PREFACE

This document presents a statement on non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) adopted in 2013 by the Council of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). The statement is comprised of four recommendations that the association deems important to advancing the professional circumstances of university NTTF, whose numbers have increased dramatically. In addition to the statement, this document includes a background report concerning NTTF, based on the report of an AERA task force established to address this issue.

AERA Statement on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
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AERA Council adopted the following statement in the form of four recommendations. The statement builds upon the work of the Task Force on NTTF, established in February 2012 to suggest ways in which AERA might better support and address issues concerning NTTF in schools, colleges, and departments of education.

Recommendation 1:

That AERA urge schools, colleges, and departments of education to be judicious in their decisions concerning the employment and expansion of the use of non-tenure-track faculty and, in cases where NTTF are employed, to provide appropriate conditions of employment and professional support.
Recommendation 2:  
That AERA convene a group to develop a statement of principles about the appropriate employment and support of NTTF within the field. Such a statement of principles could be useful to schools, colleges, and departments of education to guide local discussions and decisions concerning faculty employment.

Recommendation 3:  
That AERA, consistent with its leadership role over the years in urging strong research concerning the academic profession, encourage research on NTTF who are working in schools, colleges, or departments of education and/or working as education researchers in other fields. Possible actions for consideration are (a) to continue to develop AERA’s own research program on faculty, students, and the education research profession; (b) to encourage the National Center for Education Statistics to develop a new postsecondary faculty survey, which should include monitoring of NTTF issues; and (c) to encourage studies of the working conditions for NTTF in schools, colleges, and departments of education and the collection of sample policies (pertaining, for example, to professional development, hiring, and evaluation) from various schools, colleges, and departments of education that provide exemplary support for NTTF.

Recommendation 4:  
That AERA examine its own operations to ensure that non-tenure-track faculty who are education researchers or faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education are appropriately supported and recognized in all Association activities. Possible actions for consideration are (a) adjustment of membership fees based on individual needs and circumstances; and (b) review of conference opportunities to ensure that non-tenure-track faculty are fully welcomed and included.

These four recommendations will help to position AERA to continue to provide leadership concerning the employment of non-tenure-track faculty and to build upon its strength as a research organization in support of the field of education. These measures will also contribute to ensuring the future health of the non-tenure-track professoriate.

Background Report Provided to AERA Concerning Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Based on the Report of the Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

This background report is based on the work of a Task Force appointed by AERA then-President Elect William Tierney in 2012. It presents the charge that guided the work of the Task Force, synthesizes the state of the knowledge concerning non-tenure-track faculty and their work in schools, colleges, and departments of education, and advances recommendations to the Association pertaining to non-tenure-track faculty. The background report provides the case for why AERA should be concerned with the growth and working conditions of non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) within the academy and specifically within schools, colleges, and departments of education. The recommendations developed from the work of the Task Force and input from a Council subgroup and AERA leaders.

The Task Force members were Adrianna Kezar (Chair), Benjamin Baez, Susan Finley, Sara Goldrick-Rab, Esther Merves, Stanton Wortham, and Mary Yakimowski.

Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force focused on the increasing proportion of non-tenure-track faculty members in schools, colleges, and departments of education and the working conditions they encounter. Specifically, the Task Force was charged with five responsibilities:

• To document the changes that are occurring in the hiring and retention of non-tenure-track education faculty and establish a clear definition of non-tenure-track faculty;

• To recommend effective practices for the hiring, retention, and compensation of non-tenure-track education faculty;

• To suggest effective evaluation procedures for non-tenure-track education faculty;
• To propose ways that non-tenure-track education faculty might be involved in appropriate governance practices on campuses and be included as valued members in the ongoing life of the academic community; and

• To offer suggestions for how AERA might better support non-tenure-track faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education and throughout the academy.

The Task Force added the following to the original charge:

• To determine appropriate ways for AERA to reaffirm the professional values that have been the hallmark of the professoriate, such as academic freedom, shared governance, and peer review, through support for the tenure track or other long-term, multiyear contracts designed to achieve the same ends.

