

BEST PRACTICES FOR ASSURING THE RIGHTS OF PART-TIME FACULTY WITHIN UNIONS

A Proposal for Consideration at Chicago COCAL

By

Michael Dembrow, President, Portland Community College Faculty Federation

David Rives, Vice-President for Part-Time Membership, PCCFF

INTRODUCTION

Debate erupts periodically on listservs devoted to part-time faculty issues over the question of whether or not full-timers and part-timers ought to be in the same union. This topic clearly touches on nerves made raw by terrible experiences with full-timers who are at best indifferent and at worst manipulative, disrespectful, condescending, active antagonists to the interests of their part-time colleagues. The latter treatment becomes even more insupportable when exhibited by the leaders of their own local unions, bearing not only the power of their full-time, tenured status, but also the weight of the union that is supposed to protect the rights of all.

As a result of this experience, some argue that full-timers and part-timers should never be in the same local union, that part-timers can never expect a combined local to bargain effectively on their behalf. Some argue that to be most effective, part-timers should in fact be represented by a different international union than the one that represents the full-timers on their campus. In fact, some argue that it is best for part-timers to avoid academic unions completely, given the dominance of full-time faculty within those organizations, and seek representation by non-academic unions like the UAW.

Needless to say, there are also many who advocate the opposite position, arguing that the long-term needs of part-time faculty can best be met when part-timers and full-timers are working in solidarity within the structure of a merged local and ideally a merged contract.

There has to date been no systematic analysis of the faculty contracts at colleges and universities testing to see which arrangement results in a stronger contract. Given the number of variables that go into success at the bargaining table (not to mention potential disagreement over what would actually constitute success), it is not clear that much would be gained from such research, but at any rate at this point discussion of this topic must be limited to the theoretical and the anecdotal. We see examples of successful merged locals and dysfunctional merged locals, successful separately-organized locals and dysfunctional separately-organized locals.

Based on our experience at Portland Community College and with the academic labor movement in general, do see the value of a merged local if conditions make it possible, a value both in contractual and extra-contractual terms. However, we feel that there is no single organizational model that ought to be encouraged, let alone mandated,

by the unions or by umbrella movements such as COCAL. We do believe, though, that consensus could be reached on a set of recommended best practices that any local union could be encouraged to adopt. We will review some of those currently in existence and recommend others.

Of course, reaching that consensus is only the first step. How to get the international unions to adopt them, and then see that they are followed at the local level, given the traditions of local control that are prevalent within the academic labor movement, will be the real challenge.

In this paper we will survey some of the major elements of the debate, examine the limited documents regarding union “best practices” that currently exist in the international unions, offer additional best practices, look at some of the conditions that must be in place for such practices to be adopted, and make some recommendations for moving forward.

THE DEBATE OVER MERGED VS. SEPARATE LOCALS

Many, if not most, local faculty unions are merged locals representing full-time and part-time faculty. For example, according to its 2002 document *Standards of Good Practice in the Employment of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty*, approximately 135 AFT locals represent both part-time and full-time (some presumably under the same contract and others under separate contracts), while only 17 AFT locals are part-time only. Some of these locals are presumably merged by law, while others are by choice.

Many part-time faculty are profoundly unhappy with this situation, feeling that it does not serve them well. Email discussions of the relationship between full-timers and part-timers in their unions tend to flare up, last a couple of weeks, then abruptly cease until the next manifestation. There have been two such discussions so far this year on the Adj-L listserv--one in February, sparked initially by a query from a dissatisfied part-timer at a newly-organized local in New Jersey, and one in May that began with a posting on the new contract by the UAW adjunct faculty local at NYU.

Simultaneous with the May discussion was a piece by Keith Hoeller in the May 13 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* that dealt directly with the relationship between part-time faculty and the national unions. Hoeller is a part-time activist from Washington state who also contributes frequently to postings on the Adj-L list. (In addition, we should point to another article in *The Chronicle*, which appeared in the February 21, 2003, entitled “United We Stand?” which explores the subject at some length.)

