Contingent Faculty in Higher Education: An Organizing Strategy and Chicago Area Proposal

-DRAFT-

Joe Berry
1453 W. Flournoy, #3F
Chicago, IL 60606
312-733-2172 phone / fax
joeberry@igc.org

Project Demonstrating Excellence (PDE) presented
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Labor Studies
in the
Graduate College of the
Union Institute and University

Doctoral Committee:
Robert Atkins, Core
Rhoda Linton, Reading Core
Fernando Gapasin, Adjunct
Jack Metzgar, Adjunct
Charles Micallef, Peer
Dennis Kalob, Peer

October 2002

Abstract

The increasing employment of contingent (non tenure track) faculty in U.S. higher education since the 1970's has become one of the major issues in higher education. A rising level of activism among the contingent faculty themselves has recently become a coordinated national movement.

The rich literature on contingent faculty is largely from the point of view of administrators. Little published has yet attempted to set forward a comprehensive national strategy for contingent faculty organization, though the discussion has begun.

This PDE draws upon two decades of personal experience. The existing statistical data bases and published studies, as well a personal experience, were consulted in order to create a map of the workforce nationally and in more detail for Metro Chicago. Fifteen personal interviews were conducted with organizers, covering nearly all of the relevant campaigns in the Chicago area over twenty years. The results of the interviews are reported and discussed.

The core of this PDE is a strategic plan for a social action project, namely the organization of contingent faculty. The elements and major considerations for a national

strategic plan are then applied to the Chicago area in the form of a specific proposal, along with a brief local history.

The central concept of the strategy is that the particular characteristics of this workforce demand a unique combination of elements to make an effective strategy and to maximize the evident readiness of these workers for organization. This strategy, sometimes called the metro strategy, must include collective bargaining with individual employers, as well as broader organization. This study describes how the metro strategy might be applied to the over 16,000 contingent faculty in Chicago.

This study adds to the recent literature on new strategies for union organizing by applying the emerging principles of member mobilization and decision making, tactical and organizational flexibility and community alliances to the situation of one of the largest groups of contingent workers. The author hopes that the study can be applied usefully by organizers and organizational leaders.

To Helena, without whom this would never have been completed,
or probably ever begun.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Diagrams and Tables

Part I: Introduction, Intellectual Context, and Methods

Introduction

Background

The period since the 1970's has witnessed a massive change in the teaching workforce in higher education. Colleges and universities, and post secondary and adult education generally, are among the employers making greatest use of contingent and non-standard employment practices, with over 50% of all persons hired to teach college classes falling in that category. This sector of the academic workplace falls outside the traditional academic protections of tenure or academic freedom. Most of these teachers do not presently have the protection of collective bargaining agreements. They also frequently lack living wages, health and pension benefits, and most of the traditional perquisites of academic life.

The growth of this casualization of academic and educational labor has not been accidental. At one time it was assumed that, with most adult and higher education dominated by either private nonprofit or public institutions, decision making was driven by a more service oriented, and even democratic, criteria than in corporations. This assumption has ceased to hold in recent years, both with the rise of directly for-

profit higher ed corporations and with the change in behavior of management in traditional institutions. Rather than being a way to employ the specialized skills of a few practicing professionals or to get over a temporary financial hump or enrollment upswing, as in the past, the use of contingent faculty has become the very economic motor of the teaching component of higher education.

This casualization phenomenon is one of the major aspects of the corporatization of higher and adult education(Aronowitz 1997, Soley 1995, Slaughter and Leslie 1997, Nelson and Watt 1999). This corporatization encompasses both the mimicking of corporate practices internally and the restructuring of the entire higher educational sector so as to more directly externally serve the corporations as the primary "clients and customers" to whom students are then "sold" as product. One might say that this represents the application of Calvin Coolidge's famous line "The chief business of the American people is business" to higher education as, "The chief business of higher education is business."

Casualization of faculty encompasses both aspects of this corporatization in a number of ways. First and internally, by mimicking the recent employment practices of the corporate workforce, institutions gain the attendant savings on the "bottom line", through lesser wages and benefits, and also the increased "just-in-time" flexibility. Second and externally, casualization greatly increases the ability of higher education institutions to quickly respond to any corporate desires. With a majority of its faculty

now weakened and made more dependent by their loss of living wages and benefits, job security, tenure, academic freedom, and power within the institutions, the likelihood of effective faculty resistance to corporate goals is greatly reduced.

Along with this trend toward greater use of contingent faculty has come the proliferation of types of non-tenurable employment situations. These now include graduate teaching assistants, part-time, per-course adjunct faculty, limited term contract full and part-time faculty, “visiting” faculty, [All of these aforementioned, except graduate employees, I will refer to as contingent faculty in this PDE.] and finally some cases of previously tenurable or even tenured faculty groups being reduced to nontenurable status. Casualization has been mainly implemented by allowing retiring full-time tenured track (FTTT) faculty to be replaced by contingent faculty. This has occurred in the context of overall growth in higher education and especially in the growth of the enrollment of nontraditional students.

Faculty responses to this trend have varied. Many FTTT faculty have begun counting the days until their retirement and hoping that the degradation they perceive in faculty power and conditions will be held at bay long enough for them to get out and collect their pensions. One might call this the “apres moi, le deluge” school of thought. This response is less available to contingent faculty themselves. Some fttt faculty have responded with various combinations of guilt feelings, token complaints, or a narrowing of personal vision. A few fttt have sought to make active public alliances

with contingent faculty, but except for a few examples, this has only occurred when contingent faculty themselves organized a struggle first.

Another faculty response has been to individually attempt to gain self protection by rising into the administration or shifting into fields or subfields more in tune with current corporate priorities. These faculty thus become a major market for purveyors of specialized graduate education and retraining.

Some faculty, especially contingent faculty, simply choose to leave the profession and seek to use their education in other fields. The growth in corporate training, private tutoring schools, consulting, and other for-profit education-related ventures is testament to the pool of educated labor available to fill these jobs and economic niches.

Many contingent faculty teach multiple jobs and juggle employment every academic term with a wide array of potential employers. Job changing and the search for the best combination of pay, benefits and scheduling is a fact of life for many contingent faculty.

Many faculty engage in one or more of these individual responses, serially or concurrently. Many contingent faculty carry three business cards, one for their small consulting business, one or more for their teaching jobs, and one for some other small business or other waged job they are pursuing.

Finally, more and more faculty, and especially contingent faculty, are engaging in collective responses. This activity represents at least a partial realization that their individual status as contingents might not change in the near future and that a collective attempt to better their conditions might be worthwhile. The clearest recent expression of this response has been the growth in graduate employee (teaching and research assistant) union organizing in the past decade. There is hardly a Ph.D. granting institution that has not had at least sub rosa rumblings of organization and the number of graduate employee unions with collective agreements grows each year.

Graduate employee unionization, especially at the largest and most elite universities, has been the most publicized aspect of this movement among the contingent. This is undoubtedly of great political and ideological significance especially because the graduate school professors of the future will largely come from this group. Their attitudes toward unions in general will therefore have great social impact in the future through their training of the next generation of college teachers.

However, the growth of unionization among the other segments of the contingent faculty workforce may have greater material significance. Most faculty do not work in elite Ph.D. granting institutions. In fact, the largest proportion of higher education faculty work in public community colleges and this is where we also find the highest rate of unionization. Next to the for-profit higher education sector, public community colleges also have the highest proportion of contingent faculty.

A number of recent developments point to the incipient growth of a movement for organization among non-graduate employee contingent faculty. The national Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (COCAL), has sponsored four increasingly broad and assertive conferences in recent years. All of the major academic unions and many of the disciplinary associations have recently published research and position papers on the subject of contingent academic labor. Successful contingent faculty organizing in the private sector has recently made its reappearance after years of absence, despite the Supreme Court's Yeshiva decision which largely blocked fttt faculty organizing. Major professional organizations in labor studies and industrial relations have recently devoted conference sessions to the discussion of this developing movement. The emergence, and tactical victories, of the AAUP-supported metropolitan strategic initiative, led by Boston COCAL, has confirmed at least the plausibility of a new strategy to organize an entire regional labor force. Finally, the tactical successes of grassroots statewide initiatives in California and Washington have inspired the first attempt at a US/Canada-wide organizing and public education effort on the issues of contingent faculty, named Campus Equity Week, which took place in the fall of 2001. Given this background and context, This PDE therefore assumes that the organization of this sector of the academic workforce is both significant and needed. The specific goals of this PDE are as follows.

Goals

One major goal of this PDE, and of the larger project of which it is a part, is to contribute to this collective action on the part of contingent faculty. By closely examining organizing attempts of contingent faculty, I hope to provide some new knowledge that may usefully guide organizers and strategists in the future. I also hope to contribute to the general store of knowledge on new union organizing in a number of areas which both the labor movement and the field of labor studies have defined as priorities. These include: contingent workers generally, workers in sectors not traditionally unionized, workers in the growing and very active employment sector of higher education, professional workers, and workers who are largely not the traditional white male base of the union movement.

A second major goal of this project is to specifically contribute to the discussion of strategy for union organizing among contingent faculty. I hope to do this by developing a general strategic organizing plan, along with a local pilot proposal, that can push forward the discussion of strategy. I also hope this plan can provide part of the basis for a testing and comparison of strategies and tactics on a higher level than has yet taken place.

Therefore, besides the goal of completing the requirement for a UIU Ph.D., I would hope that this study, and especially the strategic plan section, is an accessibly written document that could both influence the discussion on organizing and could provide the

basis for actual strategic organizing initiatives. I believe that the union movement, the academic field of labor studies, and most especially, the contingent faculty themselves are ready to make use of such an effort.

Intellectual Context

Literature Review

As in any truly interdisciplinary field or project, the relevant discourse for this PDE covers many bases and flies a number of different banners. The subject of union organizing among contingent faculty draws upon work in the fields of labor organizing theories and strategies, higher education and its labor relations, and contingent work generally.

While there has been a great deal of writing on the growth of the contingent faculty over the past thirty years, most of it has been purely descriptive and/or seemingly oriented toward the interests of administrators who hire or supervise contingent faculty (Gappa and Leslie, 1993). Recently there have also been books written or edited by contingent faculty themselves (Dubson, 2001; Schell and Stock, 2001). While welcome, and not mainly directed toward higher education administrators and their problems as managers, these books and articles have generally remained descriptive in character. Some of them contain exceedingly realistic and outraged stories of abusive conditions, economic privation and gross disrespect. These pieces testify to both the material and political basis for a potential organizing movement among contingent faculty. They have generally not gone beyond, at most, case studies of a particular organized effort at a particular institution. The gradual accumulation of these case studies, predominantly

from the East and West Coasts, is a useful, in fact essential, precondition to a more general strategic discussion. As a whole, the existing literature testifies to the fact that labor conditions of contingent academics have been much easier for academics to write about descriptively than to develop strategies to change those conditions. We are left with many words on paper and the vast majority of contingent academics still unorganized.

The development of organizing strategy has barely begun in public print (Moser 1999, 2000, Schell 2001, Zabel 2000, Suhrbur, 2002) but is beginning to take place at various conferences, most notably the national Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor gatherings. Among the key reasons for this state of affairs is that those in a position to write authoritatively have little time to learn about experiences around the nation and even less time to write synthetically and strategically about them. It is all most activists can do to keep ahead of the necessities of their own struggle locally, along with keeping body and soul together. This is doubly ironic since this group of activists and this workforce generally have the writing, research and other technical skills to theorize and strategize on paper about their own situation. In this they are different from most workers and union activists, who must depend on outside academics, other sympathetic intellectuals, the odd worker-intellectual, labor educator, or researcher. A recent symposium in *Thought and Action* indicates some directions this discussion might take with Kerchner, Cobble and others seriously searching the contemporary and

historical record for precedents the might guide the development of strategy (Cobble 1999, Kechner 1999, Gray 1999).

In order to situate this needed discussion, we need to start, as mentioned above, in a number of different places. There is a rich history of theory about the labor movement and organizing, going back to Marx and before. Larson and Nissen (1987) in *Theories of the Labor Movement* probably compile it better than anyone else in the recent past, using categories ranging from agent of revolution, business unionism, and industrial reform to unionism as a pernicious monopoly. This range of conceptions of the labor movement and its social role obviously greatly informs how the movement organizes, who it addresses and what consciousness it attempts to instill. This range is also evident in the types of unions workers are being organized into and what is expected of them once organized. This latter contrast is sometimes expressed in the old (progressive or radical) organizer's aphorism, "Unions don't organize workers. Workers organize unions." In the immediate pre-1995 period, the literature mainly tried to explain the seemingly inexorable, albeit unfortunate, decline of unionism (Geoghegan 1991), justify the value of business unionism against its right-wing critics (Freeman and Medoff 1984), or seek out those innovative bright spots in an otherwise bleak landscape (Shostak 1991).

With the 1995 change in AFL-CIO leadership, a rush of new literature, mostly collected volumes of essays by various authors, emerged attempting to both describe and re-

theorize the union movement under the new conditions. Nearly all of these writings have been mainly positive about the changes toward activism, organizing and a higher public profile. However, some have retained a more critical cast, demanding more substantive reforms and reexamination (Wood, Meiksins, and Yates 1998, Tillman and Cummings 1999) than others which have tended toward describing and supporting the changes made so far (Mantsios 1998, Nissen 1999, and Mort, 1998). All of these, it should be noted, contain a spectrum of views among their various authors and, more than anything else, reflect the great increase in the discussion of unions and their role and future in the U.S.

This discussion has been made much more specific with the recent resurgence of organizing research in the 1990's and especially since the change in AFL-CIO leadership in 1995. Of this research, clearly the most influential and comprehensive collection has been *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, Bronfenbrenner et al (1998). The book came out of the historic 1996 Cornell University conference on organizing research, where over two hundred unionists and researchers presented nearly forty papers focusing upon union strategies, perhaps more than had been written in the previous two decades or more. This volume, more than any other, lays out the terrain within which my own work will walk. The presumption of the entire collection, and of much of the new discourse about organizing, is that what unions do matters and organizing success or failure is not merely, or even primarily, a matter of external legal climate, employer actions, or economic trends. As noted below, nearly all of the main

researchers on union organizing are represented in this volume, which really represents a dictionary of contemporary organizing research.

Kate Bronfenbrenner, at a 2001 organizing research conference, characterized all past organizing research in the following categories: 1) worker attitude research, mostly survey based, 2) individual voter decision making behavior, usually after elections, 3) institutional organization level research, of which there has been little, 4) time series studies, mainly looking at union density and very macro and inconsistent in results, 5) bargaining unit studies which usually just took NLRB election results, though a few have gone beyond to surveys, and a very few did the time consuming work of intensive interviewing of organizers, and 6) case studies and ethnographic studies, of which few have gone much beyond best practices puff pieces and most lack the real voices of workers.

Of particular importance for my own study, many contributors to *Organizing to Win* point to the need to relate to the less stable workforce of today with strategies that capture the entire community and labor market as the object of organizing and not merely one potential bargaining unit at a moment in time. This requires both alliances in the community and the acceptance of the need for internal union transformation if these new recruits are to be successfully brought in and involved as full participants. (Needleman, Gapasin and Wial, Fletcher and Hurd, and Waldinger et al, all 1998). Eisenscher (1996 , 1999, 2001, 2002) has also emphasized the necessity of union

transformation. Another major point that emerges in this collection is the need for effective use, education and mobilization of member organizers to reach out to the unorganized. (Turner, Nissen) The historical precedent of this lesson, that truly mass organizing has been successful only through the use of volunteer worker organizers, was reinforced by Staughton Lynd (1996) in *We Are All Leaders,* among others. While very little, if any, of this new organizing strategy literature focuses directly upon contingent academics, it provides a welcome context in which I can situate my own efforts.

Another area of discussion that bears upon my work is the very active debate over the current changes in the political economy of higher education in general, and its labor relations in particular. This employment sector has become more important with the growth of the service economy and changes are taking place that many call the corporatization of the university (Aronowitz 2000; Nelson 1996, 1999; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; White, 2000; Soley, 1995) Along with other factors, this has led to higher education becoming a major site of labor struggle in the last fifteen years. These struggles have included, at one time or another, nearly all sections of the workforce, from custodians and food service workers to, in some cases, full-time tenured faculty. (Martin, 1998). So, higher education as a faculty employer has been the focus of a number of studies. The most comprehensive one, focusing upon unionized faculty and their collective bargaining contracts, is Gary Rhoades' (1998) *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor.* The rise of the openly for-profit

corporate university is also a rising factor, both in market share and in exerting competitive pressure on traditional institutions to behave more like corporations. One book that summarizes and defends these changes from a managerial perspective is Hirsch and Luc (1999), *Challenges Facing Higher Education at the Millennium*. There is also developing a small literature about the rising graduate employee unionization movement, of which Nelson's *Will Teach for Food* (1997) is perhaps the best known.

Finally, the growing literature on contingent and other non-standard employment situations generally has great relevance to my study. This has also been mainly descriptive so far, but is beginning to deal with organizing and other collective actions as well. Here the work of George Gonos (1998) is important in situating the whole concept of contingent work. Likewise, the recent edited work by Barker and Christensen (1998), *Contingent Work: American Employment Relations in Transition* surveys recent scholarship and has one piece, by Barker herself, on contingent academics. Other recent surveys to be considered are Jackie Rogers' *Temps: The Many Faces of the Changing Workforce* (2000), Kevin Henson's *Just a Temp* (1996) and Carré et al's *Nonstandard Work: the Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements* (2000), which was published by the Industrial Relations Research Association and so must be seen as at least a contender for the position of standard work in the field at present. National (now North American) Alliance For Fair Employment's (NAFFE) report (2000) situates the growth of this sector within the developing struggle for change and also includes a section on contingent academics. NAFFE's plan to issue

subsectoral reports in the coming months will be a major addition to the literature as they are planned to integrate political economic and strategic perspectives, from the point of view of contingent workers and their interests.

I see this study, as mentioned above, fitting into the ongoing stream of pro-union organizing research, informed by a broadly Marxist framework, as is much of the new work. I also see my work as being informed by the related literature on higher education and contingent work generally. What is unusual is that this study maps a specific workforce, assesses unionization potential, and suggests a strategy for action. This is relatively unusual in the public academic literature.

Theories, perspectives and recent experiences

Luckily, as noted in the literature review above, the recent past has seen a substantial increase in the amount of writing on problems of union and labor organizing, much of it very good. A good deal of this literature represents the tardy but nevertheless valuable merging of the experiences of community organizing of the 1950s and 1960s and later, the student, anti-war, women's and gay movements, and perhaps most importantly, the civil rights movement and its children among other ethnic and racial groups. Therefore it is possible now to talk about theories of organizing and particularly theories of working class organizing in ways that are much more inclusive, accurate to social

conditions, and flexible while at the same time regaining the focus on material reality and the production of goods and services that, for many folks, was lost as a major focus in the movements of the 1960s. What follows are some of the ideas that have emerged from this dialectic. I claim no first cause origination for any of them but will attempt to apply them all toward a strategic synthesis.

Perhaps the most important advance in the recent years of theorizing has been the recognition of the differences and similarities between organizations, especially unions on the one hand, and social movements on the other. The notion here is that a movement is not an institution or organization, but rather is a social collectivity without clear edges, which in its power and motion, creates, impacts, supersedes, floods, and sometimes raises up organizations and institutions. A movement has different internal dynamics, perhaps best described as rhythms, and is built on different priorities than an institution such as a trade union. At its best, a movement is even more powerful than an institution or an organization. And the argument can be made that all substantial social changes have come primarily, not as a result of organizational or institutional changes, but as a result of social movements of this type.

However, a movement is also much more fragile than an organization or an institution. While it can rise quickly, it can fall just as quickly. History is replete with examples, from the Knights of Labor and the Populists, to the Civil Rights and anti-Viet Nam War movements, where we see examples of both the power of social movements and the

difficulty in maintaining them. A movement depends upon being built and husbanded internally by a certain sensitivity to feelings and internal process, not merely a response to bureaucratic organizational power, authority, and goals. By definition, a movement is based upon the voluntary activity of people who mainly do something else in their lives, as opposed to institutionalized bodies that gain much of their stability from paid staff, institutionalized financial resources (whether dues, foundation grants, or other sources) and lines of authority that can be traced and repeated.

Most importantly, though, for my purposes, in developing organizing strategy, a movement has a rhythm. It has a rhythm that emerges collectively; like the drums of the African slaves potentially sounding from every place in which a drummer can be hidden. The danger to the system represented by these drums was recognized by the slaveholders very early, and they outlawed the drums because they saw that this potentially democratic mass-based and popular communications network, which needed neither common language, nor specific authorship, was a great potential threat to their power. In a word, the drum symbolized the potential of the slaves to build a movement. And the effectiveness of the slaveholders' ban retarded that movement in ways that have yet to be fully understood. From the point of view of those wishing to encourage social movements in general and social movements among workers in particular, we also need to pay attention to the rhythm that emerges from the grass roots spontaneously and without individual authorship. These rhythms cannot be placed easily on the calendars or planning charts of bureaucratic organizations or staff

organizers. These rhythms represent the historical and present strength upon which all those organizations and staff organizers ultimately stand. Without these powerful mass movement rhythms, or at least an organizations potential capacity to generate a new wave of mass activity and pressure upon the enemy, the power of organizations and institutions will fade away, and very rapidly, when challenged.

One other way to characterize the difference between a movement and an organization is that movements represent the rising self-activity of people who organize themselves to move on issues that feel important to them at the moment. You know it's a movement when an office that is identified with a particular cause starts receiving more phone calls than they initiate.

Another major difference between a movement and an institution or organization (such as a union) although this characteristic may be more or less embodied in those organizations, is that form is always subordinated to content. The forms of a social movement can change, seemingly overnight, as long as the perceived goal is seen as consistent by the participants. Organizations, with their structures and staff, have a great deal of difficulty making these kinds of shifts and keeping form subordinate to content. This is the price they pay for stability. A labor education colleague of mine was fond of repeating that the strength of the labor movement is structure and the problem with the labor movement is structure. In the case of worker organization, the forms should always be subordinate to the clear and unifying content of building the workers'

struggle for their immediate perceived demands and at the same time raising the participants ‘ understanding of the place of that immediate struggle in the broader context, even while they are engaged in its transformation.

As noted above, one of the values of the recent literature has been to combine lessons and experience of the labor movement back to the 1930s and before with the experiences of the social movements from the 1950s onward. One of the key lessons drawn from this synthesis has been the need for any organizing effort -- if it is to sustain itself -- to combine immediate service, individual and collective, with advocacy organizing and direct involvement in collective struggle. Two well-documented examples spring to mind: The Communist party in the 1930s built much of its influence in the labor movement not only through direct trade union organizing but through the building of Unemployed Councils and other groups in cities throughout the nation, fighting for direct relief, unemployment insurance, public service jobs, and against evictions and soup kitchen and shelter conditions. But these Councils did not merely promote demonstrations and advocate broader reforms. Thousands of individual unemployed workers were accompanied to relief offices and supported in their personal efforts to gain direct relief in the midst of the Depression. Likewise, when faced with eviction, many thousand of working class tenants’ first reaction was to call the Unemployed Council for assistance in resisting their eviction. So clear was this perception that many documented cases exist of families sending their kid out the back door as the sheriff approached the front door, with the one-line instruction, “Go find the

reds" (Lynds 1973). This movement, extending well beyond the actual Unemployed Council membership, was built on the twin legs of individual service and mass struggle, with a third leg of a theoretical and strategic consciousness supplied by the leading organizers. Because of the strength of this movement, unemployment insurance was won, thousands of evictions were overturned, massive public works employment projects were initiated, and most importantly, thousands of strikes were won because the Unemployed Council organized its movement to walk picket lines **with** striking workers instead of breaking them. When the economy then turned up slightly, and many of the unemployed became active working employees again, you may be sure that these experiences were not forgotten when the further fires of trade unionism began to run through the factories.

A more recent example of the same synthesis is the farmworkers movement of the 1960s and after. The early United Farmworkers Movement, under the leadership of Chavez and his colleagues, masterfully combined immediate service with mass struggle. Both in the organizing period and after contracts were won, the farmworkers' movement and union combined health clinics, advocacy for government benefits such as unemployment insurance and welfare, and various employment services with their struggle for recognition, collective bargaining, and good union shop contracts. The combination of these things, representing an attempt to speak to the whole lives of the workers, necessarily also gave rise to an entire culture of struggle, just as its predecessors in the Farmers' Alliances, Knights of Labor, or the Abolition movement of

the previous century had done. The Farmworkers movement in fact was famous for its cultural component (El Teatro Campesino, its songs and corridos, the graphic symbol of the Aztec eagle carried on banners in that unforgettable march from Delano to Sacramento) which all reflected much the same consciousness that the IWW had proudly carried in the Lawrence strike of 1912, under the banner of Bread and Roses. As Cesar Chavez himself wrote, "Early on the farmworkers movement confronted the need for the creation of community to begin the process of replacing the reality of extreme individual exploitation and oppression." (Chavez 2001 [1966]). Chavez linked this need to create a community with the need to be self-supporting and not dependent on foundation grants or subsidies from parent organizations. This is why he argued forcefully that there could be no organization without dues, no matter how small. He set a pattern where the smallest organizing committee on a ranch would start to collect dues when they were first formed, first from themselves and then from their co-workers, to build commitment to the organization, an understanding of the necessities, as well as to actually create the necessary treasury and economic independence. Unfortunately, this latter is a point that too much of modern unionism, even in its most social movement variety, has largely forgotten. There are exceptions, certainly, including the recent work of ACORN in their turn toward unionization from pure community organizing. They have even organized a unit of contingent faculty in Houston.