Process of the Task Force’s Work

The Task Force examined relevant research and policies, the growth in numbers of NTTF, their working conditions, and their impact on student learning and institutional outcomes. The Task Force reviewed documents from the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the Modern Language Association, and other disciplinary societies (see appendix). It held an open meeting at the 2012 AERA Annual Meeting where 20 individuals provided input and feedback on the issue. In addition, the Task Force held numerous conference calls and also met in person at the Annual Meeting. All members of the Task Force reviewed the draft report multiple times.

A Note About Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The Task Force recognized the vast range and complexity of NTTF positions and the consequent difficulty of making generalizations or even specific recommendations about working conditions. Throughout its deliberations, the Task Force reflected on this range and complexity, with the following four groups in mind:

1 & 2. **Full-time NTTF.** Faculty in this category may focus on either teaching or research, so the category has two subgroups. Both subgroups are likely to have greater job security than part-time NTTF and working conditions that are closer to those of tenure-track faculty. Full-time NTTF in research roles may already attend AERA conferences and be active members of the Association; those in teaching roles are less likely to be involved in AERA but may desire greater participation. Many aspire to tenure-track jobs (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

3. **Part-time NTTF who teach many classes, perhaps a full course load or more.** These individuals tend to have poor working conditions. They are more likely than other part-time faculty to join or be involved in AERA, particularly if they desire future work that includes research. They are likely to aspire to full-time NTTF or tenure-track jobs (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

4. **Part-time NTTF who teach one or a few classes.** Faculty in this category sometimes have poor working conditions, which may need attention. They are less likely to be interested in membership in AERA, as they may have other full-time positions or be retired.

While there may be other useful distillations of NTTF, these four groups are the focus of this Task Force background report. We note that doctoral students sometimes teach courses in adjunct roles as part of their professional growth, and such roles, conducted under appropriate supervision, can be important and appropriate aspects of the instructional plan of a school, college, or department of education. Doctoral students serving in such roles are not a focus of this background report, however.

Among the four groups discussed in this background report, part-time NTTF need the most attention with regard to working conditions. Full-time NTTF are the group most likely to join or become involved with AERA.
Why AERA Should Be Concerned About Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

In developing its strategy, policies, and plans for the future, why should AERA be concerned about shifts occurring within the professoriate? This background report describes research on dramatic changes in faculty roles and working conditions, and the impact of those changes on student learning. Most of the research on this topic has been conducted with national data. Few studies specifically address schools, colleges, or departments of education; however, one can assume that the broader trends in the academy have implications for these units.

The background report begins with a discussion of the historical, social, and political features that have led to these changes. Our analysis of changes in the composition of faculties does not imply that the Task Force or AERA as a whole supports or endorses the changes. Rather, the Task Force has merely documented changes that are important for AERA to consider. In addition, we note that, at some institutions, collective bargaining agreements provide guidelines regarding the employment conditions of NTTF; and some accrediting agencies in education (e.g., NCATE and NAACTE) include standards concerning their employment. Any consideration of the employment circumstances of NTTF must acknowledge variations in institutional missions, goals, and contexts, which will result in variations in institutional policies and practices regarding NTTF.

Historical, Social, and Political Developments That Contribute to Growing Reliance on NTTF

Scholars have attributed the rise in numbers of NTTF to broader changes affecting higher education. The first is the burgeoning “massification” of higher education and the growth of new sectors such as community colleges (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Schell & Stock, 2001); second is the dwindling of resources, particularly from state budgets (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Thedwall, 2008); third is dwindling support for tenure; and fourth is the corporatization of higher education (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009).

The influx of tremendous numbers of students over the years (now including online students) has stretched the capacity of existing faculty, and higher education institutions have been expected to increase capacity without additional funding (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Baldwin and Chronister note that the reduction in government funding from the late 1980s through the 1990s was a major reason that institutions turned to contingent faculty. While funding dropped, the costs of maintaining a college or university increased. Institutions raised tuition but still needed to limit expenses while keeping instructors in the classrooms. By the late 1990s, for the first time in many years, institutions faced a loss of public trust, criticism of tenure, and challenges to faculty production and workload (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001).

