Institutionalizing equitable policies

and practices for contingent faculty

by

Adrianna Kezar

Associate Professor

University of Southern California

Cecile Sam

Graduate assistant

University of Southern California

Introduction

In recent years there has been a marked increase of contingent faculty[1] on college

campuses across all sectors (Schell & Stock, 2001; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007;

Baldwin & Chronister, 2002). Given the quick rise of this class of employees, few

institutions have developed new practices for including these new faculty or processes

(like promotion, faculty development and other common practices) which meet the needs

of this group (Schell & Stock, 2001; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). The original purpose

of contingent faculty was to provide auxiliary and temporary teaching support to the

institution or bring in additional expertise, with the tenure/tenure-track faculty teaching a

majority of the classes. At the time, much of the contingent work force was part-time or

temporary and did not necessarily seek further employment. Now there is a wide range

of contingent faculty starting with part-time to full-time non-tenure-track – many who

seek full-time and tenure-track appointments. The population of contingent faculty was

also relatively small. As time progressed, institutions of higher education shifted, making

contingent faculty a much larger percentage of the faculty (as much as 80% in some

institutions) and 2/3 of the current professoriate.

In most colleges and universities, the organizational culture has not been very

supportive of contingent faculty (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Baldwin & Chronister,

2002). An established hierarchy among the faculty (e.g. non-tenured and tenure/tenure-

track or full-time and part-time faculty) exists on many campuses. At times, evidence of

---

[1] We use the term contingent faculty because it is one of the most recognized labels for this growing class of faculty, and is used by The National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, and the American Association of University Professors. Contingent faculty vary in type, and distinctions are made among part-time and full-time non-tenure-track and graduate students.

the delineations are overt—for example, the acknowledgement of only tenure-line faculty on department websites. Other times, the delineations are more subtle, such as simply failing to invite certain faculty to department events. Additionally, many contingent faculty members themselves have been socialized to accept the status quo of a culture that does not support their work (Cross & Goldberg, 2009). With the numerous policies and practices unsupportive of contingent faculty, coupled with the assumption that tenure is the penultimate goal for faculty and anything other is somehow less desirable, many faculty members (not just contingents) assume that this culture is normative for academia. Yet, this situation of an unsupportive culture appears to affect the teaching and learning environment and needs to be addressed (Jacoby, 2006; Umbach, 2007). Most commentators are unanimous that given the current hiring trend, contingent faculty are not likely to go away (Schell & Stock, 2001; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Baldwin & Chronister, 2002). With this rising faculty population, we need to examine institutional processes that create new policies and practices—innovations—so that contingents can more effectively function within institutions. A few studies (for example, Baldwin & Chronister, 2002) have recommended improved practices, but no one has documented actual institutional innovations and the process it takes to get these innovations in place.

However, in order for these new policies and practices to become established in specific colleges and universities, they must be accepted into the cultural fabric of the institution. Organizational culture is defined as the values, norms, and underlying assumptions the guide people's behavior, and is key to creating a sustainable reform (Schein, 1992). Without cultural acceptance, reform of almost any type fails (Murray, 1995). Contingent faculty who are trying to evoke change at colleges or universities

must make such change something that "fits into an organization's life" (Curry, 1992, p.27). Institutionalization is a process that makes a change part of that organizational life..

Change has been occurring in a few select colleges and universities, and this paper looks at some of those institutions that are moving towards a more supportive environment for contingent faculty. Our major contribution is to be the first paper to move from calls to change to document actual changes taking place (one exception is Schell and Stock, 2001)[2]. For the most part, in our investigations, changes related to contingent faculty work conditions has occurred from the bottom-up with contingent faculty playing a leadership role. Tenure-track faculty and administrators have generally not lead change efforts, and usually become involved only further into the institutionalization process. The second major contribution is our use of contingent faculty voices systematically in an empirical study. Very few studies on contingent faculty incorporate the voices contingent faculty, though many use anecdotal stories or secondary resources. How leaders in this change movement achieve institutionalization may vary from individual context to context. However, there are some themes that can be pulled across campus experiences, through the different phases of institutionalization: mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization. Two main research questions drive the focus of this paper:

1. Through the lens of institutionalism, what are the factors and strategies used to move forward with these changes for contingent faculty?

---

[2] Their book looks at individual campus case studies and is not national in scope.

2. What challenges and issues emerge that affect the move toward more inclusive policies and practices for contingent faculty?

In the following paper we will begin with the theoretical framework of institutionalism, moving to a review of the literature first focusing on contingent faculty and research involving institutionalization of innovation in higher education. We then will explore the various stages of institutionalism through themes that emerged in our study.

<div align="center">Theoretical Framework</div>

In order to understand how progress has been made for contingent faculty, we look to institutionalization as a framework to see how both policies and practices become part of an institution (Curry, 1992; Alexander, 2005). When trying to create change in an organization, the key is trying to find a way to make it part of the culture of the organization—basic assumptions, norms and values, and policies and practices (Schein, 1992). Institutionalization offers a way of understanding how change becomes part of the organizational culture. Curry (1992) offers a three-stage model of institutionalization: mobilization—"the system is prepared for change"; implementation—"the change is introduced"; and institutionalization--"the system is stabilized in its changed state" (Curry, 1991 as referenced in Curry, 1992 p.5).   In much of the change literature on institutionalization, these stages are referred to in various manners (for examples see Kezar, 2007), however despite the typology used all of the labels indicate three stages of progression that follow similar linear patterns.

Mobilization is the first stage of the model. In this stage, the organization is beginning to prepare for change, this preparation ranges from initial awareness of a

problem to laying the foundation for a policy to be implemented. In this stage people begin to gather around a common cause or reform. It is in this stage where change agents begin to question and challenge the current status quo—previous practices and policies that are enmeshed within the current institutional culture. This stage is associated with two aspects structural change to the organization and galvanizing members. Structural change is where "innovations are reflected in a concrete fashion throughout the organization" (Datnow, 2005, p. 124). Structural changes can range from setting up agendas and priorities at meetings, to changing mission statements. Galvanizing members towards action can occur through raised awareness or disseminating information.

Implementation is the second stage, focusing on creating infrastructure and support for the reform or change. During this stage, initiatives begin to materialize in the organization, and support for the structures is developed to maintain momentum (Curry, 1992; Kezar, 2007).   These initiatives may take the form of reward incentives or sanctioning for various behaviors, other goups and people begin to cooperate—new members may join in for additional support—in those occasions when needed, technical assistance occurs for any troubleshooting or logistical issues (Fullan, 1989). At this stage, policy and behaviors are becoming part of the standard operating procedures of the organization (Curry, 1992). Members have accepted the procedure, but have not yet developed an evaluation of the innovation to truly adopt it quite yet.