One of the benefits, if it can be called that, of the progressive casualization of much of the American workforce, with estimates, based on varying definitions, ranging from 2.2% to 30% and higher (Campaign on Contingent Work 2000, 2, National Alliance for Fair Employment 2000, 2, Rogers 2000, 175) has been that there is now a base of experience to draw upon in constructing a strategy for any particular casualized sector. This base of experience includes organizing efforts by other casualized workers, support strategies by those outside the sector themselves, and experience on how management manages and plans the process of casualization. Leaving aside for the moment the entire debate over whether and to what extent casualization actually increases profits or organizational efficiency from a management perspective, recent research does, though, indicate that while human resource managers almost universally talk the language of the new, market driven casualized flexible labor-mobile economy, they often don't really want or act upon it. (Hecksher p 276-83 in Carré et al, date). A little reflection makes this point less surprising. While the casualization of the workforce does increase the power and administrative control of management over workers, it also tremendously increases the workload and stress of those particular managers who actually have to directly interact with this new, casualized workforce, namely HR managers. It destabilizes their existence as well as increasing their workload. But only research that allows privacy and confidentiality of opinion can reveal these attitudes.

The lesson here from the point of view of worker organizing is not that we can convince management through rational discussion that casualization is a bad idea and that the trend should be reversed despite competitive pressures. Rather, this information is useful in helping us construct a strategy that can play upon very real differences of perspective within the management ranks. If divide and conquer has been the watchword of the employers of mass wage labor since its inception, it can also be a tactic utilized by the workers and their organizations themselves vis a vis the immense bureaucratic management structures that have been created to oversee them. This general point, of course, is hardly new. But its application in the case of casualized workers, to those segments of management for whom casualization is both an irritation and an indignity, has not been fully recognized strategically by the movement. How exactly this can be taken advantage of strategically is a discussion for the future.

The recent past has seen a great variety in contingent worker organizations, many of whom have come to be grouped in the coalition North American Alliance for Fair Employment (NAAFE). If one takes the paradigm from the previous section and constructs a continuum with pure social service on one end and pure collective struggle on the other end, both of which are, of course, imaginary points, one can place nearly all of the existing contingent worker organizations somewhere on that spectrum. They also, of course, vary in the degree to which they are guided by a leadership that has a broader perspective and whether that leadership chooses to share that perspective with its members and educate around it.

At the extreme service end of the spectrum would be the model symbolized by the organization Working Today (Hecksher 2001, 75). Working Today's model includes collectivizing a broad range of services (job finding, health insurance, other sorts of personal support, professional development) that used to be provided by the employer in the pre-casualized model. They assume that by creating this sort of collectivity workers' lives will be better and ultimately, through some calculus never fully explained, the employment context will be altered in the favor of the workers. With no explicit commitment to collective struggle directly, however, and with its dependence upon foundation funding, it is unclear how the Working Today model can itself provide more than collective amelioration of the conditions of its own members. Historically, some mutual benefit societies, like this model, became unions, but many, perhaps most, did not.

Toward the other end of the spectrum, though not completely without a service component, might be seen the coalition Jobs with Justice, which has taken on many struggles of contingent workers over the years. Among their arsenal of community-based tactics, one of the key ones has been the Workers' Rights Board, in which workers are brought forward to testify before a community board of respected notables (professors, clerics, sympathetic business people, public officials, celebrities, etc.) as a way of generating support for particular struggles. While not the primary organization of any particular group of workers, this coalition framework, based upon the notion of a

membership pledged to go support five other struggles besides their own every year, represents a community vision of solidarity and consciousness fairly far removed from organization for individual service.

Once again the clear need is to combine these two perspectives. One of the vehicles being experimented with in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and other places is the Worker Center. This is a site, often but not always sponsored by a union such as UNITE!, where unorganized workers in a neighborhood or industry can come for services such as ESL classes, worker and employment rights information and assistance, socializing and other services. At the same time, many of these centers see themselves a centers for organizing, both around neighborhood an community issues as well as in workplaces where a number of the centers' "members" may work. This model is especially important for a casualized, subcontracted, or otherwise "irregular" workforce, as well as one subject to frequent layoffs such as garment workers, because it focuses upon a workforce and/or a geographic region. Therefore it is an important part of the model that might be applied to contingent faculty in their metro regional workforce. Another version of this model, with professional workers, is being pursued in Washington State by CWA in Washtech among "temporary" and contract workers in the high tech industry there.

Yet another idea that has been both drawn from the past and reinvigorated in the present is what Sue Cobble has called "occupational unionism" (Cobble 1999, 2000,

2001). Drawing from a close study of the waitresses' unions, and informed by examination of the building trades as well as others, Cobble argues that occupational-based unionism can both speak to the particular needs of contingent workers with many and unstable employers and at the same time draw upon the reserves of craft, occupational and professional pride that these workers feel in the actual work that they do, wherever it is situated. Other examples of this form of unionism (multi-employer, multi-worksite, and / or short term) might include longshore workers, messengers, taxi cab drivers, cartoonists, the entertainment guilds -- actors, writers, directors, stage hands -- as well as the more recent examples such as the National Writers Union, UAW and WASHTECH / CWA among computer professionals). The element here is not just the idea of a hiring hall or employment service, but also a place, literal or virtual or both, where workers doing similar work for various employers can come together to build community and struggle. The trick is how to do this without reproducing the exclusionism of many of the older "trade" unions.

One other approach, not fully divergent from those noted above, could be summarized under the rubric "community unionism " (Banks 1991). The most famous application of this model has probably been the Justice for Janitors campaigns of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) where the organizing of many casually employed janitors was facilitated through the building of community-wide movement to regularize employment, raising living standards, and generally assisting the immigrant community. Other examples of this strategy have been the Coalition of

Immokalee Workers in agriculture in Florida and the various day laborer organizations emerging in cities throughout the country. In the case of the Florida Immokalee farmworkers, a community wide movement was built to sustain an organization even in the absence of collective bargaining regulations or facilitating legislation, and among the most poverty-stricken elements of the local population, many of them without citizenship protection or even legal immigration status. Likewise, day laborers in many cities have formed organizations not only to protect themselves, regularize employment processes, enforce minimum wages, but also have reached out to allies in the community even including some employers of day labor to try to turn community hostility into community support. Special sensitivity to issues of race, gender, nationality, language, and immigration status have marked the successful applications of this approach.

As we can see the experiences of the past are rich in potential, if partial, applications for this project. More is being written all the time in this field and is being encouraged by the existence of NAFFE on a national level. The possibilities of organizing on a more flexible basis to match the “flexible” workforce have been demonstrated both theoretically and practically, among the very poorest workers as well as other professionals. The key elements that I take from this review are the need for a labor market wide strategy, the building of a movement of mutual support, the provision of services along with struggle, and the need to address the entire worker in his/her community, not just as an employee of a particular boss. When combined with a vision

of class based social justice unionism, one has the core of one version of the Metro strategy for organizing contingent faculty.

Methods

The methods I used in this PDE are described below. In addition to the specific research and activity steps described, I also relied necessarily upon my own years of experience in the contingent faculty movement, teacher unionism and the labor movement in general, as well as other organizing experiences. I have also relied upon the similar experiences of fellow activists, not limited to those formally interviewed. However, this is not a memoir masquerading as a dissertation. There is a great tradition of union and other working class memoirs, some more analytical than others. I may even aspire to write one myself one day. This, however, is not that document. The goal of this document is to project a possible strategy for worker and labor action, not to memorialize the life and lessons of one person's experiences.

Another general methodology note is that this work represents an attempt to extend some aspects of participatory and action research to include, reflexively, academics as subjects/actors who themselves may be trained researchers as well as teachers. Though this study focuses upon these academics' role as contingent teachers, the fact is that many of them are also trained researchers. This fact has two major implications for this particular project. One is that the feedback I have received from these fellow-faculty has

been particularly informed in a way that collaboration from workers not so trained might not be. Secondly, as I will discuss in the strategy section, I believe this widespread research training among contingent faculty has great implications for organizing strategy and for the capacity of participant action research to be a direct part of a strategy that relies heavily upon self organization. In other words, the proletarianization and union organization of a group so trained in research methods has strong impacts upon both this project and upon future organizing projects.

The particular uses of these methods in a dissertation are cogently discussed in *Voices of Change* (Park et al, 1993). I also profited greatly from this volume's discussions of the impact of the professionalization on participant research, the critique of university research generally, and the Ph.D. and tenure processes that structure so much of it.

As noted below, this work covers the period from January, 2000, just after I enrolled in the Union Institute Ph.D. program, through the spring and summer of 2002 when the actual writing and revising were done. The steps below necessarily overlapped, but are given roughly in the order that the bulk of the work of each step took place.

I surveyed the available relevant literature, both academic and other, related to organizing among these and related professionals and other similar employees, including the legal and other history, and the political-economic context which has given rise to the recent growth in this sector. This literature review, which is in the

previous section, includes journal articles, books and monographs, union publications, trade journals such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education,* and a number of unpublished internal and conference papers.

Personal Experience

I myself procured employment in four, ultimately, of the institutions employing contingent faculty: City Colleges of Chicago (Harold Washington College and Malcolm X College), Roosevelt University, Indiana University, NW, and the University of Illinois. I also did some contract teaching for unions through the Chicago Workers School, and thereby learned more about that form of "contract employment" which is also common in this sector. I also worked for some six months as a paid organizer for the Illinois Education Association and also for their local at Columbia College, the Part-time Faculty Association at Columbia College (PFAC). This paid work added to my personal familiarity with the conditions and culture of work in the sector, provided me with more potential informants, and also gave me more contacts for a future organizing network. This experience continued during the entire time of my research, which extended from January, 2000 into fall, 2002.

In addition, I worked as a volunteer in a number of positions that greatly informed and aided the work. I was the Midwest and Chicago contact for Campus Equity Week (CEW), October 28-November 3, 2001, the first nationally (actually North American)

coordinated action on behalf of contingent faculty. Out of this effort in Chicago came the Chicago chapter of COCAL (Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor), of which I became Chair. I also participated in the organizing and first contract negotiations of the Roosevelt Adjunct Faculty Organization (RAFO),IEA / NEA and have continued to serve on its executive committee throughout. I also was selected to serve as a delegate from RAFO to the first constitutional convention of National (now North American) Alliance For Fair Employment, NAFFE, and a year later was elected to serve on its coordinating committee representing its Campus Action Group section. NAFFE is the central network of organizations of contingent workers generally, from day laborers to college teachers. Also coming partially out of CEW, I helped to establish an independent organizing committee in the City Colleges of Chicago, called Chicago City Colleges Contingent Labor Organizing Committee (CCCLOC), which has begun a campaign among these 2,000-3,000 contingent faculty. I have continued to work with this effort as well. I also organized and participated in panel presentations on contingent faculty at United Association for Labor Education and Industrial Relations Research Association national conferences (twice each). These activities constituted not just presentation by myself, but also research, interviewing, and organizing, among other activists, leaders and organizers. The records of this personal research / participation activity include such things as E-mails, meeting minutes, notes from organizing committee meeting and negotiations sessions, local and national news articles as they emerged, and other correspondence, including planning materials for many meetings and groups. As noted above, this activity as formal research extended

over the entire period to the present (Fall 2002, but the records and activity extend for many years before that.

In the process of this activity, locally and nationally, one of the main modes of communication, unlike most traditional organizing, has been on Email. I have also participated in a number of regional and national contingent faculty e-mail lists, which are the main mode of discussion at this time in the movement. All of this material has been read, sifted, and much of it saved and referenced as needed. In many ways, these constitute the field notes of the movement, and of my own work as both a participant and action researcher, and have been essential both in gaining and keeping a general orientation and in specifically allowing my own participation and therefore credibility, both as an activist and a researcher, to develop and be sustained.

I also served on the Chicago City Colleges Adjunct Faculty Professional Development Committee, which convened an event in spring 2002 of over 50 adjuncts (one of the largest district-wide gathering in recent years) to hear Canadian labor educator D'Arcy Martin discuss and demonstrate popular education ideas in the community colleges. Finally, I was asked to serve on the advisory committee for both the Fourth and Fifth continental conferences of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor in January, 2001, in San Jose, California and in October, 2002 in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. I attended and presented at both conferences as well.

Statistical Data Surveys

I investigated the demography and condition of the contingent academic workforce using publicly available statistical data bases, such as the US Dept. of Education's NCES, recent surveys by the Modern Language Association and the American Association of University Professors, and the Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education at Baruch College, CUNY. I also examined selected state data bases, especially for Illinois and the Chicago area, drawing from US Dept of Education, NCES IPEDS data and other material from Illinois Board of Higher Education, the regulatory body for all degree granting post secondary education in Illinois. This work extends and builds upon a study I co-authored on contingent faculty in Pennsylvania (Worthen and Berry, 1999).

I then applied this data to the task of drawing a map of the workforce, focusing especially in the Chicago metropolitan area. This included the demographic makeup and present conditions of employment, especially the extent of union organization. I defined this employment sector for the purposes of this study to exclude graduate employees (teaching and research assistants) since their conditions and status differ substantially from the rest of the contingent faculty workforce, though in many practical strategic considerations, they must be linked. In drawing up this map I, of necessity, also drew upon my own sixteen years of experience as a worker, activist and researcher in this specific workforce in three states in multiple subsectors.

Interviews with organizers and activists

I conducted in-person, tape recorded interviews with fifteen selected organizers and activists. The interviewees were selected to achieve a broadly representative metro Chicago group with:

a wide range of experience in organizing efforts,

mix of staff and volunteer organizers

diversity of subsectors (public/private, level of institution, etc.)

special knowledge of conditions

completeness of coverage of organizing campaigns

In practice, through my previous experience and activity, I was able to interview at least one person from each of the contingent faculty organizing efforts in Metro Chicago since the early 1980's. This was the overarching goal -- to get at least one interviewee from each campaign. In some of the larger and more recent campaigns I was able to interview both the staff organizer and a member of the rank and file organizing committee. In one particularly important case, Columbia College, I interviewed two member of the committee. This was partly because of the importance of the campaign as a breakthrough after years of no activity and because it represented a rare adjunct-only private sector unit. Also, since I had personally organized later for this local, I wanted to thoroughly test my own perceptions of the situation and process. Finally, one

of the internal interviewees at Columbia had been the historian of the entire process and gave me access to a virtually complete file.

Partially following the lead of Kate Bronfenbrenner, probably the single best known labor researcher on union organizing, I structured my interview questions in four general areas which have the greatest relevance to union organizing strategy. These are:

Group Background - including information on demography, type of institution, employment conditions, and history, especially labor relations history

Employer Tactics and Strategy - including issues raised

Union Tactics and Strategy - including strategies other than direct organizing for collective bargaining

Outcome - including election results if any, character of organization formed, strength of ongoing organization, relations with parent organization, likely future scenarios, organizer conclusions and lessons

These audio taped qualitative interviews were of the conversational type and lasted an hour or more. One was in my home, The others were about evenly split between public places (cafes and restaurants) and interviewees homes. Seven were done before Sept. 20, 2001, the rest were done in the following spring. As interviewing progressed, it became

clear that allowing interviewees to simply narrate their own story of both their own initial reasons for involvement and ongoing participation, as well as the general story of the campaign, was the best initial method. After this was completed, usually taking over an hour, I went back and asked additional specific questions to fill in areas above that had been omitted or which seemed to have particular interest or relevance. I found few needs to recontact interviewees.

I followed standard procedures on confidentiality and obtain a signed release and informed consent from each interviewee. This was of particular importance since this type of organizing data is very sensitive and has been the subject of employer lawsuits recently. I offered the interviewees the tapes when I am finished and also a copy of my finished work. This practice assumed added importance since all of these people are contingent faculty activists with whom I need to be able to continue to work in the future. Preserving good relations with them is more than a personal imperative -- it is a crucial aspect of the movement-building that is the main point of this whole project. One of the inherent contradictions of research that is at least partially participant action research is that one's subjects may also be collaborators in research as well as comrades in the joint struggle to build some aspect of a movement for social change. Managing these multiple relationships, for the present and the future, has probably tested my own skills and capacities more than any other aspect of this PDE.

Especially at this point of evaluating and interpreting the data, but also at other points, I relied partly upon the store of my own experience: thirty-one years in the teacher union movement, direct experience as an organizer, and prior experience as a researcher talking to contingent faculty. This experience, I believe, helped me to better interpret my data, separate out reliable evidence, and evaluate patterns that seemed to occur. It also presented dangers, of course, that I might overly read into what others say in order to merely satisfy my predispositions. I have tried to consciously guard against this.

Analysis and interpretation

I order to make my interview data most useful and intelligible, I developed a list of issues and events and categorized the quotations I extracted into this list. Upon consultation with my committee and to improve intelligibility, I later added a full narrative for each subsection into which the relevant quotations were embedded as examples. Lessons drawn were listed at the end. Also as a result of the same suggestions, I added a brief narrative overall history of the organizing movement in the Chicago area.

I then wrote a draft of elements for a national strategic organizing plan. This incorporated what I had learned in the above steps, both as political economic background and projections for the sector, as well as a general organizing perspective, including specific strategic considerations. In so doing, I moved back and forth from

writing to interview and other data and back to writing and revising. The guiding principle was to produce a usable and contextually understandable strategic plan. The goal was not to write a full history, an ethnography, nor sociological a study of any of the campaigns nor of contingent activism in general, but to draw on all these interpretative methods as needed.

The last part of the written report is an actual proposal, including budget and time lines, for a specific local pilot organizing project for Metro Chicago which could be submitted to a union or other potential sponsoring organization.

At this point I have completed the requirements for the PDE portion of my doctoral work as outlined in my Learning Agreement. However, in the interest of intellectual completeness and to complete the circle of a social action project conceptually, the following are the steps that I project subsequently.

Following the completion of the PDE

I plan to present my work and proposal to an interested union(s) or other potential funding organization. This will involve drawing upon knowledge of which unions have a history of organizing and representation in this and related sectors and also which ones have a current interest that could be cultivated. This information comes both from my thirty years of personal experience of unionism in the educational field

and my personal contacts in the major and minor unions in the field, as well as information gleaned from the research in the steps above. There already exists a relationship between the proposed project and various unions and other organizations due to previous discussion, consultation, and other support for the research and organizing activities up to this point. This presentation will also likely include the joint participation of one or more other teacher/organizers in the sector, who have been found to have an active interest in the project and are willing to take some leadership. In other words, the collectivization of the project continues since union organization is, by definition, a group, not an individual, activity. The proposal as submitted will include some role for me in implementing the project, subject to negotiation with the organizations involved.

Part II: Strategic plan for national contingent faculty organizing

Map of the Workforce

In drawing a map of the contingent faculty workforce, it is necessary to do more than merely recite statistics or arrange chronology of events. For a map to be useful, it must be consciously constructed for a specific purpose, and for a map to be the most useful, that specific purpose must be explicit and limited. Just as the Mercator projection is useful for seagoing global navigation, it is distinctly not useful for comparative assessments of land area or population density. Likewise, in social science, the “map” of any social phenomenon must meet the test of usefulness and forthrightness as to its purpose.

The purpose of this map is to highlight and accurately depict those characteristics of the contingent faculty workforce, and the contexts in which they reside, that are most relevant and needed for organizing. Further, since organizing of the nature being proposed here, and as will be discussed in detail in subsequent sections, is meant to be especially self-activated, as opposed to externally driven, then the question of the point of view of the map and of the viewer of the map is paramount.

This map is divided into two parts. The second is a more impressionistic description drawn from interviews, personal experience, and the "collective knowledge" of the movement to describe the conditions under which this particular form of labor is performed. Before that, the first section immediately below and following the note on sources, drawing from both statistical and individual accounts, will attempt to draw the edges of the workforce demographically, economically, and in other quantifiable ways and thereby together lay the basis for situating this workforce in the specific political economy in which it functions so as to complete the usefulness of this map for organizing purposes.

Notes on Sources:

The main source of statistics on education in the US, including higher education, is the US Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics. As far as contingent faculty are concerned, their data and reports, though improving with the last National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF 1998-9), are still lacking much that is needed to draw a complete and accurate map of this workforce. (Johnston 1995)
One problem, in common with nearly all other studies, is that it leaves out significant portions of the contingent faculty workforce and therefore underestimates both absolute numbers and percentages. NSOPF left out many faculty (instructional staff in their terms)teaching non credit classes (a large, very diverse, and seemingly growing segment), graduate employees teaching classes, and the entire for-profit higher education segment, both degree granting, accredited, and otherwise. It is completely possible, even likely, based upon admittedly scattered data, that the "left out" outnumber the "counted" from NSOPF. This represents a technical as well as a political problem, both in using the existing reports drawn from this data and in constructing a reliable map that could help guide an organizing strategy.

The second major problem with this data is that its main ultimate source is the individual administrations of educational institutions. Previous research by myself and others, as well as the nearly universal experience of organizers in this sector, is that administrations routinely, in fact virtually universally, underestimate the actual numbers of their contingent faculty employees, their percentage of the total faculty, and the percentage of the courses taught by them. Full-time tenure track (FTTT) faculty,

conversely, are nearly always overcounted in all the above categories. This is done in a variety of ways and with a variety of motives and explanations possible. Cases exist, in my personal experience, of this “error” amounting to 100% or more of the contingent faculty on occasion.

Common statistical sources for this “error” are (all personally and directly observed by myself): leaving out faculty who teach short or other nontraditionally scheduled courses, courses taught on contract for businesses and other employers or unions, courses taught off the main campuses, “precredit” courses taught as required prerequisites to regular college courses, but carrying nontransferable &/or nongraduation credit themselves, independent study, private lessons, practicum, internship, and thesis supervision when done by contingents, teaching done by faculty who are not listed as the instructor of record even if all or most preparation, instruction and evaluation is done by the contingent, the practice of counting contingents via a “snapshot” rather than counting all those who work in a given academic semester or year, counting all co-taught courses with tenure track faculty under that person only, counting only those actually on the payroll lists in the first weeks of the term when many contingents do not make it onto those lists until mid semester (and receive late first checks as a result), omitting all continuing education teaching, even if carrying college credit, omitting contingent counselors, librarians, coaches, etc. while at the same time counting their fttt counterparts as teaching faculty, counting vacant fttt lines as

faculty, counting fttt faculty who are in supervisory or administrative positions as teaching faculty. This is necessarily an incomplete list.

Regarding motives, this is , of course more speculative, but some inference can be drawn from the mirror image distortions in counting fttt faculty versus contingents. This suggests that the “errors” are not all unintentional. Also, the one situation where administrations frequently produce much larger lists is when a unionization campaign has filed a recognition petition and the administration is required to produce an “Excelsior list” before the election. In many of these cases, this list has been found to include many names never previously counted in reports prepared by the same institutional administration, but who are now attested to be employees eligible to vote in the election and to be counted as the “universe” from which the 30% signature filing requirement is to be figured.

Another problem with all survey data in this sector is the large number of terms used to describe contingent faculty and the inconsistency of their application. This is true both for administrators and faculty, including contingent faculty, themselves. (See appendix, drawn from Worthen/Berry, 1999, for a partial list of terms used.)

Statisitical Picture

The following data are drawn primarily from the NSOPF 1999 data, supplemented by other studies, such as NCES' IPEDS reporting system data (various years). Some breakdowns were only available for earlier dates, such as the 1993 NSOPF. Estimates were supplemented by reference to other reports based upon NCES data and to other surveys, such as that of the Coalition on the Academic Workforce, Fall 1999. Based upon the data problems listed above, choices were made, when necessary, in the direction of the largest verifiable figures for contingent faculty and for the most recent available data, which usually were the same figure if within the same universe. For these reasons, totals will not always add exactly nor will percentage totals always match 100. Decisions were made with the criteria of greatest possible completeness and usefulness in application to organizing strategy for the entire contingent workforce. I have particularly chosen those statistics that signaled differences between contingent and fttt faculty and that seemed particularly relevant for organizing consideration. I have chosen to present them in as simplified a form as possible.

Table 1. History Statistics

History of growth of contingent faculty
(Best figures available from a combination of sources, but all based on NCES data.)

Chronology	Full-time tenure track data	Part-time / adjunct data
1971-86	The only figures available report that the number of part-time / adjuncts increased 133%; the number of full-timers increased only 22%.	No additional information available.

1987	Full-time percentage of total faculty (headcount) 66.9.	Part-time / adjunct percentage of total faculty (headcount) 33.1%
1992	Full-time percentage of total faculty (headcount) 58.4	Part-time / adjunct percentage of total faculty (headcount) 41.6%
1998	Full-time percentage of total faculty (headcount) 57.4	Part-time percentage of total faculty (headcount) 42.6%
1970-95	Full-time faculty headcount increased 49% or 2% per year	Part-time / adjunct faculty headcount increased 266% or 10.6% per year
1995	No additional information	Fifty-one percent of new full-time hires were not on tenure track.

Table 2. History of full-time tenure status

(Numbers are percentage of total full-time faculty. Based on NCES statistics.)

Date	Full-time tenure track percentage	Full-time non-tenure track	No tenure system at institution	Total full-time without tenure (sum of columns 3 and 4)
1987	82.4%	8.9%	8.6%	17.5%
1992	79.0%	12.4%	8.6%	21.0%
1998	71.9%	18.1%	10.0%	28.1%

In 1970, 68% of new Ph.D.'s got university or college full-time tenure-track positions. Post-1980, only 51% did, even though enrollment was up 41% between 1970 and 1980.