Some researchers, such as Slaughter and Rhoades (2009) and Benjamin (2002), argue that the rise in contingent faculty is a deliberate attempt to undermine tenure, and a reflection of a new corporate model of higher education. Others, such as Cross and Goldenberg (2009), argue that the contingent majority was an unintended consequence of various factors (e.g., declining funds, poor campus data infrastructures) and events (e.g., miscalculation of enrollments, decentralized hiring) that happened to intersect. In the field of education, faculty hiring patterns to meet instructional needs are also changing; one reason is the greater variety of programs being offered by a range of institutions, including new online programs (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2007; Hackmann & McCarthy, 2011, 2013). Although the reasons for the rise in NTTF are complex and not uniformly understood, the fact remains that they now have a substantial presence in higher education. The factors we noted as accounting for their growth are still present: massification, shrinking state budgets, a corporate model for decision making in higher education, and lack of political support for tenure.

Patterns in the Growth of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The profile of the professoriate in schools, colleges, and departments of education and across the academy as a whole has changed radically in the last two decades. Schuster and Finkelstein’s (2006) national study labeled it a “revolution.” Whereas tenured and tenure-track appointments constituted more than three-quarters of faculty positions approximately 40 years ago, today more than two thirds of all instructional faculty (including both part-time and full-time NTTF) at public and private nonprofit institutions are employed off the tenure track (Kear & Sam, 2010). Three of every four new hires are now made off the tenure track (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Amid these changes, part-time NTTF have become the fastest-growing segment of the professoriate.
Schuster and Finkelstein also note that part-time faculty increased by 376%, roughly five times faster than all full-time faculty, both tenured and non-tenured. Surveys and reports over the past several years have shown education to be among the disciplines with the highest proportions of NTTF—the proportion is 48.7% in schools, colleges, and departments of education (American Federation of Teachers, 2009; Forrest Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Various scholars have pointed out that national data reported by institutions underestimate the actual numbers of NTTF, in part because of poor data systems on campuses and decentralized hiring. Cross and Goldenberg (2009) conducted case studies of 10 elite institutions and found that departments were not consistent in reporting data to their institutions about NTTF teaching. In addition, the numbers of NTTF and the numbers of credit hours they taught were much larger than the institutions understood through their university-wide data. Cross and Goldenberg also noted that the proliferation of academic job titles within institutions and across state systems masked the actual numbers of NTTF because the lack of uniformity among titles made accurate identification and tracking difficult. Berry (2005) lists 50 titles and terms for part-time faculty alone, with examples such as “casual,” “sessional,” and “adjunct.”

**Institutional type.** These growth trends can be seen across all sectors of higher education, including the most elite institutions. Community colleges have the greatest percentage of part-time faculty, who often constitute the majority of their faculty (Eagan, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). All other institutional types have followed the employment pattern of community colleges, with increasing numbers of part-time faculty. For example, public comprehensive institutions have seen a growth of part-time faculty from 34% to 44%. Although increases in full-time NTTF have occurred at institutions of all types, they are most notable among the four-year institutions in research universities (Shawers, 2000). In 2003, public and private doctoral institutions had the highest percentages (30.3% and 32.7%, respectively) of full-time non-tenured faculty as compared with full-time tenured faculty (Forrest Cataldi et al., 2005).

