



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

October 30, 2009

The Honorable Norman H. Conway
Chairman, House Appropriations
Committee
130 Lowe House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

The Honorable Ulysses Currie
Chairman, Senate Budget &
Taxation Committee
3 West, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Chairman Conway and Chairman Currie:

Language on pages 167 and 168 (R75T) of the 2009 Joint Chairmen's Report requires the University System of Maryland (USM) to submit a report on the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty in Maryland State institutions of higher education on November 1, 2009. The Joint Chairman's Report required the USM to convene a workgroup to examine the economic status and conditions of work for graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, their educational role and contributions, and efforts made to date to improve and strengthen their status. Based upon the Workgroup's findings, the report was to include a discussion of options to make further improvements, including shared governance and collective bargaining, as well as any appropriate recommendations. The enclosed report provides the Workgroup's resulting findings and recommendations.

I hope that you find this report responsive to your request. I am happy to address any questions you may have and look forward to continuing our work together in building Maryland's future through high quality education.

Sincerely yours,


William E. Kirwan
Chancellor

cc: Mr. Joseph F. Vivona, COO/Vice Chancellor, USM;
Dr. Irwin Goldstein, Senior Vice Chancellor, USM;
Mr. P.J. Hogan, Associate Vice Chancellor, USM
Ms. JoAnn Goedert; Mr. James Sansbury; Mr. John Wolfe, USM
Mr. Benjamin Birge, UMUC
Ms. Sara Baker, DLS; Ms. Sarah Albert, DLS;
Ms. Charlene Uhl, DBM

1807
University of Maryland,
Baltimore

1856
University of Maryland,
College Park

1865
Bowie State University

1866
Towson University

1886
University of Maryland
Eastern Shore

1898
Frostburg State University

1900
Coppin State University

1925
Salisbury University

1925
University of Baltimore

1925
University of Maryland
Center for Environmental
Science

1947
University of Maryland
University College

1966
University of Maryland,
Baltimore County

1985
University of Maryland
Biotechnology Institute

Report of the Workgroup on the
Status of Graduate Assistants and Adjunct Faculty
in Maryland's State
Higher Education Institutions

As requested by the Chairmen of the
Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and
The House Appropriations Committee

Submitted by the University System of Maryland
November 1, 2009

List of Workgroup Members and Staff

Graduate Assistant and Adjunct Faculty Workgroup

Joe Vivona, Chair

USM Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
and Chief Operating Officer
Designee, USM Chancellor
301-445-1923
jvivona@usmd.edu

Jay Hutchins, Esq

Designee, Secretary of Department of Labor
Licensing & Regulation
410-230-6009
jhutchins@dllr.state.md.us

Gareth Murray

MD Higher Education Commission
410-260-4519
gmurray@mhec.edu

Sec. John McDonough

Secretary of State
410-974-5549
jmcdonough@sos.state.md.us

Harriet Cooperman

State Higher Education Labor Relations Board
410-332-8974
hcooperman@saul.com

Nariman Farvardin

Provost, University of Maryland College Park
Designee, Research Institution President
301-405-5252
farvardin@umd.edu

Dr. Janet Dudley-Eshbach

Comprehensive Institution President
Salisbury University
(410) 543-6011
jdudleyeshbach@salisbury.edu

Dr. Susan C. Aldridge

Non Traditional Institution President
University of Maryland University College
(301) 985-7077
saldridge@umuc.edu

Dr. Maurice Taylor

Morgan State University Vice President for
University Operations
Designee, Non-USM Institution President
(443)885-4075
Maurice.taylor@morgan.edu

Dr. Stan Brown

Higher Education Official Academic Affairs
Dean of Academic Support – Baltimore City
Community College
410-462-8059
sbrown@bcc.edu

Lynne Schaefer

Higher Education Official Finance and
Administration
Vice President for Administration and Finance,
UMBC
410-455-2939
lschaefer@umbc.edu

Anna Bedford

Graduate Assistant, UMCP
abedford@umd.edu
301-520-5824

Ms. Nilajah Nyasuma

Graduate Assistant, MSU
Doctoral Student Urban Educational Leadership
(202) 674-5670
ninya1@morgan.edu

Dr. Alan Nemerofsky

Adjunct Faculty
Adjunct Faculty in Psychology TU
410 780-6429
windance42@aol.com

Damon Marshall

Adjunct Faculty
Bowie State University
301-518-4896
dmarshall40@verizon.net

Edward J. Gutman, Esq.

Labor Organization
410-576-4809
egutman@comcast.net

Karl K. Pence

Labor Organization
301-373-5909
karlkirbypence@aol.com

Sally Mercer

St. Mary's College
Director of Human Resources SMCM
(240)895-4309
samercer@smcm.edu

Staff

Irv Goldstein, USM (irv@usmd.edu)
PJ Hogan, USM (pjhogan@usmd.edu)
John Wolfe, USM (jwolfe@usmd.edu)
Ben Birge, UMUC (bbirge@umuc.edu)
Jim Sansbury, USM (jsansbury@usmd.edu)
JoAnn Goedert, USM (jgoedert@usmd.edu)
Maureen David (counsel), OAG
(mdavid@oag.state.md.us)

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT

Introduction	1
I. Meeting the General Assembly’s Charge	1
The Workgroup’s Charge	1
Definitions	2
The Workgroup Process	3
II. Graduate Assistants	4
The Status of Graduate Assistants in Maryland Public Institutions	
The Role of Graduate Assistants	4
Maryland’s Graduate Assistant Population	7
Economic Conditions for Graduate Assistants	8
Graduate Assistant Working Conditions	9
Due Process Protections for Graduate Assistants	10
Graduate Assistant-Institution Communications	11
Options and Recommendations for Graduate Assistants	12
III. Adjunct Faculty	16
The Status of Adjunct Faculty in Maryland Institutions	
The Role of Adjunct Faculty	16
The Adjunct Faculty Population	17
Compensation for Adjunct Faculty	18
Job Security for Adjunct Faculty	19
Working Conditions for Adjunct Faculty	20
Due Process Protections for Adjunct Faculty	22
Adjunct Faculty-Institution Communications	22
Options and Recommendations for Adjunct Faculty	23

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Joint Chairmen’s Report, 2009 Session, R75T, Pages 167,168 – Request for Graduate Assistants and Adjunct Faculty Study
Appendix 2	Status of Graduate Assistants in Maryland State Public Higher Education Institutions
Appendix 3	Status of Adjunct Faculty in Maryland State Public Higher Education Institutions
Appendix 4	Workplan: Workgroup on the Status of Graduate Assistants and Adjunct Faculty
Appendix 5	Examples of “Best Practices” Adopted by Maryland Public Higher Education Institutions

Report

REPORT OF THE WORKGROUP ON THE STATUS OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTS AND ADJUNCT FACULTY

Introduction

The Report of the Joint Chairs of the General Assembly's Budget Committees for the 2009 Session requires the University System of Maryland (USM) to convene a Workgroup to conduct a study "examining measures to improve the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty at public higher education institutions." The Joint Chairs charged the Workgroup with the submission of a report with findings and recommendations to the Budget Committees by November 1, 2009.

The following report represents the efforts of the resulting Workgroup on the Status of Graduate Assistants and Adjunct Faculty ("the Workgroup"). Consistent with the General Assembly's Charge, the Workgroup compiled detailed information from Maryland's state public higher education institutions,¹ heard from a series of experts and members of the public, and examined the range of issues emerging from that fact-gathering process and options for addressing them. That analysis has led to a set of recommendations for improving the status of both graduate assistants and adjunct faculty. Section I of this report sets out the Workgroup's charge, briefly describes its information-gathering process and defines key terms. Section II summarizes the Workgroup's findings on the status of graduate assistants, discusses various options for enhancing their status and outlines a series of recommendations. Section III addresses the status of adjunct faculty and recommendations to improve it.

I. Meeting the General Assembly's Charge

The Workgroup's Charge

The Joint Chair's Report articulated a detailed, three-part charge to the Workgroup. (See Appendix 1 for the detailed Report language.) Specifically, the expectations of the Workgroup were as follows:

- 1) To examine the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, including:
 - (a) Current economic conditions and internal grievance and management-employee communications procedures;
 - (b) Efforts already made to improve and strengthen their economic and working conditions;

¹ Those institutions include the thirteen institutions of the University System of Maryland (Bowie State University, Coppin State University, Frostburg State University, Salisbury University, Towson University, University of Baltimore, University of Maryland Baltimore, University of Maryland Baltimore County, University of Maryland College Park, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, University of Maryland University College, University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute and the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science), Morgan State University, St. Mary's College of Maryland and Baltimore City Community College. In this report, references to "Maryland institutions," the "institutions" or "campuses" relate specifically to these institutions.

- (c) The educational role and contribution of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty;
- (d) A comparison of their status in Maryland's State public higher education institutions with national trends.

2) To consider options to improve graduate assistant and adjunct faculty status, including collective bargaining and shared governance, addressing for each option:

- (a) Impact on graduate assistant and adjunct faculty standard of living;
- (b) Effects on the educational experience of graduate assistants;
- (c) Effects on institutions' educational mission and environment;
- (d) Cost and impact on institution financial viability;
- (e) Benefits or detriments to the State.

3) To report, on an individual basis for graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, to the Committees by November 1, 2009:

- (a) A description of the conditions of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty;
- (b) Recommendations, if necessary, to improve their status.

Definitions

Among the Workgroup's initial tasks was to reach a common understanding on how to define key terms—including meanings fundamental to the scope of its work. Thus, for the purposes of this Report, the Workgroup adopted the following definitions:

Graduate Assistant- Full-time degree seeking students enrolled in a doctoral or master's degree program who receive financial benefits, including a stipend and full or partial tuition assistance, and who serve on a part-time basis in classroom or laboratory instruction, or are involved in the conduct of research or other functions relevant to their graduate education experience while also advancing the mission of the university.

Adjunct Faculty – Part-time non-tenure track faculty serving in a temporary capacity to teach specific courses on a course-by-course basis in support of the instructional mission of the institution.

Collective Bargaining – A process by which an organization's management and a union representing its employees engage in bargaining about wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. Initially, collective bargaining occurs following a majority vote of eligible employees to opt for representation consistent with requirements of the appropriate legal authority.

Shared Governance - A set of processes and practices under which faculty, staff, and students participate in significant decisions on institutional missions and policies. Under State law and USM and other institution policies, the USM and all campuses must establish shared governance councils and other mechanisms by which faculty, students, and staff advise institution

administration and participate in decision-making on major issues, informing institution policies and procedures.