National

Total instructional faculty and staff 976,410 (Fall 98) degree granting Title !V

100% eligible institutions only,

excludes		for-profit institutions and
non		credit instruction
and graduate		employees
Full-time	560,390	all figures below same universe
		as above, unless otherwise noted
	57.4%	
Part-time	416,020	
	42.6%	

Tenure status

Full-time	
tenured or tenure track	71.9%
not on tenure track	18.1%
no tenure system at institution	16.6
Part-time	
Tenured or tenure track	5.3%
not on tenure track	78.3%

no tenure system at institution	16.5%

Gender

Full-time	
Male	63.7%
Female	36.3%
Part-time	
Male	52.2%
Female	47.9%

Race/ethnicity

Full-time	
white, non-Hispanic	85.1%
part-time	
white, non-Hispanic	87.6%

Average years in current job

full-time	12.2

part-time	6.9	
Union status		Unclear where agency fee payers are counted.
Full-time		
union member	21.2%	
non-member	15.8%	
not eligible or union not available	63.0%	
Part-time		
union member	15.2%	
non-member	13.5%	
not eligible or union not available	71.3%	
Average income		
Full-time		
Total [individual] income		$68,697
from institution	60,951	
Outside	7,746	
Part-time		

Total [individual] income	$46,124	
From institution	12,426	
Outside	33,698	Unclear if this includes additional college teaching jobs as well as other employment, other data indicates 31% of part-timers work at more than one academic institution.)

Average pay per 3 semester unit course for part-time NTT faculty, Fall 1999, from Coalition on the Academic Workforce, consisting of twelve disciplinary organizations in arts, humanities and social sciences plus AAUP.

Percentage is percentage of total PTNTT faculty working at that pay level, (in the surveyed fields).

<$1,500	9%
1,501-2,000	23%
2,001-2,500	23%
2,501-3,000	17%
>3,000	27%

55% of part-timers make less than $2,501 for a 3 unit class.

Highest Degree

Full-time	
Ph.D. or first prof. degree	67.0%
Master's	27.8%
Bachelor's	4.0%
Less	1.2%
Part-time	
Ph.D. or first prof. degree	26.9%
Master's	54.1%
Bachelor's	14.1%
Less	4.9%
Only Job?	
Full-time	
Only at institution	69.4%
Other employment	30.6%
Part-time	
Only at Institution	27.5%
Other employment	72.5%

Principal Activity [on job at this institution]

Full-time

Teaching [is principal activity]	69.9%
Other than teaching	30.1%

Part-time

Teaching (is principal activity)	91.8%
Other than teaching	8.3%

Average number of classes taught

(at one institution, Fall 98)

Full-time	3.3
Part-time	2.4

Regular scheduled office hours [weekly]

Full-time	6.6
Part-time	2.0

Use multiple choice midterms or finals

Full-time	(none) [never]	43.9%
part-time	(none) [never]	41.2%

Engaged in research, writing or creative works?

Full-time	67.0%
Part-time	24.2%

Office space availability? [faculty response]

Full-time (Excellent, good or fair)	82.9%
Part-time (same)	55.8%

Satisfaction with benefits?

Full-time - yes	78.1
Part-time - yes	46.1

Distribution by program area [discipline]

Full-time	Ranged from 49.5% to 64.6%
Part-time	Ranged from 35.4% to 50.5%

Class Analysis

The first thing to say about the conditions of contingent faculty in general is that they have changed radically since the sector began to grow in the 1970s. For analytical purposes, it is defensible to posit that, in fact, these conditions have changed radically

enough to meet the dialectical requirements of quantity changing to quality. This means that the progressive deterioration of conditions, pay, security, and independence of action, as compared to full-time tenure track classically “regular” faculty, have proceeded so far and become so standard as the numbers of these contingent faculty have increased in higher education, that the quantity of changes can be posited as having transformed into the qualitative change of a new class line being drawn within higher education institutions. This class line is not meant to be drawn between contingent and regular faculty, though some have attempted to do so, but rather, as contingent faculty have become the majority, this class transformation has set them, now the normative (and majority) group of college faculty, clearly onto the other side of a class line from those who own, control and / or manage institutions of higher education in the United States. It is not so much that contingent faculty have become more differentiated from regular full-time (FTTT)faculty than before, but that they have become the norm. This change, of course has also impacted full-time faculty in many ways. The implications and details of these changes for full time faculty will be discussed in greater detail as a strategic consideration in a later section. Fundamentally, this is the classic proletarianization argument applied to higher education, just as this argument, now nearly universally accepted, was applied starting in the early 1900’s to public school teachers. This class line was the implied theoretical and practical basis for the rise of the AFT and teacher unionism, as opposed to the NEA and the concept of the schoolmaster.

Ruling class:	**Old academia (pre-1975)**	**Academia 2002**
Capitalists et al		elite top administrators
	top administrators	top administrators
Middle class:	administrators	
Independent professionals, small business owners, managers and supervisors	FTTT faculty	middle administrators lower admin. department heads
	Visiting and contingent faculty	
	academic professionals	
		academic profess.
Working class:		
Clerical and service workers professionals, crafts, skilled, unskilled, etc.	Clerical and service workers	Clerical and service workers, Contingent faculty

Diagram 1. Changing Class Positions in Academia, pre-1975 and 2002.

This is not to say that these new professional intellectual proletarians (contingent faculty) are purely that, leaving aside the question of whether anyone in a complex advanced capitalist society is purely anything in class terms (Wright 1979). Rather, this is an argument that their primary class position has changed in the last thirty years and that they are now fundamentally, in all their variety, members of the working class and in fact, the single largest numerical group of the working class employed within the walls of academia.

They do retain a contradictory class position from a variety of bases. As contingent, and in many cases part-time workers, many of them have occupations, either simultaneously or serially, other than teaching in higher education. Also, in common with most other contingent workers, their class position, and certainly their class perception, is heavily influenced by the class position of their spouses and other family members who may have more secure economic positions. Yet another source of contradiction in the class position of this group is the fact that many of them probably do not come from working class origins, either self-described or objectively delineated. In this way, they could be seen as paralleling other groups whose massive entry into the American (waged) working class was from non-working class origins, such as the rural immigrants to the factories of the cities in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, whether from rural America, especially the U.S. South and Midwest, or from Europe, Asia or Latin America. What those folks all had in common was the rural-to-urban transition and also, in many cases, the transition from peasanthood of some sort to wage labor in

an industrial society. For many of them, this constituted a lateral or even upward move in class location. For our contingent faculty, in my experience, it is often a downward motion out of some section of the middle classes, even if their formal education is greater than their parents. This crucial fact of personal and group history is one of the central elements that must be used in constructing organizational strategy for this group. The trigger, or at least the visible trigger, of this massive transition to contingent labor in the academic workforce, (Abel 1984 quoted in Schell 1998) was the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's Recommendations on the Academic Workforce.

Even more important than the absolute condition of contingent faculty, are the changes in power relations governing their labor. These power relations have altered as the organizational structure of higher education has undergone change, both through the growth of the community colleges and through the transformation of more traditional institutions. One of the central facts of these power relations from the point of view of contingent faculty is that many of those considered by higher administration -- and by the public at large -- as "faculty" are, to contingent faculty, "bosses." This large sector of full-time tenure track faculty appointees are seen by themselves, and many others, as "faculty," but in their role as department heads, lead faculty, coordinators, program directors and assistant deans, are seen by contingent faculty as the employer. The contingent and casual nature of the employment relationship that has been constructed in higher education, similar to the same phenomenon in the rest of the economy, has also been accompanied by de-centralization of authority and practice regarding the

hiring, scheduling, evaluation, assignment, and firing of contingent faculty. Since these administrator/faculty perform all these functions upon contingent faculty, they are objectively "bosses" and seen as such by contingent faculty.

This decentralization has reached such a point in many institutions of higher education that direct questions to the executive level of administration as to how many contingent faculty are actually employed, what they are doing, what they are being paid, much less any personal employment history for any of them individually, --- all of these questions are frequently responded to by the academic version of "Huh?" (repeated personal experience). It is for this reason that all figures related to contingent faculty, which virtually all emanate from institutional administrations, must be taken with the greatest caution. The lack of serious, accurate and impartial statistical data is, in fact, a major characteristic of this casualized employment relationship, of this workforce itself, and is a major consideration in organizing strategy. Just as Henry Ford was among the first to partially "de-casualize" his own workforce, through centralization, higher pay, welfare capitalism, industrial espionage, and regulation of employee's private lives, the academic management class has casualized the majority of its workforce through doing just the opposite. A clearer collective assumption by top administrators of the "Pontius Pilate" role could hardly be imagined.

This phenomenon has also led large sections of the full-time faculty, even those without supervisory responsibility, to take the same subjective attitude ("hands off") toward

contingent faculty. This perhaps is a major reason for the slowness of the national faculty unions in grappling with the strategic implications of the growth of the contingent faculty. There is no need to seek malice, or even selfishness, in order to explain this void. The invisibility of these transitions, and of contingent faculty themselves, in the eyes of the more privileged may be explanation enough.

Contingent faculty as the above should suggest, are not the only ones who are in a changing and contradictory class location in higher education. With growing pressures to abolish elected department heads and at the same time assign administrative duties to regular faculty, in a piece meal fashion, while growing the ranks of the full-time middle management, academic professionals, and both of their support staffs, (Rhoades 1998) the inhabitants of slots labeled “department head,” “assistant dean, “ “program director,” etc. have found themselves torn by their very obvious contradictory imperatives, as their percentage grows. From the point of view of contingent faculty, the fact of being managed, hired and fired by those who themselves occupy a contradictory class location, is no gift at all. Since many of these supervisors still see themselves primarily as faculty, with, in many cases, more than a whiff of populism and even leftism, in their bloodstream, they frequently play the role of supervisor in a uniquely ambivalent and incompetent way. Since many of them have not come to grips with the fact that, to those faculty whom they supervise, they are the boss, the manner in which they relate to them, in many cases, has some of the superficial attributes of collegiality but none of its content. This creates a situation in which these supervisors

tend to minimize the time spent on their supervisory duties -- to the detriment of those being supervised - and then react very defensively to being questioned, even in the most neutral and information-seeking way, by those below them about their exercise of these duties.

When faced with collective action, even of the most benign sort, many of these faculty-supervisors turn their ambivalence into feelings of personal betrayal and generalized hostility. This reaction has perhaps been most extreme in the case of some full-time tenure-track faculty members' reactions to graduate employee organizing, because it highlights the fact that they are playing the role of employer and agent of the higher levels of the administration in their economic relationship to those under them, as well as the more familiar relationship of academic mentor and professor. All of this is heightened by the increased use of contingent faculty of all sorts and the declining numbers, at least percentage-wise, of full-time tenured faculty. If that weren't enough, many full-time tenured faculty are finding their own position degraded both by having to do the work that was formerly done by additional FTTT colleagues, as their numbers decline, and also by pressures to limit their own traditional prerogatives insofar as administrative support, supplies, research money, time off, scheduling preferences, etc. Additionally, some full-time faculty have actually been confronted with the possible loss of tenure altogether, which has sparked among them some of the most substantial collective activity seen since the early days of faculty collective bargaining in the 1970s such as at Bennington and the University of Minnesota.

Contingent life and conditions

Regarding the conditions that contingent faculty work under, the overarching factor is our contingency. To put it bluntly, as in all other employment sectors in this economy, the employer's flexibility is our uncertainty. And just as all other factors of the employment relationship have a cost, if they have a value, this one does likewise. In externalizing this cost to the contingent faculty, the advantage to the employer is obvious, especially now, faced with increasing numbers of non-traditional and part-time students whose enrollment patterns are progressively more difficult to predict and more sensitive to the state of the economy. What is less obvious and more important to this map, are the ways those costs are paid by contingent faculty themselves, mainly individually at this time.

One payment method is by having less income, due to having to turn down jobs when they conflict or not being able to predict employment or to maximize employment opportunities. Income is also minimized by instability, in that it impacts all other members of a household in terms of planning their personal and vocational lives. This phenomenon was extensively studied in generations past with regard to the growth of shift work in continuous production manufacturing, but has only recently attracted attention with the casualization of much of the labor force.

Yet another way the cost is borne is by the absence or inadequacy of health insurance or health care, or the delaying of health care until health insurance can be re-acquired. This obviously not only affects the contingent faculty themselves, but all members of their family.

Besides the instability of income and the unreliability and frequent absence of health insurance coverage, the very fact of contingency itself exacts a cost from the contingent faculty member and all those living with or dependent upon them. When one cannot be sure from one semester to the next, or in many cases even shorter term, what one's schedule will be, domestic duties like child care, shopping, cooking, elder care, housework, can rapidly move from being either small pleasures or small annoyances to being insurmountable problems. These problems then require a level of collective planning and organization in the family that few families are fully equipped to meet, or should be expected to.

The fact of contingency can also destroy social life. Between the limited income and the unstable and frequently odd hours, maintaining a "life", in the sense of recreation, personal development, cultivation of personal relationships can easily vaporize. In short, this is what many people see when they get their first view, however partial, into the life of a contingent faculty member. Their first response often is, "Why do you keep doing it? Why don't you get a life?" While the question can be asked in one sentence,

the answer in a fundamental sense is really the rest of this PDE. The one-line answer, with many permutations, is, “because it is good work that I love, but a bad living.”

Besides being extracted from personal life, the cost of contingency is borne by the limiting of the professional horizons available to those who experience this life. Recent research has shown that contingent work in academia after two or three years is not viewed as “positive experience” when one applies for permanent work, but is rather viewed as a detriment, increasing with the number of years that one has done it (Barker 1998, 207). When combined with the pervasive age discrimination (hidden under the desirability of “recency” of education or degree), the result is that contingent employment, rather than being a way into more permanent employment in academia, has become the dead end day labor that performs the majority of the teaching work of higher education today. In many situations, long-time contingents are seen as necessarily “damaged” or at least suspect, “goods” when fttt hiring is done. Yet another aspect of this professional constriction is that the simple time and energy that it takes to maintain a living at contingent academic employment, or at contingent employment outside of academia (which is also common) means that there is simply no time left for the development of the sort of personal academic capital that can make one attractive on the job market. The world of peer reviewed journals, academic conferences, professional networks, updated personal references, possibilities for co-authorship or even access to research libraries and facilities, are all basically precluded for the vast majority of this group unless they manage to maintain a continuing relationship as a

graduate student, post-doc, or independent scholar in what little time they have left. At this point, obviously, we are not operating in the realm of normal people, but individual super-heroes. This is the stuff of Horatio Alger myth-making, not real life accessible to normal people.

The costs of the externalization of flexibility by academic employers, though, do not end with the exploitation and constriction of horizons for individual contingent faculty or their families. They extend much more broadly than that. For every contingent faculty member who ends up going too late to an emergency room with their kid because they couldn't afford health insurance and hence omitted appropriate and timely medical attention, there are a dozen other holes in the social fabric left unfilled and unmended. Just as the pattern which Juliet Schor described in *The Overworked American* (Schor 1991). when documenting the increase in hours of labor and multiple job holding in the American workforce in general, that pattern is especially true among contingent academics. However, the more they work, the greater the percentage of their time at work is hidden and not counted statistically. Here is how it works: If you primarily teach full time at one college, you commute once. You can pick your place of residence in relation to your sole employment and other personal considerations, thereby minimizing your commute and very possibly minimizing other trips of a personal nature. You also minimize your professional time outside of class, since you only have one set of administrators, one set of regulations, one place to turn in grades, one system of clerical and technical support to relate to, one parking lot, one office, one Email to

check, one voice mail to check, one set of keys, one calendar to relate to, one set of student regulations and grade and transfer requirements to become familiar with in advising students, one set of syllabi to submit, one set of portfolios to create, if that is required, to maintain or upgrade your employment status, and a single format of everything that one has to create as a faculty member in order to do one's job. Virtually all contingent faculty face multiples of this, even if their total number of classes is the same or less than that of their FTTT colleagues. The vast majority of contingents either teach at more than one place, have other work outside of academia, or have serious other unpaid responsibilities virtually equivalent to another job (child care, elder care, etc.). And the more they work, the more of their job is absorbed by the list above. None of this list is counted as work hours by any of the standard administrative or economic indicators, but it comes out of people's lives just the same. This is all in addition, of course, to the concrete economic expense that most contingent faculty have of maintaining an office in the home and all the overhead associated with that, since they cannot rely on permanently having any office at all and its associated services, and often cannot be in it during many of the hours that it might be useful, anyway.

Yet a final aspect of the externalization of the cost of flexibility onto the contingent faculty is the opportunist exploitation of their commitment to their job and their students. This results in their keeping unpaid office hours, giving out their home phone numbers and Email addresses, doing class and course preparations that might never be used or never used again, participating without pay in departmental work, and acting

in hundreds of other ways like an actual teacher even though we are being neither compensated nor respected like one, except, of course, by our students. The dynamic is also used to discipline contingent faculty by the implication that if one behaves "professionally" one has a greater chance of being rehired, or even possibly hired onto a FTTT position.

Impact upon students and society

The main cost, though, of this loss is not even borne by the individual, who presumably survives, or leaves, but by the community and the society of which we are all a part. It is an axiom among organizers in this sector that it is easier to get contingent faculty to sign a petition, write a leaflet, make phone calls, or even give money, than to come to a meeting. It's simply a matter of time and flexibility. For every percentage of flexibility the employer gains, the contingent faculty member loses it and becomes less able to manage any optional behavior in their own life except in units of ten minutes or less. But this does not redound merely to difficulties in organizing. The casualization of this and other workforces, as well as the increased work and commute time, is a crucial element in the decline of voluntary organizations and general citizenship behavior of all sorts. (Loeb 1999). No one can count how many community meetings, churches, political clubs, neighborhood associations, sports leagues, fraternal groups, PTAs, and, yes, trade unions themselves, have been weakened and even extinguished by the loss of voluntary time and energy by large numbers of their potential members and leaders.

This is a loss that has been partially filled, albeit malevolently, by commerce and commercial services.

The impact upon students can perhaps be best summarized by the now-common slogan on many contingent faculty picket signs and leaflets, “Faculty teaching conditions are student learning conditions.” These range from inability to know who the teacher of a course will be when registering, to not being able to easily meet with faculty outside class, to not being able to find a teacher after the term is finished, to having limited communication with the faculty at all and certainly almost none of the informal relaxed time together so important to real college life. Some have asserted that contingents are actually poorer teachers, but the research has been far from conclusive on this point. What is clear is that it is a much greater struggle for contingent faculty to do their job well than for their FTTT colleagues. This is generally invisible to most students, but when they are made aware of the situation, they have often responded with great support for struggles to change these inequities.

Perhaps the capstone of this description can be found in the series of columns recently begun in the Chronicle of Higher Education (Carroll 2001-2002) which has finally taken notice of contingent faculty in a consistent way. However, not surprisingly given CHE’s pro-administrative perspective, they have chosen to focus on these issues through the eyes of a Texas part-timer who describes in her regular column all of the compromises, hustles, and gimmicks that contingent faculty use to put together a

minimal living. (Example -- “Don’t spend more than 10 minutes on one paper”). Unfortunately, she describes them from the point of view of the Oracle of Delphi speaking to children, as if most of her colleagues are not doing these things already, and she describes them in a context that explicitly argues that broader change is fundamentally impossible, however attractive it might be. The Chronicle of Higher Education also managed to pick a spokesperson who found some contingent jobs that actually paid nearly twice the $2,000 per class that approximates the national average. Nevertheless, the very existence of this column is acknowledgment and support for many of the points made above, even if the true costs to contingent faculty and their students are never acknowledged openly.

Now, having examined both the limited statistical picture nationally and then drawn an impressionistic picture of the workforce, I turn to the strategic considerations for organizing.

Elements of a National Strategic Plan

Any strategic organizing plan must necessarily revolve around two basic considerations, however they are expressed. One is the material realities of the workplace and the power relations therein. The second consideration is how do the actors individually and collectively think and behave now, and how might they be led to think and behave under conditions of active organizing? This is not to say that the line between these two is always firm and hard, but conceptually, these are the two

categories of factors that together both create and re-create the terrain upon which organizing takes place.

Material conditions and power relations

On the first consideration, the objective, I would argue that drawing the class line in higher education involves a very important historical dimension. The relationship between contingent faculty and their employers and also their relationship to full-time tenured faculty has changed over time as the number of contingent faculty and their roles within the institution has increased. My central argument here is that the new majority faculty is a group that has experienced and is continuing to experience proletarianization in nearly all of its classical components: decline of wages, decline of job security, loss of ancillary compensation, loss of autonomy, loss of control of work process, and finally, loss of the craft ("professional") perquisites that have traditionally gone along with the work of a college teacher. This has been accompanied by the splitting of full-time jobs in both of the possible ways: one, simply cutting them into smaller pieces, i.e. a three or four or five-class full time load individually parceled out as one or two class assignments to adjuncts, and secondly, the unbundling of the various faculty tasks so that these adjuncts are mainly teachers, and play no role in the research, service, governance or generally collectively professional aspects of the institution. This latter can reach down as far as selection of textbooks, definitions of acceptable class size, copying limitations, classroom assignments, etc. The Taylorization, or unbundling, of faculty labor is continuing even within the teaching function.

Along with a description of this new proletarianized majority teaching classes in higher education must go the understanding that, like others whose work has become casualized, these faculty are now impelled to constantly search for multiple

employment, either within or without academia, and frequently both. One result of this, which has substantial strategic implications to be addressed later, is that for virtually the first time in American higher education, we have a substantial group of faculty, not just administrators, who have intimate experience in multiple institutions, and often in various sections of the country. This collective knowledge, if organized strategically, can provide a substantial factor in countering the united opposition of university and college administrators vis a vis adjunct and contingent faculty unionization as well as other issues within the institutions. What we may have here, if authors like Paul Johnston's (Johnston 1999, 2001) predictions are accurate, is the creation of a group that can collectively more fully realize the old Marxist dream [my words not his] of the workers actually understanding and thereby potentially controlling the whole work process of an entire industry nationally. In any case, at least, this mobility does provide the ability of contingent faculty to help avoid being taken in by administrative assertions couched in the language of "This is how it has to be done," "We've always done it this way,", "This is how professionals do it." or the classic "TINA" ("There Is No Alternative.")

Consciousness

As a proletarianizing group, who mostly are also individually engaged in downward mobility, in aspiration if not always in material reality, contingent faculty naturally exhibit a dual consciousness and behavior. On the one hand, the long years of higher education have instilled in them a belief in individual merit, the "Protestant work ethic," and higher education's version of the Horatio Alger myth. Their close proximity throughout this education to those who occupy the positions to which they now aspire, intensifies this feeling, and leads them to frequently pursue, sometimes for years and even decades, the search for individual solutions and personal recognition of their

"merit." On the other hand, the radically altered reality of higher education employment since the 1970s cannot help but impact the consciousness of even those most highly socialized products of American capitalist ideological hegemony -- the holders of masters and doctorates.

These breaks in consciousness manifest themselves in a variety of ways. Many initially retain the individualism of the striver while at the same time attempting to militantly struggle against what they perceive as individual unfairness directed against them and frustrating their ability to achieve individual recognition of their merit, such as a FTTT position. This can sometimes take a very personalist tone, with contingent faculty one minute kow-towing in the most obsequious way to administrators and full-timers and at another moment privately expressing positively murderous feelings toward those very same individuals. It goes without saying that neither of these behaviors nor the specific consciousness that contributes to them is a particularly useful building block for organizing. However, the understanding of where this comes from and its fundamental instability can provide the organizer with the tools to help transform this primitively and individually rebellious consciousness into something of a collective nature. Since it arises from a fundamentally unstable and changing situation, namely the uneven proletarianization of the group, this consciousness is susceptible to fairly rapid transformation under the proper collective circumstances, but is always likewise susceptible to backsliding when isolation takes hold.

Finally, I would argue that this context creates the possibility, probably for the first time in the history of American higher education, for a mass working class consciousness among faculty, not merely sympathy with workers elsewhere in the economy or the world, as was the basis for higher education faculty unionism in the pre-collective bargaining days. Further, I would argue that this context provides a possible basis not

only for the fairly narrow trade or craft or "guild" consciousness of the professional, such as has dominated most full-time tenure-track-led faculty unions since the 1960s, but also represents the potential for actual class consciousness that could be spread into the rest of the working class, starting with the working class students of most contingent faculty. The strategic power of the right to legitimately stand in front of a class of working class students and talk about many of the social realities that students, and now most faculty, face, using the pronoun "we" unselfconsciously, is a power that has only barely begun to be realized by a few activists and not yet by the movement as a whole. However, all of us who have experienced this power first hand can have no doubt of its potential.

Full-time tenured and tenure track colleagues (FTTT)

Just as the new majority contingent faculty have had their objective and therefore subjective positions changed in the last 30 years, so have the other two key groups that impact them, namely full-time tenure track faculty and administrators. Full-time faculty are coming to occupy a deeply anomalous position. They are clearly not employers or bosses in the main, the Yeshiva decision and its contorted interpretations notwithstanding. And they are becoming even less so in the years since that decision was rendered. The exceptions to this rule, namely the star faculty in a few departments at mostly Research I universities, are merely the exceptions that prove the rule of a gradual degradation of the employment situation of most FTTT faculty, which is most potently symbolized by the continuing and regular attacks upon tenure.