Embedded in the email postings and *Chronicle* articles are the following arguments for and against having locals that combine full-time and part-time faculty:

Against Merged Locals

- Full-timers are in effect the managers of part-time faculty in their departments (at least strongly influencing hiring and retention decisions) and there is thus an inherent conflict of interest.
- The bargaining goals of part-time and full-time faculty are very different.
- With the national unions dominated as they are by full-time faculty, part-time faculty issues and interests can be marginalized by full-time leadership with impunity.
- Part-timers themselves generally had no choice in the decision to include them.
- The part-time membership percentages in merged locals tend to be very low.
- Given their low membership numbers, part-timers find themselves in a “taxation without representation” situation.
- Part-timers typically have few if any representatives on the bargaining team.
- Part-time gains will inevitably be traded away for full-time needs.
- Part-timers often find themselves in locals where they do not have a full vote in union matters.
- They lead to arbitrary limits on the amount that part-timers can teach.

In Favor of Merged Locals

- There is greater power in greater numbers, including the potential power to strike.
- A merged local ideally models the way academia should be: i.e., without a 2-class system.
- Full-timers inevitably have greater access to information and can intervene more effectively on behalf of all faculty.
- A merged local is the best means to counter administrative “divide and conquer” tactics.
- Can help full-timers as well as part-timers (e.g., when overload pay is tied to part-time compensation, or in improving the FT/PT ratio).
- Part-timers can effectively organize themselves into caucuses to advance their interests within the framework of a merged union, thereby obtaining the best of both worlds.
- Part-timers simply do not have the time and energy to be active in every college at which they teach, and need the greater stability that a merged local provides.
(Adj-L, Hoeller, Smallwood)

There were also many who sought out compromise positions, arguing that the particular choice of model is less important than the behavior that informs it. Rather than stating categorically that one is better than the other, we should focus our energy on trying to find specific ways to make the particular model in place work more effectively to meet the needs of the members and to assure that part-timers have the rights to which they are entitled. This approach makes a lot of sense to us, and we would like to pursue it in this paper.

CASE-STUDY OF A MERGED LOCAL: PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Most of those writing about the relationship between full-time and part-time faculty within their unions would agree that the situation varies from setting to setting, and that much has to do with the specific culture and history of the local. Joe Berry, in his doctoral thesis on strategies for organizing part-time faculty, stresses the importance of the structures under which a local is first organized: “Organizers have noted anecdotally for many years that how a union is first organized, around what principles, and even with what leadership, marks it heavily, sometimes irrevocably, with regard to its future functioning, sometimes for a whole generation, sometimes even longer -- if it lasts that long” (117). We agree with this insight, though we have also observed that local (as well as national) organizations can evolve in substantial ways. To that end, we would like to use our own local as a case study.

Our local, the Portland Community College Faculty Federation chose to create a merged governance structure nearly twenty years ago, at the time that part-timers won representation. A full-time-only bargaining unit had been established in 1972 as Local 2277 of the AFT. A few years later, PCC’s classified employees organized themselves as a separate local of the AFT. The organizing of part-timers began a little over ten years later with an independent committee of part-time faculty calling itself the Part-Time Faculty Association.

In 1983 the Oregon Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the Oregon Education Association (NEA) began a struggle to win representation for the part-timers at PCC, the largest community college in the Pacific Northwest, and Oregon’s largest by far. This competition came against the backdrop of several unsuccessful decertification attempts by the OEA throughout the 1980s. The OEA sought to create a unit composed of part-timers teaching at least 40% of a full load; the OFT proposed a “wall-to-wall” part-time unit, composed of all part-timers teaching credit and “basic skills” (ABE/GED, ESL) courses. The independent Part-Time Faculty Association preferred a unit of 25% and above (i.e., anyone teaching at least two classes), on the assumption that this would exclude “casual” part-timers and allow the union to focus its energies on a smaller number of faculty, committed to their work as educators. However, the Oregon Employment Relations Board ultimately decided on a unit that was essentially the OFT’s wall-to-wall model, and an election was scheduled in 1985.

