

A Tale of Two Professors: A Case Study in Justice at the Community College

By Dr. Ian M. Duckles

Introduction

In January of 2016 I was hired full-time as a tenure-track philosophy professor at Mesa College in San Diego, CA. Prior to this, since 2007 I had been working as an adjunct. Having recently made this transition, I am in a unique position to compare my employment situations before and after becoming a full-timer and analyze the morality of a system that tolerates this two-tiered faculty structure. I will begin by highlighting the differences between my life as a “temporary part-time employee”ⁱ and as a tenure-track member of the Mesa College Community. Then I will examine the ethical implications of the situation through the lens of a Rawlsian conception of justice, with a particular emphasis on the unjust implications this situation has for adjuncts, students, and full-timers.

My purpose here is three-fold. First, I intend this to be a case study that any instructor could profitably employ in an introductory ethics course. Second, by using my own situation I am able to make a clearer “apples to apples” comparison between full and part-timers. While one might argue that full-timers deserve their status due to idiosyncrasies not shared with part-timers, one can’t make a similar claim when comparing part-time me to full-time me. Finally, I intend this to contribute to the criticism of this continued reliance by the community college system on what are variously called adjuncts, contingent faculty, or part-timers.

A quick note on terminology: As I use the terms in this essay ‘part-timer,’ ‘adjunct,’ and “contingent faculty” will be used interchangeably to refer to instructors who teach less than a full load and are not on the tenure track. ‘Full-time’ will refer to faculty who do teach a full load or

equivalent and are tenured or on the tenure track. I recognize that these terms may be confusing to some, especially since there are many schools that have full-time non-tenure track faculty, or full-time visiting appointments that have a limited term of employment,ⁱⁱ or some schools that have tenure-track part-timers. However, in this paper I will use these terms as described above since these are the only two job categories for faculty in the Californian Community College system.ⁱⁱⁱ

A Tale of Two Professors

In 2015 I taught a total of 17 classes: seven during the spring semester, two in the summer, and eight in the fall. For this I grossed \$67,778.22. As a part-timer I am only paid for teaching, so if we divide this salary by the number of classes taught, we get a per class total of \$3986.95, which can be rounded up to \$4000.

As a full-timer I am contractually obligated to teach 10 classes per year (five in the fall and five in the spring) for which I gross \$72,659.00. Dividing by 10 gives a per class compensation of \$7265.90. However, unlike adjunct pay which just covers teaching, as a full-timer I have other responsibilities outside the classroom. Fortunately, I work in a unionized school, so there is a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that spells out my specific duties over the course of the workweek. According to the CBA, I am obligated to work 40 hours a week (while most professors work significantly more this is how much we are contractually compensated). 25 of these hours are to be devoted to teaching (in my discipline each class meets for three hours a week, I teach five classes, so that works out to 15 hours a week plus 10 hours a week of prep-time), five hours a week for office hours, and 10 hours a week for other academic responsibilities such as serving on committees, attending department and school meetings, etc.

Thus, 25 hours out of 40 are devoted to teaching with the remaining 15 for office hours and other work. I am excluding office hours because as an adjunct I wasn't paid for holding them. So, this means that 62.5% of my full-timer salary is compensation for teaching (25 divided by 40). Multiplying my annual salary of \$72659.00 by 62.5% gives me \$45411.88 per year as my compensation for teaching with the remaining \$27247.12 being my compensation for office hours and other work for the college. Dividing this classroom rate by 10 gives me a per class compensation of \$4541.18.

So, as a part-timer I was making \$4000 a class and as a full-timer I am making just over \$4500 a class. This means that as a part-timer I made about 88% of what I currently make as a full-timer. While there is a slight difference in pay rates, it doesn't appear to be as significant a difference as others have claimed exist.^{iv} However, if we pry into the details of my situation as a full-timer versus my situation as a part-timer, some other significant differences emerge.