Institutionalization is the final stage of the process. It moves beyond standard operation procedures to the actual value system of the organization. Members come to a consensus, accepting the value of innovation, and seeing the innovation as normative

behavior for the institution. At this level, authors connect institutionalization with the changing of the organizations culture and core understanding (Curry, 1993; Kezar, 2007; Kanter, 1987). The innovation has maintained stability within the organization to be virtually indistinguishable from the rest of the institution. In a bit of irony, an innovation reaches the institutionalization stage, and is successful when it no longer is seen as an innovation, rather it is just a part of the organizational framework.

Since organizational evolution is a process over time, these three stages are more of a continuum rather than set delineated stages. Institutionalization provides a useful framework because it allows for an understanding to how leaders—anyone at the forefront of these changes—either have or would be able to establish permanent innovation at their institution. While this provides a global framework, we wanted to examine the specifics of how contingent faculty innovations move through the three phases towards institutionalization so that leaders have more specific and concrete advice.

Within each of the three phases we look towards policies, practices and culture as different aspects found in institutionalization for including contingents. Policies focus more on formal structures that have been created or that exist. Practices are behaviors, often informal, that reflect both mindset and adopted norms and present them in concrete forms. Culture incorporates both policies and practices of an institution, but also moves to more abstract values, ideas, and contexts.

Each of the institutions focused upon in this study fall on some part of this continuum. Research on change focused on institutionalization demonstrates that leaders need to use different strategies when an initiative is new to an organization than when the

initiative has begun to be incorporated into the organization or institutionalized (Kezar &

Eckel, 2002; Curry, 1992; Alexander, 2005). It is our goal to understand these strategies

and policy developments, as well as paint a clearer picture of the challenges that may

hinder the change

Literature Review

A review of the literature found that there are two distinct bodies of research that

need to be addressed in order to gain a better understand this topic. The first topic

focuses on research regarding contingent faculty—with the rapid changes to faculty

make-up in the last few years and the current economic crisis ensuring the increase of

contingent faculty, research on this population and their effect on the institution of higher

education has just begun to bourgeon. The second topic focuses on research in education

that involves institutionalization and the elements that contribute to or detract from the

institutionalization of innovation in an education setting.

Contingent faculty

Much of the literature around contingent faculty focuses around challenges that

they face, setting the context for why change is needed. Research focuses on a myriad of

problems such as lower wages (Jacobsohn 2002), minimal benefits or job security

(Baldwin & Chronister, 2002) and lack of respect and status (Kezar, Lester, & Anderson,

2006). There are faculty members who have chosen to be contingent (due to various

reasons such as family or alternative employment) and are satisfied with their role in the

academy (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007), but much of the research focuses on other

members who feel disenfranchised and like second class citizens (O'Grady, 2002). Even

those who are satisfied with the role often report being treated in inappropriate ways by

colleagues and excluded from institutional processes (CEW report, 2007; Gappa & Trice, 2009; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

But whether they are satisfied or not, these negative conditions can affect educational quality. Studies demonstrate that certain contextual and environmental factors detract from contingent faculty success and other factors help support contingent faculty (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Stapler, 2006; Sheeks & Hutchenson, ---; Gappa, Austin, Trice, 2007). For example, professional development (Thompson, 1993; Baldwin, 1998), commitment and longer-term contacts (Elman, 2003; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006), and an inclusive environment (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Stapler, 2006) have all been found to improve the environment for contingent faculty. The campus work environment can either help make faculty more productive, or can hamper them and make them less able to perform their jobs well (Schell & Stock, 2001). Also, studies have found that students exposed to more contingent faculty have lower graduation (Jacoby, 2006). Contingents use less active learning techniques, integrate less technology and do not emphasize teaching techniques for a diverse student body (Umbach, 2007). These studies suggest that the working conditions of faculty may be affected the teaching and learning environment[3].

Numerous articles from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and National Education Association (NEA), as well as other authors emphasize the changes that should take place at institutions for both equity and quality purposes including multi-year contracts, professional development, inclusion in governance, office space, equitable pay, and a

---

[3] There may be different explanations for these findings, and we are wary of generalizing an entire group of faculty members.

plethora of other issue that address problems noted in the first section of the literature review (Gappa, Austin & Trice, 2007; Schell & Stock, 2001). All underscore that contingent faculty are not to be blamed or scapegoated as lesser quality, the issue is the quality of the conditions that they are required to work under. Though there is scholarship and advocacy emphasizing normative policies and practices that institutions should follow to improve the work lives of contingent faculty (see, Baldwin and Chronister, 2002), there is a dearth of research focusing on "actual" institutions that are currently in the process of institutionalizing progressive policies and practices for contingents, especially non-tenure-track full-time faculty.

Leadership and the Factors of Institutionalization

Intentional and conscientious leadership is needed for innovation to be incorporated into the culture. Outside the stages of institutionalization already reviewed, this literature focuses on the importance of leadership, and describes factors that leaders should attend, regarding the institutionalization process. We review these issues next as they may be relevant within our study.

Leadership. Researchers have identified leadership as one of the key levers in institutionalizing organizational change and innovation (Curry, 1992; Kanter, 1983; Kezar, 2007; Boyce, 2003). Change leaders are not necessarily in positions of formal power, rather they can be found on all levels of the organization (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). Leaders are both those in formal positions, such as department chairs and administration (Kotter, 1988; Kezar & Eckel, 2005; Murray, 1997), and those in grassroots positions, such as faculty members or students (Astin & Leland, 1991). Kezar (2007) illustrates the different tasks a leader should accomplish, at different stages of the institutionalization

process, in order for the innovation to reach the final stage. The key is for a leader to take the time to understand the context and issues at hand, and to know when to use the appropriate strategies (Kanter, 1983; Curry, 1992).

Cultural Congruency. If a leader imposes change that has little connection to the culture of the organization, rarely is it successful (Curry, 1992; Kezar, 2007; Datnow, 2005). Some of the ways this can be achieved in higher education is through an understanding of the current organizational culture that exists, Kezar and Eckel (2003) use the term a "view from the balcony" to illustrate the point—leaders should take a step back to see the current organizational culture, and assess the climate to see what may be the best way of approaching a task. Ensuring that the stakeholders in the organization are educated with what is going on, such as open lines of communication and professional development can also play a role in creating cultural congruency (Evans & Henrichsen, 2008).