**Academic fields.** The prevalence of part-time faculty also varies by academic program. In recent years, the programs with the highest percentages of part-time faculty appointments relative to overall faculty numbers were education (48.7%), fine arts (47.0%), and business (46.0%) (Forrest Cataldi et al., 2005). In the humanities, 34.6% of faculty were part-time, as compared with 30.3% in health sciences, 29.7% in the social sciences, 23.4% in the natural sciences, 21.8% in engineering, and 21.6% in agriculture and home economics. According to the National Survey on Post-secondary Faculty (NSOPF:04), full-time NTTF made up 32.6% of all full-time faculty in education in 2003 (Forrest Cataldi et al., 2005) and 44.1% of all full-time faculty in health sciences. Other fields had much lower shares of NTTF. Full-time NTTF were 22.2% of the full-time faculty in the humanities, 16.2% in the social sciences, 24.0% in the natural sciences, 17.9% in fine arts, 15.4% in engineering, 22.5% in agriculture and home economics, and 17.3% in business.

**Employment equity.** Some scholars have raised concerns about the overrepresentation of women among non-tenure-track faculty. Women continue to be disproportionately represented in NTTF appointments, both full- and part-time (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). According to the NCES, in the fall of 2001, 49% of women faculty were in part-time positions, as opposed to 41% of men. According to the National Education Association (NEA), a study from 2003 found similar figures; the study also noted that, since the 1990s, the percentages for men and women had become more similar (NEA, 2007).

**Working Conditions for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

Research on the trend of reliance on NTTF has highlighted concerns about working conditions, suggesting that policies and practices to support NTTF have not been established; in fact, such policies typically emerge as an afterthought if at all (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Other research points to inequities faced by NTTF, including lack of collegiality and respect (Kezar & Sam, 2010). We review here a few of the problematic trends highlighted in the literature that relate to the recommendations made later.

**Hiring and orientation.** Most study findings suggest that colleges have no formal or systemized process for recruitment or hiring of NTTF; they approach the process very casually (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found that many institutions and departments hired individuals within days of the start of the semester. Such a short time between being hired and beginning work allows little if any opportunity for preparation for teaching or formal orientation to the institution or department, to colleagues, or to campus policies (including policies related to instruction, grading, and students). Various studies have noted that NTTF, both part-time and
full-time, are often excluded from orientation programs and workshops that provide important human resources and policy information to other faculty and staff, as well as training for work roles (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Schell & Stock, 2001; Conley & Leslie, 2002).

Curriculum input. Another major concern for NTTF is the circumscribed nature of their teaching responsibilities (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Their lack of input into the design and implementation of curricula and syllabi, selection of textbooks, and other decisions affects their morale, status, and efficacy as professionals (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Many NTTF are not included in departmental communications or faculty meetings, where information about broader curricular goals and plans to work toward them are shared and discussed. As a result, these faculty members, many of whom are well educated and very knowledgeable about the subjects they teach, are limited in their ability to make contributions to academic and curricular planning. In some cases, they may even be asked to teach courses using another instructor’s syllabus and materials or course plans that have not been updated or are not aligned with current institutional learning goals (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Kezar, in press).

Professional development. Many institutions do not provide professional development for NTTF (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Schell & Stock, 2001). Where NTTF are invited to participate in professional development, it is often offered at times that are difficult for them (Gappa & Leslie, 1993), and they may not be paid for the time invested (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001).

Resources and support. To fulfill their responsibilities as instructors, faculty often need access to instructional resources, space on campus, and administrative or support personnel. But access to these resources on a campus or in an academic unit is often inconsistent or nonexistent (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Too often, NTTF, particularly part-timers, are expected to have a home office and to buy their own supplies, putting an undue burden on faculty who are already paid less than their colleagues (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Not having access to certain resources affects not only these faculty members but also their students. Lack of instructional resources and private space to discuss student issues and concerns places unnecessary limits on effective instruction.

Salary and benefits. Full-time NTTF enjoy working conditions that are closer to those for tenure-track faculty in terms of compensation and benefits; part-time faculty encounter far worse conditions across the board (Hollenshead, Waltman, August, Miller, Smith, & Bell, 2007; Kezar & Sam, 2010). Research suggests that lack of equity in compensation and benefits is a problem for many. Pay for NTTF is sometimes 70% lower than for their tenure-track counterparts (Kezar & Sam, 2010; Toutkoushian & Bellas, 2003). Moreover, the research on non-tenure-track faculty in schools of education indicates that full-time NTTF in those schools have lower salaries than their counterparts in most other disciplines (Sallee & Tierney, 2011).