The independent local association steering committee decided that it would be advantageous to be in the same union as the full-timers and therefore voted to support representation by the AFT. Their recommendation was followed, and OFT prevailed over the OEA and No-Representation. Part-timers would henceforth have their own bargaining unit within Local 2277.

As preparations began for bargaining the first contract, the local began to wrestle with the question of how to structure the “new” organization that the local had just become. The full-time leadership of the local had been active in the organizing drive,

and by this point two of the part-time leaders of the movement had secured full-time appointments and were now on the full-time executive council. It was clear to all that part-time representation in the local governance would have to be significant and that there needed to be full enfranchisement and the ability to participate fully in the life of the union.

The local ultimately winnowed the possible governance configurations down to two. The membership rejected a model with two separate, parallel councils and a coordinating executive committee. It chose the other--a merged structure with an equal number of representatives allocated to each group, and with several positions (president, treasurer, secretary, publicist, political action VP, labor council rep) open to either. Part-timers have in fact held all of the officer positions, including President, at some point over the years. All members vote on those positions that are open to any employee group, while only part-timers vote for those offices designated part-time and only full-timers for the full-time representatives.

Several years later the local incorporated a new group of employees, full-time academic professionals (e.g., financial aid advisors, academic advisors, soft-money workforce trainers) who had previously been considered management employees. The Employment Relations Board ordered them to be part of the same bargaining unit as the full-time faculty. An Executive VP position was reserved for a member of this group, and, again, APs have held each of the other positions at some point over the years. As a result, for more than 15 years the Executive Council has been a dynamic mixture of three different groups, thereby avoiding a simple split—or polarization--between “full-timers” and “part-timers.”

With the increase in membership that resulted, and the greater difficulty involved in representing and organizing part-timers, the local for the first time hired local staff, whom it shared with the classified local. The local’s first staffer (known as the Labor Relations Specialist) had been a part-time faculty member; in fact, he had been one of the members of the original PT Faculty Association’s steering committee. He naturally focused on part-time issues, and served as the bargaining team’s chief negotiator. The part-time bargaining teams were otherwise composed of part-time faculty, with the addition of one full-timer who could provide perspective and correctives to information provided by Management. Bargaining goals and bottom lines were set by a Bargaining Advisory Committee consisting exclusively of part-timers. Full-timers had their own team and advisory committee consisting of FT faculty and APs. A part-timer rarely sat on the full-time bargaining teams.

In theory, this was in many ways an ideal structure. In practice, however, the full-timers continued to have much greater strength at the bargaining table. There was a growing sense that part-timers (and full-timers too to a lesser extent) could do better if they were negotiating a single contract together. Several years ago, the local chose to move beyond merged governance and actually merge the two bargaining units into a single contract. This would be a difficult process—there were a number of Employee Relations Board hurdles to deal with, and it required majority approval from the members

of each of the units (including non-members as well as members)--but it was felt that this was the only way that we could make real progress in our goals regarding pay equity, FT/PT ratio, and respect for part-timers. The new bargaining unit was approved in 1999 by strong majorities of each of the two units.

In hindsight, the decision to undertake bargaining-unit merger and the process that the local went through to get there were valuable in themselves. It led to a great deal of inquiry, soul-searching, and debate within the local—within both groups. It brought issues related to the exploitation, misuse, and disrespect of part-timers to the forefront of union concerns in a way that they had not been before, despite good intentions. It also led us to focus on the areas that part-timers and full-timers had in common, along with the gaps that separated them. To a certain extent the local had to rediscover and reinvent itself, and this was a healthy process.