Perhaps the most significant difference concerns job security. While our union has negotiated a robust job security program for part-timers, the protections pale in comparison to the security I have as a full-timer. As a full-timer I am guaranteed payment for teaching five classes a semester. As a part-timer I have no guarantee of employment from one semester to the next, and my job security amounts to seniority rights: part-timers with less seniority lose their courses first.

Closely connected to job security is healthcare. As an adjunct I did receive healthcare if I averaged a 50% load over the academic year (this means I had to teach a minimum 3/2 or 2/3 load in my district to qualify for benefits.^v In practice I tended to teach a 3/3 load). Consequently, if I lost a section or two this impacted my eligibility for health benefits. By contrast, as a full-

timer I am guaranteed benefits (under the CBA and the Affordable Care Act) as long as I remain employed.

A further area of difference involves step and column increases. The adjunct salary schedule offers seven salary columns with multiple steps within each column. One's placement on the columns is determined by one's level of education, and one moves through the steps based on the number of sections one has taught. As an adjunct I started at the very top of the pay scale because the highest column is for individuals with a PhD, and this column had only one step. So, aside from the occasional cost of living increase (COLA), as an adjunct I never saw my pay increase, and never would see any significant increases for the entire time of my professional career. By contrast, as a full-timer I started toward the bottom of the pay scale, and it will take me a minimum of 14 years to earn the maximum amount of pay. This means that I can look forward to a significant pay increase of around 3% per year for the next fourteen years in addition to any additional COLA increases that I might receive.^{vi} So, while my per class compensation as a full-timer is fairly close to what I received as an adjunct, in ten years I will be making \$6250 per class while my adjunct colleagues will basically earn the same amount that I earned last year.

Another area of difference concerns the degree of institutional support that I received as an adjunct compared to what I receive as a full-timer. Unlike the other differences I discussed above which are easy to calculate in an objective manner and based on publicly available information, this last area is much subtler and the differences are not as obvious. This issue was made clear to me when I saw how much time and effort the college put into orienting its new full-time hires as compared to its adjuncts. When I was hired as an adjunct I was interviewed by the department chair and another full-timer in the department. The interview lasted about an hour

and I was hired on the spot^{vii}. Once I was entered into the system by Human Resources and given my keys I was thrown into the classroom. As a full-timer, once I made it through the rigorous, multi-day interview process I was given a two-day orientation, assigned a mentor, and enrolled in a more extended year-long orientation for new faculty hires. During this orientation, I learned more about the College and the support services offered for faculty and students than I had during my previous seven years of employment as an adjunct.

A final area of difference is also difficult to quantify, but is no less important for that, and concerns quality of life. As an adjunct I averaged between 6 and 8 courses a semester at four different schools. This involved commuting about 160 miles per week, sometimes traveling as many as 50 miles in a day (when I first began my career as an adjunct, I taught at a school which involved a 180 mile round trip commute!). As a full-timer I teach at one school and commute about 50 miles a week, doing no more than 13 miles a day. This difference alone has dramatically improved my quality of life, and given me a great deal more free time.

Differences and Inequities

In the previous section I identified a number of differences between my life as a part-timer compared to my life as a full-timer. The question now is whether these differences are violations of justice. We justify and tolerate differences all the time, so the mere fact that there are differences does not immediately imply that there is an injustice. A case must be made that these differences translate to injustices or inequities.

The first and most obvious difference that would appear to be an injustice concerns compensation for teaching, and the nature of this injustice can be understood using the simple slogan “Equal Pay for Equal Work.” While this slogan tends to be associated with feminism and the unequal pay that women often receive for the work they do, we can also repurpose this

slogan to examine the situation of adjuncts. Under California law there are certain minimum qualifications that all faculty must meet in order to teach at a community college.^{viii} Within the field of philosophy the minimum qualification is a master's degree in philosophy or religious studies, meaning that every faculty member who teaches philosophy at a community college in California has at least has an M.A., with many also possessing a Ph.D. or equivalent.^{ix}

In addition, though hard numbers are difficult to come by, many adjuncts have 10 or more years of teaching experience, and in many cases existing adjuncts are much more experienced than new full-time hires, much more familiar with the student body, and often a great deal more experienced teaching many of the core courses in a particular department. This means that often the only significant difference between a part-timer and a full-timer is compensation. This is certainly the case with my situation. The only differences between me as a part-timer and me as a full-timer is that full-time me gets paid more, teaches less, commutes less, and has an office (full-time me is also arguably one semester more experienced than part-time me last semester).