Governance and inclusion as citizens. Gappa and Leslie (1993) noted the anger and frustration among part-timers about exclusion from collegial activities and career opportunities. One of the major areas about which part-timers expressed concern was their lack of involvement in decision making and governance. Their lack of input on courses that they spent a great deal of time teaching or on the design of professional development was a source of frustration. Hollenshead et al. (2007) observed that part-time faculty were often excluded from departmental or institutional meetings. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) found that full-time NTTF were more actively involved in governance; about 50% of the institutions in their sample allowed full-time NTTF to participate in the faculty senate and other forms of governance, and about 75% allowed them to participate in departmental affairs.

Evaluation. Various studies have identified “diverse, sometimes erratic, approaches to evaluating” the performance of NTTF as a major concern (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001, p. 65). Baldwin and Chronister described how institutions hire full-time NTTF to teach a variety of lower-division courses but evaluate them on the same criteria as tenure-track faculty, with expectations for research and service. Other institutions use only student evaluations of teaching, rather than creating a more diverse portfolio that could adequately capture faculty performance.

Respect and collegiality. Studies have found that NTTF often experience a negative climate among colleagues, which is disrespectful or dismissive at best and hostile at worst. Several studies of the experiences of part-time faculty suggest that tenure-track faculty sometimes express antagonism toward part-time NTTF (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Leslie, Kellams, & Gunne, 1982). Furthermore, full-time NTTF often express animosity toward part-time faculty, with whom they feel they compete for courses and job security (Kezar & Sam, 2009). The groups are in a class system where some occupy a more privileged place than others. Tensions between the groups make the climate uncomfortable.
Impact of the Growth of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on Student Learning and Organizational Outcomes

In the literature we identified four main areas where the increase in NTTF positions has affected student learning: (a) diminished graduation and retention rates; (b) decreased transfer from two-year to four-year institutions; (c) negative effects of early exposure to part-time faculty instruction; and (d) reduced faculty-student interaction and inaccessibility of part-time faculty. The literature has also highlighted more pronounced adverse effects of the increase in part-time faculty (as compared with full-time NTTF) on student outcomes. These studies are relational and cannot explain why negative outcomes occur, but each author hypothesizes that they result from poor working conditions. Other studies demonstrate that NTTF, overall, tend not to use best practices in teaching and tend to engage in lecture and passive modes of instruction. It is important to note that, to date, all studies of the impact of growth in NTTF on student learning and organizational outcomes have been conducted on undergraduate students; so far there are none on graduate students.

**Diminished graduation and retention rates.** Increased reliance on NTTF, particularly part-time NTTF, has been found to be negatively related to retention and graduation rates. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2004) and Jaeger and Eagan (2009) found that graduation rates declined as proportions of NTTF increased. Similarly, Jacoby (2006) found a negative correlation between increases in part-time faculty and graduation and retention rates. Harrington and Schibik (2001) tied lower retention rates to increasing reliance on part-time faculty.

**Decreased transfer between two-year and four-year institutions.** Gross and Goldhaber (2009) found that students at two-year colleges that had more full-time, tenured faculty were more likely to transfer to four-year institutions. They found a 4% increase in transfers to four-year institutions per 10% increase in the proportion of tenured faculty. Eagan and Jaeger (2009) also found that increased proportions of part-time faculty were correlated with lower transfer rates. About 80% of two-year faculty are NTTF.

**Negative effects of early exposure to part-time faculty instruction.** In a study of college freshmen, Harrington and Schibik (2001) found that increased exposure to part-time faculty was significantly associated with lower second-semester retention rates, lower GPAs, and fewer attempted credit hours. Bettinger and Long (2010) found that early exposure had a negative effect on students’ major selection.