One way the discussion of the space between the contingent faculty and the full-time tenured faculty is being carried on is the current debate in the California community colleges over what constitutes equity or parity and thereby will guide the local

allocation of the categorical pay equity money in the state budget. This debate holds great importance not only because the California community colleges constitute the largest system of higher education in the United States but also because it is the sharpest version to date of the decades-long discussion of what are the differences and similarities between the duties of the full-time and the contingent faculty, expressed most baldly in a single percentage. The direct question being addressed pursuant to the legislation in California is, "What percentage of a full-time faculty member's total work is constituted by the teaching and other duties that part-time (contingent) faculty members do?" This debate is being conducted in every single community college district in the state through the collective bargaining process, and the percentages may well end up ranging from the sixties to one hundred.

Of course, community college full-time faculty, as mainly teachers, do not have exactly the same duties as faculty in four year schools, so this will not be the final word in the discussion of what constitutes equity for all contingent faculty. However, this debate opens up discussions that, depending on how they are pursued, can be positive or negative for the future of higher education and for contingent faculty organizing. Positively, it forces out into the open discussion of all of the tasks that contingent faculty are presently conducting pursuant to their instructional duties, whether paid or unpaid, mandated or just necessary to be an effective teacher. It thereby creates pressure for those duties to be considered necessary and paid, in the context of revisions of compensation strategies. Examples of this would be office hours, syllabus development, materials development, collective grading of departmental exams, development of grading norms, student advising and much of the rest of department activity that directly relates to instruction. Negatively, however, this debate could result in support for the existing administrative thrust to unbundle faculty work by focusing attention on the potential to separate the work of curriculum development

from instructional delivery, from evaluation, from individual student contact such as tutoring and advising, all of which have traditionally been packaged in the person of the individual faculty member, and the norms for which have been developed collectively by faculty. So, as is nearly always the case for important discussions, the results could make things better, or worse. That's why it's important. It is also why it has been a major subject on contingent faculty list-serves in California and elsewhere.

At the same time that contingent faculty numbers have been increasing and their conditions have been proletarianized, an evolution has also taken place among the full-time tenure track faculty in almost all sectors of higher education. At the Research I universities, this has manifested as greatly increased publishing requirements, a much higher bar for hiring, promotion and tenure, and, at the same time, pressure upon the non-stars to teach more, though that pressure has often been successfully resisted. The overall decline in full-time tenured faculty at Research I universities as a percentage of the total teaching faculty has meant that departmental curricular work and other collective business is split among fewer hands. So for those who are not "stars," able to command the astronomical salaries that one sees on the front pages of the newspapers, even this relatively elite group has found their traditional purposes threatened. (Aronowitz 2000, Rhoades 1998, Nelson and Watt 1999).
[These and subsequent description of general trends in higher education and among FTTT faculty and administrators, are drawn from a combination of the works immediately previously noted, also (Martin 1889, White 2000, Soley 1995, Margolis 2001, Kaplow and McGee, 1965, Slaughter and Leslie 1997, and Hirsch and Weber 1999. These are combined with the interview data, statistical data that make up the maps of the workforce put forward here, and my own years of direct experience with literally dozens of institutions (form Research I to Community colleges), as well as discussions with hundreds of faculty in the course of activity in the organizing and union

movement. The analytical use made of all this material is my own recreation from all of these sources.]

These Research I FTTT faculty have further seen their position altered as they have become the employment supervisors of more and more graduate employees. Formerly, their main relationship to graduate students was as academic mentor. The increasing use of grad employees (CGEU, 2001) has altered FTTT roles and this change has been particularly uncomfortable for some FTTT faculty when grad employees have tried to unionize. In some universities large numbers of FTTT faculty have been open allies. In others most have been neutral or hostile with only a very few openly standing with the grad employees, such as at Yale (Nelson 1997, 1999).

For those in universities not granting Ph.D.'s, and with a heritage of focus upon teaching, the changes have been in the direction of higher research requirements but not necessarily a lowering of teaching loads. At these institutions as well, we see the spectacle of committees passing on the hiring, promotion and tenure of applicants, when the majority or at least many on the committee could not pass the bar themselves. This pattern is reflected throughout higher education over the past two decades. (Aronowitz 2000)

The liberal arts colleges seem to have been impacted by these changes the least, internally, but externally the environment in which they function has become much more hostile to the traditional niche market that they occupy. So while liberal arts colleges have hired fewer contingents and have transformed the work of their full-time tenure track faculty less, a great many more of them have simply collapsed, through bankruptcy, merger, or a radical transformation to attempt to live with the new market realities. This trend began in the 1970s, with religiously-based liberal arts colleges in

small towns throughout America (with Parsons College in Iowa becoming Maharishi University one of the most famous then) but it seems to have greatly accelerated.

In the community colleges, which are by far the single largest sector of American higher education, full-time faculty have found themselves a decreasing percentage of the total instructors, now almost always a minority. In more than a few cases, entire departments have been reduced to one full-time department chair managing a flock of "birds of passage" part-timers. In institutions where the department chairmanships were never highly coveted, generally only giving partial release time and little if any increased pay, this new situation has resulted in departments literally conscripting chairs on rotational or name-in-the-hat basis, under the threat that if existing full-timers did not "pull their weight," that their whole department would be consolidated with another or that leadership would be imposed upon them in the person of a Dean or Dean's selection. This has taken place at the same time that the general drive to eliminate departments as arenas for faculty governance and collective academic decision-making has continued (Evelyn 2002). In a great many community colleges today, the word "department" is merely an archaic colloquialism with no official administrative meaning any more.

The changes this has meant for the average full-time community college faculty member include the following: pressure to teach more and to teach larger classes; pressure to serve on more committees and spend more time on collective departmental business; and pressure to perform more semi-administrative functions, despite the fact that administration has been one of the sectors of higher education growing in numbers along with academic professionals and contingent faculty; and a loss of full-time disciplinary colleagues, and thereby a loss of the sort of collegiality in all ways that used to be the particular mark of these teaching institutions. All of this has occurred while the FTTT faculty have been individually aging as well as collectively contracting and

while the general level of economic support on a per-student basis for community colleges as institutions has been shrinking. The result has been a drop in morale, individually and collectively, such that few who knew the community colleges in the 60s and early 70s would fully recognize them today if visited after thirty years absence.

So if one is to compare the trajectory of the changes in the work and work life of contingent and FTTT faculty, they might be summarized thus: one, contingent faculty have changed from being the occasional professional imported to teach a specialty class as a professional courtesy to their fellow professionals in academia, the situation pre-1970s, to the present situation where contingent faculty of various sorts together make up a majority of the faculty and at a great many institutions are doing the majority of the teaching under conditions much inferior both to those of the occasional professionals of the 1960s and to their FTTT colleagues. This, with some wiggles, is basically straight-line deskilling and proletarianization. Two: Full-time (FTTT) faculty, have been affected more variously across the sectors, but virtually all, except for the minority of "stars" at Research I universities or the minority in other places who have become mainly administrators, have seen their working conditions and traditional perquisites degraded. This includes pressure to publish more, fewer bodies to conduct departmental work and business, increasing administrative burdens for some, loss of close disciplinary colleagues as retirees are not replaced by FTTT faculty, pressures to do more clerical work themselves, often through web and computer applications, and a general deterioration of the academic climate as bottom line considerations come to more obviously dominate traditional academic ones. (Currie and Vidovich 1998, among others).

This is now a complicated calculus, for while in some ways the difference between the FTTT faculty and contingent faculty is now greater than ever, in other ways the forces

acting upon them both have now exposed themselves much more obviously and potentially laid the basis for alliance much firmer than ever before. If present trends continue, and many top administrators and their consultants are openly pushing for them, we will see a convergence but it will be a convergence of the casualized, the de-skilled and the insecure with a just a few holding super-professor/consultant status left at the top, who will be making the sorts of decisions that traditionally were made collectively by all FTTT faculty.

Implications for organizing contingent faculty, especially their relation with FTTT, will be greatly impacted by how both groups respond to these changes. If most FTTT see their danger of job loss or job degradation as converging with the contingent majority, then new openings for faculty unionism are clearly available. If, on the other hand, the majority of FTTT faculty respond to these conditions by looking for individual ways out: counting the days till their own retirement, seeking to become a "star," pursuing administrative advancement, focusing upon developing outside consulting businesses related to their discipline -- if they respond this way, then the potential for alliance greatly decreases and the potential collective power to defend FTTT positions for the future will decline as well. The attack on tenure in all its forms is merely the most obvious example of an administration strategically responding to these changes. Administrators also wave the carrot as well as the stick in encouraging individual responses with early retirement packages, increased numbers of administrative or partially administrative positions, and rewarding (even requiring) outside entrepreneurial behavior (including grants and corporate contracts). Administrators also encourage/force faculty unions to bargain multiple tiers ("selling the unhired"), by creating further degraded conditions for not yet hired FTTT faculty. (Personal experience and example of City Colleges of Chicago/ AFT Local 1600 contract

negotiations). The fact that most faculty unions have come to be led by representatives of the senior FTTT cohort has allowed this tactic to be effective in many cases.

FTTT thus exhibit a number of characteristics typical of what is happening to the rest of the "full time permanent labor force," just as contingent faculty exhibit many of the characteristics of the growing "non-standard" labor force in the rest of the economy. Ultimately, these changes may make the very vocabulary of "contingent" and "permanent" passé. Unlike most other industrial nations, and even many less industrial nations, in the United States most employees who do not have union representation function under the "at will" common law doctrine. What this means from the worker perspective, and also from the organizer perspective, is that there is no legal restriction upon the employers to keep them from dismissing employees for any reason or no reason and with no notice or explanation. The exceptions to this, which cover only a minority of the workforce, are 1) union contracts with just cause discipline and discharge provisions; 2) public employment with civil service due process discipline and discharge protections; 3) civil rights laws forbidding discrimination against protected groups (race, sex, color, national origin, religion, veteran's status and in some localities, sexual orientation -- but these can be difficult to enforce, more and more requiring a "smoking gun" for successful litigation; 4) retaliation for exercise of rights under various labor and employment laws (National Labor Relations Act, OSHA, FMLA, etc.), and 5) legally enforceable "tenure" regulations for traditional FTTT faculty. While this list of protections has expanded over the years, the practical ability of most workers without an organization to stand with them to enforce these laws has always been limited due to both costs and fear of retaliation.

Since World War II, there has been a social expectation, at least in the primary labor market, where standards were largely set by union contracts and by the labor management "pact" post World War II, that regular jobs would be full-time, include benefits, and carry the expectation of continued employment as long as work was adequately performed and the employer did not experience an economic crisis. There might be temporary seasonal or emergency layoffs, but the relationship between the employer and employee was seen by both as ongoing and having some permanence Herzenberg, Wial, and Alic 1998). The fact that this social expectation had virtually no legal standing in nonunion workplaces did not make it any less real in the relationships at the workplace. It is the destruction of that relationship, legally supported or otherwise, that is much of the story of the changes in the entire American workforce in the years since the 1970s. In application to higher education, where this expectation had been considered legally enforceable, through tenure statutes, case law and frequently union contracts, the change has been somewhat more gradual as it applied to those occupying the permanent positions, but the pressures for change have built up just the same.

If enough of the remaining FTTT faculty, and the organizations they lead, can be convinced that the future of higher education lies with an active alliance with contingent faculty and their organizations, then the future of the struggle is much brighter. The answer will be mixed, of course, with likely more FTTT community college faculty making this decision than those in the most prestigious realms of higher education. The implications for what the movement of contingent faculty should do are perhaps less that might appear initially. Our main goal should be to build our movement in whatever way we can, largely independently if we must and in alliance with FTTT if we can. Our ability to build our own movement is what will mainly determine how most FTTT faculty line up. Just as the civil rights movement only gained

real allies and legal changes after it had built a powerful mass force based upon those who personally needed civil rights the most, we will have to do the same. Only by so doing can we hope to make alliances as equals and even win over some FTTT faculty to following our leadership on occasion rather than being condescending big brothers.

Administrators' perspectives and vulnerabilities

Having looked in some detail at both the contingent faculty and FTTT faculty, let us now turn our attention to those who exercise real power in higher education: the administrations. In an economically counter-cyclical industry, such as most of non-elite higher education, there has always been a certain pressure on administrators to let the bottom line lead institutional policy. Non-elite higher education is a counter-cyclical industry in the sense that the demand (and arguably need) for its product grows in periods of recession and depression, just those times when funding for the institution either through government appropriations or voluntary donations is likely to be at its lowest. Likewise, in good economic times, more potential students are likely to find living wage jobs and therefore delay their return or continuation in higher education. This phenomenon has become both more pronounced and more important since the 1970s as more college students are working adults as opposed to new high school graduates. This inherent condition of the "industry" has always produced pressure on administrators to pay attention to the short term economics of their enterprise, but in the period of the post World War II boom, there was enough money coming to the system to sustain growth, real growth, even in times of recession such as during the "Eisenhower" recession of the 1950s and the "Kennedy" recession of the early 1960s.

What changed for administrators in the 1970s was the same thing that changed for employers throughout the economy: in the private sector it was called "the profit

crisis." In higher education, being mostly public or non-profit, it was referred to as a "budget crisis." But it amounted to the same thing. The attempt to prosecute an unpopular war on the basis of government borrowing, while at the same time not raising taxes or seriously reducing public services, resulted in a lessening of economic growth and rising prices, the heretofore capitalist impossibility of "stagflation." This manifested itself in higher education with increasing numbers of non-traditional students, many of them veterans or re-entry women, literally banging on the doors of higher education while at the same time the relative disposable institutional income of administrators was shrinking. They responded to this problem, some with serious soul-searching, others arguing to themselves that these were mere temporary expediencies, by hiring legions of contingent faculty and also cutting costs in other ways (larger class sizes, deferred maintenance, contracting out of non-instructional services and seeking educational contracts outside the institution, "contracting in") (Rhoades 1998, Slaughter and Leslie 1997).

The net result of these pressures upon higher education administrators was to make that generation of administrators (and trustees) more open to traditional corporate management models to solve their problems. As that generation of administrators retired, many college presidents and boards of trustees, quite rationally from their perspective, replaced the retirees with people directly from the corporate sector, figuring that if the problem was parallel to that of corporate management, why should the institution pay for on-the-job retraining of academics when you could hire people with corporate management experience who were ready to go "just-in-time"? Thus, in the 21st century, we have many more educational institutions being run by people who not only have taught very little but who quite frankly do not see themselves primarily as educators, even rhetorically, and who much prefer to be labeled CEOs than to bear the burden of "educational leadership." (Hirsch and Weber 1999, Basinger 2002)

Another aspect of the counter-cyclical nature of non-elite higher education that has potential importance strategically for organizing is that, unlike most economic enterprises in this society, higher education is most vulnerable to strikes and other direct action by employees or students at those moments when the economy is at its worst. So instead of the classic, albeit never completely true, rule that "good times lead to stronger unions and bad times weaken unions", the potential clearly exists for bad times to strengthen unions if the greater need for, and potential militancy of, contingent faculty during times of recession can be harnessed organizationally into struggle at those very moments when the colleges are under the most pressure to respond to increased student demand and those same moments when colleges are considered the most important by legislators searching for training options out of rising unemployment.

In addition to the counter-cyclical nature of the industry, the calendar and rigid schedule of traditional higher education lends itself much more to certain kinds of direct action than others. "Working to rule" actions of various sorts are clearly possible, but much harder to enforce than in a factory, with faculty members in their own offices and classrooms. Timing is even more important than in factories, but also more predictable, because of the scheduled nature of the academic calendar. The experience of public school teachers exercising maximum leverage with work actions halting the beginning of the school year and then bargaining the make up days is something that might be usefully applied to higher education as well. "Work to rule", then, is difficult, but work stoppage is actually less risky, in some contexts. In a similar vein, a sit down strike involving faculty remaining in their classrooms "on duty" and keeping office hours but simply refusing to perform educational functions while maintaining occupation of the facilities -- and also, incidentally, access to all the resource and

communications facilities -- might be a tactic worth considering once a movement became strong enough.

The fact that higher education administrators are becoming more corporate in their views and their origins makes them potentially more vulnerable to job actions since they are less service-bound and more bottom-line oriented themselves. This has taken place both by the direct growth of the for-profit higher education sector, which is obviously corporate to its core, but also by the imitative practices that have developed in the private non-profit and public sector. These have included outsourcing, contract education, and a general greater reliance on just-in-time behavior vis-a-vis employees and students, driven by a hardening in their conception that higher education's real customer is the future employer of their students, who are their product. (Nelson and Watt 1999, Aronowitz 2000). Before the 1980's, administrators would "take" the occasional faculty strike, as they did in the public schools in some cases, and see it as a political problem but not an economic one, since they saved the money not paid as wages during the strike, and still received the tuition and state funding. Examples include the San Francisco State student-faculty strike of 1968-69, the Compton College (CA) strike in the early 1980's, both of which were extended in nature. Now, with higher education much more tuition-driven and focused on the bottom line, institutions are much more vulnerable to the economic impact of strikes because anything that might drive away students would hurt "profits": tuition, corporate contracts, federal student aid money, workforce development contracts, etc.

Another aspect of the vulnerability of corporate-led just-in-time higher education, especially now that the majority of student body are "non-traditional" and part-time, (Evelyn 2002) and therefore not tied to being full-time students at any particular moment, is that the administration cannot stockpile services of the faculty, much as they

would like to. They are attempting to move in this direction with distance education, substitution of technology for faculty, modularized learning, etc. but still, in the main, they are forced to rely upon the moment-to-moment time-appropriate interaction face to face of faculty (workers) with students (product). This is a leverage that manufacturing workers have begun to exploit in the just-in-time high performance factory environment, such as in the auto industry in the 1990's, but which faculty have only begun to dimly grasp and have not organizationally utilized at all. This will become even more important as the increased use of distance education and the concomitant increase in the use of contingent faculty proceeds apace, as it inevitably will, with ups and downs.

Who are the activists?

Another major strategic consideration in organizing contingent faculty is the rise in the number of women in the academy along with the rise of contingent employment. This has occurred just as women were becoming less likely to see themselves wanting only part-time or contingent employment, but rather confronting their professional and economic need to support themselves and others. This contradiction between the material trends, the numbers of women involved, and their rising aspirations for equality, have meant that women, especially in the contingent-impacted fields of English composition and English as a Second Language (ESL), have often been the leading activists, and even more often, the majority of strong supporters of organizations struggling both for better pay and conditions in contingent jobs and for fair and preferential access to full-time jobs. (Personal experience and interviews in Organizers' Voices section).

This has not meant, however, that any disciplines are uniformly hostile to organization. Even business departments, where one might expect to find the headquarters of ideological anti-unionism, have turned out in practice, at least among contingent faculty, to include many who recognize that they personally need organization even if they are ambivalent about "joining the labor movement" in a more general or political way. It does remain true, however, that those fields where the fewest alternative well-paid and secure ("good jobs") employment opportunities exist outside the academy, are those which have produced a disproportionate percentage of activists. (Organizers' Voices section and personal experience).

Another characteristic of the activists -- and this is drawn from personal experience, discussion at movement meetings, and interview data -- is that activists tend more likely to be people without the Ph.D. and from less prestigious institutions. The Ivy League Ph.D. leading an organizing drive among contingent faculty is not unheard-of but anomalous. Though no certain causation for this can clearly be determined, a little reasonable speculation might be useful in formulating strategy. One possibility is that people with masters only are more likely to have mixed in their graduate classes with folks from unionized professions: public school teachers, nurses, etc. People with doctorates are more likely to have mixed in their classes largely with people from elite backgrounds. Another possibility is that people who ended their education with masters are more likely to have some sort of union experience in their own personal and family backgrounds than those who have achieved the extra years of education necessary for a Ph.D. Another possibility is that Ph.D.s are more likely to still believe that they personally can achieve individual upward mobility ("grab the brass ring") by snaring a full-time tenure track position. This would hold especially true for those from elite institutions.

In sum, my years in the movement as well as this research have tended to show that those most likely to get involved are those most committed to the job. This can be because they are freeway flyers who teach for a living and therefore feel the inequities particularly personally or it can be that group who are particularly committed to education and the teaching process, even if they do not personally mainly teach for the income. Both groups are well represented and exist in all disciplines. However, I have found that people who do this work for more than a couple of years are much more likely to become activists. Unfortunately, they are also more likely to be psychologically and physically damaged by the experience by the time they become activists. Years without respect, material or professional, both makes people angry and also undermines their own self-confidence. The answer to both problems that many have found is in the collective struggle, especially if there is at least one other person around who had some past experience and a broader perspective. This question is explored in greater depth in the interview material.

The message: respect

One old union organizer's aphorism is that no matter what the material situation for any group of workers, ultimately all organizing revolves around a demand for respect: Respect for the people who are doing the work and respect for the work that they are doing. Perhaps the most famous single union picket sign of the twentieth century came from the Memphis AFSCME sanitation workers strike in 1968, "I Am a Man". That aphorism certainly holds true for contingent faculty who work side by side with FTTT faculty and yet are usually as invisible to them as to their employers. Every time an FTTT faculty or administrator uses the world "faculty" to refer only to the FTTT, one more piece of grit is ground into the eye of any contingent within earshot. The list of disrespectful and inequitable irritations could fill this page: new parking tags needed

every year no mater how long one has taught, limits on copying, ID's, library access, recreation facilities, names in class schedules and catalogs, in phone books, on office doors, invitations to meetings and other functions, notices of college or departmental news or meetings,

One seldom recognized aspect of the exploitation of contingent faculty is that in addition to doing the same work in the classroom as the FTTT faculty, the contingent has to also do the extra emotional work to maintain "faculty behavior" and confidence vis-a-vis the students within a context where that is not supported by the institution. This requirement imposed upon contingent faculty is as draining ultimately as any of the sort of emotional work outlined by Arlie Hochschild in her well-known book on the subject (Hochschild 1985) because not only is it required but it is also completely unsupported and unacknowledged. And this is just one way in which contingent faculty are placed in a position of super-exploiting themselves in order to do their job. They cannot do their job successfully (teach their students) while at the same time treating their students the way they are treated by their employers. If they did, little learning would take place and any student who could, would exit the classroom.

This requirement also creates among contingent faculty a schizophrenia, an unstable schizophrenia, not totally different from the double consciousness that writers like DuBois (Dubois 1965 [1903],) and Ralph Ellison (Ellison 1972 [1947]) described for African Americans. African-Americans had to, and still have to in some ways, maintain a dual face, one toward the world of power, mostly white, and another toward the African American community internally. Contingent faculty, in less extreme form of course, are also confronted with the need to maintain one face toward all those who have or might have power over them and another face which can only be revealed among themselves. To some extent this phenomena exists in all jobs, especially those

with no job security, but contingent faculty are an extreme case because of great contrast between the public perception of heir status and the reality of their existence. The brittleness that results from this dual demand sometimes creates a situation in which contingent faculty are afraid to reveal their true status to their students for fear that they will lose their respect and thereby lose the ability to effectively teach them. The same holds true for contingent faculty's relationships with people outside academic. One of the reasons why Gappa and Leslie's book title, *The Invisible Faculty,* was appropriate is that contingent faculty are not only treated as invisible by administrators but that they are "in the closet" by their own actions, for perfectly rational although ultimately collectively self-limiting reasons. Just as the movement for gay rights allowed gay people to exit the closet individually, so as to join a collective struggle for equality and social legitimization, likewise the movement for contingent faculty equity, can and has allowed some contingent faculty to come out of their closet to students, friends and others.

Therefore we need demands, programs and slogans that speak to personal respect and concern for the educational process as well as to compensation and benefits.

Specific demands

While all organizing may be ultimately about respect, specific issues still retain importance. Thirty years of contingent faculty activism have left us some patterns that we can observe. Two central clusters of issues consistently emerge at the top of the priority list and symbolize for most contingent faculty the lack of respect that they feel. These issue clusters cross the individual situations of contingent faculty, whether they be freeway flyers, full-time temporaries, people with other full-time jobs outside of academia, etc.

One of these clusters of issues is job security, with two major sub-divisions. First, the security of assignment, placement and retention of existing contingent work and second, acknowledgment of that work and experience in the form of preference for full-time tenure track positions when they occur. The central demand that has been raised in both of these areas has been that of seniority rights. While seniority systems are never perfect, and the principle itself is far from ideal as a manner of allocation of resources, jobs, or anything else, it is still the best general system yet devised to be substituted for the whimsicality and favoritism that virtually all employers use in its absence. It goes almost without saying that the variety of seniority systems that have evolved, and their relative strength and enforceability, almost defies description. This is also not to avoid all the negative aspects of the present tenure system, one of the worst of which is that it treated as a gift or special reward, subject to gross manipulation, rather than a variety of basic job security that all worker should have as a right. But the core principle of seniority in education, namely recognition of work adequately performed in the past and recognition of the fact that experience in general leads to greater skill -- that central principle is one that never fails to resonate among contingent faculty, as it does among workers generally, however compromised it may be in practice through discriminatory hiring, differential treatment, or other unfair practices. This greater efficiency by familiar and committed employees redounds to the benefit of the employer as well as the student. The fact that most employers strongly resist this demand points toward a conclusion that most administrators actually are much less concerned with the quality of the education provided and the accumulated skills of the providers than they are with the danger that a more experienced, and hence perhaps rebellious or stubborn, workforce might challenge their “right” to manage in the context of restricted administrative flexibility. This is one more reason why most contingent faculty have come to the unshakable conclusion that the people running the majority of higher

education institutions today are not only ignorant of what goes on in classrooms but are in fact militantly agnostic about it. The depth and firmness of this assessment is surprising and strongly contradicts the still-common perception of FTTT faculty that administrators, even up to the president, are still "colleagues", albeit attenuated ones. This is one more example of the nascent development of one more building block of class-consciousness among the new majority faculty.