Focus. Leaders will find it difficult to encourage change and innovation in a culture when the actual goals are vague or ambiguous or priorities are in disarray (Murray, 2008). Numerous scholars note that part of a successful initiative is a clarity of vision—the tenets of the reform can be clearly explained and communicated (Massy, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994; Kezar, 2007). Clarity can be enhanced by models and benchmarks (Kezar & Eckel, 2003), through member values being in congruence (Litzler et al, n.d.), and aligning resources with the change effort (Boyce, 2003).   As the innovation enters various different phases, maintaining focus on the desired end result becomes both a necessity and a challenge for change agents (Murray, 2008).

External environments. When looking at organizational reform, leaders often focus on the institutional level rather than the external environments which may also play a role in the success of a reform (Datnow, 2005). In the K-12 literature on institutionalized reforms, scholars argue that supportive infrastructures must exists at the various levels: state, district, and community (Moffet, 2000; Fullan, 2001; Anderson & Stiegelbauer, 1994). Though institutions of higher education they are subject to the external influence of the similar levers (Eckel, Green & Hill, 2001; Clark, 1998). Eckel and Kezar (2003) demonstrate how accreditation processes, disciplinary societies, professional associations (such as the AAUP) and other external groups can shape change processes. Crisis such as the recent economic collapse, also affect how policies and practices are institutionalized (Levin, 1980).

Partnerships. Leaders should attend to connections both internal and external to aid the institutionalization of an innovation. Osa and Schock (2007) discuss the use of both networks and influential allies to begin mobilizing and supporting people for change. Networks help facilitate communication, as well as provide additional means for both information and resources. Influential allies, such leaders in formalized positions, lend credibility and social capital that can move the change to the next stage, as well as have links to the external environment (Lueddeke, 1999). Among contingent faculty, several networks currently exist including COCAL (Coalition for Contingent Academic Labor) and the New Faculty Majority—two groups created to link contingent faculty members with those who are at different campuses or locations, exchanging information and offering support. There are also professional groups such as the NEA, AAUP, and

AFT who often lend support in terms of resources and experience with regards to

enacting for change.

<div align="center">Methodology</div>

The research team used a qualitative two-part methodology: document analysis

and interviews. Our document analysis focused heavily on employment contracts for

contingent faculty, searching for promising practices, policies, and language. We also

spent a year participating and observing contingent faculty listservs and incorporating the

information as part of our data as well. Our interview approach focused on conversations

with roughly 30 institutions/individuals,[4] ranging from senate presidents to non-tenure-

track faculty in leadership positions, such as union leaders or faculty on committees.

These individuals work with institutions that have either promising institutional policies

towards contingent faculty or working towards them. The interview methodology

allowed for us to obtain a fuller understanding of the policy changes from the

perspectives of those actually involved in the process (Mishler, 1986).

Sample

We based the selection of these institutions on numerous sources to ensure that

they did in fact have either promising or progressive policies: 1. review of union

contracts, focusing on policies for contingent faculty: i.e. governance, multi-year

contracts, and positive language; 2. review of existing literature for potential nominations

(as suggested in Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007); 3. attended and observed at conferences

with contingent faculty forums (such as National Education Association's Higher

Education Conference); and, 4. garnered nominations from the NEA, AAUP, and AFT.

---

[4] We spoke to 30 different institutions and some institutions included several individuals or even a team. Therefore, we use 30 as the number of institutions we spoke with but actually conversed with upward of 45 people.

Following the identification of institutions, we sent requests to the chairs of

academic senates or union leadership, where we were either granted an interview or

directed to an individual more integral to the contingent faculty movement. The

institutions are all North American non-profit traditional institutions: community

colleges, four-year teaching colleges and universities; and research universities. We had

a mix of institutions by type[5]: 4 technical colleges; 12 four-year colleges and universities,

and 14 community or two-year colleges. The vast majority were unionized: 22.

Data Collection

Data collection began with document analysis of 483 contracts on file through a

digital database (HECAS) provided by the NEA (Schensul, Schensul, & Lecompte, 1999;

Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Of the contracts reviewed, 85 demonstrated exemplary

language that was analyzed further. The contracts were viewed for established policies

for contingent faculty, which may indicate if an institution has progressive policies

towards contingent faculty. Examplary contract language varied: some contracts

expressly highlighted the importance of contingent work, others expressed the

importance of certain rights in order for contingent faculty to function, and others had

entirely separate contracts for contingent faculty. More information was gathered from

documents and public media such as meeting minutes, web pages, and contingent faculty

list-servs. The contingent faculty listserv (ADJ-L listserv) was a key source of

information about these campuses as well as general trends on contingent faculty

organizing. Since the campuses we spoke with were often on the leading edge of the

---

[5] Far more community colleges nationally have made progress on issues for non-tenure-track faculty that are systemic
and deep. Finding institutions in the four year category proved much more challenging, particularly as they are
typically not unionized. Yet, half our sample was of non-two year institutions so the finding should be applicable
across institutional type.

changes nationally, their contingent faculty leaders were actively in participating and offering advice on the listserv. This information added to interviews that we collected.

Interviews with 30 institutions/faculty leaders provided follow-up and additional information on various institutions. Our interviews focused on the following information: 1. exemplary practices and policies, particularly ones not listed in union contracts (also some institutions were not unionized); 2. narratives about the policies and practices put in place; 3. challenges they experienced and ways they overcame challenges; and 4. issues that emerged that shape their progress toward institutionalization: partnerships, external environment, focus, number of contingents, culture amongst contingents and tenure-track and administration, retirements and turn-over, and the like.

We conducted interviews over the phone because the individuals were geographically dispersed (Mishler, 1986). At times we spoke to teams of people, some faculty felt that as a team they could voice different views of their change process. Sometimes tenure-track faculty, who partnered to make the change, were brought into the interviews. The phone interviews usually ranged between 45-60 minutes in length. The interviews were digitally recorded (when allowed), and extensive notes were taken. We also asked them to forward any important documents that reflected policies or other relevant documents.

