see as much of my paycheck as possible. This cycle repeated itself 14 times in my case.

2) The pay scale relative to full-time faculty is atrocious. I consider myself a good teacher. I am highly regarded by my students and I love being in class. But, during the 14 years I was an adjunct, the minute I stepped off campus I was off into other worlds professionally—and needed to be. Don't misunderstand me—during this time I was very

happy to be touring and performing internationally and I made most of my income outside of SUNY. The point is that SUNY paid so little, I could only reasonably offer the University so much of my valuable time. I feel the pay scale forces adjuncts to be careful with their commitments to the University. It doesn't work out that teaching 3 courses is better than 2 if that forces an adjunct to give up a much better pay check elsewhere-- ultimately I think the students feel this effect the most with limited contact hours with some faculty members.

3) There is no path to job security at SUNY New Paltz for most adjuncts. This dead end is built into the system and federally mandated. If an adjunct employee demonstrates their value to their department, and the department wants to hire that adjunct—then a line must be approved. This is a process in itself, and can take years. Once that is done, a full search must be completed for the best candidate, raising the risk to the adjunct of not getting the job. In my case I was employed at New Paltz for 14 years when a line opened up in my department. I was qualified for the position and eventually got the job. I challenge tenured faculty to consider how it would feel to go back into the pool of all available candidates when applying for a major promotion—even though your qualifications are well known. While it is prudent and fair for the university to search for the best candidate—the result for adjuncts is that no matter how accomplished you may be—the university's commitment to you is legally mandated to be finished at the moment a line is opened for which you have demonstrated excellent qualifications and service. In my discussions with adjunct colleagues the solution most often has been to leave SUNY and apply for positions elsewhere—in the case of qualified candidates, SUNY loses out. I consider myself very fortunate to have made it through this process here at New Paltz.

There are many more issues than this, but I think it is most important to address what all this means to education. It is my observation that the key issue for the University is not to assess the impact that a reliance on adjuncts has on education, but rather to assess the impact this particular institutional style of adjunct employment has on education. Faculty with low pay, minimal commitments from the SUNY system, and short-term contracts do not make a department a vibrant and exciting place to work. Every one is too busy scrambling to keep their lives together in this kind of environment. Colleagues are going to come and go. Important decisions on the future of education, curriculum offerings and direction are going to be made by fewer and fewer tenured professionals. The robust exchange of ideas will narrow as fewer permanent faculty engage in these issues. Is this the face we want to show to young people aspiring to get the best education? Is this what colleges and universities are doing in Europe, India, and China?

There's a bumper sticker I see on a student's car every day I come to teach, and it makes me stop and think every time I see it. It says "Everyone does better when everyone does better". As an institution, SUNY needs to change direction in its adjunct policies. Instead of hiring adjuncts for fiscal expediency, SUNY needs to make sure its departments are adequately staffed with full-time faculty, and employ adjuncts where needed to add to the diversity of a department's offerings. Hiring adjuncts for fiscal expediency is a course of action that will, by its very nature, lead to abuse. Adjunct positions should offer opportunities for career advancement, pay and benefit parity. This can be translated into

the idea that the University should offer respect to all faculty members. When we do that, we will be one step closer to everyone doing better.

I am thrilled to see this discussion moving forward, and again I want to relay my best wishes to the committee for initiating this process. Thank you for the opportunity to present my thoughts.

Vinnie Martucci  
Music Department