The second cluster of issues that inevitably comes up is that of equal pay, compensation and treatment for equal work. The notion of equity in this context is so deeply rooted in this society, hyper capitalist though it is, in general that any labor educator can relate literally dozens of examples of conversations explaining that, "No, there really is no general equal-pay-for-equal-work law in this country, despite how obviously just the principle." All general legislative efforts in this direction, other than to protect specific groups from invidious discrimination (women, racial and ethnic minorities, etc.) have been unsuccessful. The concept of equal pay for equal work, like the idea of seniority, is not a perfect principle. It fails to recognize inequality of need, inequality of effort, inequality of condition within which the work is performed, the inherent inability of all work to be equal, and other considerations. Nevertheless, it has exactly the same virtues, and thereby the same necessities, as the seniority demand. Namely, it is a restriction upon the capricious unfairness of employers and secondly, it highlights a truly important principle, namely the principle of equity, however imperfectly applied. Highlighting this principle has the added advantage of drawing previously disparate individuals together in a collectivity which makes it possible for them to conduct collective discussions, act together for greater equity, and perhaps ultimately create compensation principles that supersede and go beyond equal pay for equal work. But the doorway of equal pay for equal work is the one that must be walked through on the way to anything better. And perhaps the path beyond that doorway would have to lead

to a post-capitalist alternative as well, in which a community of equals could democratically apportion resources "to each according to their need".

These two clusters and their assigned importance should not be seen as a universal even for contingent faculty in all societies at all times, but rather for the context of the capitalist United States in the current period. If for instance the social wage were higher in the U.S., as it is and has been in other countries, these issues might not matter as much. If health care were not tied to employment in so many cases, the specific issue of job security would be less crucial. If no one were allowed to sink below a reasonable living standard even with temporary unemployment, job security would be less important. If limits were generally placed upon rents and the prices of other essentials of life, pay levels and other direct individual compensation would be less important. But since the social wage in the United States is so uneven, so low, and falling, these two clusters of issues must be seen as the crucial demands now just as they are for most contingent workers in the U.S. economy.

Competitive unionism

A little history

With the rise of a movement among contingent faculty, and the declining percentage, and in some institutions declining absolute number of FTTT faculty, it was probably inevitable that as the national unions became more interested in contingent faculty, that competition for bargaining units would ensue. One has the precedent of the AFT/NEA representational wars in the public schools in the 1960's-1980's. Even for higher education contingent faculty this has occurred before, most especially in places where the common pattern was combined contingent/FTTT units, like in the public sector in California and New York. Now, however, we see the phenomenon recurring, especially

with the rise of contingent-only units, and also into the private sector, where the contingent faculty are safe from the roadblocks of the Yeshiva decision, which largely halted private sector FTTT faculty organizing in the 1980's by declaring FTTT faculty managers of their institution.

As with most complicated and developing phenomena, a little history is necessary here. The earliest major faculty bargaining units in higher education came in the public sector in New York, specifically the City College (now the City University of NY) system. That unit, nearly unique in the United States, has come to include all FTTT faculty, all adjunct faculty, and all graduate employees (considered adjuncts at CUNY). Dating from the 1960s, this bargaining unit, represented by the Professional Staff Congress, AFT, has a peculiar, perhaps unique history and one that has exerted a certain influence on the movement generally because of its size and its placement in the nation's largest city. However, the pattern of placing graduate employees within a combined all-faculty unit has not been reproduced. The PSC faculty unit has always been led by FTTT faculty who, because of their number and geographic placement, have also been major figures in the national AFT and hence in the national faculty union movement. Their president, Irwin Polishook, was for years the leading elected higher ed person in the AFT until his recent retirement and the defeat of his chosen successor by an insurgent caucus, which included the self-organized independent organization of contingent faculty, CUNY Adjuncts UNITE!.

In California, in the community colleges and California State University systems, (but not the University of California) the pattern has been to have combined unions with one union local representing both FTTT and contingent (all PT in the CA community colleges) faculty, and the pattern has further been combined bargaining units with one collective bargaining contract covering both, with some sections applying only to one or

the other. This has also been the general pattern in Washington State, though not without exception in any of these places. The major point to be made here is that until recently, the decision of which union would represent contingent faculty was generally made in conjunction with the decision of which union would represent FTTT faculty. The contingent-only units that existed were basically the exceptions that proved the rule and generally existed either for very peculiar historic reasons or because of particularly obdurate and hostile full-time faculty leadership. Most units nationally, however, were and are FTTT only, with the contingents unorganized. (Hurd et al 1998) This pattern has begun to change and there are a rising number of contingent-only bargaining units now being formed and therefore the potential for competition by the major unions for representation rights in contingent faculty-only units is now different than it once was. The increasing number of contingents relative to FTTT faculty only adds heat to this fire.

The issue of whether or not having various organizations competing to organize adjunct faculty has recently been debated on a number of contingent faculty list-serves (Adjunct Mailing List, August-October, 2001).

Arguments against competitive unionism

Arguments against competitive unionism have included the following: one, it tends to confuse and ultimately de-mobilize people in the proposed bargaining unit because a major focus of the campaign inevitably becomes the competing union as opposed to the employer. Therefore the net result is a lower level of participation, higher level of cynicism, and ultimately a weaker union coming out of the competitive election and attempting to negotiate a first contract. The very process of the competitive campaign tends to reduce the propaganda to a level of “what we can do for you” and the sale of a

particular union as the better insurance agency rather than the building of a union as a workers' movement necessary to build from the grass roots up in order to combat the employer with solidarity.

Two, competitive unionism tends to move the decision-making on the organizing campaign from the grass-roots leadership to staff, who assume a larger role, are more numerous in the campaign, and generally run it in an organization-specific, pre-trained manner rather than having it emerge organically from the particular conditions of the situation, through the emergent grass-roots bargaining unit leadership.

Three, competitive unionism confuses potential allies, especially other unions on campus, students and other community allies, and lowers the level of potential support for unionization in general among these allies. Support among these sorts of allies, especially full-time faculty, is very important in helping to break down the level of fear and fatalism among part-time faculty and everything that lowers the level of allied support ultimately hurts the movement.

Four: in most situations of competitive unionism, the administration, while not able to actively push a non-union option (no agent) as easily, frequently tries to pick which union they would rather deal with as the most amenable and supports that effort sub-rosa. The years of competitive unionism in higher education in California -- through the 1970s and into the 1980s -- demonstrated this pattern over and over again. (Personal experience and private confidential communications.)

Five: Competition can be very costly. The economic and other resources used for it could better be used to do additional organizing. These also tend to make many in the

rank and file more cynical about the higher levels of all unions involved and encourages backward parochialism.

Finally, competitive unionism can leave a bitter taste in the leadership of whatever new union emerges as well as the leadership of the local group of the union that loses. These animosities may persist for years or even decades, even potentially fueling decertification campaigns, sectarian opposition to agency shop, and sparking, even decades hence, individual and group challenges to agency fee determinations. These can, obviously, constitute a continuing assault on organizational effectiveness of the bargaining agent to the detriment of faculty at the table.

Arguments for union competition

On the other hand, arguments have been made both in principle and specifically, for competitive unionism. They have included the following: one, the principle of exclusive representation has not always served American workers well and is not even the most common system of representation in the industrial world. Having multiple unions representing multiple perspectives that workers purposefully join, can sharpen and raise the level of discussion around employment issues and bargaining while at the same time not necessarily undermining solidarity toward the employer.

Two: specifically U.S. labor history gives us numerous examples of competitive unionism being part of the engine that drove labor advances forward. The very founding of the AFL was partly as a “dual union” to the Knights of Labor in the 1880’s. The growth of the AFL between 1900 and 1920 is hard to imagine without the prod of the IWW and the Socialist Party. Likewise, the tremendous growth of the AFL after 1935 is impossible to imagine without the formation and competition from the CIO. Finally,

and applying specifically to education unions, the evolution of the NEA into a union (restricting membership to working faculty, acting as a collective bargaining agent, instigator of strikes, etc.) was stimulated almost exclusively by the growth of the AFT at its expense. Therefore the argument is that however messy, uncomfortable and expensive in the short run competitive unionism may be, in the long run at least in some cases, when openly tied to principled differences, it has served American workers well by pushing both the political level and the energy of the union movement forward. Counterexamples, of course, especially in specific localities and industries, could easily also be listed.

Three: the argument has also been made that, especially with regard to groups that have been ignored or discriminated against by the unions of a particular industry, such as contingent faculty within the general movement of faculty and educational unionism, competitive unionism can force attention to these folks and cause leaderships of existing unions to make commitments and exercise resources on their behalf that they never would have done otherwise. This thereby makes the issues of the previously submerged, invisible, discriminated-against group matters of public discussion, and whoever wins will therefore be a better union than either would have been without the competition. One could draw this conclusion from the example of the struggle to unionize public higher education in California in the 1970s and 1980s, where the AFT found itself forced both by principle and by organizational rivalry, into arguing for combined contingent/tenure track bargaining units against the NEA affiliates, who only wanted to organize the FTTT faculty. In this case, obvious organizational advantage dovetailed with principled solidarity and clearly resulted ultimately in better conditions for the vast majority of contingent faculty in the community colleges(where AFT became the majority rep) and the state universities (where NEA won) than would have been the case otherwise.

Four: A final argument which has been made in favor of competitive unionism is that having competing unions actually builds the movement in two other ways. One, it causes more discussion than would take place otherwise among contingent faculty and their allies, and secondly it encourages contingent faculty, or at least some activists, to look for additional structures to pursue their own specific interests and build the contingent faculty movement -- additional to the FTTT-dominated education unions. Basically, this is an argument that says that competitive unionism helps to open the door to additional structures such as Coalition for Contingent Academic Labor (COCAL), nationally and locally, and groups such as California Part-time Faculty Association (CPFA) and the National Association of Graduate Employee Unions, all of which function across organizational lines and as pressure groups upon broader education unions.

My own conclusion: the inside-outside strategy

I would argue that while many useful points are made in this debate, the fundamental argument being conducted here is the wrong argument. The question of dual unionism generally has been a red herring that has not served the labor movement or the U.S. working class well for the last 100 years. Briefly, I would argue that the question fundamentally is not one, two, three or many unions, but what is the political and class content of those organizations and to what degree do they actually represent mobilized democratic, participatory bases among the workers. The assumption of much of the anti-dual union forces over the history of the American labor movement has been that all divisions will be exploited by the employers, especially in the hostile context of the American political economy and must, therefore, necessarily be avoided whenever possible. (Of course, many of these same forces have put their own opposition to dual

unionism on hold in practice when their own survival or political convictions seemed threatened.) The number of counter-examples historically that the pro-competitive unionists cite clearly demonstrate that this is not axiomatic. On the other hand, it is certainly easy to make long lists of examples of competitive unionism campaigns where one side or the other was clearly, if not openly, a company union, or at least the bosses' choice in an attempt to deprive workers of the most militant and democratic participation and representation possible. The Teamsters vs. United Farm Workers struggle in the fields in California in the 1960s and 1970s, along with the earliest portion of the fight between the NEA and the AFT would be merely the top two examples of a long list reaching back to the company unionism of the 1920s and 1930s and before. Here again though, I would argue that the issue is not multiple unions or union competition, but the content of the struggle. One can find examples of even Teamster locals that formerly functioned as cats-paws for the employers in the struggle of the farmworkers, that have since those days been transformed into militant, democratic instruments of workers' struggle. Likewise, one can point to victorious NEA affiliates, that, having gone through the wringer of struggle with the AFT and coming out the other side, found themselves transformed by that struggle and, over the first years of holding bargaining agency, became unified, democratic, militant unions.

If, as I argue, the proper perspective on this debate is not for or against competitive unionism but rather for or against democratic, participatory social unionism, then the question that must be asked strategically and tactically, is: what actions will best bring this about? My general argument, which will be extended in the remainder of this document, is that contingent faculty in particular and perhaps other sections of contingent workers, and even workers in general, need structures that will allow them to best exercise the highest degree of solidarity and consciousness that can be generated at any particular time among any particular group. In other words, what organizational

structure in a particular situation will best provide an unscreened funnel for the maximum amount of activism and class consciousness in any particular situation. I further argue that this will usually include multiple organizational forms, but not necessarily multiple unions. I argue that one of the lessons of competitive unionism is that multiple avenues of discussion and attack on particular problems can stimulate change and growth within unions and other faculty organizations. In other words, "movement building" as opposed to narrow "union building" alone is what is needed. This can mean competitive unionism but it can also mean non-union bodies such as COCAL, CPFA, contingent caucuses in professional organizations (and unions), and other structures that have not yet been fully explored but are likely to be invented in the context of the struggle.

The principle that is being suggested here therefore is not one of unitary mechanical solidarity but rather a flexible vision of solidarity that strives in the long run to unite all who can be united while isolating those who are fundamentally enemies. Others before, their origins now lost, at least to me, have termed this "the inside-outside" strategy. And I argue that its pursuit represents the highest level of strategic thinking available to us in the contingent faculty movement at this time. The historical precedents for such a strategy range from the dual card-holders of the IWW who also worked in their AFL unions to the similar actions by TUEL activists in the 1920s, to women and minority caucuses and other formations within hundreds of unions in the 1960s and onward. Perhaps the most striking example of this strategy was represented by the Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM, etc.) (Georgakas and Surkin 1975) and the League of Revolutionary Black Workers vis-a-vis the UAW and its local and national leaders in the late 1960s. While the success of that strategy was cut short by the disinvestment decisions of the owners of the Big Three automakers, among other reasons, the experience of that work and its impact upon the UAW is an example that

has never been fully studied with an eye to its general principles applicable to submerged and discriminated sub-groups of workers in other times, places and industries. This inside/outside strategy has found a partial reflection even within the official AFL-CIO structure with the recognition of the need for "constituency groups", A Phillip Randolph Institute (APRI), Latin American Council for Labor Advancement (LACLA), Coalition of Black Trade Unionists (CBTU), Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA), Pride at Work (PAW), and Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW). One of the ways to recognize an organization committed to democratic social movement unionism is to look closely at the politics of their organizing lists.

The politics of lists

In organizing, as in any other social or collective activity, certain archetypes emerge that can symbolize the core values around which an activity is being conducted and also reveal a good deal of the motives of the people who can be associated with that archetype. So it is with the politics of lists and organizing. How one constructs one's lists, who is included, what information is seen as essential, and what one does with those lists can be seen as archetypal behavior.

Three examples drawn from my own direct recent experience in Chicago illustrate the point. In a beginning attempt to organize contingent faculty at the Chicago City Colleges, 2001-2002, one union sought to construct a list that included only the most senior faculty (those who had taught three semesters or more) and only those who had taught at least six units for each of those three semesters. This list was constructed from Board of Trustees documents listing the hiring of part-time faculty each semester, and included names, departments and colleges, and load. This list was most accessible to the existing union of full-time faculty who had the negotiated right to an automatic full

Board agenda and documents from every board meeting. This list was then supplemented with names drawn from the information of existing FTTT union chapter chairs and department chairs, who were sometimes the same people. In other words, this is a list that is constructed from the outside of the contingent sector and top-down. This list was used to have FTTT union leaders (who also sit on FTTT hiring committees) and department heads (the contingents' direct bosses and hirers as well as being FTTT faculty bargaining members) seek out individual part-timers on campus and present them with authorization cards to be signed in full-timer's presence. Therefore, there was no need for home phone numbers, Email addresses, home addresses, or any of the sort of information that would be necessary to have confidential, safe, non-coercive and egalitarian contact with a workforce made up of fearful and transient workers. This is organizing via "clout" and implied "muscle", to use the Chicago vernacular. There was also no initial evidence of a tracking function (keeping a record of a potential member's attitude and action toward the union and the organizing effort). No effort was made to create an actual organization of contingent faculty prior to card circulation, much less one that would reach beyond the immediate proposed bargaining unit, a minority of the contingents.

This list construction revealed a number of things about the strategy that was to be pursued: one, there was to be no effort to organize all contingent faculty, rather only those who taught "credit" (units) classes, and not those (of a roughly equal number) who taught non-credit continuing education. Two: by focusing only on the most senior and heaviest load credit part-timers (this workplace does not employ full-time contingent faculty so all contingents are part-timers) they revealed a priority for organizing the easiest, quickest and cheapest-to-construct bargaining unit, however small a minority it might be of the total contingent faculty. In this case, this minority would be no more than a quarter of the total at the most. Three: they revealed a

preference for those faculty who not only would be the easiest to organize but also likely the most stable to keep organized and most able to pay enough dues to support their organizing and subsequent servicing, given that they both taught more classes and were likely to have higher pay rates already. This particular preference revealed a reluctance to actually take on, in practice, the legal barriers that do exist, but rather a preference to take a small group through the perceived "hole" in the law. [See fuller discussion of this legal issue and its history in the Chicago history section later.] In summary, this list construction reveals a philosophy of business, dues-unit unionism without any broader strategy for fundamental change in the workplace, given that only a minority of the workers are even being initially considered, or focused upon later. This is pre-eminently a strategy of outside organizing, not a strategy that would be generated from internal organic leadership within the sector. This is the strategy of a full-time majority and full-time led union deciding to organize a small minority of its contingent colleagues but only those relatively easy and inexpensive to organize and only in small enough numbers that they would not upset the political balance of forces existing within the full-time dominated union.

By contrast, another union, also becoming interested in organizing contingent faculty in the City Colleges at about the same time, pursued a different list archetype. Their first step was to file a Freedom of Information Act request with the Board of Trustees, as any citizen can do, asking for the names and colleges of all contingent faculty, credit and continuing education, also noting their load. This may or may not have been the same list as the semester-by-semester hiring list acquired in the previous example. This had the value of universalizing the group and the potential bargaining unit but provided only a mailing address at a college and no other information. This list was then to be used to do a blind mailing with an enclosed information request (not authorization) card to be included as a way of seeking potential activists on each campus.

This list archetype likewise can be unpacked to reveal a set of assumptions about strategy and organizing. First, this is the strategy of an organization that has more money than contacts -- that can afford to send out expensive, first-class mass mailings in an attempt to generate internal contacts from the outside. Two: this also reveals a willingness to keep options open regarding the size and composition of an eventual membership or bargaining unit. This is not surprising, considering that this is an outside union with no existing bargaining unit within this employer's workforce and therefore no existing political-economic relationships to be protected. Anything new is a plus. Third: this strategy reveals a desire, through the use of information cards rather than immediately using authorization cards, to actually attempt to build a core of activists within the sector rather than merely immediately signing people up as individual, atomized dues-units appended to an existing body.

Yet a third list collection and usage effort was underway at exactly the same time among exactly the same sector. This one was generated by an independent organizing committee born out of contacts developed during an anti-privatization struggle of the previous year and Campus Equity Week activities of fall, 2001. This committee consisted of contingent faculty aided by a few close allies among full-timers, organized clericals, and among the one organized sector of contingent faculty (the adult educators teaching primarily ESL, GED and ABE). This list was developed piecemeal through the gradual recruitment of a network of activists on all seven campuses and focused primarily not upon all the members potentially in a new bargaining unit but upon those who have exhibited any tendency toward collective activity or open support for organizing, whether they might be themselves in any initial bargaining unit or not. This list grew to a point somewhere between five and fifteen percent of the total group contingent faculty and included within it fuller contact information such as personal

Email, home address, multiple phone numbers, as well as identifying work information: college, department, and some schedule information. This list was accumulated from sign-up sheets at meetings, personal referrals from individuals, responses to group mails, campus visits, and the like. It exists in a relational database that also includes the history of participation of each of these people revealing their degree of activity, when they got involved, and other history relevant to their membership in the broader organizing committee.

Unpacking this list reveals yet a third set of priorities. One: This list implies that what is important is the building of an organizing committee, based on networking with existing activists or potential activists who actually are members of the potential unit. This is both an inside-out and a bottom-up strategic presumption. Second: this list implies that, at this stage of organizing, deep information about individuals who can be involved as activists is more important than aggregate information about large groups who may or may not be reachable in the short run and who are fairly unstable as contingent workers. Three: the construction of this list through personal contacts reveals a reliance upon low-cost and low-level organizing that neither relies upon existing power structures within the organization or institution (as in example number one) nor on the expenditures of large amounts of funds (as in example number two). Four: following from the above priorities, it presumes that the way effective mass lists for organizing will be eventually constructed will be from this core group of activists who can prioritize those areas most important to get complete lists from first in the organizing process rather than starting from whatever aggregate list can be extracted from the employer, incomplete as it almost certainly would be. In other words, this list implies a future organizing strategy keyed on building from existing grassroots political strength to other areas of potential grass roots political strength, with authorization

cards being not **the** key goal, but rather a benchmark on the way to building an effective union.

These three strategies can be visualized by thinking of the colleges as a creek and the contingent faculty workforce as boats flowing over a rocky bed. Many, or perhaps most, boats are stranded, sunk or damaged by the rocks. In this context, the first alternative could be seen as focusing upon the few boats that have remained afloat, despite the perils, and husbanding them into a protected pool. The creek, here, is used as the factor that selects who is chosen. The second alternative might be seen an attempt to temporarily flood the creek, hoping to identify those boats with the potential to stay afloat under the new circumstances. Here, the cost of flooding the creek is balanced against the number of boats floated in order to select who is chosen to be included in a protected group. The third alternative entails actually getting into the creek, carefully picking one's way among the rocks to find the concentrations of boats, both whole and damaged, that can be accumulated and repaired and, by linking them together, pulling them through the rocks in a possible but complicated and tortuous path. It also includes literally moving some of the rocks and deepening the channel so that ultimately, virtually all the boats can be re-floated. Here, the creek itself gets changed so that the boats flowing down it can better survive. One might note that only this third alternative involves actually standing in the creek and remaining there.

The point here is that lists and the list-making process reveal not only the priorities of the organizers but also tell us a good deal about the kind of organization they visualize producing in the end: whether this organization can be democratic and participatory or top down, exclusive or inclusive, relatively independent and autonomous or a dependent attachment to a larger body. These are all crucial considerations in the very organizing of any union, as Markowitz makes clear in *Union Activism After Organizing*

(Markowitz 2000). This demonstrates, as every experienced organizer has long known, that *how* people are organized initially places a firm stamp on the kind of organization that ensues.

Union staff: promotion or demotion?

Virtually all successful organizing efforts eventually include some role for paid union staff. One of the major elements of the rise in commitment to organizing in the labor movement as a whole since 1995 has been major push to allocate more resources to organizing. One of the key arguments for this shift in resources has been the need to hire staff organizers. Historically, or at least for the last 30 years, most unions were governed by the 3% rule -- which was that 3% of their resources were allocated to organizing. If there was an individual designated as an "organizer" they frequently combined that title with other titles they carried and often were existing staff who were being "pushed aside" into an area where they could do no harm, would not cause problems for the elected leadership, and also weren't expected to do much good or much of anything. Some had referred to union organizing departments at "the Post Office of the union movement" -- the place people were sent when they couldn't conveniently be fired but had to be kicked upstairs in some way. This practice clearly was an aspect of the decline of organizing and the shrinkage of the labor movement both in density (percentage of the workforce) and in absolute numbers.

Part of the context for this situation in the labor movement was that the hiring of staff, for organizing or servicing, out of the bargaining unit in most unionized jobs, was seen as an individual promotion for the individual involved. Put more bluntly, working for the union was a better and easier job even if not more highly paid (though it sometimes was that as well) than working "on the job", "on the line," or "with the tools." This

situation combined with the ultra-legalism of U.S. labor relations practices, especially since Taft-Hartley, and the need to bargain over many more social welfare concerns, compared to other industrial nations, created a context in which a larger percentage of the labor movement was populated by paid staffers, either elected or hired, than in other countries. Secondly these paid staffers developed, in general, an extreme (and understandable) aversion to losing their position and going back "to the job." The number of these folks and their motivation to hold on to their positions has marked the American labor movement especially deeply in the years since World War II. This trend combined with a gradual shift in staff job functions from organizing to servicing bargaining units, often in the most specialized and arcane areas, such as health benefits, retirement pensions, third-level grievances and arbitrations, professional legislative and political operations, member consumer benefits such as credit cards, buying clubs, etc. and the technicalities of the growing number of employment laws enacted since the National Labor Relations Act (OSHA, ADA, ADEA, Civil Rights Laws, FMLA, COBRA, etc.) The net result is the production of a large cadre of full-time union staff, elected and appointed, who are largely concerned with keeping their now-mostly-technocratic positions and in keeping these positions safe from political threat.

This situation described above has constituted a large portion of the terrain within which any reform effort within the union movement must function, whether one has the ideology of AFL-CIO President John Sweeney or reformers to his left. The situation among faculty has in many ways not reflected this general terrain for a couple of crucial reasons. As with much other unionism among professional workers, especially in the time that it was struggling to be born and gain legitimacy, taking a staff job, either as hired staff or an elected position with partial or full release time, did not constitute a "better job" than the work that was being done by the bargaining unit members. In fact, it was almost universally acknowledged that working for the union was harder work,

more stressful and often in the early days paid less. It was also a black mark on one's resume if one decided to go back into professional work in one's field since most employers, given the choice, would avoid hiring professional agitators. The result of this situation has been healthy for unions made up of full-time permanent professionals: nurses, teachers, engineers and others. They have avoided many of the problems of the mainstream labor movement because nobody pursues union staff work as career enhancement without at minimum, also, a deep ideological commitment to the union as at least necessary for their group of professional workers, if not as a social movement more generally defined. This normative (ideological) commitment to the idea of organization is almost always the primary motivation for professional workers to either run for office or seek union staff positions. This means that the problem of careerism, while certainly not absent, is much less in professional unions than in unions where to lose one's professional staff position might mean going back to the much more unpleasant job done by members.