Analysis

The interview data and documents were analyzed using Boyatzis' (1998) thematic analysis, focusing mostly on both inductive and deductive coding around strategies that leaders used to move the contingent faculty agenda forward. Examples of

deductive codes include bargaining units, governance, and contract language. A variety

of inductive codes emerged: such as data use, generational differences, and contingent

faculty apathy. Criteria used to identify themes/subcategories for improving performance

were: 1. the number of different individuals who brought up the code/theme; 2. the

amount of time they discussed the concept; and 3. level of significance they placed on a

code/theme. Our institutions can be categorized into the following phases of

institutionalization: 12 in the mobilization stage; 13 in the implementation stage; and only

5 in the institutionalized stage. As a result, we have information about mobilization at 30

campuses, implementation at 18 campuses, and institutionalization at only 5 campuses.

This pattern is not surprising, since so few campuses have made progress on this front.

While we have fewer institutions that have made it to institutionalization, we still feel we

can learn lessons about institutionalization from these few important campuses.

Trustworthiness

We triangulated our information in four ways: 1. consistency between

information found in contracts with interviews; 2. input from external reviewers

regarding our interpretation of the contracts; 3.interviews with multiple people at the

institutions; and 4. different researchers reviewing the data and analysis. Each institution

in our study had a corresponding contract, we used the interviews to either confirm or

reject the promising practices that we found in the contract language. To ensure our

understanding of the contract was accurate, we asked for input from external reviewers

who are familiar with contract language. With information from both the initial interview

and contract, we interviewed other people at the same institution to try and garner an

accurate portrait of the progress. Finally, with all of the data collected, both researchers

conducted analyses independently, and conferred when discrepancies in interpretation arose.

<div align="center">Results</div>

We now describe the three phases and the detail we were able to identify in order to better understand mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization. Despite differences of overall environment on each individual campus, there was little if any difference between two-year and four-year institutions, union and non-unionized campuses, and how they all moved through the stages of institutionalization. As we show how faculty moved towards institutionalization and the strategies that they used, we also describe practices and policies within each stage that were most effective as the faculty moved towards cultural change.

Mobilization

The mobilization stage roughly mirrors how it is described in the literature; awareness is important, and the status quo is questioned. The mobilization phase is characterized by three important tactics: 1. Developing awareness; 2. Creating a network; and, 3. Breaking invisibility. Mobilizing contingent faculty is extremely difficult and involves challenges not represented in literature on institutionalization, which typically involves full-time employees with regular working conditions. For example, some contingent faculty members have absorbed the negative messages spread by tenure-track faculty and believe in their own lack of self worth and as a result may feel unmotivated to fight for their rights. In this case, awareness and challenging the status quo are vital. On other campuses, contingent faculty are extremely fragmented—there is a the lack of unity between tenure-track and nontenure-track and even among groups within the contingent

faculty – contingent faculty in composition and the arts are treated much more poorly

than in the professional areas. Even within the same department, contingent faculty often

do not interact with each other due to different teaching schedules and lack of a

communal workspace. Because contingent faculty tend to be isolated, and as a result are

often more disenfranchised, creating a network is particularly important.   Still other

contingent faculty are largely invisible on many campuses, practices that make them

more visible and their plight are critical.

Interviewees noted how full-time non-tenure-track and part-time non-tenure-track

often see each other as "the enemy" and are competing and fighting for courses. They

noted how administration often, by either design or accident, further this animosity and

drive a wedge between groups so that they do not develop collective momentum. For

example, on some campuses the administration does not establish a part-time to full-time

faculty ratio, so courses are often seen as a zero-sum game—a set number of classes that

places both groups of contingent faculty in direct competition. Contingent faculty lack

time to be involved as they are often teaching at multiple institutions, have a second job,

or have incredibly high workloads and it is not uncommon for them to teach between 12-

13 classes a year. All these elements of contingent faculty work make mobilization

difficult.

The major outcomes of the mobilization phase in terms of policies and practices

mostly relate to practices such as the development of communication tools, networks and

regular meetings, and unionization. Campuses in this stage have few established policies.

Campuses in the mobilization phase generally have a climate that is antagonistic towards

contingent faculty. Now we review the tactics of the mobilization phase.

Developing awareness. Mobilization is very unlikely to occur unless awareness is developed and apathy overcome among contingent faculty. Almost all the people we interviewed mentioned how development of awareness was the first key factor to mobilizing, and it can occur in many different ways. For some institutions, the apathy toward poor work conditions was overcome by some significant galvanizing event such as a person being unfairly fired, a major grievance that is filed, a non-tenure-track faculty member excluded or thrown off a governance body. While these events can be ignored, contingent faculty leaders worked to make these inequitable acts visible to the community. A second way that campuses create awareness was through data collection, demonstrating how poor the work conditions were compared to other institutions or compared to tenure-track faculty members. These contingent leaders often looked for model institutions or more exemplary contract language to make comparisons to their particular campus. One contingent faculty leader describes the way they used data: "contingent faculty weren't really aware of the disparity in salary between nontenure-track and tenure-track faculty. I think at some level they were, but to see it in black-and-white and to be told how underpaid they were by a percentage hit home more."

Another part of awareness is also becoming aware of differences in the experience of contingent faculty on the same campus– for example, being a contingent in composition, the medical school, and social work may very different in terms of how they are treated on campus. This awareness is pivotal in how they move towards implementation as they can see pockets to target (composition) or models to follow or allies to target (the professional schools).

Creating a network. The second major practice during mobilization is creating networks. Once a community develops awareness, there is an opportunity capitalize on this attention, and creating these communication vehicles is a way to disseminate information as well as further unite individuals. The most prevalent mechanisms for communicating and connecting people were campus-based list-servs, web sites, and electronic or printed newsletters. Contingent leaders also encourage people to join the national contingent faculty listserv (ADJ-L) and this suggestion further created awareness about the problems and created enthusiasm and mobilized people. As one contingent faculty member explained: "our campus listserv has been invaluable in letting people know about the bad experiences contingent faculty are facing and the reason working together is important. We've also gotten out lots of data through the listserv." Though mobilizing through the use of newletters and flyers and word-of-mouth have been used in previous years, the onset and ease of technology to allow for mass communication makes such mobilization on a national level a much easier task. Information about large nationwide events like Campus Equity Week can be disseminated in a matter of minutes.

Breaking invisibility. The third major practice to mobilize a campus is to break invisibility. By developing awareness, contingent faculty leadership is created. Through networking, the number of leaders and activism is increased. By breaking invisibility, contingent faculty leaders are able to develop allies among other groups on campus. A powerful mechanism for breaking invisibility is to distribute data, and make other people aware of the sheer number of contingent faculty on campus and the extremely low pay which most tenure-track faculty are unaware of. The second important mechanism is

selling the expertise that contingent faculty have to offer. As one contingent leader noted:

> We have been very active in publicizing and promoting the incredible expertise among the contingent faculty. Our arts faculty have received many awards in the community, our business, science and technology faculty are known leaders in their fields. We make sure that people see the value we have to offer and we might be worth fighting for better working conditions.