Negotiation of the first merged contract began soon thereafter. The negotiating team consisted of equal numbers of part-time faculty, full-time faculty, and academic professionals. These negotiations were long and difficult, lasting nearly 18 months, but they did in the end secure substantial gains (10% salary increase for each of the four years of the contract, a tripling of our health-insurance trust, paid office hours, access to professional-development dollars previously open only to full-timers) that part-timers could never have achieved on their own. Needless to say, we still have a long way to go to fully achieve our goals.

It might be argued that we were able to achieve strong improvements in 2001 chiefly because we were in a period of budgetary growth and could also give decent increases to full-timers. We faced a potentially greater challenge this past winter, when poor budgetary conditions led us to suspend negotiations for a year and extend our current contract for a year with only minimal increases. With limited money available, it was natural to expect an atmosphere of selfishness and self-interest to prevail. In the end, though, we were able to take advantage of the extension to further shrink the pay gap between the two groups by increasing the part-time schedule by 3% and the full-time by only 1%, supplemented by greater increases to the part-time health-insurance trust. Full-timers were glad to get any increase under these conditions and most were in favor of giving more to part-timers. In the end, only a handful voted against the extension package.

Along with these contractual gains, there have been other gains that have flowed from the two groups being together. The experience of the merger process served to raise consciousnesses and helped to promote a culture in which part-time faculty are more in the “mainstream” of the college. There have been great gains in terms of faculty recognition, professional development, participation in curriculum governance, and the hiring of part-timers into full-time positions (over the last five years, 65%-75% of all vacancies have been filled by former PCC part-timers), all of which at a level beyond what is required by the contract.

We are not using this example to argue that a merged local is inherently better. To a substantial extent, it's a question of local history, local culture and local leadership. Some of the specific reasons that the relationship has worked out positively at PCC:

- A history of shared governance;
- A governance structure that mandates shared governance through designated positions;
- A merged unit that came about as the result of conscious choice by the faculty;
- Stable leadership that has been supportive of part-time needs;
- A generally progressive faculty, many of whom are active in social movements such as Jobs with Justice;
- A complex bargaining unit that avoids a neat division between full-time faculty and part-time faculty;
- Local staff who see the defense and improvement of part-time working conditions as a core purpose of the union;
- A workplace in which a number of full-time faculty have experienced working in part-time positions;
- A fairly benign college Management style that tends not to intrude on union business.

Finally, we need to stress that our local is far from being a model. Even though we were able to convince the college to add a number of full-time faculty positions at the time of merger, our full-time/part-time ratio continues to move in the direction of part-time, as a result of the combination of a surging enrollment (hence new sections opened) and a declining budget (hence those sections filled with less-expensive part-time faculty). Although we have a good percentage of voluntary membership among our long-term part-timers, overall it is a struggle to build an overall membership base of even 50%. We get good support from both groups when we need it, but it is a challenge to keep activism and awareness at a high level on an ongoing basis. These are probably cycles that all unions experience.

POSITIONS OF THE NATIONAL UNIONS

Each of the U.S. national academic unions--the AAUP, the AFT, and the NEA—has developed excellent position papers regarding the treatment of part-time faculty *by the institutions that employ them*. On the subject of the relationship between part-time and full-time faculty themselves, however, the results are mixed.

The national unions have so far not taken official positions with respect to whether full-timers and part-timers should be in the same local or bargaining unit, or whether they should be in separate units. While the leaders of the national unions appear committed to the principles of fair treatment and empowerment, they adhere vigorously to the established notion that the organization of the local is a local matter and is best decided at the local level. The NEA policy on part-time faculty states this very clearly:

Where part-time faculty wish to bargain collectively, they should be able to do so. However, care should be taken in determining how they will be organized and what their relationship will be with full-time faculty who might also be in a bargaining unit. It should be a local determination whether the part-time faculty are part of the full-time bargaining unit or whether they are part of a separate unit. (<http://www.nea.org/he/policy12.html>)

AAUP President Jean Buck took a similar (though perhaps less dogmatic) position in an Adj-L posting in May:

At the risk of repeating a truism, ultimately the decision has to be made at the local level. The proportions of tenured vs. contingent faculty, their collegiality or lack thereof, the propensity of the government agency granting certification to include various constituencies in the bargaining unit, among many other variables, all bear on the advisability of choosing one model over another. (May 9, 2004)

The AFT does indicate a preference for merged locals (American Federation of Teachers, 11), but again leaves this decision up to the local.