This reality has had a number of concrete manifestations in the faculty union movement in particular. It has meant that many elected officers, even with substantial release time, tend not to stay in those positions but return to the job after a number of years, even without term limits in the constitution and by-laws. The exceptions to this pattern are some major big local unions and state and national unions, where the pay and prestige of leadership clearly dwarf faculty status. But this represents a small percentage of those who are cashing some kind of check for doing union work. In most faculty unions, the typical "staffer" is part-release time volunteer or elected person who spends something less than half their work time performing union tasks. Perhaps the majority of even local union presidents of faculty unions fall into this category; certainly in small units they do. This pattern has been healthy for participation, union democracy, and in many other ways. But it has had disadvantages. For one thing, the relative

unattractiveness of union office compared to work on the job means that relatively fewer people run for office; many faculty unions go decades without a contested election for anything. It is hard to see this as healthy for union democracy and participation. Even if one factors in the famous faculty aversion for direct conflict face-to-face over important matters (as opposed to purely "academic" controversies) one is still left with the strong suggestion that when union leadership is linked with personal sacrifice, rather than perks of officer, both in the present and the potential future, participation at some leadership levels can decline. This may be the inevitable price one pays for attempting to have participatory and largely grass-roots unionism in a period of overall conservatism and among a relatively privileged group of workers. Clearly, one alternative: individualist careerism, bitter contested elections based largely on personalities rather than program, and extensive patronage networks that develop electoral machines based on appointive positions that get people out of the bargaining unit work, and other perks -- all this is clearly less attractive than what we find presently among full-time faculty unions. However, as in all things social, this is not a snapshot of an object at rest. It is more than a little blurred because the object is moving and it is moving with some speed.

The growth of the contingent faculty, who are now clearly a majority of faculty members and thereby potentially a majority of the faculty union movement, changes this dynamic of staff and leadership in a number of ways, all of which are quite relevant to organizing strategy. First, the point must be made that to talk about organizing strategy without interrogating the structure(s) of the organization which one is building and/or organizing people into is clearly to play "hide and go seek" with one eye closed permanently as the seeker. It must be admitted that a good portion of the labor movement still finds this proposition controversial. The debate around the AFL-CIO's "organizing to change, changing to organize" has indicated that most unions remain

reluctant to institute even the changes necessary to actually recruit members, much less transform and open themselves sufficiently to make new members full participants in a changed organization. If contingent faculty are to be successfully organized in their mass into the existing faculty unions, the existing faculty unions will by definition be transformed, both in structure and ideological content, and in many cases the faces of those occupying positions of leadership, both elected and hired. This is both a potentially dialectical and extremely painful process, even for those organizations who face precipitous shrinkage or even death as the only realistic alternative. In this, then, faculty unionism parallels the situation in the rest of the labor movement, though the pressures to change are less perhaps since two of the three major faculty unions, AFT and NEA, are still growing, unlike most unions. Two: the attitudes of most contingent faculty toward the potential of holding union office and/or elected or appointive staff positions is a different one than among their FTTT colleagues. It is both more fearsome in the sense that, as contingent workers, gaining the label of activist or agitator can much more easily preclude further employment and/or access to the privileged ranks of FTTT faculty. On the other hand (and as the example of some combined faculty unions has already begun to show) union work is in some ways a better job than being a contingent academic. For this reason, among others, a number of faculty unions have ended up with ex-contingent activists as their hired staffers, if not their elected leaders. This has created an interesting political dynamic in some faculty unions whereby the sympathy for and understanding of contingent faculty is greater among hired staff, many of whom have been contingent faculty, than it is among the elected local and state leaders (generally all FTTT) whose greatest fear in the short run is not employer action but rather political backlash against them by their FTTT base for appearing to be too sympathetic or favorable to contingent faculty. This attitude manifests itself both in fear of diluting the representation and servicing of FTTT faculty and in a general elitist prejudice against the workers occupying the “lower tier” of the faculty workforce.

Directly related to organizing efforts, then, are a number of questions. One: how prominent a role should outside staff (meaning "outside" the potential bargaining unit) play in making the decisions involved in organizing such as timing, selection of targets, and other tactical and strategic decisions of all sorts? Two: If staff are to be hired internally, on what basis should that hiring be done, such as full-time or part-time, temporary or permanent, selected by whom, assigned to what duties, part of a staff union bargaining unit, etc.? Third: should hired staff be paid more than the virtually universal maximum of $30,000/year that most organizing contingent faculty can hope to make (unless in some FTNTT positions) often working well over what is generally considered 100% of a full-time load? If they should be paid more, how much more? If less, how much less? And what other compensation, as well as how much job security, should go along with these positions? How should these positions compare with the generally more stable, better paid, often unionized themselves, servicing reps in unions? For people in a contingent, low-paid employment situation, the existence of even temporary and part-time union staff jobs becomes very quickly a major political and economic factor in the dynamic of the organizing campaign and the committee in particular. This is a situation that faculty unions have not yet come to grips with strategically and, basically, never had to come to grips with when their main focus was organizing tenured and full-time tenure track faculty, as has been the case in most faculty union organizing since the 1960s. I will suggest some possible answers to these questions but it should be understood that it is also my conviction that most full useful and productive answers to these questions will come only through the internal transformation of policies and practices of existing unions. These questions regarding paid staff and structure are one of the best examples of the need for an inside-outside strategy. Only in the context of a independently led movement of contingent faculty can these seemingly irreconcilable contradictions on a small group basis be in fact

reconciled, not through vaporizing their contradiction, but rather through reducing that particular dialectic to a secondary position within the broader organizing movement. Thereby a situation is created, as so often happens in successful social movements, where however a particular problem is resolved in a particular case becomes less important because the umbrella of the movement and the "movement process" provides a forward motion and a protective shield from the worst possible consequences of a negative resolution.

Another aspect of this problem that also is suggestive with regard to organizing strategy is the co-optation phenomenon, both potentially by the employer and by the higher union organization. Even though usually union activism at this stage in the movement, and certainly taking a staff position, does not generally make one more attractive for employment by higher education administrators, the exceptions are important for the movement. There are an important, even if not common, scattering of cases where employers have picked out leading activists, organizers, stewards, lower level elected officers or even local presidents and offered them, if not full-time faculty positions (which are harder for administrators to directly offer by themselves) but administrative jobs. Just as in the broader labor movement where the story of the honest, militant but a-political shop steward becoming the "driver" foreman is archetypal, this phenomenon is not unknown in faculty unionism. Given the insecurity and weaker economic position of contingent faculty, it can only be expected that this phenomenon will be important in organizing in this sector. We have seen it, in a Chicago example, as early as the first contract period where a new energetic but careerist steward was recruited to be an administrative "liaison" with the union and adjunct faculty, on a part-time temporary basis, of course. A small crumb, but it was effective, at least until the person got a full-time job elsewhere. Limited experience over the past 30 years seems to indicate that that is the case. The most important factor for

our consideration here is not what these people do once they are extracted from the struggle and placed in positions beholden to the employer, but rather what is the impact that the extraction of them from the struggle has upon the movement at that time and place. Every organizing effort has a moment in its history when the extraction of two or three key leaders, while not necessarily fatal, could set it back months or even years and also permanently alter the political trajectory and dynamics of that effort. As the movement grows it is to be expected that employers will learn this lesson more thoroughly.

The phenomenon of co-optation however is not limited to the employer. Higher union bodies can also fundamentally affect the trajectory of an organizing effort by their choice of hiring people on staff in a whole variety of times, places and status's. This problem extends into the ongoing work of existing unions if they embark on new organizing efforts, increase or change staff, and advertise to hire people. In many cases, the only internal applicants they will receive are contingent faculty and then they are faced with the decision of whether to hire their own contingent faculty or an outsider. This is not a choice that most full-time faculty union leaders relish. But it is one that commonly arose, for instance, in the local unions in the California community colleges, one of the largest educational systems and networks of faculty unions in the United States.

The issue here, again, as with the issue of union staff in general I would argue, is not a primarily a question of whether or not individual faculty should take these positions or on what terms, or whether union locals or higher bodies should hire them. Just like the issue of whether paid staff should be elected officers or hired operatives, examples can be found on both sides, encouraging and discouraging participatory, democratic social unionism. To ask the question this way is simply to ask the wrong question. As is the

case with so many other questions, in the union movement in particular, and the labor movement more broadly defined, and in social movements in general, the main answer does not lie in union structure or even in the process of individual decision making. The answer lies in the question of power. Who has the power to decide whether hiring is to be done, exactly who is hired and potentially fired, and on what basis? Who has the power to define what the job is and whom do they answer to? These are the questions worth asking in this situation and, I would argue, the answers to which provide signposts on the path to real movement-building and not just bargaining unit growth. To be more specific: the existence of an independently led, non-beholden movement among contingent faculty, whether embodied in a metropolitan strategy such as COCAL, a statewide independent body such as CFA, or a caucus or committee with an independent political base inside its larger faculty organization, is indicative of a movement from the grass roots. That grass-roots movement should be the source of the power to make, or heavily influence, the decisions about staffing as well as the other crucial decisions essential to any organizing effort. This is another example of the need to be close enough to the movement-building end of the spectrum and of the need to pursue a social movement unionism.

Once again, the organizational structure through which this power is exercised could exist in many different forms and it could be labeled advisory, informal and organic, or formal, constitutional and full of the trappings of organizational rigamarole. But neither matters if the movement activism that gave birth to these independent bodies atrophies at the root. Virtually every union in the country has mandated committees in its constitution that neither function nor exist in real life. Likewise, the formal channels of power for contingent faculty, while they can be helpful, are not the primary question. The primary question always is: are practices being pursued that will build, re-build and continually reinvigorate the movement at the base, from which the power,

militancy, collectivity, and ultimately political correctives for erroneous decisions, all flow.

To carry this argument one step further: this issue is not merely the threat of losing the leadership capacities of the person who is hired out of the struggle, whether to the administration or to union staff, however important that dynamic might be in the development of the group process. An even larger issue raised by a focus on the question of power is that the collective exercise of power by any democratic group changes that group and everybody in it. The very process of working through the decision and then making that decision, even if it is tactically less than the optimum result, usually creates a new and higher level of process, a new dialectic if you will, within the organizing group. Collective learning has also occurred. In that sense, it is not merely just democratic and morally superior to have these decisions made as collectively and as close to the base as possible, it is in fact healthier for the development of the struggle and the movement, if not always in the short run for the development of the organization as an institution.

For example, if a national union is working with a group of contingent faculty to organize them and chooses to provide resources and support in the form of taking one of their activists and putting him or her on part-time staff at a monthly salary of $500, the decision of how to allocate that resource is now made once and for all, as long as the person keeps that job. By contrast, if that same $500/month is allocated to the organizing committee as a whole, and the organizing committee then has to decide whether to use some of it for a newsletter or website, some for a list-serve, some to pay gas and an hourly stipend to send one of their number to leaflet or stuff mailboxes on various campuses, then the group both preserves the power to make these decisions and has numerous, repeated opportunities to practice choosing and evaluating how to

support and budget their own existing strengths, with support from the larger union. Clearly in this latter case, "union learning", or real labor education, has now occurred and can be applied to future situations as needed (Martin 1995).

Reverse engineering a good union -the example of participant action research (PAR)

One useful way of constructing good organizing strategy is to perform the intellectual exercise of reverse engineering. Look at a union that functions well: 1. It serves its members honestly, efficiently, and militantly in its day-to-day relations with the employer; 2. Democratically involves the greatest number possible in both the day to day functioning of the union and in the tactical and strategic decision-making of the union; 3. Consciously pays attention to the continuing need to struggle for solidarity and equality and therefore against historic inequities in its ranks; 4. And provides a healthy and friendly context in which larger questions, outside the bargaining unit, of solidarity with other unions and workers throughout the nation and world can be discussed and acted upon appropriately. If this is a reasonable definition of "good" union, then the exercise of reverse engineering can help us take the constituent pieces of that good union apart both functionally and historically and perhaps help us answer the question: "How do we build such a union?" from the beginning of an organizing campaign. 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. More recently, formal study has reaffirmed that conclusion (Markowitz 2000). A good deal of what is suggested in this chapter on strategic considerations, as well as that which will be suggested subsequently in the Chicago Area Proposal, is drawn in one way or another from this

sort of re-engineering intellectual exercise, performed over and over again, consciously and unconsciously, with hundreds of different permutations, by both myself and many colleagues over years of experience.

One of the advantages of this exercise is that it can bring to light elements of a good union that need to be considered in organizing that otherwise may fly below the radar or be hidden by “common sense” or “obvious” assumptions: the kind of thing that can cause organizers in workshops to roll their eyes, say “Well, of course!” and look at their watch to see how much time they’ve wasted in this particular exercise. However, in this case, that reaction would be wrong. The concept here is the necessity of creating a contrast between what has seemed universal and natural and how things might be, or even are in some circumstances, different. The concept is familiar is most familiar in theater, but is reflected in the old joke, “I don’t know who discovered water, but I’ll bet it was not a fish.” {Origin unknown]

One example of this is the function of research in a good union and how it, in fact, is often a wonderful, although usually unremarked upon (in the academic literature), example of what has been called participant action research. PAR, as it has sometimes come to be defined, combines the idea of the use of participants in a process, organization or social struggle, as co-researchers with the action research idea that the context is one in which collective social change is being sought. It does not mean that all are equal: there is almost always a lead researcher(s), but that party must be a participant in the action, not merely an observer, and for full participant action research to really exist, the project must be collectivized to include other, albeit secondary, participants as colleagues and decision makers. The measure of the effectiveness of participant action research is not the production, directly, of universal theory, though it may contribute to that, but rather to the collection of evidence or data and its analysis in

a form that can contribute to refining (or changing) and reaching the goals of the social action process.

Good unions are almost always engaged in a constant process of using their officers, executive board members, stewards and sometimes members in an informal and sometimes not very well planned process of participant action research. The best unions combine this constant data-gathering, which is really indistinguishable from democratic political functioning, with periodic, internally transparent and formal semi-strategic planning processes. Here the channels for this evidence and data are as open as possible, to flow into recommendations for decision making and prioritizing for the organization. Perhaps it is because most unions, and the American labor movement, have remained so closed to outsiders in this regard that the connection between the development, in the research world, of participant action research theory has not really taken unions as a major example to be looked at in the study of this methodology. Very few academics have been allowed into the heart of this process within unions. Consequently, it is seldom written about, even in the labor studies/labor education literature. I do suspect, through, that most labor educators will recognize this process immediately as one that they are familiar with and have even participated in, on occasion, but have almost never written about except perhaps in a brief report for the union itself.

I do think that it is useful for organizers to consciously consider the fact that much of what a regular "good" union does in its constant preparation for decision-making is really participant action research, even if it is not theorized in that way. And I would further suggest that some, certainly not all, of the existing writing on the process of participant action research could be usefully examined and applied to unions', and consequently union organizing committees', functioning in a way that would be

profitable both to unions and to theory development. I do not attempt to walk further down this path here, but I think it is important that a consciousness of it informs the strategic development of an organizing effort. The hundreds of contract surveys and one-on-one campaigns conducted, by stewards and other worksite representatives, the day to day work of mobilizing, informing and asking questions of members that takes place almost as second nature in a good union, are really networks of participant action research. What theorizing this can do is bring the practice of good trade unionism, and its explicit prejudice toward participatory democracy, together with the knowledge creation theory that has been usefully developed in the participant action research literature. This could be reverse engineering at its best.

One final example, specific to contingent faculty organizing, will suffice: during Campus Equity Week activities in Chicago, the CEW coalition decided to attempt a brief survey seeking faculty pay and income of institution information, with the specific purpose of constructing two comparisons for use in publicity and internal education. The two comparisons were: the percentage of regular FTTT pay that contingents got for doing essentially the same work -- in other words, the pro rata percentage or the inequity ratio -- and secondly, the percentage of institutional per-class income (from tuition, state aid, etc.) that ended up in contingent instructors' pockets -- in other words, the rate of exploitation. In order to do this, the coalition was forced, having no full-time staff much less a staff researcher, to go to activists at different institutions and ask them to get this information and report it back. A brief form was developed and some progress was made, enough that a span of pro-rata percentages at Chicago area institutions and a span of rates of exploitation could be asserted reasonably in the publicity materials. Much more could be and should be done in any specific organizing campaign. What made this participant action research specifically was a number of things. One, the question was posed out of the needs of the struggle. Two, it was both

posed and answered collectively by those who were participating in the struggle. Third, the information was both sought and provided by activist participants. Fourth, the information was interpreted and analyzed for use both centrally and by participants. Last, this information was used, in the form of various educational materials, by the whole range of activists involved in the project that was Campus Equity Week in Chicago.

Strategy conclusions

If the above constitutes many, though far from all, of the considerations necessary to construct a strategic plan, how might these bones be put together in a skeleton that could support an actual project? This needs to be answered on two levels: first, on the level of the national movement and second in specific form in a particular metropolitan area labor force. This local answer is the subject of the following sections. Nationally, the elements of a strategic plan could perhaps be reduced to a list of points. They are only points, because as this document is primarily the work of one person's thinking. A full national strategy can only come about through the collective interplay of forces actually in and around the movement itself. To attempt to do more in any detail, besides being presumptuous, would not be useful and perhaps would actually retard the process of strategy development because it would seem to discourage the contributions of any people or groups who felt that they had not developed their thinking in a general sort of way to a level expressed in this or any similar documents. As is many times the case, in organizing and in social movements generally, how and on what level one expresses one's ideas is often more important than the exact content, correct or incorrect, of those ideas. This is because the goal is not primarily to be "correct" or "accurate" in the academic sense, but rather to contribute effectively to a social process that involves a wide variety of other people and forces operating in very

different circumstances and levels of development but sharing, or at least potentially sharing, a common goal. This is a much more complicated task indeed.

With that proviso, I will put forward the following points:

Guides for a national strategy

1. A national strategy must be focused primarily but not exclusively on movement-building, not organizational growth. This is properly reflective of the stage we are in now when movement-building should be primary.

2. A national strategy must take into account the importance of both the lack of job security and the lesser economic power of contingent faculty relative to FTTT and the resulting fear and fatalism as a factor in contingent faculty consciousness and behavior.

3. A national strategy must recognize that the "new majority" faculty are now part of the working class and that their concerns include both economic and job security equity as well as the desire to defend and improve education for their largely working class students.

4. A national strategy must understand that contingent faculty are part of a casualized workforce and must be organized as a whole workforce and that can have a particularly important role in opening the door to essential coalitions on and off campus because of the social and ideological nature of their work.

5. The organizational forms that the movement should create must be allowed to be varied, fluid and not necessarily reflective of only the present trade union structures.

6. A national strategy must be democratic in form, content and activity, as participatory as possible, and with a leadership that reflects the base in all aspects.

7. A national strategy must be "inside-outside", recognizing the need for independent organization, in whatever form, of contingent faculty, as well as the need for solidarity with FTTT, reflected in as high a level of organizational unity as possible.

Part III: The Chicago Experience

A short history

I now move from the national context to the Chicago area, site of my interviewing and much of my personal experience since 1999. Chicago was a relative latecomer to the organization of contingent faculty compared to both the Northeast and the West Coast, where activity extends back to the 70's and even earlier in a few cases.

The only Chicago area example of activity I could unearth before the passage of the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act (IELRA, 115 ILCS) in 1983 (effective Jan. 1, 1984) was in the Chicago City Colleges among the adult educators. This was not specifically union organizing activity, which came about after the law was passed. This is significant, since a fair number of FTTT bargaining units had been already established and gained contracts before this enabling legislation was passed. These cases, most prominently AFT units in the Chicago City Colleges and the Board of Governors state university system (not University of Illinois), had come about through direct action including some hard fought strikes. None of these units originally included the contingents. I have not been able to ascertain exactly what percentage of the teaching force was contingent in the Chicago area at this time, but indirect indications are that

the rise in contingent faculty took place somewhat later in this area than in some sections of the nation, such as California.

In any case, the IELRA, modeled after the NLRA, was passed without the organized voice of contingent faculty. One could easily surmise that this was one reason that the law was so unfavorable toward this group. As passed, it directly excluded from coverage all community college faculty teaching less than 6 credit hours per semester. It also excluded a category defined as "short term employees" but contained no definition of that category. This omission was corrected in 1991 when an amendment defined "short term" as those working less than two consecutive calendar quarters and with no "reasonable assurance" of re-employment. This amendment was further interpreted in a precedent setting state appellate court case in 1995, called the Harper (Community College) Decision (William Rainey Harper Community College 512 vs. Harper College Adjunct Faculty Association, IEA / NEA, and the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board), which interpreted these requirements together in such a restrictive manner as to virtually eliminate all community college contingents, and perhaps others, from the protective coverage of the law. The decision put a stop to virtually all organizing among community college contingents, all of whom are part-timers. The only exceptions were cases where enough political pressure could be brought to bear upon a local board of trustees to agree to "voluntarily" abide by the results of an election (a so-called "consent election") and not raise a challenge based upon the Harper Decision. This only occurred twice, once at Logan CC downstate and at College of DuPage, just months before the IELRA was successfully amended in 2002 to remove "reasonable assurance", which virtually no part-timers have by definition, and replace it with "reasonable expectation" which virtually all have. The 6 credit rule remains in force and its repeal is the next subject of the continuing effort to reform the law.

Returning to 1983, as the law came closer to reality, the leadership of the University Professionals of Illinois, Local 4100 of the Illinois Federation of Teachers, AFT, began a campaign to organize their contingent colleagues, called lecturers, as well as the non-teaching academic professionals. This campaign, which included three Chicago-area Bachelors and Masters granting universities (Chicago State, Governors State and Northeastern Illinois) along with others throughout the state, was successful in gaining recognition for a portion of the lecturers (probably a minority, based upon load and seniority). Sally Edwards, an academic professional and volunteer organizer at Chicago State, was my interviewee for this campaign. Called Unit B, these lecturers and academic professionals gained a multi campus contract in 1985, which was split up into multiple contracts when the Board of Governors system was devolved to individual campus boards of trustees.

The first Chicago area community college to organize was suburban Oakton in 1984, where one of the original committee, Deb Brown, was my interviewee. This was a grassroots campaign coming from part-timers themselves and with an unfriendly relationship with the already organized (IEA) full-timers, who were not supportive. For this reason, Oakton part-timers became a separate local, but of the same union, in this case the Illinois Education Association, NEA. Their unit covered all those teaching 6 units or more per semester.

At about the same time, about 1985, a group of faculty and staff at a new, Southside, for-profit career school, named Metropolitan and owned by Josten Company, began to organize under the NLRA which governs the private sector. This school trained LVN's and computer technicians. All of the employees were completely at-will, with no job security, and some were paid so poorly they qualified for food stamps, though all were full-time. They successfully organized with a progressive SEIU local (long since

merged) as a single unit, faculty and staff. My informant, Hal Jones, was one of the organizing committee. The school was closed during the term of their first negotiated contract.

In 1988, after nearly a decade of sporadic agitation by an evolving group, the adult education teachers, of noncredit ESL, GED and ABE classes primarily, for the Chicago City Colleges (CCC's) elected AFSCME as their bargaining agent, with their own local, 3506, within the AFSCME (state) Council 31. They ended up with AFSCME after AFT Local 1600, representing FTTT faculty in CCC's, repeatedly shunned their requests. This large unit covered nearly all adult educators and coordinators, called part-time, but working up to 25 hours a week in the classroom. Their number was nearly 2,000, but has since been seriously reduced by cutbacks. My informant, Sam Elder, was one of the original volunteer organizers.

1990-91 saw two area community colleges' part-timers attempt to organize. Both campaigns were sparked by union leaders outside the proposed units and both resulted in litigation, but with different results. At suburban Harper College, Illinois Education Association organizers approached contacts among the adjunct faculty (FTTT were represented by AFT 1600 who then had no interested in part-timers.) about unionizing and, finding a positive response, proceeded to build a committee, sign and file cards. The district challenged part-timers' right to IELRB coverage under the new short-term employee definition and thus began a series of litigations that continued until the aforementioned Harper Decision was finally rendered in July of 1995, ending all immediate hope of union recognition under the law. My two informants included one of the original committee at Harper, Barb Polk, and one of the staff organizers, Sean Thomas.

In Elgin, after torturous internal battles, the FTTT leadership of Elgin CC Faculty Association, an AFT local, decided to follow the written recommendations of national AFT and try to organize their part-timers into their own bargaining unit. They hoped to avoid problems with new limiting amendment to the IELRA defining short-term employees by limiting their proposed bargaining unit to a very small percentage (under 25%) of the credit part-timers, namely those who had taught 6 units or more for many years, thereby demonstrating "reasonable assurance". The District appealed and the ultimate decision in their case, rendered at about the same time as the Harper Decision, was favorable for this greatly truncated (under 30) group. They were then successful in an election and in folding them into the existing contract, with some separate provisions. This represents the only case of a joint ft-pt bargaining unit in Illinois public higher education, unlike California and New York, where combined units have been the rule. The included group remains much less than half of the credit part-timers and includes none of the noncredit faculty. My informant was a FTTT activist in the organizing and recognition struggle, Stan Davis.

The next open unionizing effort, actually overlapping the previous two in time, among non-tenure track faculty (NTT) was another campaign by AFT 4100. This time they were responding to a request from an existing committee of faculty at completely unorganized Northern Illinois University, a Ph.D. granting public institution in DeKalb. The very low pay of these faculty led them to take the plunge and they ended up with an election in 1992 covering the NTT faculty who had the largest loads and were the most senior. Again, my interviewee, Flo Smith, was one of the original volunteer organizers.