**Reduced faculty-student interaction and inaccessibility of part-time faculty.** Most studies highlight the substantial effects of diminished interaction with part-time NTTF. Contact time and interaction between traditional faculty and students have been shown to foster student success (Benjamin, 2003). Research suggests that the inaccessibility of part-time faculty to students due to time pressures, lack of office space, and faculty’s holding jobs at multiple locations has a negative effect on student outcomes (Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 2009; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Jacoby, 2006).

**More pronounced adverse effects of part-time faculty.** The practices of full-time NTTF often parallel those of tenured and tenure-track faculty (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011). Most studies focusing on the differences in effects find that more negative outcomes are tied to part-timers’ limited time for faculty-student interaction and limited access to instructional resources, staff, and development opportunities, as well as lack of participation in the design of courses and curriculum (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Harrington & Schibik, 2001; Jacoby, 2006).

**Use of poor teaching strategies.** Studies also indicate that NTTF do not use teaching practices associated with higher levels of learning—high-impact strategies such as student-centered teaching, collaborative learning, active learning, experiential learning, service learning, and culturally relevant teaching (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). These findings are based on national studies that asked faculty to report on their teaching practices and compared non-tenure-track faculty with tenure-track. These studies demonstrate that NTTF spend less time preparing for class than tenure-track faculty (Benjamin, 2003; Umbach, 2007). NTTF are also leery of trying new pedagogical practices because such practices may affect their student evaluations, which institutions often rely on to determine if instructors will be rehired each term. A recent research study by Rutz, Condon, Iverson, Manduca, and Willett (2012) found that faculty development efforts were failing with NTTF, who felt unsafe about experimenting in the classroom because of concerns about student evaluations.

**Effects on organizational outcomes.** Studies indicate that the rise in NTTF positions is affecting organizational outcomes such as morale, institutional memory,
collegiality, and functional organizational climate. Non-tenure-track faculty are less satisfied than tenure-track faculty regarding salary, benefits, job security, and time for keeping current in their fields (Benjamin, 1998). Women are less satisfied than men on three satisfaction measures: overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with benefits, and satisfaction with salary (Tourtoushian & Bellas, 2003). The most satisfied individuals are in professional or vocational fields; the most dissatisfied are in liberal arts (Benjamin, 2002). As noted earlier, NTTF register a high level of concern about collegiality and respect. The combination of diminished satisfaction and lack of collegiality leads to lower morale and a diminished organizational working environment.

In summary, it is clear that NTTF constitute the majority of faculty in the academy and will continue to do so if current hiring trends are any indication. Specific data about schools, colleges, and departments demonstrate that NTTF make up a large percentage of the faculty in the field of education (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Repeated studies over the past 20 years, through the most recent national study in 2007, demonstrate that policies and practices to support NTTF continue to be minimal. Last-minute hiring, misaligned evaluations, and active exclusion from key processes such as departmental meetings and input on curriculum make it difficult for these faculty to succeed. Studies demonstrate a relationship between the rise in NTTF positions and negative outcomes for students and student learning; an emerging area of research concerns the negative impact on overall campus operations and climate. In general it would seem important to provide supportive policies and practices for NTTF; but findings about the negative effects on student learning suggest an additional need to do so. The rise in numbers of NTTF and their poor working conditions suggest a need for AERA to devote more attention to NTTF in education and in the Association’s membership, and to examine its conference approach and the leadership role that AERA might play in engaging deans of schools, colleges, and departments of education in a conversation about these trends.

**Action Steps Recommended by the Task Force**

Based on its deliberations and review of research on NTTF, the Task Force developed four main recommendations for the consideration of the AERA Council.

**Recommendation 1**

That AERA urge schools, colleges, and departments of education to be judicious in their decisions concerning the employment and expansion of the use of non-tenure-track faculty and, in cases where NTTF are employed, to provide appropriate conditions of employment and professional support.

**Recommendation 2**

That AERA convene a group to develop a statement of principles about the appropriate employment and support of NTTF within the field. Such a statement of principles could be useful to schools, colleges, and departments of education to guide local discussions and decisions concerning faculty employment.