Given all of this, the differences described in the preceding section would seem to be a clear example of an injustice. Justice is, obviously, a highly contentious issue within philosophy and there are likely as many different accounts of justice as there are philosophers. That being said, it does seem that most major theories of justice have a few shared elements. Perhaps the most significant of these is the idea of justice as fairness, in which a fair distribution of goods (whether economic or social) is seen as just and an unfair distribution is seen as unjust. While there may be a great deal of discussion as to what counts as a "fair" distribution of goods, the idea that a fair distribution would be a just distribution is widely accepted.

The question at hand then is whether the distribution of goods described above is fair and just. While it might appear unjust or unfair at first glance, we should nevertheless explore the issue philosophically to determine whether our initial impressions are accurate. Since I have been invoking the notion of justice as fairness, it seems appropriate to use John Rawls, perhaps the most famous philosopher who makes this connection.^x

One of the key aspects of Rawls' theory of justice is that it is not intended as a complete picture of morality. Instead, Rawls intends his account to be "a political conception of justice for a constitutional democracy."^{xi} Rawls rightly recognizes that different societies may have different systems of justice depending on how those societies are organized socially, culturally, and politically. Living in a constitutional democracy, we can focus on the systems of justice that are appropriate from this perspective, and ignore the questions of justice that would arise if this system of reliance on part-timers existed under other political arrangements.

So, working under these assumptions, Rawls' analysis begins by looking at how citizens are conceived within this framework. "Justice as fairness starts from the idea that society is to be conceived as a fair systems of cooperation and so it adopts a conception of the person to go with this idea."^{xii} He quickly notes that one of the key assumption underlying constitutional democracy is a conception of citizens as free and equal.^{xiii} Rawls uses this conception as a framework to derive his two principles of justice, and even working with these basic assumptions underlying citizenship in a constitutional democracy, we can see some significant injustices in the case study described above.

The most obvious of course is the discrepancy in pay. As I noted above, full-time me is just as experienced and qualified as part-time me, yet makes significantly more money, and, perhaps more importantly, will earn significantly more income over the total time of my

professional career. This is clearly not a “fair system of cooperation” since it violates Rawls’ second principle of justice, which states, “Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions: first, they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity; and second, they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society.”^{xiv} Examining the inequalities outlined above through the lens of Rawls demonstrates clear injustices. I will take it for granted that federal and state law as well as the Human Resources departments at the various colleges ensure that the first clause of this principle is satisfied.^{xv} However, it does seem that the current arrangement fails to satisfy the second clause of the principle. To argue that this difference is not an inequity, one must argue that part-timers or the “least advantaged” benefit from the existing system; an assertion I will debunk in the following paragraphs.

It is worth noting that, as initially conceived, there was a very clear role for adjuncts at two-year colleges. One of the initial conceptions of the community colleges (particularly in California, where the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education set up a template since adopted by many other states^{xvi}), was as the primary vehicle for delivering vocational and adult education. Particularly in the realm of vocational education, it makes perfect sense to set up a system where experienced members of a particular field could come in on evenings or weekends to teach a class or two to students trying to get a degree or certificate. In many cases these individuals would not want to take the pay-cut that comes with being a full-time instructor (as compared to what they would make working full-time in their field). In addition, the reason they are appealing instructors is because they are currently active in their profession, something they would lose if they became full-timers. Given all this, there is clearly a role for part-timers that satisfies Rawls

second principle of justice, and arguably this was the initial intent behind provisions in the law that allowed for the use of part-timers.