As far as I can discern, with the possible exception of tiny unit modifications, no new organizing activity occurred among contingent faculty for over five years, largely as a

result of the chilling effect of the Harper decision. The breakthrough came in the private sector, in 1998, at historically liberal-left Columbia College, where adjuncts finally, after years building an independent Part-time Faculty Association at Columbia (PFAC), and partly inspired by the victory of part-time workers with the Teamsters in the 1997 UPS strike, decided to shop for a union. They ended up with IEA, their own local, and the veteran Harper College IEA staff organizer, Sean Thomas. Their lopsided, well-publicized victory in 1998 at this downtown, Bachelors and Masters -granting arts-concentration college, sparked further organizing. They successfully bargained a first contract covering just a bit over half of all adjuncts. They then proceeded to successfully organize nearly all the remaining adjuncts, making PFAC with over 800, along with AFSCME 3506, by far the largest groups of organized contingent faculty. My interviewees for the crucial first campaign included two of the volunteer activist organizers, Steve Jacobs and Tim Cook, and the staff organizer, Sean Thomas. For the unit modification effort, I personally was the main organizer, as a paid staffer. I chose not to go through the charade of interviewing myself, but my experience certainly informs this analysis.

At about the same time, Local 4100 also made an attempt at the private sector, but with a different result. Robert Morris College is a technically non-profit career oriented downtown Chicago college which behaves as if it were a for-profit. None of the faculty, full or part-time, had job security or tenure, though many had been there for years when they approached local 4100 for help. The unionization effort, though, was solely focused upon the full-timers and, after a vicious, consultant-engineered anti-union campaign that included firings, the election in 1998 was lost 2-1. My informant for this campaign was the staff organizer, Ann Morse, but since the interview was not tape-recorded and took place before my research protocols were in place, this campaign will not be a source of quotations and information from it will be used for background

purposes only. It should also be noted that Local 4100 had also had contact with people at both Columbia and Roosevelt who ultimately chose to go with IEA and their own locals therein.

Roosevelt University also proved to be fertile ground in 1999 when the same IEA organizer went in to try to find contacts and build a committee, eventually called Roosevelt Adjunct Faculty Organization (RAFO). Moving slower due to lack of previous grassroots organizing, the result was the same, a massive election victory in 2000, after a year of organizing. Once again, the institution was a historically anti-racist and left-leaning downtown Chicago university, granting Bachelors and Masters degrees, now with a new, equally large, campus in the western suburbs. The first contract took over a full year to get, but made substantial improvements upon PFAC's at Columbia. In this case as well, employer opposition limited the initial bargaining unit to more senior adjuncts, just over half of the total, but plans were explicit from the beginning to follow the Columbia model and expand the unit as soon as possible. This plan is being activated in the summer of 2002. My interviewees were one of the original committee, Olive Light, and again the staff organizer, Sean Thomas. I was also personally directly involved in the last days before the election as a guest of Sean Thomas and the committee. Later, as a Roosevelt adjunct myself, I was on the RAFO committee creating the bargaining agenda, an alternate at the table, and a member of the first executive committee, a position I still hold.

Also inspired by the Columbia success, a small committee of at-will faculty and staff at the nearby for-profit trade school, American Academy of Art, approached Sean Thomas of IEA in 1999 for organizing help. This began a nearly unprecedented saga, which continues in a small way to this writing in summer 2002. The story includes ownership changes, intense anti-union efforts conducted by a national consulting firm, over 50%

employee turnover, massive increase in hiring of part-timers, and two elections, both ending, literally, in tie votes, which are one-vote losses for the union. After the second election, the school was “restructured” allowing them to effectively fire two of the key committee leaders and a ULP protest was lost. A separate lawsuit by the union remains under consideration. My informants for the story of this rare campaign in the growing for-profit sector of higher education was one of the original committee members, Karl Black, as well as the staff organizer, Sean Thomas. I was also personally involved as a volunteer guest organizer sitting in on committee meetings from just after the first election onward.

1999 also saw the campus chapter of local 4100 at Governors State, in the South Suburbs, embark on a unit modification effort, with the encouragement of the central local leadership. Conducted almost solely as a card campaign from outside the unit by a full-time leader, it resulted in voluntary recognition by the new campus administration. The resulting expanded unit B, though still probably a minority of the total contingent faculty, now includes the most senior part-timers with the most classes, joining their FT non-tenure track colleagues. My informant here was the FTTT activist, Kathy Moon, who conducted the effort.

The latest completed campaign was at College of DuPage, where an existing independent group, College of DuPage Adjunct Association, after many years of trying non-union alternatives to gain improvements in this conservative Republican stronghold, also turned to Sean Thomas and the IEA in 2000 for assistance in gaining collective bargaining recognition. COD is one of the largest community colleges on one campus in the US and the total number of part-timers might reach 2,000 or more. Given the Harper Decision, it was clear that a consent election strategy was needed and a political pressure campaign was mounted, based upon the campus and community ties

of the long-time group and the hard-won support of the existing FTTT faculty IEA local. A number a unusual factors came together to allow a unit definition agreement to be reached which, though only covering a minority of part-timers at present, is fully expected to be expanded soon. The election was won, again overwhelmingly, and bargaining was just completed in 2002. My interviewees were Ruth Voss, one of the leading activists, and staff organizer Sean Thomas. I was also slightly involved in this campaign myself.

The latest developments in the movement in the Chicago area are numerous. Due to over three years of effort, mainly by IEA, especially spurred by the Oakton and COD local leaderships and organizer Sean Thomas, the IELRA was successfully amended to open the door to unionization for all credit community college part-timers teaching 6 units or more and also to the hundreds, probably thousands, of noncredit adult and continuing education teachers in community colleges as well. One factor is this victory, as well as in the COD victory, was the placement of a particular conservative Republican state senator in both a heavily contested primary campaign and in the Chair of the Senate Education Committee. This provided the politically astute CODAA leadership with essential leverage, both to get his support for our reform bill and to parlay that relationship, along with an upcoming bond issue, into great pressure on the COD board to come to an agreement. The fact that this chess game was being played to its finale just at the time of Campus Equity Week (CEW), with a week of coalition activities in the area, was timing that could barely be hoped for. In fact, the kick off for Metro Chicago CEW was a jam-packed legislative hearing on our bill, with this state senator and two of his colleagues, on the COD campus just as the crucial consent election negotiations were going on. CEW also coincided, this time due to the purposeful assistance of local 4100, with the hearings of the Illinois Board of Higher Education on their proposed first ever and legislatively mandated study of the state of

nontenure track faculty in Illinois. Testimony at these hearings as part of CEW got press and laid the basis for an organized public critique of the deeply flawed study when it was released some months later.

Also coming out of CEW were two important developments. One was the forming of the Chicago chapter of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (COCAL) as an area wide group to assist organizing in all institutions and to continue the work of CEW generally in terms of publicity and mutual support. This built upon the unprecedented coalition nature of CEW in Chicago, where IFT and IEA were at the same table, along with others, on the agenda of fighting for contingent faculty.

The second main "child" of CEW was the start of a campaign to organize the 2,000 plus unorganized part-timers in the Chicago City Colleges. The independent committee that emerged, called City Colleges Contingent Labor Organizing Committee (CCCLOC), proceeded to develop organizationally, and is now, after affiliating with IEA, is in the midst of an organizing campaign that will move into high gear in fall 2002. The pressure of CEW and other forces also belatedly changed the historic opposition of the AFT local 1600 leadership to organizing part-timers. The resulting contested campaign (CCCLOC, IEA / NEA vs. Local 1600, IFT / AFT) in the City Colleges was not what many hoped for, but it will, if national and local history is any guide, result in the organization of at least a substantial portion of City Colleges part-timers.

In a related development, grad employees organized by Graduate Employees Organization (GEO, IFT / AFT) finally in 2002 achieved agreement with University of Illinois for a bargaining unit for a representation election, after years of struggle. This initial agreement only covers University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), but is expected to be extended to the University of Illinois, Chicago (UIC) as well. This victory

is the result of a sophisticated, militant, and persistent comprehensive strategic campaign that included civil disobedience, job actions, legal challenges, and excellent coalition work with other unions and the community, including CEW and COCAL, as well as internal organizing.

There will be further discussion of these recent events and their developing implications in the subsequent section where I examine the possibilities for an overall Chicago Area organizing proposal. With this brief summary of the history of organizing of contingent faculty in the Chicago area, let me now turn to a brief map of the local workforce and then to the key points raised by my interviews.

Map of the Metro Chicago Workforce

On the spectrum of metropolitan contingent faculty workforces, the mix of metro Chicago's employing institutions seemingly falls somewhere near the middle. It is neither overwhelmingly public sector, as in California, nor vast majority private as in Boston. (See appendix for lists and maps of institutions.) Metro Chicago or "Chicagoland" commonly refers to as "the City" plus "the County", meaning the remainder of Cook County, plus "the Collar Counties", referring to the counties surrounding Cook in Illinois. It often does not refer to the bordering section of NW Indiana and that section will also be left out here for ease of analysis, though the labor force does overlap somewhat.

<u>Institutions</u>

Metro Chicago has many large and small private sector non-profit institutions (72, of which 39 are the City) which employ large numbers of contingent faculty (Roosevelt, Columbia, Northwestern, Loyola, DePaul, National Louis, University of Chicago, and many lesser known institutions). Their total number has declined recently with some mergers and further mergers may be consummated.

It also has a large public university sector: this includes University of Illinois, Chicago, the "lesser" state universities Northeastern Illinois and Chicago State in the City, as well as Governor's State and Northern Illinois, outside. There are 20 community colleges, seven in the Chicago City Colleges system and thirteen in all the suburban counties.

Chicago is one of the national centers of the for-profit higher education industry, with one of its major players, DeVry Institute and University, centered here, recently joined by University of Phoenix, offering both graduate and undergraduate degrees in selected fields. This sector includes numerous proprietary trade schools in various fields offering both accredited degrees and trade certificates. 26 are listed as registered with the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Also, there are in-house "corporate universities", such as at Motorola. There are also out-of-state based institutions that offer classes in the Chicago area and employ local contingent faculty. Some of these are listed as www links on the IBHE website. {See list in appendix.]

Finally, there is a large, although very diffuse, adult education infrastructure divided into two major sectors and with English as a Second Language classes as its largest component, although many other subjects are also taught. The two sectors are tuition free classes, such as those offered by the Chicago City Colleges', Adult Learning Skills Programs (ALSP), offering programs in English as a second language (ESL), (HS) Graduate Equivalent Degree test prep (GED), and adult basic education (ABE). Some

other free classes are offered by community groups and churches, but this sector is rapidly shrinking as tax and charitable support for it is declining. The other adult education sector is tuition-based and includes Berlitz language schools, and a whole private ESL industry, corporate education, unaccredited trade schools, and small group informal teaching and consulting that fades into executive private tutoring at the high end. This then is the institutional overview of who employs contingent faculty in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Table 3: Chicago Area Institutions of Higher Education

Chicago Area Institutions of Higher Education

Type of Institution	**Number**	**Location**
private non-profit	39	City
	33	suburbs
public universities	3	City
	2	suburbs
public community colleges	7	City
	13	suburbs
private for-profits	14	City
	12	suburbs

Source: Illinois Board of Higher Education, <www.ibhe.org> 2002

Head Counts

No one has ever fully counted how many contingent faculty work in these sectors combined in the Chicago Area. I could find no counts at all for these last for-profit groups, but personal discussions with faculty suggest that this group might be very

large. This suggestion is supported by extrapolation from the estimates made by Robinson (1999). He estimates nationally that the for-profit sector, in total faculty, might well be about as large as the entire traditional private non-profit and public sectors combined (250,000 full-time and 500,000 part-time). What contingent faculty statistics exist, both for the for-profit and the traditional segments, are usually based on administrative reports, which if my personal past experience is any guide, are uniformly low, both for reasons of political embarrassment and logistical difficulty of counting. The lack of centralized statistical data is partly a function of the decentralization of the hiring and management of these faculty and suggests that, as in the garment industry in the early part of the century and as is being attempted in other sectors of contingent organizing (high tech permatemps, day laborers, agricultural workers, etc.) the workers organization or union may turn out to be the force that not only organizes the workers but "organizes (regularizes) the industry."

Because of the lack of previous studies, the numbers of contingent faculty in the Chicago area must be inferred and extrapolated from a number of sources, including reports by US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics and Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). One of the parts of the organizing proposal in a following section will be an agenda for needed further research. In brief, the chart below represents my best estimates drawn from the percentages and headcounts reported for the entire state of Illinois in the public and private institutions by IBHE.

Based upon student enrollment data to project relative size of public institutions geographically, I estimated that 37% of the public university faculty and 58% of the public community college faculty are in metro Chicago. Applying these percentages to the IBHE faculty figures yields an estimate of the total number of faculty in public institutions in the Chicago area. I then project that the statewide public sector tenure

track / non-tenure track (contingent) ratios from IBHE would hold for the Chicago area. (My personal experience suggests that the non-tenure track faculty percentage is probably actually higher in the metropolitan area.) I then applied the IBHE FTTT, FTNTT and PTNTT percentages to those totals and those figures appear in the chart.

To get an estimate for the private sector, I first calculated the enrollment ratio, public / private, in the Chicago area (60 / 40) and the applied that to the total estimate of the Chicago area public sector faculty. This, of course assumes that faculty / student ratios are comparable in public and private sectors. I believe this calculation is conservative and defensible since the projected figures are the private ones and my personal experience in both sectors in Chicago is that private institutions generally have a lower teacher / student ratio and hence more faculty relatively than public institutions. Therefore, I believe that the resulting figures are a very conservative estimate. I took the national ratios from NCES for FTTT, FTNTT and PTNTT in the private sector and applied that to the Chicago area private sector faculty estimates.

Table 3: Metro Chicago Faculty

Institution Type	**# FTTT**	**%FTTT**	**#FTNTT**	**%FTNTT**	**#PTNTT**	**%PTNTT**
Public Univ.	2,775	51%	974	18%	2022	31%
Public comm. col.	2,517	25%	-	-	7,385	75%
Private, both non-profit and for-profit	6,060 (all FT, TT and not)	58% (all FT, TT or not)	1,254	12%	4,386	42%
total			2,228		13,793	

These estimates result in a minimal conservative estimate of 16,021 contingent faculty in the Chicago area. This figure is conservative both because of the reasons listed above and for the following added reasons:

1. This figure does not include people teaching who are not considered faculty by their institutions, such as graduate employees. This group could easily add 1,000 to 2,000 to the total given the number of Ph.D. and MA granting institutions in the area who use graduate employees to teach. They are all contingent.
2. This figure grossly undercounts the formal and informal for-profit sector, being limited to those degree-granting institutions that report to the IBHE. Virtually none of the faculty, full or part-time, in the for-profit sector have tenure, and are therefore at-will employees, with much more similarity to contingents in the traditional institutions than to FTTT faculty. Also, the percentage of these faculty who are part-time tends to increase, in my personal experience, as one descends down the scale of non-degree granting institutions and the increasing informality of employment relationships. I estimate that the true figure here could well add 10,000 to the total, though of course some have multiple jobs in teaching.
3. This figure also leaves out the non-credit classes taught through many of these same institutions. In the Chicago City Colleges alone, this is at least 2,000 adult and continuing education faculty. Again, some of these teachers also teach in one or more places for credit, but I estimate that this group could easily add 5,000 to the total metro-wide.
4. This figure also leaves out branches in metro Chicago of out-of-state institutions who offer instruction here and often employ contingent faculty here. This number could easily reach the hundreds, but it is basically a guess except to say that it is totally omitted.

Based upon all of the above, my personal estimate is that there could easily be 30,000 contingent faculty in the Chicago area. Given multiple jobs, rapid transition in and out of employers, and the overall fluidity of this labor force, a solid figure will never be

arrived at, probably, until such time as organization has proceeded far enough to have provided its own pole of stability in a major portion of the workforce. At that time, if the experience in California is any indication (the only place where the majority of this sector is organized into collective bargaining units) then the hyperactive Brownian motion of this sector may have slowed enough to allow individual pieces to be counted. By then, also based on the California experience, it can be reasonably predicted that there will be fewer pieces to count because a higher percentage of them will be working more classes, with fewer employers, at something approaching a living wage, and therefore with less turnover in the sector in all ways.

Demography

The composition of the sector does not seem to radically diverge from experience in other parts of the country, with women occupying a disproportionate part of the sector especially in certain fields that heavily employ contingent faculty (ESL, humanities, composition) (Coalition on the Academic Workforce 2001). There may be more Black contingent faculty percentage-wise in Chicago than in many other areas, both because of the historic centers of Black education here (Roosevelt, Chicago State, certain of the community colleges, Northern Illinois in some fields, Governor's State) and because, as still one of the most segregated cities in America, alternative employment opportunities for educated black people remain severely constricted. This is based upon interview data, personal experience and observation. The statistical research to support these speculations remains to be done. However, these factors retain importance in constructing an organizing strategy. The figures in the chart below are from IBHE for the entire state and only cover the public sector. National figures for both public and private sectors would indicate that the male/female percentages would probably be similar for Chicago area alone. The race/ethnicity comparisons for Black, Hispanic and

Asian might be higher for Chicago area. It is not known if these comparisons would hold in the metro Chicago private sector. This is one of the detailed research tasks that an organizing campaign would need to take up.

Table 4: Illinois Demographic Public Sector Faculty Profile

	Public Universities			Community Colleges	
Demographic Characteristics	**FTTT**	**FTNTT**	**PTNTT**	**FTTT**	**PTNTT**
Female	32.2%	51.0%	44.8%	39.3%	46.2%
Male	67.8%	49.0%	55.2%	60.7%	53.8%
Median Age	50	47	45	50	47
Ethnicity					
White	82.3%	83.8%	82.5%	83.1%	79.9%
Black	5.6%	4.9%	7.9%	8.1%	9.9%
Hispanic	2.5%	3.0%	2.4%	1.0%	2.3%
Asian American	8.3%	6.1%	5.0%	6.7%	4.6%

Source, IBHE *All Faculty Matter!...*, 2002

It is also possible that fewer contingent faculty in the Chicago area than in some other cities in the nation are retirees, continuing to work part-time in their own or institutions other than that from that which they retired. It is not clear that this is the case, but it may likely be, based upon the tremendous outflow of retirees from Chicago to areas with better qualities of life and better weather, as compared to California or Florida or other sunbelt or rural locations. Obviously, the percentage of retirees working, either as contingents or under separate arrangements, impacts organizing strategy.

Another demographic fact with implications for organizing is that, as a capital of a region (the Midwest), Chicago draws many folks from the surrounding states for employment of various kinds. While few probably come to Chicago specifically to work as adjunct faculty, a substantial number of adjunct faculty originally may have come to Chicago to go to school, to accompany spouses, or for jobs that they no longer have, and hence find themselves in this labor force essentially as older or more recent transplants, but with limited freedom to leave. This relative rootlessness/rootedness is characteristic of many of the metropolitan contingent faculty workforces and its significance, specifically for organizing, may be mixed and is certainly unclear. As an aspect of the proletarianization of this workforce, it is suggestive. However, academic labor has always been a workforce of high mobility, with many full-time tenure track faculty seeing themselves as part of a national workforce in their disciplines, and this has been the case since before World War II.

Income

Because of the relatively low pay currently in this sector (as low as $1,200 [personal documentation] for a three-unit, fifteen week course and probably averaging well under $2,000) virtually all these folks have more than one job or source of income. In addition to those who teach in more than one place, some have multiple jobs teaching or are doing other work for the same institutions, a factor that seems to have been overlooked in the existing literature. These can include teaching and counseling, teaching and tutoring, teaching and community outreach, teaching and clerical or technical work, teaching and any one of a number of academic professional jobs that have been one of the growth areas in college employment in the past twenty five years. Some are public school teachers, teaching at least partly because of the relative decline in purchasing power and salary in the Chicago Public Schools and other poorer districts. Some have

other full-time or part-time jobs outside of academia, either in related fields to their teaching or completely different, ranging from curators of art galleries to low level clerical, hospitality and taxicab work and including a whole range of activities labeled "consulting". Some have two or three "businesses" as supplementary self-employment. There is also a relatively small sector of independent professionals and business people -- real estate brokers, doctors, lawyers, and others -- who more closely approximate the pre-1970s contingent faculty as community professionals coming in to share their specific expertise with students and for whom the direct compensation is of little importance. This sector appears to be a minority of the total and growing smaller. There are also people temporarily teaching part-time who may have had full-time jobs before but who because of family obligations, health problems or other difficulties, can now only work part-time or cannot make a long term commitment to a particular employer. Retirees are yet another segment, either retired from college teaching, K-12 teaching, or from other work. A final category are those who make up the rest of their living from unearned income, either income of their spouse, inherited wealth, investments, rents, etc. It should also be noted that individual faculty may be in more than one category at a time and may shift categories during their work lives.

My research has not revealed any comprehensive studies that could reliably quantify these employment and income categories. The following table is from IBHE and covers only the public sector and is for the entire state. Chicago figures are perhaps somewhat higher. These figures are useful because they are adjusted for percentage of a full-time load the average part-timer is carrying (FTE) in the bottom two rows. Thus the main point here is to underline the great distance from equity or "equal pay for equal work" that currently exists. Research conducted by the Chicago Coalition for Campus Equity Week showed pro-rata figures under 50% in all cases, including the private sector, with the exception of FTNTT faculty.

Table 5: Annual Illinois Public Sector Faculty Pay, Fall 2000

	Public Universities			Community Colleges	
Salary Headcount	**FTTT**	**FTNTT**	**PTNTT**	**FTTT**	**PTNTT**
Mean Salary	$66,000	$42,800	$13,000	$53,800	$6,200
Median Salary	$50,400	$30,400	$8,000	$49, 800	$4,000
Full-time-equivalent					
Mean Salary	$66,600	$42,800	$34,400	$53,800	$15,000
Median Salary	$62,200	$30,400	$16,200	$49,800	$14,200

Source: IBHE *All Faculty Matter!...*, 2002

The additional income question is key for organizing for at least two reasons: one, it is a major propaganda point made by those who oppose improvement in conditions for contingent faculty. Administrators, or even those who have advocated "reform" from a mainly administrative perspective (Gappa and Leslie 1993) have argued for decades that these folks do not work primarily for money and do not therefore need, or want in many cases, the traditional perquisites, compensation, or responsibilities of faculty. Answering this propaganda is a major factor in any successful organizing strategy. Two: the diversity of personal economic situations that actually does exist among contingent faculty gives rise to a diversity of motivations, consciousness, and perspectives upon oneself as an educator and upon one's place in the world. This is not a unique problem in this sector: the organization of factory workers in the early part of the twentieth century had to confront a similar variety in origins and present personal situations, although perhaps not as extreme. These considerations should push

organizers toward those demands that can unite this group even though these faculty will not all place the same priority on all demands that they support. Also, pursuing unifying demands can further the process of raising contingent faculty consciousness as to the actual place that they occupy and are coming to occupy in the class system, that of highly exploited professional intellectual workers in a major industry in the Chicago area.

Unionization

According to Hurd and Bloom (1998, updated 2002) Illinois is not one of the top states for unionization of higher education faculty generally, not being in the top ten, and having only 7,762 organized faculty, most of whom are in full-time only bargaining units. Nearly all organization is in the public sector, with the exception of the two new IEA adjunct units at Roosevelt and Columbia in Chicago, which together total about 1,000-1,100. Columbia is the one of only two contingent bargaining units that cover the majority of the possible faculty, in their case probably over 90%. The other one is the adult educators at City Colleges of Chicago with over 800 members represented by AFSCME 3506. Roosevelt's unit is currently about half their possible members, but a unit expansion campaign is currently underway. All of the other represented groups are relatively small, under 200. Elgin (IFT), Oakton (IEA) and College of DuPage (IEA) are all currently only represented units of 100-150 and represent a minority of contingent faculty at their institutions. Northern Illinois' IFT unit represents about 120 FTNTT, but leaves out the majority of other contingents. The IFT units in the former Board of Governors' schools, Chicago State, Governor's State, Northeastern Illinois, likewise represent minority fractions and all are under 100 in what they call their unit B's.

Therefore, the total unionization in metro Chicago for contingent faculty is about 2,650 and even if we allow for members who are not teaching in a current semester but will return, 3,000 would be a very generous estimate. Of these, about 550-600 are in IFT / AFT locals, 800 in AFSCME, and the remainder in IEA / NEA locals. All units have agency shop and in all cases the vast majority are members rather than feepayers. The source of this data is personal experience in organizing and interviews with current and past leaders of these unions. If one takes both my high (30,000) and minimum (16,021) estimates of the size of the entire workforce, and the most generous 2,650 estimate of unionized contingent faculty, then this yields a unionization rate of 10%-19%. This is higher than nearly any other contingent workers, but well below the figure for FTTT faculty, for the public sector generally, and, of greatest importance, well below the level needed to exercise substantial leverage upon employers and government to improve compensation, benefits, conditions or job security. The fact that no Chicago Area representation election among part-time contingents, who are the vast majority, has ever been lost (and only one nationally, (Robinson, 1994) demonstrates these numbers could change much more rapidly that is common in the labor movement. I hope, in the final part of this section, to show how this might be done with adequate political will, resources, and strategic flexibility.