Research Institution – An institution offering a full range of baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral programs, whose mission places high priority on research.²

Comprehensive Institution – An institution offering a full range of baccalaureate programs, whose mission includes offering graduate education through the master’s degree.³

Other Institution—Other education institutions, in this report include non-traditional institutions with specialized missions, such as distance education, liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and non-degree granting research programs.⁴

The Workgroup Process

The Workgroup met on a bi-weekly basis from July through October 2009 to gather information from all Maryland institutions and to hear the perspectives of the graduate assistants, adjunct faculty and institution representatives. The Workgroup first met to review data, policies and other information provided by the institutions, largely obtained through detailed surveys to which every institution responded regarding the roles, numbers, economic benefits, due process rights and working conditions of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, as well as the concerns raised by these groups and recent measures taken by the institutions to address their needs. Summaries of the results of the surveys appear at Appendices 2 and 3 of this report. Staff to the Workgroup also attempted to locate national data against which the experience of Maryland institutions and the status of its graduate assistants and adjunct faculty could be compared, but had little success in identifying reliable sources of that information. An explanation of the challenges in seeking out national data related to adjunct faculty in particular is provided in the Supporting Documentation at p. 67.

The Workgroup then afforded graduate assistant, adjunct faculty and institution representatives opportunities to present their perspectives on the current status of and issues confronted by the two groups. Counsel to the Workgroup from the Office of the Attorney General also briefed the group on the legal status of graduate assistants under federal tax and other laws. At its August 31, 2009 meeting, the Workgroup held a public forum where a series of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty offered their views, and it heard a presentation arranged by the American Federation of Teachers from graduate assistant and faculty members from Rutgers University, where collective bargaining occurs for both groups. Finally, the Workgroup explored best practices at Maryland institutions to improve the status of graduate assistants and adjunct

²For the purposes of this report, “research institutions” include: Morgan State University, University of Maryland Baltimore, University of Maryland Baltimore County, and University of Maryland College Park.

³In this report, “comprehensive institutions” include: Bowie State University, Coppin State University, Frostburg State University, Salisbury University, Towson University, and University of Maryland Eastern Shore.

⁴In this report, “other institutions” include: Baltimore City Community College, St. Mary’s College of Maryland, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, University of Maryland University College, University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute, and University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science.

faculty identified by the Workgroup's staff. A copy of the Workgroup's meeting schedule and work plan, with lists of presenters, is attached as Appendix 4. Many presenters made the text of their presentations available to the Workgroup, and they are included in the Supporting Documentation submitted with this report at pp. 16-67 and 160-182.⁵

In its final meetings, the Workgroup analyzed findings derived from the information gathered, identified aspects of the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty that warrant improvement, discussed options to address those issues, and formulated recommendations.

II. Graduate Assistants

This section addresses six aspects of the status of graduate assistants: 1) the role of graduate assistants; 2) the graduate assistant population and availability of assistantships; 3) economic conditions; 4) working conditions; 5) due process protections; and 6) graduate assistant-institution communications. For each element, this section sets out the Workgroup's findings, followed by a summary of the issues raised before the Workgroup with respect to that element. At the end of this section, the report identifies aspects of graduate assistant status determined by the Workgroup to require further action, discusses options explored by the Workgroup to improve the status of graduate assistants, and outlines a series of recommendations to achieve those improvements.

Many of the findings in this section were obtained from detailed surveys of Maryland institutions conducted by the Workgroup and designed to elicit institution-specific information regarding the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, as well as concerns raised by graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, and recent measures undertaken by institutions to address those concerns. The information provided in survey responses generally addressed institution experience in the 2008-09 academic year. With respect to graduate assistants, the results of the surveys are summarized in Appendix 2, *Status of Graduate Assistants in Maryland State Public Higher Education Institutions*. Unless otherwise specified, the information provided in this section is derived from the surveys, as summarized in Appendix 2.

The Status of Graduate Assistants in Maryland Public Institutions

1. The Role of Graduate Assistants

"Graduate Assistants" are enrolled students making progress toward a master's or doctoral degree who serve as teaching, research or administrative assistants to faculty and academic departments. Assistantships allow graduate students to receive financial support to assist them in the pursuit of their studies, while assuming responsibilities that help to prepare them for post-degree research, teaching, or other professional employment. Questions arose as to whether graduate assistants are "employees" whose status may best be enhanced through traditional employment-related measures, or whether they are essentially students whose

⁵ In addition to the appendices attached to this report, extensive Supporting Documentation, including the texts of presentations to the Workgroup, copies of relevant policies, and other documents, has been submitted to the General Assembly with the official copies of this report. A copy of the Supporting Documentation file is available from the USM upon request.

responsibilities as graduate assistants are inextricably related to their educational experience, needs and expectations.

Findings

Across Maryland institutions, the most common form of graduate assistantship is that of a teaching assistant. Teaching assistants aid professors with many aspects of classroom instruction, from actually teaching course sections to ancillary tasks such as grading. Teaching assistants' roles may include teaching or assisting in 1-2 course sections per semester, typically within the department of the student's specific disciplinary interest, assisting in student laboratory instruction, or working with a professor who is teaching a course with grading, tutoring individual students, and other responsibilities. They are expected to provide between 10-20 hours of service per week.

Research assistants provide research, laboratory and technical support to professors. Because this assistance is almost always in the area of the student's specific research interest, there is often a substantial relationship between the work that the student does as part of the assistantship and the student's own research toward the graduate degree.

Other graduate assistants provide administrative support in various areas of the institution. They may, for example, serve in residence halls as hall directors or advisors, or provide ongoing administrative support or work on special projects for their departments or other institution offices.

Institutions rely on the work of graduate assistants to support the institution's mission and advance campus priorities. At the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP), which enrolls the largest number of graduate students in the State by far, UMCP officials state that teaching assistants are responsible for teaching approximately 10% of all undergraduate credit hours, often to freshman-level students. It is also recognized that the presence of talented and creative research students in institution laboratories is vital to cutting-edge research.

There is significant variation in the functions of graduate assistants depending upon whether the student attends a research institution or a comprehensive institution. Research assistants and teaching assistants who provide or assist with actual instruction perform the most academically challenging services and overwhelmingly are likely to be doctoral students at research institutions. At comprehensive institutions, where the vast majority of graduate assistants are master's degree students, their functions may include a wider range of institutional activities, and they are more likely to serve as departmental administrative assistants, residence hall directors, or teaching assistants who assist professors but are not responsible for teaching sections or courses themselves.

For Maryland institutions, maintaining a relationship between the work that graduate assistants perform as part of their assistantships and their core graduate education experience is a high priority. Institution representatives cited a series of reasons for this approach. Most importantly, assistantships are awarded to students who hold particular academic promise as part of the graduate education admissions process; students are not "hired" through an employment process or for particular job-related skills in any conventional sense of the word. In addition, the overriding factor in determining whether a student will maintain an assistantship

over time is the extent to which the student is making good academic progress toward their degree.

Institution officials further explained to the Workgroup that the research and teaching skills acquired by most graduate assistants in the course of their assistantships are directly relevant to both the content of their future, post-degree careers, as well as their desirability to higher education faculty and other recruiters. Sophisticated research techniques learned and processes mastered as a research assistant apply to the student's own doctoral research and future career. In addition, doctoral degree recipients are expected to have the higher education teaching skills learned as teaching assistants when they seek post-graduate academic positions.

Moreover, by encouraging graduate assistants to work with their faculty mentors, that mentoring relationship—which is critical to graduate education success—is strengthened. Assistantships provide unique access to mentors' laboratory and other research resources to support a graduate student's own research interests, progress toward a graduate degree, and development as an independent researcher. In the process, the student's ability to learn professional as well as academic skills from their mentors is enormously important to their subsequent professional careers.

Graduate assistants who serve as administrative assistants often gain relevant professional skills and experience from their assistantships. As one comprehensive institution explained, it seeks to assign graduate administrative assistants to the departments of their academic affiliation or offices on campus related to the student's academic interest (e.g., an MBA student specializing in marketing may be assigned to the institution's development office).

Legal Status of Graduate Assistants: Employees or Students

Analysis of relevant legal requirements does not resolve the question of the employment status of graduate assistants. Federal wage and tax law recognizes the dual nature of graduate assistantships at times as work related and sometimes part of the educational process. Graduate students, who are simultaneously pursuing an advanced degree while they perform research, even if receiving a stipend, are not considered to have an employer-employee relationship for the purpose of determining wage and overtime requirements under the Fair Labor Standards Act. In addition, full time students who work for the institution they attend are not subject to FICA withholding under §3121 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Under Internal Revenue Code, §117, support in the form of scholarships or fellowships is not subject to income tax as long as the graduate assistant is a degree candidate, and uses the funds for qualified educational expenses, such as tuition and fees. Scholarships, fellowships and other forms of support in excess of qualified educational expenses are taxable to the recipient as income. Tuition reductions or waivers are not considered taxable income for graduate students enrolled in a degree program who perform teaching or research activities for the institution in which they are enrolled.

Issues Raised

The issue of whether graduate assistants should be viewed as employees or students was fundamental to the Workgroup's deliberations. Traditionally, graduate assistants have been

seen as students who may benefit educationally from having secured an assistantship, and not as employees. Some graduate student representatives voiced the opinion that at least some of their graduate assistant service was sufficiently distinct from the academic and skill development expectations of their graduate programs that it can and should be compartmentalized as “employment.” Generally, the ability to make that distinction was deemed greater in administrative and teaching assistantships than in research assistantships.

A representative of the graduate assistant union at Rutgers University described a model for graduate assistantships in which the work of the graduate assistant is deliberately severed from the student’s academic experience. The Rutgers graduate assistant, for example, spoke favorably of being assigned a teaching assistantship in a department different from the one in which he was seeking his doctorate.

For the reasons described above, Maryland academic administrators maintain unanimously that a strong link between a student’s assistantship and graduate academic experience is an important value and, at some institutions such as UMCP, it is part of the institution’s stated policies. They acknowledge that, in some situations, a sub-set of the tasks associated with a given assistantship may be job-like, but stress that compartmentalizing that subset of the overall assistantship experience across the institution’s graduate assistant community is not feasible. Of equal importance, they assert that any measures that might sever this link, however well-intended, will harm graduate education at the institution.