Unfortunately, the role of adjuncts has spread well beyond this important, but limited, role they were originally intended to play. According to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (the APA is one of the members of this coalition), when graduate students are included, adjunct faculty make up more than 75% of college and university instructors.^{xvii} Given the differences outlined in the previous section, this is a clear injustice since these inequalities are not to the greatest advantage of the part-timers.

One might respond by arguing that the use of adjuncts is justified because most adjuncts want to be part-time and wouldn't apply for a full-time position if it became available. Fortunately, there is some data on this question which indicates that between 50% and 75% of part-timers would prefer a full-time job.^{xviii} Thus, while some may be satisfied as part-timers, many would prefer a full-time position and are likely working as adjuncts until a full-time position become available (this was certainly my situation). Given this it is not plausible to argue that a majority of part-timers benefit from the status quo, even if some may find it to their liking.

So, adjuncts do not generally benefit from the current system, but perhaps it is beneficial to the students. A Rawlsian framework can justify certain inequities if they improve the least advantaged members of society. It might be possible to argue that even though adjuncts are disadvantaged compared to full-timers, this inequality produces better outcomes for students. That is, perhaps some adjuncts can be mildly disadvantaged in order to make the students and thereby all of society better off. However, I don't need to make that argument because there is a great deal of research that indicates that students are not being given the best chance at success when colleges rely on adjuncts for the bulk of their instruction. This is a complex issue, so I can

only highlight some of the significant impacts on student success, but as I will show there are clear ways that students are negatively impacted.

From an administrative perspective, the most important components of student success are those components that can be easily quantified and tracked. These would include measures such as graduation rates (number of students who graduate with a degree or certificate), transfer rates (number of students who transfer to a four-year institution), and persistence or retention rates (students who take classes in their first year and then are ‘retained’ or ‘persist’ into the second year).^{xix}

For each of these measures, there is strong evidence that students who are exposed to part-time faculty do worse, and the more exposure to part-timers the worse students do. For example, a 2006 study by Jacoby found that, “graduation rates for public community colleges in the United States are adversely affected when institutions rely heavily upon part-time faculty instruction.”^{xx} A 2009 study by Jaeger and Eagan went further in quantifying this impact. They found that, “a 10% increase in the overall proportion of credits earned in courses taught by part-time faculty members reduced the students’ likelihood of earning an associate’s degree by 1%.”^{xxi} Given that community college students take about 50% of their courses from part-timers, this means that, “the average student [is] at least 5% less likely to graduate with an associate’s degree compared to his or her peers who only have full-time instructors in the classroom, holding constant all other variables in the model.”^{xxii} Turning to transfer rates, in an earlier study Jaeger and Eagan concluded, “Findings suggest that students tend to be significantly less likely to transfer as their exposure to part-time faculty increases.”^{xxiii} Gross and Goldhaber are then able to more accurately quantify this effect in a 2009 study in which they conclude:

For every 10 percent increase in the percent of tenured faculty in the two-year college, holding all else equal, the chance that a student will transfer to a four-year college increases by 4 percent. The effect of tenured faculty is remarkable not only because it seems to have a positive effect on transferring, but also because it has an effect across all students, something not found for the transfer and articulation policies.^{xxiv}

Finally, looking at retention or persistence rates, Jaeger and Eagan concluded, “high levels of exposure to part-time faculty in the first year of college are consistently found to negatively affect student retention to the second year.”^{xxv}

Taken together this data indicates that students are negatively impacted when colleges rely on adjuncts, and the greater the percentage of adjuncts the worse students do. There is also a racial and class dimension to this inequity since the problem is most prevalent at the community college level, which is also the primary point of entry into higher education for low-income and minority students. Thus, those students who are most in need of the benefits that higher education can provide are thrust into a system that denies them the tools they need to succeed. This then creates a perpetual underclass that is denied the resources needed for upward social and economic mobility, and this is a violation of the first clause of Rawls’ second principle of justice regarding equality of opportunity. It is important to stress that most of this research does not argue that these differences are a result of poor pedagogical skills or lack of preparedness among adjuncts, but are rather a product of the systematic disadvantages that adjuncts face (e.g. not being able to stay around after a class because one needs to rush to another campus to teach another class there). Much of the research cited here concludes that the solution to these

inequalities is to either hire more full-timers or significantly increase the resources available to part-timers.