Visibility is critical for getting other faculty, who have more time and even leverage, involved (like tenure-track). If contingent faculty have to shoulder the whole burden, the process is slow and can falter. Campuses that institutionalized change sometimes had tenure-track faculty who played a leadership role. But tenure-track faculty leadership was also a point of contention because if these faculty did not understand contingent faculty work conditions well enough, sometimes they misspoke or made errors that hampered the mobilizing and caused bad feelings.

There was one tactic used by campuses the five campuses that moved toward institutionalization that was not used by others in the mobilization phase which seems important to point out as it might be key toward institutionalization. In the mobilization phase, these campuses focused more on underlying values, assumptions and stereotypes held by tenure-track faculty, administrators, and among contingents themselves. Rather than focus on policies and practices, they focused on values and only pursued policies and practices once some baseline in changed consciousness was raised. They foreground values over overt practices. For example, on one campus, the first step was reducing the hierarchy amongst faculty in as many ways as possible: invitations to events, inclusion

on webpages and directories, and uniform recognition of years of service. This created some unity and understanding among faculty that eased the introduction of new policies and practices. Once mobilization phase is finished the campus is poised to implement policies and move toward better working conditions

Implementation

Implementation is much more complex than described in the literature. Implementation is noted as creating infrastructure and capitalizing on momentum to support the change. However, the vast number and array of elements that must be brought together make implementation a challenging issue that often either gets cut short or takes many years to realize. While mobilization followed a clear path of tactics, implementation was a scattershot of many different tactics that needed to be used in combination to be successful. We present them in the order that some campuses follow or some tactics that seem necessary before another was to be successfully used. These strategies include: 1. Developing a rationale; 2. Using data, benchmarks, and model institutions to guide policies; 3. Creating a regular meeting task force or committee charged with contingent faculty work conditions; 4. Being included in governance; 5. garnering outside pressure from unions, media, students, and accreditors; 6. Utilizing allies and departments to leverage changes; and 7. Creating a plan of action.

Campuses that are in the institutionalization phase used two practices that do not appear to be present at calcifying institutions. We want to pay particular attention to developing a rationale and creating a plan of action. Implementation entailed addressing the "main line" concerns among contingent faculty that tend to be those addressed by unions: salary, job security (multiyear contracts or seniority), benefits, and sometimes

addressed secondary issues such as office space, pay for office hours, and governance. However, most of the secondary issues were more fully addressed when campuses moved to institutionalization such as clerical support, professional development, systemic orientation, and visibility and respect on campus.

Of the campuses in the implementation phase, we have made a distinction between early and late implementers. Early implementers are those campuses that have fewer policies in place, or have just begun to implement new policies. Late implementers are those schools who are making major progress and have overcome hurdles but have not entirely made it to full institutionalization, though some of their practices and policies may have made it to the final stage.

Developing a rationale. While calling attention to inequities was sufficient for mobilization, in moving towards implementation contingent leaders realize that they needed a more complex and multifaceted rationale. All the campuses that moved towards institutionalization made a clear connection between contingent faculty work conditions and the educational outcomes and learning environment for students: "momentum really developed for changing contingent faculty policies when we could connect it to how it was impacting students, that was when the tenure-track faculty noted they were willing to sacrifice part of their pay." They were able to demonstrate and link how not been paid for office hours, having no place to meet with students, being unable to mentor students or write letters of recommendation because of lack of longevity would affect the experience of students. Contingent faculty leaders also describe the way that low morale compromised the community and again student educational outcomes. They acknowledge the difficulties of finding funding for campuses and engaged in discussions

about ways to lower expenses so that greater equity could be created for contingent faculty.

Using data, benchmarks, and models. Data collection is critical to mobilize people, and it became even more important in the implementation phase. Almost every campus that we spoke with had identified some model campuses through the listservs they were on. If they were unionized, the HECAS database was available, They used the data to develop an action plan for implementing changes: "for every policy we have in place now, we found a campus with the kind of policy we wanted in place. These models helped us imagine much better policies than we would have come up with ourselves. And we did not look to any one campus, we pulled the best from several different campuses." One contingent faculty leader talked about the use of benchmark data:

> Our institution is very prestigious and always likes to compare themselves to star
> institution (pseudonym). Star institution actually has strong policies for
> contingent faculty as it is in one of the few strong union states. We were able to
> use this institution that they use as their reputational peer to convince them to
> create new policies on campus around salary, multiyear contracts, governance,
> professional development and seniority.

Yet data is often hard to obtain: "in Canada all the staffing information is public and available. Here, it is hard to get data. The administration controls it and is often unwilling to share statistics on numbers, salary. States do not collect data. Data could be so helpful to our cause, but it is hard to come by." However, other campuses obtained data needed through important partnerships with individuals or groups who knew how to gain the necessary information and were willing to share.

Creating a regular meeting task force or committee. One of the vehicles that was important to starting off implementation is creating regular meetings of contingent faculty (and often tenure-track faculty) through a task force or committee charged with contingent faculty work conditions. This strategy was most used on four-year campuses and it was often set up through the faculty Senate. However, on unionized campuses the union leadership set up meetings within union membership to regularly discuss how to move policies and practices forward. A tenure-track faculty member comments on this issue: "Contingent faculty have little if any venue to meet in. They are not organized in any way and this task force has been extremely important in bringing them together as well as getting them in contact with tenure-track faculty members."

Being included in governance. One of the differences between early implementers and late implementers is participation in governance. As noted in the introduction to this section,we labeled some campuses as early implementers because they had fewer policies and practices in place for contingent faculty members And late implementers that had many more policies and practices in place. A defining feature of late implementers is that these campuses included contingent faculty in governance, which tends to propel more and broader changes. There is also a difference in how they are included in governance with early implementers being token members on faculty Senate, invitations to departmental meetings with little follow-up or compensation, and often no or a partial vote. Campuses that had more policies and practices in place increased the number of contingent faculty to be proportional to their percentage (or at least much closer), guaranteed representation on key committees such as curriculum, and ensured a vote. As one contingent leader noted:

You always be a side order of fries unless you participate in governance. Some

contingent faculty think governance is a luxury and we should just focus on rights

like benefits. But if you are going to be a real member of the community, treated

as a professional, and included, you must participate in governance.