With its *Standards of Good Practice*, the AFT has gone well beyond the other national unions in addressing the problem (though it is not treated as a problem per se) of the status of part-timers within their unions. Along with sections that address the treatment of part-timers by their institutions, as do the policy papers of the other unions, the AFT devotes an entire section of the report to the goal of “Insuring Full Rights for Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty Within Their Unions.” By utilizing a “Best Practices” model, it adopts a strategy that we feel is potentially very powerful. The report lays out eight policy goals, each of which is discussed at length:

1. National unions seeking to organize part-time/adjunct faculty members should be committed to sustain a vigorous organizing campaign at the campus and to make a priority of part-time organizing nationally.
2. Where full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members are in the same union on campus, the part-time/adjunct faculty must have full voting rights on all union matters, including the election of officers and the ratification of contracts. Part-time/adjunct faculty, often treated as second-class citizens at work, should never be treated as second-class citizens in their own union.
3. Where full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members are in the same union on campus, part-time members should be actively encouraged to participate in all union affairs.
4. Where full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members are in the same union on campus, the part-time/adjunct faculty have a right to expect that their union, including the full-time faculty, will push for full implementation of the standards of good practice in this report.

5. Where the full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members at an institution are not in the same union, regular communication and information exchange should be established between representatives of the full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty.
6. Given the rewards that come from developing an effective union, membership dues for part-time/adjunct faculty should be set at a high enough level for the local union to be strong, while at the same time taking into account the limited compensation part-time/adjunct faculty receive.
7. All faculty unions on campus should take responsibility for initiating programs aimed at increasing understanding between full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty members.
8. National, state and local higher education unions should provide information to, and advocate on behalf of, part-time/adjunct faculty applying for unemployment insurance during periods when they are not teaching. (11-12)

The AFT leadership is to be applauded for tackling this issue head-on. (The AFT Higher Ed task force that produced the document was joined by four part-time faculty activists from the field.) This is not to say that every local in AFT has made an effort to put these principles into practice; far from it. It remains that there is considerable strife and disagreement between some part-time and full-time teachers in the same or between the separate union locals.

However, these eight major steps do point the way to what the locals at each campus can do to fight for full representation of part-time faculty in unions. We would like to suggest some further ways of implementing each of them, in some cases (using what has worked for us) taking them a step further:

1. **Unions should make a priority of organizing part-time teachers.** We would add that this extends beyond the initial creation of the unit: organizing must be ongoing, and its goal must be the creation of empowered, active members. Locals should have resources available, including finances and people, that can benefit part-time teachers. Staff, including representatives and organizers, must contact and organize part-time teachers. Often, reaching part-time teachers can be difficult since they may have no office and may be rushing from one campus to another. A union local can make resources accessible to part-timers to arrange for meeting and organizing opportunities, such as use of the union office or facilities. The experience and skills of union organizers can be applied to the challenging task of organizing part-time teachers. If a college is adamantly opposed to bargaining with part-timers, or state laws forbid such organizing, an established faculty union should be in the best position to lobby to repeal such measures.