**Recommendation 3**

That AERA, consistent with its leadership role over the years in urging strong research concerning the academic profession, encourage research on NTTF who are working in schools, colleges, or departments of education and/or working as education researchers in other fields. Possible actions for consideration are (a) to continue to develop AERA’s own research program on faculty, students, and the education research profession; (b) to encourage the National Center for Education Statistics to develop a new postsecondary faculty survey, which should include monitoring of NTTF issues; and (c) to encourage studies of the working conditions for NTTF in schools, colleges, and departments of education and the collection of sample policies (pertaining, for example, to professional development, hiring, and evaluation) from various schools, colleges, and departments of education that provide exemplary support for NTTF.
Recommendation 4

That AERA examine its own operations to ensure that non-tenure-track faculty who are education researchers or faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education are appropriately supported and recognized in all Association activities. Possible actions for consideration are (a) adjustment of membership fees based on individual needs and circumstances; and (b) review of conference opportunities to ensure that non-tenure-track faculty are fully welcomed and included.

These four recommendations will help to position AERA to continue to provide leadership concerning the employment of non-tenure-track faculty and to build upon its strength as a research organization in support of the field of education. These measures will also contribute to ensuring the future health of the profession.

Notes

1. It is important to note that education faculty and researchers may work in other disciplines, such as sociology, history, political science, and economics. However, because most are in schools, colleges, and departments of education, this document focuses on recommendations for those specific units.

2. “All full-time faculty” includes faculty with tenure, those on the tenure track, those not on the tenure track, and those in institutions without a tenure system.
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Example Statements and Resolutions by Disciplinary Societies Regarding Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

American Historical Association
*Standards for the Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty* (2003)

American Philosophical Association
*Statement on Non-Tenure Track Faculty* (1994)
http://www.apaonline.org/?page=ntt&hhSearch-Terms=non-tenure-track+and+faculty+and+statement

American Studies Association
*Statement on Standards in Graduate Education* (2005)
http://www.theasa.net/committee_graduate_education/page/statement_on_standards_in_graduate_education

College Art Association
http://www.collegeart.org/guidelines/parttime.html

Linguistic Society of America
*The Employment of Part-Time and Temporary Teaching Staff* (2000)

Modern Language Association
*Professional Employment Practices for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members* (2011)
http://www.mla.org/pdf/clip_stmt_final_may11.pdf
http://www.mla.org/pdf/awak_issuebrief09.pdf
*Statement on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members* (2002)
http://www.mla.org/statement_on_nonten
*Recommendation on a Minimum Wage for Full-Time Entry-Level Faculty Members* (2002)
http://www.mla.org/mla_recommendation_o
*Recommendation on Minimum Per-Course Compensation for Part-Time Faculty Members* (2013)
http://www.mla.org/mla_recommendation_course

Ensuring the Quality of Undergraduate Programs in English and Foreign Languages: MLA Recommendations on Staffing (2002)
http://www.mla.org/ensuring_the_quality

Statement on the Use of Part-Time and Full-Time Adjunct Faculty Members (1994)
http://www.mla.org/statement_faculty

National Council of Teachers of English/Conference on College Composition and Communication
http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/laborequity
*Resolution 5: On Professional Standards for Instruction*
*Statement From the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty* (1997)
http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/useofpart-timefaculty

Organization of American Historians
*Standards for Part-Time, Adjunct and Contingent Faculty* (2011)
The American Educational Research Association (AERA) is the national interdisciplinary research association for approximately 25,000 scholars who undertake research on education and learning. Founded in 1916, AERA aims to advance knowledge about education, to encourage scholarly inquiry related to education, and to promote the use of research to improve education and serve the public good. AERA is dedicated to strengthening education research by promoting research of the highest quality, undertaking education and training programs, and advancing sound research and science policy. The Association publishes six peer-reviewed journals and research and methodology books central to the field. It also offers courses, small grants, and dissertation and postdoctoral training initiatives supported by federal research agencies and private foundations.