Several contingent leaders even pronounce that governance was the most important factor

to implementing and institutionalizing change. One challenge to participation in

governance -- even at late implementers and campuses that were institutionalized -- is

creating a system that encourages participation rather than making participation a burden.

Only two campuses have compensation for faculty who participate in governance or

included governance within evaluation and promotion.

Garnering outside pressure. Some campuses stall in the implementation phase—

they may only obtain only minor salary increase and marginal health benefits (that they

have to pay for) and then are unable to move forward. Others had mobilized, but were

stuck in long-term discussions about policies or could not get the institution to engage

with them in discussions -- including unionized campuses that may not even be able to

move collective-bargaining forward. In these many instances, garnering outside pressure

from unions, media, students and parents, and accreditors was a way to push forward the

implementation. In the words of one contingent faculty member:

We use the opportunity of our accreditation visit to meet separately with a review

team and give them an earful about the problems we were experiencing. This

resulted in a poor accreditation report. But that may not have been enough, we

also got an op ed in the paper about the same time and this created some

community pressure as well. I think getting lots of outside concern can get the
attention of people you need to start implementing policies.

Utilizing allies. Another way the campuses got stuck was that they implemented
policies and practices campus wide, but they were not translating down into departments.
In fact, one of the most common problems that we heard was that policies and practices
were so unevenly implemented, and there is no enforcement of the policies uniformly
throughout the campus: "So you can have a policy that says contingent faculty members
should receive funding for professional development, but that doesn't mean that it
happens in the departments. You can have a campus-wide policies that says each school
will have they orientation for contingent faculty members, but that typically doesn't
happen either. Even policies such as salary or benefits, which you think would be harder
to circumvent, are often subverted in the departments." One of the ways to overcome this
challenge to implementation is utilizing allies in departments to leverage changes. While
many contingent faculty leaders pressed administrators to hold departments accountable,
the strategy was often unsuccessful. Instead, they worked to generate tenure-track faculty
allies (often who were or became department chairs). By creating five or six model
departments on campus, with good policies and practices, it became harder for other
departments to ignore the issue. Also, these tenure-track faculty members started to
discuss the problem at faculty Senate more vociferously, pressuring departments that
were not following the policy.

Creating a plan of action. One of the distinguishing characteristics of campuses
that have moved towards institutionalization is that they created a plan of action. Most
campuses leaders that we spoke with emphasized a specific issue or a policy they were

trying to get in place, such as seniority rights. They tended to have an incremental

approach and were using data and models to help them improve the policies they had in

place. However, campuses that were moving towards or had institutionalized change

conceptualized all of the changes that they wanted, and worked towards a grand plan.

They did not short shrift their future vision by only working toward small gains. They

also were realistic about their plan of action, and knew that without utilizing many of the

other strategies listed above, such as getting external pressure or full participation in

governance, then their plans had little chance of success. But having a plan provided a

blueprint for their actions as part of governance, for what data to collect, for what allies to

target, and for union negotiations.

Institutionalization

As we established in the last section, creating a rationale for the change and

having an action plan are essential to move toward institutionalization. Also, earlier we

discussed starting with underlying values in the mobilization phase as appearing to be

something shared by campuses that have institutionalized changes. We describe these

under mobilization and implementation, but these issues are clearly connected to the

institutionalization, but happen earlier. What characterizes the institutionalization phase

is that the campus moves beyond what are typical "mainline" union contract issues such

as salary, benefits, and job security to the less visible, but equally important, issues of

professional development, mentoring, socialization to the campus, and inclusion. This

phase is characterized by the valuing of contingent faculty members, with practices and

policies reflecting this commitment: a full integration into the culture. A contingent

faculty leader describes how institutionalization looks different: "if you walked into a

department on campus five years ago, you would have no idea the contingent faculty

members existed. Now, every contingent faculty member's picture is on the wall across

campus. Their accomplishments and day-to-day activities are listed in our campus

newsletter. They're visibly a part of awards ceremonies, celebrations, and considered

equal members to all other faculty and educators on campus."

There are four the main strategies used during institutionalization: 1. Addressing

the climate of the campus; 2. Moving beyond mainline policies and just pockets of

departments to entire campus; 3. Creating a single faculty; and, 4. Taking leadership on

major issues on campus. However, it should be noted that many campuses became too

focused on salary, benefits, and job security. They have difficulty seeing the value of

issues related to inclusion and climate, which they see as a luxury and potentially even an

unachievable goal. This lack of vision is an obstacle for these campuses, impeding them

from moving forward towards institutionalization. We should note that many of the

contingent faculty leaders interviewed were preoccupied with more mainline issues than

an overall vision for an inclusive campus. We realize the such mainline issues are

important, especially in these economic times. However, these mainline issues should

not be the sole focus of contingent faculty, at the cost of a long term vision for an

inclusive campus.

Addressing climate. While the mobilization and implementation phases certainly

impact the climate of the campus to be more favorable towards contingent faculty

members, addressing climate becomes a focus within institutionalization. Also, because

of advances made in the climate during the mobilization and implementation phases, the

issue is not combating antagonism towards contingent faculty, but examining campus

policies and practices to make sure they are more inclusive and not unintentionally unfair towards contingent faculty members. With active animosity gone, most of the poor climate is residual from institutional practices and policies that simply ignored or excluded contingent faculty. At this point contingent faculty members talked about scanning the host of campus practices for inequalities: invitations to events, access to funding and resources, evaluation and assessment processes, curriculum development, administrative support, leadership opportunities and the like. One critical aspect for addressing the climate and remaining inequitable policies and practices is being able to have discussions about sensitive issues. These issues include the growth of contingent faculty members as a challenge to the institution of tenure, the importance of protecting tenure-track and full-time jobs (while also obtaining parity for contingent faculty) members, that absolute parity in pay or benefits may not be a final outcome, and viewing contingent faculty members as good teachers, but realizing that their working conditions impact quality. If these types of issues are not discussed openly, they can create tension and block institutionalization leaving campuses at the implementation phase.

Moving beyond mainline policies and pockets of change. The issue of moving beyond mainline union type policies (even on non-union campus mainline issues are still the most prevalent and first issues addressed), is interrelated with the issue of addressing climate. As campuses begin to think more about the overall climate for contingent faculty, they are naturally drawn to a broader host of issues that impact whether they feel included and valued on campus. They also begin to fine-tune issues, such as creating a process for full-time or part-time contingent faculty to move on to tenure-track lines, intellectual property issues, academic freedom, paid office hours, tuition remission, and

the like. For people with union contracts, they start to drill down the language in each area to be more precise, and to cover a broader set of issues that might emerge to better protect contingent faculty. Institutionalized campuses have policies and practices that penetrate all departments and are no longer exceptional policies or practices. One contingent faculty member describes this issue: "the difference now is that every department has professional development opportunities, every department socializes contingent faculty members into the life of the department, and every department recognizes the value of and looks towards contingent faculty for leadership. It used to be that only happened in pockets."