2. Maryland’s Graduate Assistant Population

Findings

In the 2008-09 academic year, Maryland institutions supported nearly 6,000 graduate assistantships. Five thousand of those assistantships were in the research institutions, and 4,031 of them were concentrated at the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP). The proportion of graduate students who were able to secure assistantships also varies by type of institution. At UMCP, 61.5% of full-time graduate enrollment, and 40% of all graduate students, held assistantships. At comprehensive institutions, the assistantships are most often available to 5 to 15% of graduate students. Similarly, doctoral students are more likely to hold assistantships than are master’s-level students; at the University of Maryland Baltimore, 80% of PhD students hold assistantships, in contrast to only 5% of master’s degree students.

There is intense competition for graduate assistantships across Maryland institutions, and the number of available assistantships falls far short of the demand by students and applicants applying to Maryland graduate programs. Assistantships provide an important tool for recruiting highly talented graduate students.

Assistantships typically extend for multiple years, although appointments most often are made of single academic year periods. Three institutions generally make multi-year appointments: Morgan State University (MSU), Bowie State University (BSU) and the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences (UMCES). For reasons related to funding availability described in the next section of this report, however, most Maryland institutions are unable to make numerous multi-year appointments unless a long term funding source, such as a multi-year grant, is available. Nonetheless, doctoral student research and teaching assistants often

are re-appointed by their academic departments for multiple years if the student continues to make good progress toward his or her graduate degree, and the assistantship can extend from four to six years. The terms of a student's assistantship, including its duration, are set out in the graduate assistant's appointment letter or, less frequently, in a contract.

Issues Raised

Graduate students and institutions share the desire to support more graduate students with increased numbers of assistantships at all levels. Securing an assistantship is considered, in and of itself, a benefit. There is no question that the demand for assistantships is greater than their availability in Maryland institutions, but funding and other constraints limit those numbers.

Some graduate assistants express concern with the small numbers of multi-year appointments. Reliance on annual or, in some instances, only semester-long, appointments leaves graduate assistants with no financial security as they contemplate years of graduate study. For many international graduate students, this issue is particularly important, because the financial support provided by an assistantship can be critical to the maintenance of their visa status.

3. Economic Conditions for Graduate Assistants

Findings

The economic benefits offered to graduate assistants have three components: stipends, tuition assistance and, depending upon the institution and the individual award, other benefits that may include health benefits, and room and board waivers.⁶

Stipends: Stipends for assistantships range from approximately \$5,000 to \$40,000 per year, depending upon institution, type of assistantship, and degree specialization area. In addition, stipends may be for either the academic year, or the full calendar year, and their amounts can vary accordingly. The highest stipends generally are paid to research assistants whose appointments are paid with external grant funding. The degree level of the student's academic program dictates the stipend amount at many institutions; at Morgan State University, for example, master's-level students received stipends of \$10,500 per year, while doctoral student stipends were \$16,000 per year. The lowest stipends typically are paid to master's-level students in part-time administrative assistantships at comprehensive institutions. (See Appendix 2.)

At UMCP, which employs nearly two-thirds of the State's graduate assistants, the mean stipend for a 20-hour per week, 9-month assistantship is \$16,912, and \$23,816 for a 12-month appointment; the full-time equivalents for these positions is between \$37,317 and \$47,732. For the lowest paid administrative assistants in master's degree programs, the FTE equivalent salary was approximately \$13,200 in the FY 2008-09 academic year.

⁶ It should be noted that many institutions also employ graduate students who have not been selected as graduate assistants in campus positions on an hourly or other pay-for-work basis, like other student employees. For the purposes of this report, these students are not considered graduate assistants.

Tuition Assistance: Supplementing these stipends is tuition assistance. The stipend amount is one of two major elements of the economic benefit provided to a graduate assistant, with tuition assistance completing the calculation. Tuition assistance generally is valued between approximately \$5,000 and \$19,400 annually, depending upon the institution and the graduate program. In some highly specialized programs with higher tuitions, at research institutions or professional schools, graduate assistant tuition assistance will have commensurately higher value. In institutions where graduate assistants serve as residence hall advisors, their economic package may include a waiver of room and board expenses rather than tuition assistance. When an institution supplements a graduate assistant's economic benefits with tuition assistance, the graduate school or the student's academic department typically must identify a source of funding for each student awarded an assistantship.

Other benefits: Some Maryland institutions, including UMCP, provide some form of health benefits, and many institutions offer other campus benefits, such as reduced parking fees and access to facilities and resources available to faculty. In addition, graduate residence hall advisors and directors, who generally do not receive tuition waivers, typically are given room and board assistance.

Issues Raised

Graduate students addressing the Workgroup expressed the concern that stipends are low, relative to the cost of living in Maryland. They also cited as economic concerns the financial uncertainty that arises without multi-year assistantship commitments and the dearth of affordable graduate student housing.

However, the ability of institutions to increase graduate assistant stipends is dependent upon the sources of funding for these positions. For some institutions, graduate assistants are not included in full time personnel counts or related fringe benefits as it relates to state mandatory cost compilation. Additionally, the full funding of mandatory costs is not realized; and institutions must rely on tuition and other sources, such as grant funding, to pay for graduate assistant positions, tuition assistance and increases in stipend levels. Graduate assistant funding is unpredictable and must compete with other important institutional and academic department priorities and can be severely constrained when economic conditions are difficult.

4. Graduate Assistant Working Conditions

Findings

Within the general category of "working conditions," three issues emerged during the Workgroup's deliberations: workload, leave, and the prevention of unrealistic or unwarranted expectations by mentors and/or supervisors.

Workload: Across Maryland institutions, graduate assistants typically are expected to complete, on average, either 10 ("part-time") or 20 hours ("full-time") of research, teaching or other service per week as part of their assistantships. The Workgroup heard testimony from graduate assistants from UMCP that full-time workloads sometimes exceed 20 hours. According

to a 2006 survey at UMCP, 36% of respondent teaching assistants asserted that they worked more than 20 hours per week. (Supporting Documentation at p. 62)

UMCP's provost explained that the institution responded to these survey findings by conducting an in-depth investigation of graduate assistant assignments throughout the campus. That investigation, in fact, identified one large department with many teaching assistants that made inordinate demands by requiring assistants to teach 4 sections each year. UMCP reduced that expectation to only three course sections per year in the 2008-09 academic year and believes that it has solved this significant workload inequity. Excessive workload was not reported as a problem at other institutions.

Leave: Graduate assistants typically do not accrue leave, although some forms of leave are provided at a few institutions. At the University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) in particular, administrators addressed concerns raised by graduate assistants by establishing special sick, annual and maternity leave benefits. A description of these benefits was presented in the Best Practices session of the Workgroup's meetings and is included at pp. 76-77 in the Supporting Documentation. Similar forms of leave exist at UMCP. (Supporting Documentation at pp. 94-95)

Improper or Excessive Mentor and Supervisor Expectations: The Workgroup heard anecdotal testimony from UMCP of graduate assistant supervisors who demanded that their assistants provide personal services far outside their appropriate assignments, such as baby-sitting or lawn-mowing, or imposed undue workloads. While no specific, individual cases were brought to the Workgroup's attention, institutional representatives acknowledged that, while rare, such practices could occur in individual situations.

Issues Raised

Because graduate students rely heavily on faculty support for their research and recommendations to advance their careers, the possibility is real that graduate assistants who believe that they have been subject to undue demands might not seek recourse for fear of retaliation. Unless institutions have effective grievance processes in place, individual complaints may not be addressed.

With respect to systemic workload issues, such as the department-wide workload expectations described by UMCP, it was suggested by students and institution representatives alike that mechanisms also need to be in place to identify and resolve graduate assistant concerns. Students also noted that reliance on internal and informal departmental solutions is not always sufficient for this purpose.

5. Due Process Protections for Graduate Assistants

Findings

All institutions provide some form of recourse for graduate assistants who believe that they have been treated unjustly or inappropriately. As indicated in Appendix 2, there is considerable variation in the nature and extent of those due process protections. At one end of that

continuum, some of Maryland's research institutions have extensive grievance policies and procedures for graduate assistants which are formalized in binding institution policies.

In particular, the policies of UMCP and UMBC were explained in the Workgroup's "best practices" discussion and are included at pp. 69-103 of the Supporting Documentation to this report. These policies apply to the full range of graduate assistant grievances and incorporate the principles that traditionally are associated with solid due process protections: objective fact-finders, the opportunity for disputing parties to present evidence, clear timelines for the grievance process, and the ability to appeal initial decisions to additional neutral decision makers. We note also that at one research institute, the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (UMCES), special policies are in place to address intellectual property issues related specifically to graduate assistants.

Other institutions offer graduate assistants the same due process protections as they do graduate students or student employees generally, or provide for informal mediation or other dispute resolution at the department or graduate school levels on their campuses. As a general matter, and not surprisingly, the formality and depth of those grievance procedures are commensurate with the extent of graduate education and graduate assistantships at the institutions.

Issues Raised

Graduate assistants cited the need for clearly established due process protections in order to protect individual assistants, especially with regard to inappropriate assignments and excessive workload. They complained that informal, department-based processes are inadequate because they may leave the complaining student vulnerable to retaliation from the student's supervisor or mentor.

In contrast, representatives of the graduate student association at UMBC deemed that institution's grievance policies to be quite effective. (Letter of Jessy Warner-Cohen, Supporting Documentation at p. 161). In addition, UMCP's policies were instituted in 2008 and similarly extend grievance rights past the graduate student's own department, incorporate generally accepted due process standards and are binding across the institution. To date, no grievances have been filed by UMCP graduate assistants under these revised policies.

The variation in grievance procedures at other institutions is, for some, a concern particularly at those institutions that only afford informal channels for resolution that are limited to the student's department or school. To the extent that these less developed due process procedures leave students potentially vulnerable to retaliation or to decision-making by faculty members within the student's department who may have an interest in the subject of the student's complaint, such processes raised concern.

6. Graduate Assistant-Institution Communications

Findings

Across Maryland institutions, graduate student participation in campus shared governance is well-established. All USM institutions must have student shared governance councils, as does

the University System Student Council which advises the Chancellor and the Board of Regents (USM Policy I-3.01 *University System of Maryland Student Council Constitution, Supporting Documentation* at p. 14). In addition, every institution with graduate students has formal, ongoing graduate student councils or associations that communicate with and provide advice to institution administration, and most institutions include graduate student representation on their institution senates or other shared governance bodies. Graduate students also commonly participate on departmental committees, and school and dean's advisory committees.