While less a matter of justice, a final group that is disadvantaged by the reliance on part-timers is the full-timers, and this in at least two ways: first, the increase in institutional responsibilities of full-timers, and second, a loss of academic freedom.

Regarding the first issue, there is an enormous amount of behind the scenes administrative work that is necessary to keep a college functioning and accredited. While one might argue that much of this work is unnecessary or frivolous, the fact remains that this work must be done if faculty want to continue to offer courses and receive funding. Furthermore, given that very few institutions are willing to compensate adjuncts for this work, the burden for completing it falls primarily on the backs of full-timers. As the number of full-timers has shrunk and workload demands increase, full-time faculty have to spend more and more time on administrative work and less time on classroom prep and research. In addition to negatively impacting students, this also makes the job of a full-timer less appealing as one must devote considerable time to completing tasks that don't impact teaching and research, the very things that motivate one to become an academic.

This overreliance on adjuncts also negatively impacts the academic freedom of full and part-timers. The negative impact on part-timers is quite easy to understand. Most part-timers are at will employees with no guarantee of future employment from term to term.^{xxvi} While adjuncts are almost never fired, most are aware that their continued employment depends on maintaining the good graces of chairs and deans. Adjunct faculty who rock the boat or raise uncomfortable questions can easily be pushed out simply by not being given classes during the next term,

effectively terminating their employment. This arrangement has a chilling effect on adjuncts who are afraid to speak up or make too much noise.^{xxvii}

This also extends to full-timers. In addition to being overburdened with administrative work, full-timers are less able to organize effectively to criticize or question various college policies promoted by administrators. The full-timers are often too busy to reflect on and examine these issues, and even if they are aware, they have less support in their efforts as they can't ally themselves with adjunct faculty members who are fearful of losing their future classes. As a result, the power of all faculty is weakened and full-timers are less able to mobilize against the many political, economic and administrative threats to the college.^{xxviii}

Conclusion

Given the analysis above, I think it is clear that part-timers are the victims of inequity and injustice, especially when compared to their full-time counterparts. These injustices impact the adjuncts themselves, their students, and their full-time colleagues. To change this system there needs to be greater awareness of these inequities on the part of adjuncts, students, and full-timers. One way to raise awareness about these issues is to integrate these concepts into our courses. By using my own circumstances as a case study, students and others in the education community can gain clearer insight into the disadvantages adjuncts face. In my own—admittedly anecdotal—experience I have found that students become quite upset and incensed when the situation of adjuncts is explained to them, and often want to know what they can do to help change the situation. By giving students this information and incorporating these kinds of examples into our pedagogy, faculty can go a long way towards forming alliances with other groups to bring about change and correct the injustices that exist within the current system.

And what would this change look like? Ideally, it would involve converting existing part-timers into full-timers. A conservative estimate conducted by my Union found that it would cost about \$265,000,000 to make this conversion in California.^{xxix} This is clearly a significant amount of money, but in the context of the roughly \$170 billion California state budget, it is actually a small fraction. How to raise even this small amount of money is, of course, a difficult political question, and one's proposed solution will often depend quite a bit on one's political values. In my opinion, the easiest and most just solution would be to raise taxes on the wealthiest Californians, and to use this money to, among other things, hire significantly more full-time professors. While some might claim this is a pie in the sky dream, it is worth noting that there is a great deal of popular support in California for taxing the wealthy to help out everyone else.^{xxx} While this solution may not be popular with everyone, I think it is the best and most just solution to this problem.^{xxxi}

ⁱ This is how these positions are defined in the California Education Code. See, for example, CA Ed. Code section 87482.5.