Creating a single faculty. Institutionalized campuses have a single faculty. There is no longer talk about tenure-track versus nontenure-track, full-time contingents or part-time contingents, or part-timers who teach only a single class. Also, all faculty contributions to campus are more similar in nature. All faculty are expected to participate in governance in some way. All faculty are considered equal and competent teachers, and participate actively in curriculum development. All faculty are scholars who should keep up on changes in their field and should participate in professional development. When we speak of a single faculty, we are not speaking of bargaining units. Rather we are speaking of a change in faculty mindset. Of our institutions that reached this stage, some faculty were in separate units, while others were wall-to-wall.

While we only had a few research universities in our sample, research was not considered an obligation for contingent faculty members, but was certainly valued among those who made this a part of the role. Therefore, full institutionalization of policies and practices that are positive towards contingent faculty makes the faculty a single

community with relatively similar expectations, and supports the faculty to meet to

expectations. Part of becoming a single faculty is also establishing contingent faculty

lines as career paths -- therefore policies and procedures must address issues of

promotion, evaluation, and faculty development. Contingent faculty who feel part of the

professoriate on campus focus more on their responsibilities and less on their rights -- we

heard faculty on institutionalized campuses talk much more about the teaching and

learning environment rather than their working conditions. This result does not

necessarily mean there are no distinctions among faculty roles, but there is equal respect

when distinctions in the role do occur. The hierarchy does not exist. One tenure-track

faculty member speaks about becoming a single faculty again:

> For years we were a divided faculty. At first, we actually didn't even realize we
>
> were divided (at least the tenure-track faculty) because we were not aware of the
>
> other faculty members. Then we went through a real period of animosity towards
>
> each other and the administration. I wish that animosity weren't part of our past. I
>
> think that happens on many campuses. But now we really treat each other with
>
> respect, NTTS have full participation in governance and there are no distinctions
>
> among us.

> *Assuming Leadership*. On campuses that have moved to institutionalization,

contingent faculty take on leadership roles with major issues on campus. A contingent

faculty leader talks about the significant leadership roles that they now play:

> We are really looked to now for our expertise on a set of issues. Since we were
>
> doing much of the online courses, we developed a template for how courses should
>
> be offered and assessed. The same process is now used with tenure-track faculty

and it was our model. We've also been active in reducing class size on campus

which is getting out of control…We have also worked to create the student

outcomes assessment measures that are used on campus because of our familiarity

with pedagogical theories which made us the likely experts on campus.

As this interviewee suggests, campuses the move towards institutionalization have

strong contingent faculty leadership, are rewarded for this leadership, are respected by

their colleagues and their suggestions implemented.

<div align="center">Discussion: Theoretical and Practical Implications</div>

From a theoretical perspective, the findings reaffirm theories of

institutionalization, which suggest that leaders need to be attentive to the organizational

phases and context in order to appropriately and smoothly create change. Our study

helps to understand some key issues not addressed in the broad theory of

institutionalization that are specifically important to institutionalization of contingent

faculty policies and practices. First, mobilization is particularly difficult because of the

divisions among faculty, the unwillingness of the administration to change the status quo,

the isolation of contingent faculty, the difficulty of contingent faculty to get involved

because of their heavy workloads and multiple responsibilities, and the apathy among

faculty as a whole. Mobilization requires understanding all of these factors and using

strategies that can address these varying challenges. For example, making the contingent

faculty problem more visible on campus provides more leadership by attracting tenure-

track allies. While mobilization is never easy on any change initiative, it is a particularly

vexing problem when considering contingent faculty policies and practices. Yet, the

increasingly important role of technology for easing mobilization bodes well for future

efforts to bring faculty together to work toward improved policies and practices for contingent faculty.

Implementation has its own challenges. Many of the institutions that we examined were at risk of losing momentum, stopping short of their goals, having leadership turnover that significantly affected their progress (either a major contingent faculty leader or changes in the administration), or facing significant backlash from tenure-track faculty or the administration. Many of the institutions found ways to navigate these challenges of implementation by creating allies in departments, using outside pressures, invoking institutional benchmark data, or participating in governance. The strategies we identified are more specific than the literature on implementation and helped to create more step-by-step advice for contingent faculty leaders. Also our research suggests that a complex set of strategies need to be used in conjunction to continue to move forward towards full implementation.

Institutionalization is still quite rare in higher education. While implementation is usually impacted by administrator or tenure-track faculty unwillingness to change, ironically, institutionalization at this point appear to be shaped by the contingent faculty leaders themselves. Contingent faculty leaders tend to focus on a narrow set of rights such as salary and benefits, and tend not to focus on deeper issues such as climate and inclusion. They have not begun to stress the responsibilities of contingent faculty and emphasize how those responsibilities contribute to the educational and teaching and learning environment. The institutions that had moved into this phase had a broader vision and used a key set of tactics to activate their plan such as rationale for their change, addressing climate and underlying values, and a plan of action. The process of

institutionalization we identified mirrors the literature of accepting and valuing

contingent faculty members and having positive practices and policies be the norm for

the institution. The outcome of institutionalization resulted in a unified faculty and the

new status quo was put in place. It is also important to emphasize that campuses that

moved toward institutionalization focused on values over policies and practices. They

recognized that changing policies to change attitudes is less likely to be effective and

work. This follows what we know from organizational theory about changing cultures

(Schein, 1992).

Some of the key factors that can shape institutionalization also emerged within

our study. Leadership was important across each stage and on campuses where leaders

left or burned out, we saw stalling of their progress. External pressure and groups clearly

played a role in the implementation phase to keep change moving forward. Accreditation

teams, community groups, the media, policymakers, and students were all used to

generate support and awareness for the changes and pressure administrators to negotiate.

Networking was important across both mobilization and implementation.