Only one institution, the University of Maryland Biotechnology Center, however, provides specifically for graduate assistant representation on its Faculty/Staff Senate. In all other institutions, the expectation is that the graduate student representatives on shared governance bodies will voice the concerns of graduate assistants and advocate effectively on their behalf.

Issues Raised

At institutions where a significant proportion of graduate students hold assistantships, graduate student representation on shared governance bodies is likely to result in reliable advocacy for graduate assistant interests and routine communication of graduate assistant concerns to appropriate administrators. In institutions where only a small minority of graduate students holds assistantships, this assumption may not be consistently valid without changes to how the representation of graduate assistants in shared governance is achieved.

Union representatives fault shared governance for its advisory nature, and for the discretion that institution administrators have in deciding whether and how to act on problems raised through shared governance proceedings. However, institution representatives hold shared governance to be a central value of their campus communities. They maintain that it provides a mechanism which commands a response to concerns raised by those communities.

OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

Workgroup Conclusions Regarding the Status of Graduate Assistants

In analyzing all of the findings and issues raised, the Workgroup reached consensus readily with respect to many of its conclusions. To summarize these areas of agreement:

- > Graduate assistants are students who are awarded assistantships as part of a financial assistance package that they receive upon admission to an institution.
- > Graduate assistants perform valuable teaching, research, or administrative services for the institution, typically while gaining professional skills important to their post-degree careers.
- > Assistantships are highly prized by graduate students, and the availability of assistantships falls short of the demand for them by students.
- > The economic benefits received by graduate assistants include an annual or semester-long stipend, tuition assistance, and, at some institutions, other benefits.

None of these elements typically is funded by the state as a mandatory cost, and institutions must identify discretionary funding for assistantships from tuition, grants and other sources. Within these funding constraints and cognizant of the variations in graduate assistant stipends depending upon funding sources, increasing stipends for some students remains an important goal.

- > Under state and federal employment compensation laws, graduate assistants generally are not considered employees, although those laws do not necessarily preclude their treatment as employees.
- > Graduate assistants should not be expected to provide more hours of service than set out in their appointment letters, nor should their mentors or supervisors expect graduate assistants to provide excessive or inappropriate services.
- > Currently, levels of due process protection for graduate assistants vary between institutions. Effective due process procedures must be available to graduate assistants statewide so that their grievances may be heard and resolved fully and fairly.

There were a few matters about which Workgroup members were unable to reach consensus, specifically:

- > Whether some portion of the service performed by graduate students as part of their assistantships should be treated as “employment.”
- > Whether concerns regarding the economic benefits and working conditions of graduate assistants on Maryland campuses are shared by many graduate students, or whether those concerns represent isolated conditions or situations that had been addressed previously.
- > Whether campus shared governance policies, processes, and practices, through which the concerns of students, faculty and staff traditionally are explored and addressed, are adequate to resolve concerns of graduate assistants.

Regardless of Workgroup members’ views on these matters, consensus was reached as to aspects of the status of graduate assistants that warrant further action. These are:

- > When economic conditions improve for the state overall and for higher education specifically, each institution should review the amounts of and standards for determining its graduate assistant stipends.
- > Institutions should establish standards for graduate assistant workloads and appropriate supervisor and mentor expectations. These standards must be communicated effectively to faculty who work with graduate assistants.
- > Enforceable policies and procedures encompassing fundamental due process standards should be in place on every campus.

- > Strong channels of communication must exist on every campus to encourage the open exchange of information and discussion of concerns between graduate assistants, faculty and administrators, including the opportunity for members of the graduate assistant community to meet with faculty and administration for such discussions on a regular, periodic basis.

Options

Part of the Workgroup's charge was the consideration of mechanisms for achieving the above improvements in the status of graduate assistants, including collective bargaining and shared governance. For some members of the Workgroup, collective bargaining presented a desirable option. These members believe that some aspects of a student's assistantship readily can be cordoned off from the student's overall graduate education experience and addressed through labor relations mechanisms. Their views are based on the following perspectives:

- > Because graduate assistants provide services under the direction of the institution for which they are compensated, they are employees.
- > Graduate assistants need a process for addressing issues that are traditional concerns of workers—job security, communications, pay, and benefits.
- > Unionization will not threaten the financial viability of institutions because it only requires bargaining over economic issues in a way that recognizes both institution fiscal challenges and graduate assistant demands.
- > The concerns of graduate assistants are not addressed effectively through traditional shared governance.
- > Federal and state compensation laws are not dispositive as to whether a graduate assistant is an employee.
- > Graduate assistants should have the opportunity to decide themselves whether they wish to unionize on a given campus.

Other Workgroup members concluded that campus and USM shared governance systems are generally effective and, where necessary, can be amended to improve the status of graduate assistants. Acknowledging the need to bolster elements of existing processes on some campuses, they believe that incremental improvements will achieve as much as collective bargaining without creating drastic shifts in the relationships between graduate assistants and other campus constituencies or jeopardizing important aspects of graduate education. Their preference for improved shared governance mechanisms over the introduction of collective bargaining is based on the following perspectives:

- > Shared governance is the norm in higher education and currently serves as an effective mechanism for raising and solving graduate assistant problems.
- > Any needed mechanisms for raising and solving graduate assistant problems that are not already available through shared governance, which is a proven system for

addressing issues that arise out of institutions' academic enterprises, can be established through specific improvements to current policies and practices.

- > Collective bargaining compels artificial distinctions between student's educational experience and skill-building and "employment" in ways that may harm important relationships between graduate students and their mentors. For example, it may chill the free flow of communication between students and faculty, including constructive criticism from faculty mentors important to a student's career development.
- > In most legal and policy respects that impose burdens on graduate assistants, they are treated as students, rather than employees; e.g., they are not required to make FICA payments and are not subject to institution furlough plans.
- > It is questionable that a system relying on the selection of exclusive bargaining representatives will genuinely represent the interests of widely diverse graduate assistant populations. Unlike most unionized employees, graduate assistants serve on a temporary basis, and the students who may vote to select an exclusive bargaining representative or may negotiate a collective bargaining agreement will effectively bind new groups of graduate assistants who inevitably had no voice in those decisions.

Recommendations

Irrespective of the lack of consensus among its members regarding the options discussed above, the Workgroup recommends that Maryland institutions take a series of actions:

- > **Economic Status:** Each institution should undertake a study of the economic benefits received by its graduate assistants (including stipends, tuition assistance, and other benefits), as compared to an appropriate group of peer institutions for the current academic year. If those benefits do not compare favorably to peers (i.e., at least at the fiftieth percentile, adjusted for geographic differences), the institution should calculate the amount required to achieve comparability.

The institution should report its results to its governing board by November 1, 2010.

- > By November, 2010, the governing boards for each Maryland institution, including the Board of Regents for the USM's constituent institutions should adopt minimum standards for:
 - **Due process Protections:** Grievance procedures for graduate assistants that include fundamental due process protections (i.e., detailed description of the process; time limits governing the grievance process steps; the opportunity to appeal decisions beyond the departmental level; the opportunity for the graduate assistant to be heard in the process; and provision, when necessary, for final resolution of the grievance by the chief academic officer of the institution).
 - **Economic Benefits:** Stipends, tuition assistance, and other benefits.

- Working Conditions: Appropriate workloads and supervisor/mentor expectations, with requirements for the effective communication of these standards to faculty who supervise/mentor graduate assistants.
 - Graduate Assistant/Institution Communications: Effective participation by graduate assistants in institution shared governance organizations, to include periodic, formal opportunities for elected representatives of the graduate assistant community to meet and discuss issues of concern with institution faculty and administration regarding issues of concern.
- > The above policies should be implemented by April 30, 2011, and institutions should report to their respective governing board no later than May 31, 2011 regarding implementation.
 - > No later than December 30, 2012, the governing board should complete an evaluation of whether implementation of the above policies adequately addressed the areas of concern regarding the status of graduate assistants identified by the Workgroup, and whether further consideration of options to improve graduate assistant status is necessary.

III. Adjunct Faculty

This section addresses seven aspects of the status of adjunct faculty : 1) the role of adjunct faculty in Maryland institutions; 2) the adjunct faculty population 3) compensation; 4) job security; 5) working conditions; 6) due process protections; and 7) adjunct faculty –institution communications. For each element, this section sets out the Workgroup’s findings, followed by a summary of the issues raised before the Workgroup with respect to that element. At the end of this section, the report identifies elements of the status of adjunct faculty that warrant further attention, discusses options to improve aspects of adjunct faculty status, and outlines a series of recommendations to achieve those improvements.

Many of the findings in this section were obtained from the Workgroup’s survey of Maryland institutions, described on p3 of this report. With respect to adjunct faculty, survey results are summarized in Appendix 3, *Status of Adjunct Faculty in Maryland State Public Higher Education Institutions*. Unless otherwise specified, the information this section is derived from those surveys.

THE STATUS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY IN MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS

1. The Role of Adjunct Faculty

Findings

In contrast to the varied functions performed by graduate assistants, adjunct faculty across Maryland institutions primarily provide instruction on a part-time basis, teaching one or more courses per semester to undergraduate and graduate students. While some institutions also

employ small numbers of adjunct faculty in other roles, such as laboratory supervisors, artists-in-residence, or as temporary, grant-funded researchers, teaching is generally the sole function of adjunct faculty in Maryland.

The kinds of courses taught by adjunct faculty can vary widely, however. Traditionally, adjunct faculty are professionals with distinguished, full-time careers outside of academia, such as law or business, who teach occasional courses in their fields of expertise. Adjunct faculty currently also teach “overload” courses of all types, i.e., courses for which the demand from semester to semester is unpredictable and for which it is impracticable to hire full time tenured or tenure-track faculty, or substitute for faculty who are on sabbaticals, medical leave or otherwise temporarily unable to teach their expected course load. Many of these courses are lower-level undergraduate courses.

The circumscribed teaching role of adjunct faculty contrasts with that of tenured and tenure-track faculty (“regular faculty”). Regular faculty are also expected to conduct research, advise undergraduate students, work intensively with graduate students as mentors and advisors, and serve in various other capacities within the institutions. The proportion of time that these faculty are expected to devote to teaching duties varies according to many factors, depending upon the type of institution, the nature, extent and funding source of a faculty member’s research, the faculty member’s field, etc. Institution representatives at research institutions estimated that some tenured research faculty, for example, are expected to devote less than one-third of their efforts to classroom instruction. At comprehensive institutions, estimates are that approximately 60% of regular faculty effort is devoted to instruction.