2. **Part-timers should have an equal and full voice in the union, including the right to vote for officers and contracts.** In order to ensure true representation in the union, PT should hold full voting rights on their contract and on any issues related to their union governance. This is mandated in the AFT Constitution, but it is not always enforced; violations should be reported. Within the local structure, certain officer positions should be specifically allotted to those representing full-time and those representing part-time, with each classification voting for their own representatives. Other positions who should represent all interest, such as treasurer or president, can be voted on by all members.
3. **Locals should encourage part-time faculty to participate in the union.** PT are often less connected to the campus and college than their FT peers. They should be made aware of opportunities to become involved and to lead in their union. Since part-timers may already feel disenfranchised and may find it difficult to devote time to union involvement, lack of involvement may become a problem. A local which represents full-timers has to show that its members are supportive of part-timers. While their full-time colleagues may have more flexibility in scheduling their time for union activities, part-time teachers are under considerable pressure to piece together enough paying hours. Flexibility in scheduling union meetings and other possibilities, such as online discussions, are needed to reach part-timers. As the two job classifications become more unified, the advantage of part-time and full-time teachers working together in the same local and the accompanying strength in numbers will become more apparent.
4. **The local union should work towards the goals of full equity between PT and FT articulated by the national unions.** Not only should the local guarantee equality in the union, it should also fight to end the status of part-time teachers as second-class citizens in academia. The union should be striving for equality in pay, an appropriate full-time/part-time faculty ratio, access to health coverage, a system of tenure, assigned office space, input on curriculum, and opportunities for research among part-time teachers. These should be goals for **BOTH** groups. Even when they are under separate contracts, full-timers should be looking for ways to design their contract to aid **all faculty** in achieving these goals.
5. **Locals should support open communication between PT and FT if they belong to different unions.** All of us in labor have to avoid the divide and conquer strategy that Management employs. Outreach must be proactive. If possible, a representative of each unit should attend the executive council meetings of the other. Having an observer from the other unit attend bargaining sessions, or somehow be involved in the process, would help to promote solidarity and prevent Management-induced division.
6. **The PT dues rates should be set fairly.** Until PT reach pro-rata pay with their FT counterparts, charging comparable dues would be punitive. Unions should employ progressive dues structures that set rates so those earning more pay proportionally higher rates. On the other hand, the rates need to be high enough that the local can be stable and can fully fund the activities that are needed for it to represent part-timers vigorously. It should be recognized that representing part-timers often entails higher costs for mailing and other outreach and support activities.

7. **Locals should strive to increase understanding between PT and FT.** Many myths and misunderstandings exist between these two classifications. Some see any gains by one side or another as taking away from their position. In order to be fully united, all education professionals have to see the interdependence of their struggle. For example, health care is an issue for all workers, whether it is gaining access to a group plan or halting the erosion of benefits. Academic freedom and control of curriculum is an issue for all teachers, whether it means having a say in the selection process or resisting the efforts of outside vested interests to corporatize education; each group must be made to see that they have a shared interest here and ought to be given shared responsibility. Certainly, both groups have an interest in expanding the budgetary pie (though part-timers must be confident that their share will increase) and electing education-friendly legislators; joint political action is an effective way to raise consciousness and build solidarity.
8. **Unions should fight to make unemployment compensation available to part-time teachers.** In some states, education workers are forbidden by law from receiving unemployment compensation during term breaks. Such clauses, intended to prevent full-time teachers from “double dipping” by drawing on unemployment benefits along with their salary during summer and other breaks, penalize part-time teachers who have no money-earning opportunities available to them when school is not in session. Local unions should work to modify these laws and lobby to make this a legislative priority for their state affiliates. Moreover, they should advocate for part-timers by making available information on how to apply for unemployment compensation in those states where it is possible but difficult. The union can be a source of education and consciousness-raising for part-timers. The Part-Timer’s Survival Guide from the LA College Faculty Guild is a good example of such efforts, as well as Joe Berry’s guidelines for receiving unemployment in summer term (City Colleges Contingent Labor Organizing Committee at <http://www.chicagococal.org/downloads/UnemploymentArticleFall2002.doc>.)

AN INITIAL SET OF SPECIFIC BEST PRACTICES

As we have seen, the eight steps laid out in the AFT *Standards of Good Practice* provide good philosophical guidelines for improving the status quo. We would like to supplement them with the following set of specific action items:

- Part-timers should have full and equal voting rights within their unions.
- Part-timers should have a substantial number of positions on the local governing board reserved for them, sufficient to give them an effective voice. They should be able to run for top leadership positions such as President, Vice-President, and Treasurer.
- In locals where part-time and full-time have separate bargaining units, the perspective of the other unit should be sought when bargaining priorities are being developed.