ⁱⁱ Although increasingly these "visiting professors" have their contracts renewed indefinitely, essentially making them full-time non-tenure track faculty.

ⁱⁱⁱ And this is a matter of state law and the education code which is binding on all public community colleges in California.

^{iv} Surprisingly, this data is extremely hard to find, and what data is out there is fairly limited, and there isn't really any good aggregate information on this issue. This article (Laura McKenna, "The College President to Adjunct Pay Ration," *The Atlantic* Sept 24, 2015, accessed May 17, 2016. <http://tinyurl.com/hts57x7>) gives a pretty good picture of the difficulty of tracking down this information: This is one of the major reasons why I have chosen to use my own situation to explore this issue. Having just been hired full-time I am in a unique position to make a clear apples to apples comparison.

^v California state laws prohibits "temporary, part-time faculty" from teaching more than 67% of a full-time load in any single community college district. See CA Ed. Code section 87482.5. A typical load for a full-time philosopher is 5/5, so an adjunct philosopher can only teach 3 classes per semester in any one district (the 67% limit primarily impacts language instructors who, under these rules, can generally teach two sections of a language class), forcing adjuncts to work in multiple districts in order to make ends meet.

^{vi} I will also receive additional increases when I get tenure and when I am promoted from assistant to full professor.

^{vii} And this was one of the more robust hiring processes I experienced as an adjunct. Many schools hired me sight unseen based solely on my CV.

^{viii} See Ca. Ed. Code Sections 87356-87358.

^{ix} An anonymous reviewer raises the following objection, “The author should be more clear-eyed about “equal pay for equal work”. If one interprets this literally, one could argue that there should not be steps in a pay scale. Why should a senior philosopher be paid more for teaching an Intro class than a junior faculty? Because of the very suspect idea that more senior faculty are better teachers?” This is a fascinating objection, and a decent response is, frankly, beyond the scope of this essay. That being said, it is a general feature of American labor that one should expect more pay the longer one works in a position. That is, as one advances in his or her career, one should receive more money for the work he or she does. In many academic settings it does make more sense to pay senior faculty more money. They generally have longer academic resumes with more publications and more grants. They clearly add “extra value” to the college to justify their larger salaries in comparison to junior faculty. At the two-year schools where the main emphasis is on teaching some of these assumptions become more questionable. In this case, one could argue that more senior faculty provide greater service to the college via their work on committees and their institutional knowledge, and are thus deserving of greater compensation.

^x An anonymous reviewer raises the following objection, “The author should at least speak to the worry that the only kind of justice at issue is a field specific one, not necessarily society specific one, or even a more general notion of justice. A yearly pay of \$67K puts one about 20% above the median household income in the U.S. (to say nothing of the vast majority of other societies). At the least, one might expect an explanation of why Rawls can reasonably applied to things like, ‘the philosophy profession in the U.S.’” A full answer is obviously beyond the scope of this footnote or this essay, but I would argue that the issues discussed in this essay are a matter of societal justice. Echoing Socrates’ argument in the *Apology* about the role of the philosopher in society as well as his account of the proper ‘punishment’ for someone guilty of his ‘crimes,’ I would argue that the teaching profession is enormously important to society and that a society that doesn’t value education and intelligence will quickly destroy itself (stay tuned USA). Given this, I do think it is just that educators make more than the median household income. This increase is justified by their increased education (MA minimum with many PhD’s) and the essential role they play in society.

^{xi} Page 223 in John Rawls, “Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical.” *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 14.3 (Summer 1985): 223-251.

^{xii} *Ibid.*, 232-233.

^{xiii} *Ibid.*, 233.

^{xiv} *Ibid.*, 227.

^{xv} That being said, demographic information about the racial and ethnic make-up of full-time faculty might be used to make a case that these positions aren’t really “open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.” For reasons of space I will not pursue this discussion here.

^{xvi} This website <http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/welcome.html> maintained by the University of California Office of the President provides a nice summary of the details.

^{xvii} Coalition on the Academic Workforce, *A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members*. June 2012, accessed April 4, 2016, http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf.