Issues Raised

Unlike graduate assistants, adjunct faculty uniformly are considered employees. While a few adjunct faculty expressed a desire to hold regular faculty positions, institution representatives made clear that adjunct teaching is rarely a path to a regular faculty position.

2. The Adjunct Faculty Population

Findings

Numbers of Adjunct Faculty: During the 2008-2009 academic year, Maryland institutions employed 4,882 adjunct faculty. They were distributed among the types of institutions as follows:

Research	1,600
Comprehensive	1,430
Other	1,852

It is important to note that the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) employs 1,513 adjunct faculty—nearly a third of the total for all Maryland institutions.

As these numbers suggest, adjunct faculty play an extensive role in institution teaching. With the exception of UMUC, UMCP and the University of Maryland Baltimore (UMB), adjunct faculty statewide comprise roughly 40% of total faculty and teach approximately 30% of all courses. At

UMCP and UMB, Maryland's most research-intensive institutions, adjunct faculty representation is lower: 22% and 17% of total faculty and teach 11% and 10% of courses, respectively.

At UMUC, adjunct faculty represent 86% of the total faculty and teach 73% of all courses. UMUC is Maryland's statutorily-designated open university and a major online education presence. Most of its students are working adults, with a significant proportion members of active military who enroll in UMUC programs taught at military bases worldwide or through the institution's extensive online systems. UMUC recruits fully credentialed, and typically fully employed practitioners in the fields in which they work.

Adjunct Faculty Characteristics: Individuals are drawn to adjunct teaching for a range of reasons, and, as a general matter, tend to fall into three groups: 1) highly reputed professionals with full-time employment outside the university who are willing to share their expertise to teach an occasional course, typically at a graduate or professional school; 2) individuals with master's or doctoral degrees who desire careers as full-time, tenured faculty, but have been unable to secure such positions and, instead, teach multiple courses as adjunct faculty, sometimes at multiple institutions, often at an equivalent of full-time hours; and 3) persons who choose to teach on a limited, part-time basis for personal reasons, for example, as a post-retirement activity or while principally engaged in family-related or other personal activities.

Issues Raised

The large numbers of adjunct faculty at Maryland institutions raised concerns by some for the impact of this phenomenon on the quality of educational services for students. These concerns are based upon the assumption that part-time teachers may not be able to devote sufficient effort to the needs of their students outside the classroom.

A related concern was raised regarding the possible impact of adjunct faculty reliance on an institution's accreditation status. As described in the Supporting Documentation at p. 66, the employment of large numbers of adjunct faculty may be scrutinized by many accrediting organizations, but will not, in and of itself, jeopardize a school or institution's accreditation.

In addition, there was considerable discussion of the differing needs and expectations of adjunct faculty, depending upon which of the three groups the faculty members belongs. While institution representatives are certain that their adjunct faculty comprise a mix of these characteristics, it is very difficult to estimate the proportions of these three groups. First, adjunct faculty typically are hired by individual academic departments on short-term contracts, rather than by a central office. Second, to draw any conclusions regarding the backgrounds and motivations of adjunct faculty would require a survey of faculty members themselves. While detailed institution surveys were completed for the Workgroup process, surveying individual adjunct faculty is an initiative requiring far more time than the Workgroup process provided.

3. Compensation for Adjunct Faculty

Findings

Compensation for adjunct faculty varies widely, depending upon a series of factors. The range of compensation, per three-credit course, is from \$1,700 to \$13,888 per course. The factors

that determine the compensation level are as follows: First, compensation typically is highest when the faculty member is a well-regarded professional with expertise in a high-demand, highly compensated field such as law, business or engineering; particularly at research institutions and professional schools, per-course salaries of \$4,000 and up for these individuals are the norm. High levels of compensation in high-demand disciplines are largely market-driven.

Second, compensation levels are often dependent upon the instructor's academic qualifications. Most institutions pay adjunct faculty with doctorates or other terminal degrees more than they do master's or bachelor's degree recipients. At the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, for example, instructors with doctoral degrees are paid a minimum of \$2,500 per course, while master's-level faculty received a minimum of \$2,200 per course. Other factors include whether the course is taught at the graduate undergraduate level, and whether the course makes demands greater than the typical three-credit course, often involving clinical or laboratory supervision. Finally, the lowest salaries, in the range of \$1,700 to \$2,500, are paid by comprehensive institutions to adjunct faculty who do not hold the appropriate terminal degree in the academic field where they teach. These adjunct faculty teach entry-level undergraduate courses.

Across Maryland institutions, health and retirement benefits are not available to adjunct faculty.

Issues Raised

For adjunct faculty who are not hired for their specialized professional expertise, per-course compensation is often low. An adjunct faculty member with a master's degree who teaches a full-time load of ten undergraduate courses per year at the lowest compensation levels may be paid between \$17,000 to \$25,000 annually. To the extent that some adjunct faculty are attempting to pursue full-time careers through adjunct teaching at multiple institutions, these levels are universally agreed to be problematic. However, it is unknown how many adjunct faculty fall into this category and equally unclear how institutions can identify funding sources in the current economic climate to improve adjunct compensation.

Adjunct faculty compensation is subject to the same budget and funding policies, practices, and constraints as graduate assistants. For the reasons described in Section II.3 of this report, the availability of funding for adjunct faculty positions is unpredictable and challenging. Moreover, health and other benefits for adjunct faculty are not funded by the state. Even if funding availability were not an issue, state statutes and regulations governing eligibility for health and retirement benefit generally preclude their availability for part-time faculty hired on single-semester contracts.

4. Job Security for Adjunct Faculty

Findings

At nearly all Maryland institutions, adjunct faculty are appointed for a single semester to teach one or more specific courses. The terms of that appointment are documented in a contract or appointment letter. These appointments do not confer any rights or preference for future

employment to the faculty member, although it is common practice for highly skilled adjunct faculty to be re-hired for subsequent semesters.

At two institutions, MSU and BSU, annual contracts may also be offered; and UMCP, UMBC, and the University of Baltimore hire small numbers of part-time, non-tenure track faculty into longer term, salaried contracts which provide benefits and a degree of job security, consistent with USM Policy II-1.06 *Policy on the Employment of Part-time Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty in the University System of Maryland*. (Supporting Documentation at pp. 8-10) This policy addresses the appointment of such faculty hired on more than a half time basis and in at least their fifth semester of appointment. It establishes minimum contract provisions, requires that these faculty be authorized to participate in institution shared governance and provides for a range of benefits, including tuition remission, various forms of leave, and the same access to institution-controlled benefits as part-time regular faculty.

Institutions explain that they must appoint adjunct faculty on a short term basis because adjunct faculty typically are hired to teach courses for which student demand is unpredictable, to fill sudden short-term vacancies due to tenured faculty sabbaticals, illness or other leave, or to provide expertise in an area that does not warrant a full-time regular position. It is impracticable to employ longer-term faculty for these functions. Institution representatives also note that many adjunct faculty do not wish to make long-term contractual commitments to the institution because of personal or family reasons, or because they are fully employed professionals in their chosen fields.

Issues Raised

The lack of job security is a major concern for some adjunct faculty. While some adjunct faculty prefer short-term appointments, others rely on adjunct teaching as their sole, full-time livelihood and, thus may be employed at more than one institution. For these employees, the lack of job security from semester to semester is challenging. It was claimed that the persistent need to be seeking out teaching opportunities for the next term can take a personal toll and interferes with their current teaching assignments.

5. Working Conditions for Adjunct Faculty

Findings

Institution surveys and adjunct faculty testimony identified three issues to the Workgroup with respect to adjunct faculty working conditions: access to sufficient office resources and administrative support, professional development opportunities, and workload expectations that extend beyond teaching. A common complaint of adjunct faculty nationally is inadequate access to office space and equipment and administrative support to meet and otherwise communicate with students. Because adjunct faculty are on campus for limited hours each week, and because they often teach during evenings and weekends, they are not assigned full-time office space or administrative help.

However, most Maryland institutions reported that they have taken measures in recent years to provide: office and meeting space, either in dedicated adjunct faculty space or other shared facilities; access to copiers, telephones, computers, and other office equipment; and

administrative assistance. At BSU, for example, evening adjunct faculty complained that access to these resources was impracticable, and the institution changed its departmental office hours to remain open for those faculty and their students. In addition, nearly every institution reported that adjunct faculty are linked into the campus's computer network and have email access to students and the institution's electronic resources. (Appendix 5, Best Practices Summary)

Similarly, many institutions described intensive efforts to enhance professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty. At this time, all institutions now provide formal orientation and initial training for adjunct faculty. Baltimore City Community College (BCCC), for example offers a day-long Adjunct Faculty Academy at the beginning of each semester. Most institutions also encourage adjunct faculty to participate in other professional development activities open to regular faculty, including programs provided by campus faculty development centers, special training opportunities focused on teaching in higher education, access to online and written resources for faculty, and mentoring by senior faculty. At UMUC, adjunct faculty may apply with regular faculty for grants to attend outside professional development conferences and seminars. (See Appendix 5 and Supporting Documentation at pp. 125-159 for accounts of best practices by Maryland institutions to improve adjunct faculty working conditions.)

Finally, at the public forum, two speakers asserted that adjunct faculty at UMUC were expected to perform student advising, research and service functions beyond the instructional responsibilities specified in their contracts and for which they were compensated. Institution representatives, however, emphatically maintained that there is no expectation that adjunct faculty will do more than teach the courses for which they are specifically hired. While some institutions, such as UMUC, look favorably upon outside professional achievements when considering adjunct faculty members for promotion to regular faculty positions, the employment responsibilities of adjunct faculty are confined to their instructional duties. The Workgroup was not made aware of any complaints of inappropriate workload for adjunct faculty beyond the public forum testimony of the two persons cited above.

Issues Raised

If adjunct faculty lack adequate meeting space, channels of communication and administrative resources to prepare course materials and communicate with students, the learning experience of their students can suffer. Because of the part-time nature of adjunct faculty employment, the provision of these services can pose difficult challenges for institutions. It also must be noted that, for institutions that provide many of their course offerings online, such as UMUC, the provision of office and meeting space is neither appropriate nor feasible.

Professional development opportunities are important for adjunct faculty, both to formally orient adjunct faculty to campuses where they may work only sporadically and to provide adjunct faculty with the similar training and development resources as are available to regular faculty.

Because adjunct faculty are compensated only for specific teaching services, any expectations beyond the performance of direct instructional services would be effectively uncompensated. Were such expectations actually imposed on adjunct faculty in Maryland institutions, they could constitute an undue burden.