- In locals where part-time and full-time have separate bargaining units, part-timers should be involved, formally or informally, in the bargaining processes of the full-time faculty, and vice versa.
- In locals where part-time and full-time are in the same bargaining unit, part-timers should have representation on the bargaining team that is at least in proportion to their membership.
- If the local has a website, special web resources for part-time faculty should be developed, perhaps using templates and links provided by the national unions.
- If the local has a process for setting legislative priorities, attention should be given to legislation that would improve the status of part-time faculty.
- Local dues should be set according to a progressive dues schedule that taxes lower earners at a lower rate.
- Locals should work affirmatively to ensure that part-timers are included in their delegations to state, regional, and national conferences, trainings, and conventions.
- State, regional, and national affiliates should work affirmatively to ensure that part-timers are included in their governance bodies.

IMPLEMENTING THE BEST PRACTICES

The AFT *Standards of Good Practice* are certainly a model and a step forward, but they apply only to the AFT locals—and even among those locals there is not a clear mechanism that would lead to their implementation. Again, despite good intentions, the national unions are constrained by their adherence to local autonomy. We would argue that a trans-union movement such as COCAL needs to take the lead in expanding on the AFT’s guidelines and the best practices that we have suggested above, and creating a COCAL-endorsed set of best practices on the full enfranchisement and effective representation of part-timers within a union setting.

This set of guidelines could be developed by a group of COCAL activists and forwarded to the unions for consideration, or the unions could be asked to assemble a joint task force to develop a shared document which could then be forwarded to COCAL members, or some other strategy. The ensuing discussions should be lively, but we suspect that there will be a great deal of overlap among the national unions.

The challenge, of course, will come with the implementation phase. Simply having such a document, no matter how well-conceived, group-conceived, and comprehensive, does not mean that it will be followed. Strategies must be developed to induce locals that are not meeting the standards to move in that direction. Some of this can come in the form of information and consciousness-raising, some will require various forms of pressure. We may want to look at techniques such as surveys and report cards as a way to raise awareness and create pressure for change. It may be that there need to be basic guarantees in the constitutions of each of the national unions, so that enfranchisement is guaranteed within (or perhaps despite) the requirements of local autonomy; if so, then there will need to be a serious lobbying effort to bring about these changes.

As a mass movement bringing together individuals from many unions and three nations who are working on these issues on a daily basis, COCAL would seem to be the ideal vehicle for initiating and perhaps overseeing this process. We hope that participants at the 2004 conference will have an opportunity to work on this issue, create a more extensive developed set of best practice recommendations, and develop a plan for moving it forward.

WORKS CITED

Adj-L (Adjunct Listserv). Archived at <<http://listserv.gc.cuny.edu/lyris.pl?enter=adj-l>>.

American Association of University Professors. "Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession." November 2003. Available at <http://www.aaup.org/statements/SpchState/contingent.htm>.

American Federation of Teachers. *Standards of Good Practice in the Employment of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty*. 2002. Available at <http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/higher_ed/standards_pt_adjunct.pdf>.

Berry, Joe. "Contingent Faculty in Higher Education: An Organizing Strategy and Chicago Area Proposal." Doctoral Dissertation. 2002. Available at <<http://www.chicagococal.org/downloads/JoeBerryDissertation.pdf>>.

Hoeller, Keith. "Union Matters." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 13 May 2004.

National Education Association. "12. NEA Higher Education Policy on Part-Time and Temporary Faculty." NEA Policy Statements. May 2002. Available at <<http://www.nea.org/he/policy12.html>>.

Smallwood, Scott. "United We Stand? Part-time Professors Are Forming Unions, but Many Wonder If Teaming Up with Full-timers Would Be Better." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 21 February 2003. Available at <<http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v49/i24/24a01001.htm>>.