^{xviii} It is hard to find consistent numbers on this topic. One survey [American Federation of Teachers. "A National Survey of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty." *American Academic* 2 (March 2010).] of 400 part-timers concluded that about 50% want a full-time position. Another, larger survey (discussed in Flaherty, Colleen. "R-E-S-P-E-C-T," *Inside Higher Ed* May 6, 2015, accessed April 25, 2016, <http://tinyurl.com/jxxl57f>.) puts the number at 73% (as does the earlier referenced study from the Coalition on the Academic Workforce). In either case, it seems safe to say that at least half and as many as $\frac{3}{4}$ of current adjuncts want a full-time position.

^{xix} I have a suspicion that many of these administrative benchmarks are guilty of some version of the Texas Sharpshooter Fallacy or the Drunkard's Search. Be that as it may, these are the benchmarks that administrators use to evaluate the college and the performance of various programs and departments.

^{xx} Daniel Jacoby, "The Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates." *Journal of Higher Education* 77, no. 6 (2006):1081-1103. The quotation is from the abstract.

^{xxi} A.J. Jaeger & M.K. Eagan Jr., "Unintended Consequences: Examining the Effect of Part-time Faculty Members on Associate's Degree Completion." *Community College Review* 36, no. 3 (2009): 184.

^{xxii} *Ibid.*, 186.

^{xxiii} M.K. Eagan Jr., & A.J. Jaeger, "Effects of Exposure to Part-time Faculty on Community College Transfer." *Research in Higher Education* 50, no. 2 (2009).

^{xxiv} B. Gross & D. Goldhaber, "Community College Transfer and Articulation Policies: Looking Beneath the Surface." *Center on Reinventing Public Education*, Working Paper No. 2009_1.

^{xxv} A.J. Jaeger & M.K. Eagan, "Examining Retention and Contingent Faculty Use in a State System of Public Higher Education." *Educational Policy* 25, no. 3 (2010): 507-537. The quotation is from the abstract.

^{xxvi} In California, this fact was established in *Cervisi v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd.*, 208 Cal.App.3d 635. This decision allows adjunct in California to apply for unemployment insurance during the winter and summer breaks. This can often result in significant additional income for part-timers to the tune of close to \$5000 a year.

^{xxvii} This "chilling effect" is difficult to quantify, but I encountered it often as a union activist. Faculty would often complain to me about unfair treatment, but would be unwilling to formally pursue the matter out of fear of reprisals and a loss of future employment.

^{xxviii} Special thanks to Dr. Jim Miller who has helped me understand the implications for academic freedom of the increased adjunctification in higher education.

^{xxix} This calculation was done by the President of my local, Jim Mahler. He found, "Using the average salary of \$35,784 per year for the full-time equivalent temporary, part-time faculty member and a modest \$70,000 average starting salary (including benefits) of a newly hired tenured/tenure-track faculty member, it would cost ($\$70,000 - \$35,784 =$) \$34,216 to convert a full-time equivalent temporary, part-time faculty position to a full-time tenure-track position. Using the statewide goal of 75% of all sections being taught by full-time faculty, this would require the conversion of 7,762 part-time positions, or ($7,762 \text{ positions} \times \$34,216 \text{ per conversion} =$) \$265,584,592 to reach the statewide goal of 75%." This analysis comes from a public letter he sent to Governor Jerry Brown on October 14, 2014.

^{xxx} In 2012 California voters approved Proposition 30 which raised taxes on the wealthiest Californians (individuals making more than \$250,000 and households making more than

\$500,000). In 2016 California voters approved Proposition 55 which extended this tax for another 12 years.

^{xxxi} I would like to extend special thank to Jim Miller, Kelly Mayhew, Nina Rosenstand, and the anonymous reviewer who all provided enormous help and feedback on this paper. I would also like to thank Thomas Urban and the participants at the Teaching Philosophy at Community Colleges panel at the 2016 Pacific Division meeting of the APA who inspired me to write this paper.