6. Due Process Protections for Adjunct Faculty

Findings

Institutions address the grievances of adjunct faculty in two ways. While most institutions afford adjunct faculty with the same grievance rights as tenured faculty, a few institutions provide them with informal grievance mechanisms only.

For the majority of institutions that do the former, the grievance process comports with traditional due process standards. For example, all institutions of the USM are required by Board of Regents policy to implement grievance procedures that include: “descriptions of the process to be followed by complainant, the time limits governing the steps in the grievance resolution process, and the levels of review available to the complainant; provisions for the participation by faculty in the process; and provision, when necessary, for final resolution of the grievance by the chief executive officer of the institution.” USM Policy II-4.00 *Policy on Faculty Grievances*, Supporting Documentation at p. 14.

The minority of institutions with an informal adjunct faculty grievance process provide that grievances should be addressed either at the department level, by the appropriate dean, or at the office of human resources or academic affairs.

Issues Raised

Some Workgroup members pointed to the need for adequate mechanisms to address adjunct faculty complaints, noting that grievance procedures lacking adequate due process protections do not guarantee full and fair consideration of an adjunct faculty member’s complaints. Processes that do not provide recourse beyond the departmental decision makers who hire and supervise adjunct faculty leave faculty members vulnerable to retaliation. In addition, the maintenance of lesser due process protections for adjunct faculty than for tenured faculty may contribute to the perception that adjunct faculty are less valued than other faculty.

7. Adjunct Faculty-Institution Communications

Findings

Adjunct faculty participation in institution shared governance varies among institutions. With the State’s large adjunct faculty presence, UMUC has reserved six seats of the eighteen seats on its Faculty Advisory Council for adjunct faculty, who may also fill any of its three at-large seats. At Frostburg State University and UMCP, shared governance representation is similarly guaranteed for non-tenure track faculty, most of whom are adjunct faculty. At a few institutions, adjunct faculty are not permitted to participate as voting members in institution-level shared governance councils. At the remaining campuses, adjunct faculty may participate, but the institutions report that they generally do not play a significant shared governance role.

At all institutions, adjunct faculty are invited to join in departmental committees and other decision-making groups, and at some institutions, such participation is not uncommon.

Issues Raised

Because adjunct faculty participation in shared governance at most Maryland institutions is limited, the traditional mechanism for the airing and resolution of concerns has not been fully available to adjunct faculty. Few institutions expressly bar full voting representation by adjunct faculty, but adjunct faculty representation in shared governance bodies is often impracticable. Adjunct faculty are not regularly on campus and often teach during evenings and weekends when those councils do not meet. Unlike regular faculty, institutional service is not compensated for adjunct faculty. For shared governance to fulfill its role with respect to adjunct faculty, these concerns warrant attention.

OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY

Conclusions Regarding the Status of Adjunct Faculty

In analyzing all of the findings and issues raised regarding the status of adjunct faculty, the Workgroup reached consensus readily with respect to many of its conclusions. To summarize these areas of agreement:

- > Adjunct faculty are employees who provide classroom instruction on a semester-long contractual, part-time basis.
- > Adjunct faculty play an important role at most institutions, and are responsible for teaching 30% of all courses at the state's comprehensive institutions.
- > Adjunct faculty provide instruction, but are not responsible for the other duties required of tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- > The reasons for hiring adjunct faculty vary greatly, from providing narrow, high-demand professional expertise at the upper division and graduate education level to maintaining the necessary degree of personnel flexibility to meet evolving needs or accommodate variations in course loads to substituting on an emergency basis in an entry level course.
- > The qualifications of adjunct faculty also vary widely, from master's degree recipients to holders of terminal degrees with distinguished careers in full-time professions.
- > The characteristics and aspirations of adjunct faculty vary widely, depending upon whether an adjunct faculty member is fully employed as a professional elsewhere, is teaching multiple courses at multiple institutions as his or her sole livelihood, or prefers limited, part-time teaching for personal reasons. Information is unavailable to determine how many adjunct faculty fall into each of these categories.
- > Compensation for adjunct faculty varies widely, based upon the qualifications of the individual, the nature of the courses taught, the institution and department within

the institution, the Carnegie classification of the institution, and the subject matter of the individual's expertise.

- > The means for addressing grievances and other concerns by adjunct faculty ranges from informal processes at some campuses to access to the same formal grievance procedures as tenured faculty at other institutions.
- > While some institutions promote participation by adjunct faculty in campus shared governance, it is currently limited on many campuses by virtue of policy or practice.

There were a few matters about which Workgroup members were unable to reach consensus, specifically:

- > How disparate the concerns of adjunct faculty are, in light of the wide variations in their characteristics, compensation, etc. Wide variations in adjunct faculty qualifications, motivations for teaching, and institution reasons for their employment raised questions as to whether there is a "community of interests" among adjunct faculty.
- > Whether there is sufficient information regarding adjunct faculty characteristics, needs, etc., to draw any conclusions as to their status as a group.

Regardless of Workgroup members' views on these matters, consensus was reached as to aspects of the status of adjunct faculty that warrant further action. These are:

- > When economic conditions improve for the state overall and for higher education specifically, the amounts of and standards for determining its adjunct faculty compensation at each institution should be addressed.
- > Institutions should consider whether it is feasible to provide a measure of predictability and job security for some of their adjunct faculty in those circumstances where such measures do not impair the flexibility needed to hire adjunct faculty on an occasional, as-needed, or otherwise limited basis.
- > Enforceable policies and procedures encompassing fundamental due process standards should be in place on every campus.
- > Strong channels of communication must exist on every campus to encourage the open exchange of information and discussion of concerns between adjunct faculty, regular faculty, and administrators, including the opportunity for members of the adjunct faculty community to meet with regular faculty and administration for such discussions.
- > Additional analysis is needed to add greater definition to the adjunct category.

Options

Part of the Workgroup's charge was the consideration of mechanisms for achieving the above improvements in the status of adjunct faculty, including collective bargaining and shared governance. For some members of the Workgroup, collective bargaining presented a desirable option, based on the following perspectives:

- > Adjunct faculty need a process for addressing issues that are traditional concerns of workers—job security, communications, salaries and benefits.
- > Unionization will not threaten the financial viability of institutions because it only requires bargaining over economic issues in a way that recognizes both institution fiscal challenges and adjunct faculty demands.
- > The concerns of adjunct faculty are not addressed effectively through traditional shared governance.
- > Adjunct faculty should have the opportunity to decide themselves whether they wish to unionize on a given campus.

Other Workgroup members concluded that campus and USM shared governance systems effectively can be marshaled to improve the status of adjunct faculty. Acknowledging the need to improve elements of existing processes on some campuses, they believe that incremental improvements will achieve as much as collective bargaining without radically altering or restricting institutions' ability to meet the temporary and part-time instructional needs of their students. Their preference for improved shared governance mechanisms over the introduction of collective bargaining is based on the following perspectives:

- > Shared governance is currently an effective mechanism in many instances for raising and solving problems identified by all members of the campus community.
- > Any needed mechanisms for raising and solving adjunct faculty problems that are not already available through shared governance can be established through specific improvements in current policies and practices.
- > It is important not to impose formal bargaining processes that may slow the natural and expeditious resolution of concerns and issues that can be addressed through existing or amended campus policies and practices.
- > Given widely diverse adjunct faculty populations, it is doubtful that a community of interests necessary to form the foundation for collective bargaining exists at any institution.
- > The introduction of collective bargaining into Maryland higher education academics is a significant measure that should not be undertaken without solid evidence of the need for major, systemic improvements. Particularly in the absence of information regarding the numbers and the specific needs of adjunct faculty in various categories, such an action is not prudent.

- > Unlike most unionized employees, adjunct faculty serve on a temporary basis, often for just a semester. Thus, the adjunct faculty who are employed when votes are taken to select an exclusive bargaining representative or agree to a collective bargaining agreement will effectively bind adjunct faculty in future semesters, a large number of whom will not have participated in those decisions.
- > Bargaining may stress the fiscal viability of institutions or schools and departments within institutions, given both systemic and immediate state funding constraints. It is possible that funds for any bargained economic benefits would have to be taken from other academic programs and personnel, and pressures to raise tuition may increase.
- > Collective bargaining necessarily addresses adjunct faculty concerns in isolation from the academic context in which they arise and without the participation of groups who may have competing concerns, such as students.

Recommendations

Irrespective of the lack of consensus among its members regarding the options discussed above, the Workgroup recommends that Maryland institutions take two sets of actions. In recognition of the lack of information about the detailed characteristics of adjunct faculty and their utilization on Maryland campuses, the first recommendation is for additional analysis at the institution level. Then, flowing from those studies, the second recommendation calls for changes, where warranted, in institution policies and practices.

- > Each institution should complete a study of adjunct faculty on its campus to:
 - Evaluate compensation patterns, particularly minimum compensation levels, as compared to an appropriate group of peer institutions for the current academic year. If those benefits do not compare favorably to peers (i.e., at least at the fiftieth percentile level, adjusted for geographic differences), the institution should calculate the amount required to achieve comparability.
 - Develop a profile of the adjunct faculty on its campus, identifying in more detail the reasons for hiring adjunct faculty: the qualifications and other professional and employment activities of adjunct faculty; the extent to which adjunct faculty carry a full-time teaching load for repeated semesters; and the availability of office space, computer and network access and other administrative amenities for adjunct faculty.
- > The institution should report its results to the governing board by June 30, 2010.
- > Based upon this information, the governing boards for each Maryland institution, including the Board of Regents for the USM's constituent institutions, should adopt minimum standards for:
 - Adjunct faculty compensation;

- Grievance procedures equivalent, to the extent feasible, to those afforded regular faculty;
 - Effective participation by adjunct faculty in institution shared governance organizations, to include formal, periodic opportunities for elected representatives of the adjunct faculty community to meet and discuss issues of concern with regular faculty and administration;
 - Basic access to office and meeting space, where appropriate, computer networks and other administrative services and amenities.
-
- > The above policies should be implemented by April 30, 2011, and institutions should report to their respective governing board no later than May 31, 2011 regarding implementation.

 - > No later than December 30, 2012, the governing board should complete an evaluation of whether implementation of the above policies adequately addressed the areas of concern regarding the status of adjunct faculty identified by the Workgroup, and whether further consideration of options to improve adjunct faculty status is necessary.