COCAL, New Faculty Majority, and union groups were major sources of support for

faculty in this study. It is doubtful that the leaders may have merged on these campuses

without the support from these external networks. A single contingent faculty leader on a

campus can feel like they are in a hopeless situation without the external social

networking. Also, contingent faculty leaders leveraged information from listservs and

other multimedia sources to mobilize people and show others that they are not alone

fighting for these issues. The external groups also provided ideas to propel campuses

through implementation. Therefore, one of the most important findings is that contingent

faculty leaders should connect to broader networks to help institutionalize changes. Again, technology played a pivotal role in creating networks. Most faculty network virtually, there is no money or opportunity for contingent faculty to meet in person. Technology enabled virtual relationships and support and information sharing of promising policies and practices and strategy. Virtual communities play a significant role in forwarding change and as the media advances it provides greater potential to fuel such movements. For example, graduate students unionization web forums have advanced sites where they catalog union language, share campus statistics, and active blogs. These practices will likely become more prevalent among contingent faculty over time.

The issue of focus also became an issue. Contingent faculty leaders often could not decide on a focus. There was often dissent about how far they should take the campus and they typically compromised at minor changes, for example many campuses had conflicting and unresolved priorities, some focusing on salary and others wanting governance. Unresolved divisiveness amongst faculty prevents institutionalization and addressing deeper change.

In terms of practical implications, this research provides a much-needed dissemination of information to those interested in promoting contingent faculty policies. Leaders have shared insights and strategies to navigating institutional contexts and culture. They also noted the difficulty of finding information regarding model institutions and practices from other campuses that may further their cause. This study is meant to not only understand higher education change at all three levels of institutionalism, it is also to understand the different tactics and challenges that must be met for an agenda to be moved forward. We see that there still is a long way to go until

change practices and policies because part of the institution, however there are

movements towards that accomplishment.

References

Alexander, E.R. (2005) Institutional transformation and planning: From

Institutionalization theory to institutional design. *Planning Theory, 4*(3), p. 209-

222.

Anderson, S., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1994). Institutionalization and renewal in a restructured

secondary school. *School Organization, 14*(3), 279-293.

Aronowitz, S. (2001) The last good job in America. In *Chalklines: The politics of work

in the managed university*, ed. Randy Martin. Durham: Duke University Press.

Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision*. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass

Baldwin, R. G. & Chronister, J.L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure*. Baltimore, MD:

Johns Hopkins University Press.

Benjamin, E. (1998)Variations in the characteristics of part-time faculty by general fields

of instructional research. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 104, p.45-59.

Benjamin, E. (2003). Reappraisal and implications for policy and research. *New

Directions in Higher Education*, 123 p.79-113.

Bland, C., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact

of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in

research and doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 89-

121.

Bogdan, R. & Bicklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction

to theories and methods*. (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Educational Press.

Boyatzis, R.E. (1998), *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA :Sage Publications.

Boyce, M.E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education, 28*(2) 119-135.

Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. New York, NY: Elesvier Science.

Colbeck, C.L. (2002). Assessing institutionalization of curricular and pedagogical reforms. *Research in Higher Education, 43*(4), 397-421.

Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* (105), 17-2

Cross, J.G. & Goldenberg, E.N.(2003). How does university decision making shape the faculty? *New Directions in Higher Education*, 123, 49-59.

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

Curry, B. (1992). *Instituting enduring innovations: Achieving continuity of change in higher education*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.7.

Datnow, A. (2005). The sustainability of comprehensive school reform models in changing district and state contexts. *Educational Administrative Quarterly, 41*(1), 121-153.

Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). On change: En route to transformation. Occasional Paper, No.1. Washington DC: American Council on Education.

Elman, S. E. (2003). A regional accreditation perspective on continent faculty

appointments. *New Directions in Higher Education,* (123), 71-78.

Fullan, M. G. (1989). *Implementation factors*. School improvement program

    Distinguished lecture series, Portland, OR.

Gappa, J., Astin, A.,& Trice, A. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's*

    strategic imperative. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jacobsohn, W. (2003). Composition and the future of contingency: Labor and identity in

    composition. In *Tenured bosses and disposable teachers*, ed. T. Bousquet, T.

    Scott, and L. Parascondo. Urbana, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Jacoby, D. (2006), The effects of part-time faculty employment upon community college

    graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1081-1103

Kezar, A. (2007). Tools for a time and place: Phased leadership strategies to

    Institutionalize a diversity agenda. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(4), 413-

    439.

Kezar, A., Eckel, P. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in

    higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *The*

    Journal of Higher Education, 73(4) p.435-460.

Kezar, A., Lester, J., & Anderson, G. (2006). Challenging stereotypes that interfere with

    effective governance. *Thought and Action*, 42. 121-134.

Levin, C.H. (1980). *Managing fiscal stress: The crisis in the public sector*. Chatham, NJ:

    Chatman House Press.

Litzler, E., Claiborne, C., & Brainard, S.G. (2007). Five years later: The

    Institutionalization and sustainability of ADVANCE. American Society for

    Engineering Education.

Lueddeke, G.R. (1999). Toward a constructivist framework for guiding change and innovation in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(3), 235-260.

Massy, W., Wilger, A., & Colbeck, C. (1994). *Departmental cultures and teaching quality: Overcoming "hollowed" collegiality*. Change, 25, 11-20.

Mishler, E. (1991).Research interviewing: Context and narrative. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moffet, C.A. (2000). Sustaining change: The answers are blowing in the wind. *Educational Leadership, 57*(7), 35-38.

Murray, G. (2008). On the cutting edge of torpor: Innovation and the pace of change in American higher education. *AACE Journal, 16*(1), 47-61.

Outcalt, C. (2002). A profile of the community college professorate, 1975-2000. New York: Routledge.

Osa, M., & Schock, K. (2007). *A long hard slog: Political opportunities, social networks , and mobilization of dissent in non-democracies*. Emerald Insight Publishing.

Schell, E. & Stock, P. (2001). *Moving a mountain: Transforming the role of contingent faculty I composition studies and higher education*. Urbana, Il: National Council of Teachers in English.

Schuster, J.H. & Finkelstein, M.J. (2005). *American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. Jossey-Bass: New York, NY.

Schensul, J. J., Schensul, J.J., & LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *Ethnographer's toolkit*.

 Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Sheeks, G., & Hutchenson, P. A.(--) How departments support part-time faculty. *Thought*

 and Action, 85-90.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004) *Academic capitalism and the new economy:*

 Markets, state, and higher education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thompson, K. (2003). Contingent faculty and student learning: Welcome to the

 strativersity. *New Directions for Higher Education,* (123), 41-47.

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent

 faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 91-

 123.

Ward, K. (1998). Addressing academic culture: Service learning, Organizations, and

 faculty work. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73, 73-80.