Appendices

Information Request	Authors	Due Date
Policy regarding the use of public higher education facilities to display or screen obscene material	University System of Maryland Morgan State University St. Mary's College of Maryland Baltimore City Community College	September 1, 2009

Graduate Assistants and Adjunct Faculty Study: The committees request that the University System of Maryland (USM), in conjunction with other stakeholders, submit a report by November 1, 2009 examining: (1) the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty in Maryland's state public higher education institutions, including: (a) the current salary, benefits, internal grievance procedures and present procedures for management-employee communications for graduate assistants and adjunct faculty at USM, Morgan State University (MSU), St. Mary's College of Maryland (SMCM), and Baltimore City Community College (BCCC); (b) efforts undertaken by USM, MSU, SMCM and BCCC to improve and strengthen conditions for graduate assistants including salaries, benefits, policies and working conditions, (c) the educational role played by the various categories of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, including the degree to which graduate assistants and adjunct faculty contribute to the function of and educational experience at these institutions; (2) assessment of how the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty in the above institutions compares with graduate assistants and adjunct faculty nationally; and (3) consideration of collective bargaining and other options that build upon the principles and practices of shared governance for improving the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty, addressing: (a) the estimated impact of collective bargaining or shared governance options on the standard of living for graduate assistants and adjunct faculty; (b) the effects of collective bargaining and shared governance options on the educational experience of graduate assistants and on the educational mission and environment of institutions; (c) the costs to the institutions and their impact on institutional financial viability; and (d) any consequential benefits or detriments that might be incurred by the State as the result of collective bargaining or other options for graduate assistants and adjunct faculty. The report shall include a description of conditions for graduate assistants and adjunct faculty at USM, MSU, SMCM and BCCC and make recommendations, if deemed necessary, for measures to improve the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty in the above institutions. Due to the fundamental employment differences between graduate assistants and adjunct faculty the report should separately examine the two groups according to the factors listed above.

USM shall convene a group of the following individuals to prepare the report: (1) the Secretary of the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, or the Secretary's designee; (2) the Chancellor of USM, or the Chancellor's designee; (3) the State Secretary of Higher Education, or the Secretary's designee; (4) the Secretary of State, or the Secretary's designee; (5) a representative of the State Higher Education Labor Relations Board; (6) three Presidents or their designees representing research, comprehensive and non-traditional USM institutions with experience in collective bargaining on their campuses; (7) one President or the President's designee of either MSU, SMCM, or BCCC with experience in collective bargaining on their campus; (8) one senior higher education officer with expertise in academic affairs; (9) one senior higher education officer with expertise in administration and finance; (10) two graduate assistants currently enrolled at a USM institution, MSU, SMCM or BCCC; (11) two adjunct faculty members currently employed by a USM institution, MSU, SMCM or BCCC; and (12) two representatives of organized labor operating in Maryland's education market.

Information Request	Author	Due Date
A study examining measures to improve the status of graduate assistants and adjunct faculty at public higher education institutions	University System of Maryland	November 1, 2009

STATUS OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTS IN MARYLAND STATE PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Institution	Graduate Assistant Roles	Numbers	Stipends	Length and Type of Appointment	Grievance Process and other Policies	Formal Orientation and Training	Shared Governance Participation
RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS							
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK	Teaching Assistant, (TA)w. duties in line w. the student's educational objectives; Research Assistant (RA); Administrative Assistant(AA)	Of 10,157 graduate students, 4,031 held assistantships; 40% of total graduate enrollment; 61.5% of FT graduate enrollment	GAs receive stipend, tuition remission and health benefits; Mean stipend for 9 months: \$16,912; for 12 months: \$23,816 (FTE equivalent between \$37,317 and \$47,732) Value of tuition remission and health benefits up to \$17,820/yr.	Academic year or 12 months, reappointed at department discretion; typically run for 4-6 years; terms set out in letter of appointment	2008 Policies for Graduate Assistantships include formal GA grievance process	Numerous (11+) campus and college training programs; department training and mentoring; Best practices study underway	Graduate student body has representation on University Senate, Graduate Council and other committees and advisory groups
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE	TAs, typically as part of their instructional program; RAs	130 TAs; 253 RAs 80% of PhD students; 5%of MS students	\$19,000 to \$26,000, depending upon the discipline; set consistent w. regional standards	Typically 12-month contract or appointment letter	Grievance process set out in policies	RAs: Formal and informal TA: Varies by program	Takes place at institution level through Graduate School Association; At School level, graduate students participate on Many committees.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY	TA, RA, AAs, Residential Assts	650-700 GAs; 30 graders	Minimum: \$11,324 for Masters; \$14,857 for PhD, up to \$30,000 if external support available; also receive health benefits, leave and tuition remission; Some grad. students employed hourly as graders	Typically academic year appointment letter; some multi-year commitments, with year-to-year renewal if the student is making satisfactory progress	Graduate Council Grievance Committee: provides mediation when disputes cannot be resolved informally; formal policies exist	UMBC-wide and departmental training for TAs and RAs; GA handbook and PROF-it teacher training seminars available to GAs	Graduate Student Association participates fully as one of 5 Campus Senates
MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	TA, RA	59 GAs; 6.5% of total graduate student enrollment	\$10,500 Masters \$16,000 PhD	Typically multi-year, depending upon satisfactory annual progress and eligibility; appointment letter and contract	Hearing process available at the School of Graduate Studies	Done by individual departments	Graduate Students represented on University Council, Graduate School Advisory Committee and Graduate Students Association; also participate on various institution committees
COMPREHENSIVE INSTITUTIONS							
BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY	TAs; RAs; GAs working w. faculty or staff on special projects	34 in Colleges; 8 in other departments; 2.5% of total graduate student enrollment	\$10.00/hr Masters \$11.00/hr PhD, for 20 hours/week; Tuition remission	Multiyear appointments for 2 years, Masters; and 4 years PhD GAs have a Contingent I contract and appointment letter	Informal dispute resolution with the Dean of the Graduate School	Institution wide orientation provided at the beginning of each academic year, including review of policies and procedures	Graduate Student Association works with Graduate School Dean to communicate concerns

FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY	Graduate students w. 3.0+GPA, work in programs directly related to area of study as GA/Associate; Res. Directors	GA: 81 Intl Fellows: 6 RD: 5 14.5% of total graduate student enrollment	GA, \$5,000-\$6,650/academic yr; Grad Assoc: hourly RD: \$4,000/yr, room & board waiver ; Summer stipends of \$1,000-\$1,400	Academic year appointments, with renewal up to 3 year with satisfactory academic progress; award letter and contract	Informal process with department chair, dean and other officials; discrimination and harassment complaints addressed under FSU policies	Formal orientation by Office of Graduate Students; departments also provide orientation	All graduate students represented on Graduate Council, the shared governance body for graduate education
SALISBURY UNIVERSITY	FT Masters students only-- TAs; GAs working in areas related to academic program, including research	80 GAs 22% of FT graduate student enrollment	Generally: TAs: \$10,250/yr Non-TAs: \$5,000/yr RAs may receive higher stipend w. grant funding	Semester or academic year contracts	Same grievance process and policies as all other SU students	Formal training for TAs; other GAs trained by department or unit	Graduate students have a seat on the Graduate Council, the shared governance body for graduate education
TOWSON UNIVERSITY	TAs; RAs and Doctoral RAs; Other GAs	TAs: 40.5 RAs: 31 Doctoral RAs: 22 GAs: 269 (data are for 20-hr/week equivalents) 10% of graduate student enrollment	TAs and RAs: \$8,000 Doctoral RAs: \$10,000 GA: \$4,000 + partial tuition remission No health benefits Summer Assistantships also available	Academic year appointments, by letter and acceptance form	Formal grievance process, set out in GA Handbook	Full-day College of Graduate Studies and Research workshops for TAs; individual departments provide training for other GAs	All graduate students represented on Graduate Council, the shared governance body for graduate education; graduate students serve on other institution - committees
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE	GAs, TAs and RAs	56 GAs, including 8 TAs; 23 RAs 12% of graduate student enrollment	GAs 9-month: \$10,378 minimum 12-month: \$12,201 to \$18,000, varies by department Tuition remission + health benefits Student Asst: paid hourly	Academic year contracts	GA grievance process—up to review by Dean of Graduate Studies—outlined in Graduate Student Handbook	Formal TA orientation begun this year, with follow-up meetings planned	Graduate School Council implemented recently

OTHER INSTITUTIONS							
UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE	GAs: research, lab technical support, admin support; Grad Fellows: PhD students, some are TAs; Student Asst: paid hourly	GA: 37 FTE Grad. Fellows: 5 Student Asst: 8 3.4% of graduate student enrollment	Masters': \$4,260 to \$14,000, depending on duties and department	One year contracts, some renewed for a second year or semester	None applicable to GAs only. GAs follow same policies as other student employees; Discrimination and harassment complaints addressed under FSU policies	Some UB-wide training; most training occurs within a unit, and some have GA manuals	No specific role for GAs, although GAs may have role in shared governance as part of graduate student bodies
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	RAs: commit 20 hrs/week as part of research training	60 RAs All research assistants receive assistantships	\$19,000 to \$21,000 +health benefits	Multi-year appointments made via appointment letter	Same process as other employees; special policy related to graduate student authorship		
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	GAs assist faculty with instruction	124 GAs				Given UMUC's mission, with little research and most students already employed, GAs are not numerous	
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BIOTECHNOLOGY CENTER	RAs		All RAs affiliated w. other USM institutions which set their stipend levels	Multi-year, documented by home institution	Home institution's grievance process	Lab orientation provided	GAs have representatives on the Faculty/staff Senate

No GAs: Baltimore City Community College, Coppin State University, St. Mary's College of Maryland

Data generally are for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Tuition remission for GAs was from \$7,800 to \$19,400 in the 2008-2009 academic year.

Stipend data are generally for nine-month academic year.

STATUS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY IN MARYLAND STATE PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Institution	Role of Adjunct Faculty	Numbers of Adjunct Faculty	Compensation	Length and Type of Appointment	Grievance Process and other Policies	Availability of Training and Campus Resources	Shared Governance Participation
RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS							
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK	Chiefly lecturers/instructors; Many adjunct teaching faculty (AF) have full-time outside professional employment elsewhere	473 Part-time, non-tenure track faculty (PTNTT) AF are 22% of total faculty; teach 11% of total courses	Paid by the course or salaried; Range of median adjunct salaries: \$5,191 to \$13,888/course Varies by school, degree, duties other than teaching	Generally, semester or annual contracts; Senior lecturers and professors of practice may have multi-year contracts' Some PTNTT faculty have job security	Same grievance process as other faculty, set out in Faculty Grievance Policy	Teaching resource guides and other online materials, invitation to new faculty orientation each semester; access to shared office space, photocopying, supplies, etc.	PT instructional faculty have a voting representative on the University Senate
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE	In-classroom, or laboratory and field clinical instruction; AF typically are employed outside higher education and teach one course/semester	Approximately 310 AF 17% of total faculty; Teach 10% of total courses	Per course: \$3,000-5000 Per credit hour: \$900-2100 Per contact hour: \$50 Varies by field of expertise and duties	Annual or semester appointments; terms documented in appointment letter	If informal department efforts fail to resolve a dispute, the AF may use either the School or UMB grievance process	UMB orientation programs available, supplemented by schools and programs; Shared offices with phones, electronic equipment and clerical support	Varies by School; AFs encouraged to participate in faculty organizations, but typically not as voting members
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE COUNTY	Lecturers/instructors; clinical or practice professors, research faculty; artists-in-residence; visiting PT Typically hired by the course, and often employed FT elsewhere	275 PTNTT 36.3% of total instructional faculty; Teach nearly 30% of course units	Per course: \$2,800-\$7,000 Varies by college an department, instructor qualifications and seniority	Typically hired by semester to teach one or more courses; terms documented in appointment letter	Access same grievance policy as tenured faculty, set out in faculty handbook'	Formal AF orientation at beginning of each semester; AFs have access to Faculty Development Center programs; Office resources vary by department, but shared resources and administrative support available to all AFs	AFs may serve in shared governance bodies but typically do not do so.

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	PT instructional faculty	Of 507 FTE equivalent teaching faculty, AFs are: 36% of total; Teach 50% of total courses	Per course range: \$2,000-\$4,200 Dependent upon rank, teaching experience, duties	Most have semester contracts, with some AFs teaching general education courses having annual contracts	General faculty grievance procedure applies to AFs with at least 50% time appointment	Orientation varies by department; AFs have office or meeting room space, computer access and telephone service	No AF participation
COMPREHENSIVE INSTITUTIONS							
BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY	PT instructional faculty	184 AF 33% of total faculty Teach 31% of total courses	Per course range: \$2,500-3,400 Varies with extent of course preparation, area of specialization	Typically annually, but also on "as needed" basis, with terms set in an Adjunct Contract	Resolved through "chain of command" up to department chair or Dean	BSU Faculty Institute at the beginning of each semester; periodic additional training at Center of Excellence in Teaching and Learning; Adjunct offices in each department, with equipment	AF may participate at all levels
FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY	PT instructional faculty	258 AF 34.4% of total faculty Teach 18.7% of total courses	\$2,000 per course	Single semester or term (e.g., summer) contracts	Informal resolution encouraged; formal grievance and appeal process the same as for other faculty Policies assembled in NTT faculty handbook	AFs invited to new faculty orientation each year and range of faculty training programs; Shared office and meeting space; campus network account; access to equipment	AFs eligible for election to Faculty Senate and its committees; two seats reserved for NTT faculty

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY	AFs teach 1 to 2 courses per term	281 AFs 43% of total faculty; Teach 20% of total courses	Range per course: \$2,200-2,500; Place within range varies with experience and class size; Occasionally exceed range due to market conditions or faculty reputation	Semester contracts	Same grievance process and policies as other SU faculty	Training provided within departments; all faculty professional development activities open to AFs; Shared offices and equipment; AFs have SU network accounts	No participation—limited to FT faculty
TOWSON UNIVERSITY	Clinical, visiting and senior lecturers	709 PTNTT 56 TU staff also teach PT 46% of total faculty; Teach 35% of all courses	\$2,500 per course; Amount may be higher for laboratory and clinical courses and supervision, up to \$5,000	Typically, semester contracts	Same grievance processes and policies as other TU faculty	New PT faculty orientation held each semester; departmental mentoring; Shared office space w. access to phone and computer	AF generally do not participate in campus shared governance activities, but are involved in faculty committees at the department level
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE	PTNTT, teaching 1-3 classes per year	131 AF 39.6% of total faculty; Teach 23% of all courses	Generally, per course: \$2,200 w. Masters degree; \$2,500 w. doctorate; Salaries may be higher in specialized fields, and at Baltimore and Shady Grove, up to \$6,600	Semester contracts	Informal processes at the department level	New AF Initiatives include AF FAQ and upcoming handbook; formal AF orientation to begin this semester; Some departments provide office space; network access provided	AFs do not participate
COPPIN STATE UNIVERSITY	PTNTT teaching	53% of total faculty; Teach 30% of total courses	\$1,700 for undergraduate courses; \$2,300 for graduate courses; May vary at School of Nursing	Semester contracts	Informal resolution through Division of Academic Affairs and Office of Human Resources	AF invited to same orientation and professional development activities as other faculty; Shared or individual office, access to equipment	AF generally do not participate in campus shared governance activities, but are involved in faculty committees at the department level

OTHER INSTITUTIONS							
UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE	Qualified individuals who teach individual courses; some salaried PTNTT faculty	350 AF, including 170 lawyers teaching one section each AFs teach 31% of all courses	Per course: Undergraduate: \$2,125-5,000 Graduate and Law: \$3,500-5,000 Salary varies with qualifications, course level and market	Semester contracts for AFs hired to teach individual courses; Salaried PTNTT faculty terms set out in appointment letter	Informal, except that discrimination and sexual harassment complaints follow campus policies	Varies by School, but campus-wide core AF orientation program about to be implemented; Office space, equipment and network access provided	AF may participate in campus shared governance activities, but only salaried PTNTT faculty may vote
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	Typically PT professionals employed in other field; limited to 15 hours/year	1,513 AF 86% of total faculty; Teach 73% of all courses	Range: No terminal degree: \$2,160-\$2,550 With terminal degree: \$2,760-\$3,660 Dependent upon experience, seniority and accomplishments at UMUC	Semester or term contract	Same grievance process as other faculty; Policies set out in Faculty Handbook	Participate in formal faculty orientation and other professional development programs as other faculty; Office space issues not relevant to UMUC; upcoming network access	Six seats on 18-seat Faculty Advisory Council reserved for AF; may also fill at-large seats
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND BIOTECHNOLOGY CENTER	Only unpaid, honorary appointments to research colleagues; no teaching or other assignments						
BALTIMORE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	PT instruction	275 AF 45% of total faculty; Teach 300 course sections	Non-nursing range: \$1,710-2,149; Nursing range: \$1,958-2,475 Salaries increase with seniority at BCCC	Semester contract	Informal process with department chair or Human Resources Office	Adjunct Faculty Academy offered each semester; Office space in Adjunct Suite or in department, with equipment and network access	No AF participation

SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND	Instruction in specialty areas and where temporary need from overload, sabbaticals, etc.	67 AF 31% of total faculty; Teach 19% of courses and 10% of credits	Per course range: \$3,000-\$5,000 Varies by course discipline, qualifications and market	Semester "letter of contractual services"	Grievance process set out in applicable section of Faculty By-laws	Campus new faculty orientation and departmental mentoring; AF access to campus professional development activities; Shared office, administrative support, equipment, network access	AF my participate as voting members during second consecutive semester teaching at SMCM
---	--	--	---	---	--	--	---

UMCES has no adjunct faculty.

Data generally are for the 2008-2009 academic year.

"Per course" data refer to three-credit courses.

AF are not required to do research, student advising or campus service unless specifically noted.

WORKPLAN: WORKGROUP ON THE STATUS OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTS AND ADJUNCT FACULTY

Meeting #1: July 20, 1pm

Introductions

Charge

Definition of the issues

- Who are “graduate assistants” and “adjunct faculty”?

- Data needed to complete tasks

Workgroup members’ discussion of major issues, goals/objectives

Agreement on agenda for future meetings

Meeting #2: August 17, 1 pm

Staff report on educational role and economic status of GAs and Adjuncts

Perspectives on role and status of GAs/Adjuncts (presentations and/or panel discussions)

- Institution representatives

- Graduate assistant representatives

- Faculty representatives

Meeting #3: August 31, 1 pm (longer if needed to accommodate public forum)

Follow-up on open Meeting #2 issues

Presentations and discussion of best practices

Open public forum

Meeting #4: Sept. 14 , 1 pm

Presentation of draft findings and discussion of findings and potential options

Meeting #5: Sept.29, 1 pm

Presentation and discussion of draft report and potential recommendations

Meeting #6: Oct. 12, 1pm

Discussion and approval of final report and recommendations

Meeting #7: October 26, 1pm

If needed to complete Workgroup activities

EXAMPLES OF “BEST PRACTICES” ADOPTED BY MARYLAND PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

FSU: GA orientation at campus and department levels required; mandatory training for GA supervisors

TU: Periodic GA/graduate student meetings with the provost to raised and discuss concerns; led to, e.g., improved GA parking policy and increased stipends

UMB: UMB has established a “big brother/sister” program to assist graduate students, including graduate assistants in meeting informal challenges associated with the first year of graduate school. A central graduate student office provides students with meeting space, computers and amenities that provides resources for interaction and has promoted both collegiality and professional development.

UMBI: Graduate student retreat

UMCP: Major improvements to GA status arising out of development of the strategic plan, including grievance process and GA policy manual

UMES: Office of Graduate Studies website; outreach to out-of-state and international students on impact of loss of assistantships

ADJUNCT FACULTY

Professional development

BCCC: BCCC offers an Adjunct Faculty Academy each semester, as well as five 5 additional hours of professional development activities at no cost to the AF. (Presentation by Mr. Stan Brown)

Formal AF orientation, training and access to campus faculty professional development activities are also provided at Coppin State University.

At Morgan State University, AF professional development is focused on effective teaching, with workshops on topics such as “Research and Best Practices on Differentiated Instruction” available to AF.

BSU: Department office hours extended to the evening to accommodate AF and their students; AF FAQ

CSU: New AF orientation and mandatory participation in required periodic HR Office workshops

FSU: NTT Faculty Handbook; 2 seats on Faculty Senate designated for NTT; new faculty orientation and other training available for AF

MSU: Teaching workshops for AF

St. Mary’s: Increased AF orientation and training

SU: Reduced parking fees for evening AF

UB: Strong law school AF orientation and professional development program

UMCP: Voting representative for PTNTT faculty on the UMCP Senate; Lecturer Appreciation Event

UMUC: Third of all seats on Faculty Senate for AFs; training, awards, conference travel, faculty leadership institute available to AFs

BSU