Organizers' voices

Context and presentation framework

What follows are excerpts, arranged by general themes, taken from the fifteen interviews I did with organizers in the Chicago area. The organizing campaigns covered all of the (completed) new unit organizing and also the major unit expansion efforts in the area that I could discover, with the exception of one for which I was personally the main organizer, the Columbia College unit expansion in 1999-2000. I felt interviewing

myself in this context would be laughable, but the experience, of course, informs all of the work in this entire document. I believe these are all the campaigns that have occurred in the contingent faculty sector in Metro Chicago. They have ranged from the late 70's up to the present moment, summer 2002. They do not include campaigns still in progress, though information from these current efforts has been gathered and informs the analysis in other sections of this PDE.

Of the efforts discussed, all except three were ultimately successful in gaining a first contract. Two were defeated in elections, both in private institutions, one a for-profit art school and one in a technically non-profit college, but which behaves like and is thought of generally as a for-profit. This latter campaign is also anomalous in that it only included the full-time faculty and excluded the part-timers. The third defeat, in a public community college, came after a successful labor board election, when the college successfully challenged the legality of the entire process under the rubric that the part-time faculty were not legally covered by the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act. So this third defeat occurred in the courts, not at the ballot box. The section of the law that the decision was based upon has been legislatively amended in Spring, 2002, to effectively abrogate this court decision.

The institutions/campaigns discussed (thirteen) were of the following types. The names that follow are the names of the various organizers, changed to protect their identity, with the exception of Tom Suhrbur, who specifically asked to be named properly.

Private

For-profit (2): (all faculty and staff combined, both trade schools) (Tom Suhrbur, Karl Black, Hal Jones)

Technically non-profit, but for-profit in all but name (1):(full-time only) (Ann Morse)

Non-profit (2): (4 year schools, part-time only) (Olive Light, Tom Suhrbur, Tim Cook, Steve Jacobs)

Public

Community Colleges (5): (part-time only, one non-credit) (Barb Polk, Deb Brown, Ruth Voss, Sam Elder, Tom Suhrbur, Stan Davis)

Universities (3): (one was multi campus system, full and part-time contingents) (Kathy Moon, Sally Edwards, Flo Smith)

The organizers interviewed were:

Tom Suhrbur and Ann Morse, full time union staff;

Kathy Moon and Stan Davis, full-time tenured faculty and elected leaders;

Sally Edwards, a full-time academic professional, then without job security;

Barb Polk, Deb Brown, Flo Smith, Hal Jones, Karl Black, Olive Light, Ruth Voss, Sam Elder, Steve Jacobs, and Tim Cook, volunteer contingent faculty.

I have arranged the selected quotations according to a series of themes that emerged in the largely unstructured interviews. Quotation marks are omitted for longer quotations, which are indented, except in cases where the interviewee quotes a third party or themselves in the past. Editorial clarifications are in brackets.

In order both to make explicit my interpretation of the interview material and the other raw material of this study, as well as to make it accessible to the reader, I will discuss in sections the themes and emerging lessons that seem to me the most relevant for

organizing. These are organized below in two overlapping sets of categories: one, the chronological stages that exist in almost any organizing campaign, and two, the common issues that seem to emerge that need to be addressed. I have separated the discussions of each of these, but also must acknowledge that these divisions are somewhat arbitrary and definitely overlap. My point here is not to defend my categories as in any way scriptural or specifically necessary methodologically, but merely to provide access points into the discussion of the material in chunks that are digestible, and hopefully logical.

"How and why I first got involved"

In this section I mean to examine the stories of my organizers as to how they first got involved both in this sort of activity, union organizing, and in this particular campaign. One of the single most common answers to this question was some version of "I'd been an activist ever since the sixties," or "I remembered being an activist in the sixties" in the anti-war movement, the civil rights movement, often previous union organizing activity, often a part of the organized left, but always with the focus on seeing oneself as an activist. Sam Elder, one of the organizers of the adult educators at the Chicago City Colleges, explained:

> The civil rights movement, the anti-war movement and socialist and communist ideas, and the experience that there is a ruling class, that we live in a class dominated society, and that I have experienced and been in struggles where we forced people in power to do what they did not want to do -- from forcing university administrations to being part of a global movement with successful revolutionary movements -- it runs in my blood.

He made this link between his history as an activist and the commitment to organizing among adult educators:

> When I was working in a machine shop and we had a union, I was active with a number of coworkers to try to change the conditions, because I believed in that possibility, not because I read about it, because I experienced it and I read about what explained it. So when there was an organizing drive, it was like, of course. This is what we should do. We would be fools if we didn't do it. I have been part of crowds of 25,000 or 100,000 people who asserted ourselves and forced changes that nobody would have predicated two or three years before that.

Tim Cook, one of the volunteer organizers at Columbia College, also had an activist history. He had been a member of the Milwaukee school integration committee, had done "political stuff of one sort or another," been involved in the anti-war movement, and wrote his dissertation at the University of Chicago on the history of police in New York. He finished his dissertation in 1995. "I knew [organizer] Steve Jacobs and may have signed a couple of circulars. I may have started going to meetings in '95," he said. By then he was teaching the history of Chicago and labor history. "I thought, I did not have the dissertation [to do any more] and I ought to do something with social utility if I did not have a job beyond Columbia."

I will return to this issue in the section where I discuss building the organizing committee and leadership relationships, and the seeming importance of having someone, preferably more than one person, with this kind of background involved in order to have an effective ongoing committee, and not just a successful card campaign.

Another common and often overlapping motivation were personal feelings of being exploited and discriminated against, often linked to a strong desire to help others in that same situation who had not yet developed as sophisticated an understanding as the organizer. Ruth Voss, an elected leader of the part-timer association at College of DuPage, told the story of how this motivation and perspective grew out of her experience. “I applied for positions but never got them. 1988, 1990, 1994 and it came down to myself and person with a Ph.D., and they hired her,” she said. Then she [the person hired] taught for a year and went into administration. In '98 the college opened up another search. It went to another person from another school. Ruth explained that she was rejected for that position because she did not have current, recent, credit hours because she was at that very time teaching at COD, working in a restaurant to make extra money, and teaching in two other schools. Finally, she says, “I got involved actively in CODAA because of my colleagues who said, "I helped them [administration or department heads] when they needed the help." I told them, "Don’t think this will do you any good."

Some organizers even expressed a level of surprise after years of acting on “other people’s issues” that there really was a struggle to be had right where they were and that they could bring their past experience and skills to bear together with a personal feeling of righteous indignation and personal injustice. Olive Light, the part-time faculty member and volunteer organizer from Roosevelt, tells how personal circumstances and the realization that she was being exploited coincided with her commitment to participating in the organizing drive:

> I know for myself I felt like it was a great opportunity to teach, get something on my CV and it was very excited. And now I look back and think," Yo! You are a labor historian. Isn’t this a little exploitative?" Then after first semester we bought

> a house and my salary was mortgage money. It started to feel a lot different and that sort of coincided with the organizing drive. It fit for myself personally. We were looking for a house just as I got involved.

Another trigger, for some people, was a perceived change in the conditions of work, from a more family or paternal-like situation, to a more explicitly exploitative and powerless position. This is consistent with other organizing research that indicates that more important than the absolute conditions of workers causing their openness to organizing, is the perceived direction of change in their conditions, either real or feared in the near future. It is virtually an axiom in labor history that organizing takes place most often in a defensive mode where people defend what they feel is threatened or might be threatened, or has been recently taken away. The changes currently taking place in all of higher education would suggest that this motive is likely to become much more commonly felt. One organizer in particular commented on having been anti-union in the past and having been brought up anti-union and changing under the force of circumstances. Karl Black, the leading full-timer but at-will employee organizer at American Academy of Art, tells this story of how his view of unions was changed:

> I had never liked unions. I always felt that unions held you back basically. I worked in Western Electric. They started to organize while I was there. I was threatened that if I did not support the union, my tires would be slashed. I was threatened personally by a union organizer. Physical threats, and I did not join. I had to pay dues even if I was not a member. I was totally, absolutely against union my entire life. I changed when this owner took over. My every eye opened as to how a private individual could mess up a lot of people's lives. So now I am for unions.

This also goes to underline the importance of personal familial example that can lie dormant for many years in the unconscious of a potential organizer, and then emerge almost to their surprise when conditions change and someone actually approaches them and says, "Will you get involved?" Kathy Moon, the full-timer activist at Governor's State, told the story of her father's experience with the Post Office, a memory that lay dormant for her until the right time came:

> My father belonged to the union at the Post Office and was not active, but the union saved his job 3 times. [He] never got along with bosses and managed to get fired several times and the union always got his job back so I always felt indebted to the union. I never thought about it much because I thought professionals don't need unions…I first found out GSU was unionized at my interview. I had just gotten hurt by not having protection so it seemed a useful way to go. I am a pragmatist. I had no intention of becoming active in the union. I did not become an officer until I was tenured, but I did picket. I probably would have if someone had asked me, but nobody did.

Yet another factor that a number of organizers mentioned was that somebody else close to them set an example or were pro-union. Parents and spouses were both mentioned and in some cases, people commented that they didn't have such a pattern, and eventually got active anyway, implying that others they were involved with had those models.

The final repeatedly expressed trigger for involvement was just that mentioned above: "Someone approached me and through their action, perhaps not right away, caused me to overcome my own fear enough to do something." Repeatedly organizers commented on the importance of being individually asked to do something and the importance of

the example set by the activist who asked them, even though it might take days and even weeks until they actually responded positively. Deb Brown, part-timer and volunteer organizer in the Oakton campaign, said:

> I remember when I was first approached about it, my first concern was, what is to prevent me from getting fired? The goes back 15 years. No part-timers were doing this. I remember being told there were no guarantees. But I guess over a period of time enough of us decided we were willing to make some kind of a commitment to see where this would go.

In response to the question, "What made you overcome your fear?" she answered:

> I suppose it was the dedication and commitment of the original individuals. Fortunately my day-to-day existence did not completely depend on working at Oakton. I was not eager to give up the job, but I would have survived. It was just inspiring to see Jim and Karen, that they could make this kind of commitment, then some of the rest of us could come along.

The fact that people could bring this memory up, in some cases after over a decade, complete with change of tone of voice when they spoke of it, reveals both an emotional content and a historical importance that is important for organizing as well as probably helping to explain why these individuals in most cases were successful organizers -- they were still in touch with how they were first involved. The people who could not remember how they first got involved and could not tell a story beyond one line were not people who maintained their activism since or perhaps were never the most effective organizers. In the next section I examine the beginnings of the campaigns that these activists organized.

Campaign beginnings: sparks and issues

In this section, I present a discussion of how campaigns began, what sparked them collectively, and the initial issues and tactics that inaugurated them. In terms of issues --overlapping, of course, and with many campaigns mentioning more than once -- the most common issue seemed to be the extended lack of pay raises for years, while other faculty and employees were getting raises and inflation was continuing. Flo Smith told how their campaign began in 1988 when, having received no pay raises since 1977, "...someone sent out a flyer from [the] education [department]. So we would meet in a room, with no management around and cluster around a table with about 6-8 education people [and] started comparing notes." Sam Elder described an effort the convince the Board of the City Colleges:

> In winter of '86 I and a few others went down to the Board meeting in December and I made a presentation about it is hard to celebrate Christmas when you are going to be laid off for three weeks without pay. Five years without an increase is what really laid the basis for it.

Deb Brown at Oakton said: "The main issue was pay. We had not gotten a raise in seven years. $300 a credit hour, per semester."

At Columbia, Steve Jacobs described doing a survey to find out how much contingents were actually making.

> We did a survey of part-timers to see if our understanding was correct about what we were feeling -- if we really had people in the same ballpark. Which

> reassured us a lot because we did get some hard numbers on people's income, how much they taught, how much they depended on part-time teaching as part of their income. One third had less than $10,000 [total] income and another third $10-20, so that blew [the administration's argument]. The administration liked to talk about Columbia especially as a professional school and that these are highly paid professionals teaching here part-time.

Karl Black reported that at the American Academy of Art, "Our new director of the school said you could be fired for talking about how much money someone is making. So we knew that was a dead end." This also told them that comparing pay would be a key way to organize.

The second issue was a lack of job security and a feeling that security had become more threatened than before, often mixed with feelings of unfairness about the variability of pay, conditions and stability throughout the institution and from department to department among contingent faculty. Olive Light explained:

> Working conditions varied tremendously across the board -- almost feudal. ... People felt very under-paid and lacking long-term stability with the institution. Even for people who had taught for years and years, it could really be hit or miss whether you got classes or not.

Sally Edwards, from Chicago State, described how a particular administrator's behavior exacerbated the sense of insecurity:

> We had a horrible president. Our enrollment was dropping. He would do things like someone would come in the morning and the locks would be changed in the

> office. He was the best recruiting tool we could possibly have had. The main concern was job security.

A number of organizers spoke of the impossible conditions for teaching that finally reached a level of intolerability in the form of gang offices, lack of telephones, lack of private space to meet students, lack of access to copying, and reflected a continuing and consistent theme throughout this entire research of concern for the content of education as well as for the welfare of faculty members.

Tactically, the spark that lit the organizing effort was often was irrefutable evidence of an administration that refused to respectfully treat very modest collective proposals for change, presented through unofficial committees or other self-organized bodies. A number of organizers told of the moment walking out of administrators' offices after such a meeting and realizing that unionization was the only alternative, often after years of attempts in other ways. Steve Jacobs, part-timer and member of the organizing committee at Columbia College, described a critical point turning point that occurred in 1995-96:

> At the end of this period we again met with the administration and they said, "Well that's all very nice but there is really nothing we can do about it. You have our feelings." A couple said they used to be part-time teachers. At the end we asked them, "OK if there is one thing, will you form a commission with part-timers on it to investigate the condition of part-time faculty?" Several weeks later they sent us a letter saying no. It was not possible to do that. That's really what sort of set us off. We are getting nowhere this way.

Two organizers spoke of their campaigns being sparked at least partially by the reading and internalization of national organizational statements, either union or professional organization, about the importance of organizing contingent faculty for better treatment. Likewise, some organizers spoke about how the lack of knowledge, especially in the early days, of activity in other places in the country, made people feel alone, fearful and hesitant. As time passed, organizers of later campaigns repeatedly referred to the knowledge of the existence of a movement, especially locally, as inspiring them to move forward. These inspirations ranged from a neighboring college organizing, where perhaps some contingents worked in both places, to inspiration at Columbia by the 1997 UPS-Teamsters strike, revolving around part-time workers and the recognition of the massive public support that victorious strike engendered. Olive Light at Roosevelt heard about the experience at Columbia through Tom Suhrbur: "Tom Suhrbur gave us the scoop about what had happened at Columbia, and that is what really piqued people's interest at Roosevelt." The story of Columbia reached Karl Black at the American Academy of Art as well: " The other factor that influenced me was the success of Columbia College. Some of our part-time teachers were working there, too, so we were getting information."

Repeatedly organizers mentioned the use of existing formal or informal gatherings as places that began or pushed forward their campaigns. Any gathering of part-timers or contingent faculty was to be exploited, whether called by the administration, such as an orientation meeting for part-timers, or accidentally created by the existence of gang offices. Sam Elder said:

> City Colleges used to have, in '79 and '80, city wide regular meetings where all teachers would come together and they'd have workshops. That was when I got my first impression because there was actually an organizing drive going on

> then. It was a pretty radical group of people. There were activists influenced certainly by the 70's and some the 60's. All lot of them were community based and their attitude was that this education exists to serve the community, education is a tool for liberation, so it was a pretty feisty group in the late '70's.

Olive Light from Roosevelt said that prior to the first organizing meeting, she "did not know any adjuncts at all. This is the first time I saw who I worked with."

In one case a low-level administrator mobilized other employees to pressure the president around his own issues that then resulted in the other employees cutting themselves loose from this self-seeking low level administrator and deciding to organize a union, based on their concerns as workers. Hal Jones, from Metropolitan, a for-profit, told the following ironic story that took place in the mid-1980s:

> ... the deputy administrator -- who had recruited me -- was having some conflict with the president of the campus. Because he had hired a lot of the teachers and staff, he sort of mobilized a protest and we all walked into the president's office. This guy [the deputy administrator], made some play. I forget what the issues were about, but for us, for the staff, the issues were extremely low wages and typical workplace issues. I was making something like $14,000 a year as a teacher. The secretary and receptionist, they were working full time and qualified for food stamps.

Realizing that a group with concerns in common had been inadvertently mobilized, he seized the opportunity:

> What I did almost immediately was took a bunch of teachers and went to have lunch and I said, “Let's cut him [the deputy administrator] loose. He’s a loose cannon. He has these personal issues with the president. We should get serious and bring a union in. “ Everybody said yeah, that sounds great. No resistance to the union idea at all.

The full-time tenure track leaders who decided to organize contingents had to face some opposition from within their own ranks. Stan Davis at Elgin, a full-timer himself, said that there were two years of discussion leading up to the vote in March 1990. The vote was, he said:

> ... to say the least, extremely contentious. The vote was very close, like 33 to 26 or so. ... Later, we had two full-time faculty union members go to testify to the [labor] board against our petition. The arguments against included different hiring basis, that we would be overwhelmed by them [numerically]...I think there was also just a fear of change. Fear of the unknown.

But he countered:

> The pie can be bigger. The school could charge more for its services. So they outnumber us, so what? What are they going to do? Kick us out of our offices? It’s kind of a ridiculous argument. I don’t know what the part-timers would do to us. First and foremost it is a simple justice issue. It’s the right thing to do.

Kathy Moon, the full-timer from Governor’s State, described how the decision to organize contingents took place at her institution:

> I was [in the past] a contingent and I know what kind of hell they go through and felt they should have some protection. Some of the [full-time] faculty said you shouldn't have done it without a faculty vote. Only the union executive committee voted.

She explained the nature of the opposition:

> In the senate, there was some objection because some of these people were hired without peer review and now they would be protected by the union and some of them really don't have the credentials. My answer was that what we need to do next is get a good peer review system and we need to be involved in selection of contingent [lecturers], who are not the same as adjuncts, which are not in unit. In the next contract would like to have peer review on more of the selection of lecturers and evaluation ... not only by deans and chairs. I said these people have been there and they deserve protection. I agree with you that we need to have quality and faculty [sic] should be the ones doing it and this will give a better handle on this that what we had previously. It was an opportunity and I took it.

Despite the differences, we see campaigns being sparked by a few people, inspired by some combination of economic and educational frustration combined with a hope for better that overcame their fear.

<u>"How we chose a union"</u>

The most common story about choosing a union told by rank and file organizers is a story of rejection. Deb Brown from Oakton Community College put it simply: "We went with IEA because they were the only ones that would have us." The story of rejection -- either overt hostility or explicit lack of interest by full-timer-led faculty

unions, which were by then widespread in the Chicago area -- is one of the saddest chapters in faculty unionism. These stories, especially pre-1998, are the most common stories, even when mixed with other stories from the same campaign, of choosing a union. Sam Elder from the Adult Educators at City Colleges remembered their initial organizing effort in 1979-81:

> We asked AFT to help us organize. At that time, we weren't covered by the law. And they didn't extend themselves. SEIU did give us some resources and some help. But we did not end up with a union, no.

In 1985 they tried again:

> When the law was passed in ''85 a few of us who had always been interested in having a union went to the AFT leadership on our campus and asked them for their help because they had the right to information, since they were a recognized union they could get list of all the teachers and all their phone numbers....They basically blew us off. They said you are mostly people who are just in it for spending money and ring money and you're just part timers. You're not serious about this and we're not going to bother.

The third effort, the one that finally brought in a union, took place in 1987. But the union was not one of the traditional teacher unions:

> We were interviewing AFSCME, UAW, Teamsters, and SEIU and some people made overtures to AFT. ... AFT doesn't want to come along and they are the natural because we're teachers. We're working for the same colleges, and they are the big union already there. They have already won major breakthroughs.

> They got one of the best, if not the best, contracts in the country in the community colleges. [Two of our activists] had past experience with SEIU and AFSCME and they knew that AFSCME was very close to management despite its progressive rhetoric on being anti-racist, anti-apartheid. ... In the end, the two of them and....myself were the only ones against AFSCME...so we went with AFSCME.

Beyond the matter of who would take us, factors that played a major role in choice in those situations where a self-organized group of contingents went union shopping, as opposed to being approached by an organizer from outside the proposed unit, was the perception of whether this union had a serious progressive history and rhetoric, a perception of previous success in organizing "people like us," or whether the organization "just wanted dollars and bodies and was not prepared to really help us" with sufficient arms-length autonomy. Hal Jones, who was one of the organizers at Metropolitan, a for-profit, tells this story:

> The main question was what union to bring in. Most of these people did not have union experience, but they had civil rights experience ...One guy had been in and around the Black Panther party. Sort of the whole social, civil rights, progressive mentality of the Black community was what was really pushing it... We went and visited PUSH [People United to Save Humanity, led by Jesse Jackson], before going to SEIU, but the first thing PUSH wanted was money. It was really opportunist. We just walked away from them. Then [we] went to SEIU...I suggested SEIU [specifically one particular] local I knew led by this guy who was a really decent progressive great guy, who by himself went out and organized these locals in the 60's, mainly of very poor women in the service industries. My dad, who was involved in the labor movement, knew him.

Considerations were also expressed that revealed a serious future orientation on the part of even early and inexperienced committees. There was, for instance, concern in favor of being in the same overall organization as the full-time faculty even in cases where the full-time faculty were presently indifferent or hostile to the part-time organizing. Ruth Voss, leader of the part-time association at College of DuPage, said: "we knew the [FT] Faculty Association was IEA and that might be more efficient to get full-time sympathy." But this concern played both ways. Steve Jacobs from Columbia College's PFACC said:

> We started calling unions, AFT and IEA and UAW and a couple others. We chose to go with IEA and the reasons were basically because, with AFT we would have been folded into a large local...and we wanted to run our own show.

Committees also discussed the advantages of being in a "teacher's union" that "might know our concerns better" rather than being in a union such as AFSCME or SEIU that represented workers other than teachers as well. Tim Cook from Columbia College explained:

> My brother in the AFSCME local [3506 in City Colleges] once said to me, "We're a union with people in hospitals and collecting garbage and what do they know about being a teacher. You really want to think about getting in a teachers union."

Sometimes the choice to organize with a particular union was made under forced conditions. Flo Smith from DeKalb remembered this experience with AFT in 1991-92:

> We held the meeting at University Hall and there were five or six of us there. And we invited them to talk. They gave us the pitch about joining the union and [how] they would help us get more wages, more rights and try to rectify some of the problems. But the kicker was that then he says you have the next 20 minutes to decide. They left the room, while the six of us sat there and tried to decide if we wanted to commit to organizing the temporary faculty. We had no real idea who people were. We called them back in and told them we would attempt to do this ...[Then we were told] we need to have all the cards by March.

Once the hurdle of finding a union that appeared at least minimally hospitable was crossed, these committees now had to run a campaign. What follows is their assessment what they did that worked.

<u>"What we did right"</u>

The collective expression of the organizers was that virtually everything that was done was worth doing, or at least not harmful. This supports the research of Bronfenbrenner (Bronfenbrenner 2002, 2001, 1998, 1995) and others who have quantitatively documented that the more different innovative and membership-involving tactics used, the more effective the organizing campaigns. These tactics build on each other in a geometric fashion, not merely an additive one.

The kinds of things that people did that they felt were right fell into two categories. One was what might be called skill-building and group development, and the other might be called campaign tactics.

Under the first, interviewees listed such things as learning to make decisions and then to act on them collectively, learning to overcome fear, often through the discussion of inspirational or courageous acts by one of their number. Sam Elder at City Colleges remembered:

> We had to make lots of decisions, like what to do when management challenged our right to pass out our newsletter. ...[One of our activists] was challenged and just continued to pass them out, just ignored the administration. He set an example that was inspirational.

Another was learning not to give up and to keep getting lists and continuing to search for people because, when found and contacted, people were overwhelmingly positive. Hal Jones reported on the organizing effort at Metropolitan:

> The secretary of the president was pro union and would sneak us these documents. They thought we were getting them out of the garbage. We would hit them back every time they hit us. ...Within one week we had 45 or 47 of the [approximately 50] employees on cards. It was that easy. We went for everybody in the whole place.

Along with learning the value of persistence were comments on the importance of timing and momentum and the awareness of appropriate levels of security and secrecy, especially in the intimidating environment of the for-profit schools. Karl Black, one of the original organizers at the American Academy of Art, a for-profit trade school, explained:

> We felt that because of the owner we had to do it under extreme secrecy, so we each contacted one person we felt we could trust. It might seem a little strong to most people but we kind of tried to do it just like the French Resistance in the Second World War. We wanted to time it so management was busy elsewhere and not notice because we knew what Otto [the owner] would do if he found out. We would be gone in a second. We waited to time it during our accreditation inspection. It was not only accreditation but also enrollment so management gave a lot of attention to that. So we spent that time contacting other people.

In terms of campaign tactics, organizers repeatedly stressed the importance of being honest, whether that communication was through literature, one-on-one, phone contacts or websites. Openness and honesty was crucial. Deb Brown from Oakton put it emphatically: "[You] have to be honest with people. You get into big trouble if you get into organizing and start promising people all sorts of things and then can't do it."

Connected with that was realizing that every single direct contact with a contingent faculty member was precious, because they were so difficult to make and sustain, and they should be evaluated and strategized about. Tim Cook from PFACC said: " To have any kind of contact is precious, outside of on the phone or by Email. These personal contacts are very important and I keep struggling to find out how to have more of them."

From this flowed the repeated assertion that people will sign cards and support the organization when that personal direct contact can be made. In contacting people, it is important, said these organizers, to conduct discussions with people in places where they were comfortable and not afraid to talk, whether that was in offices with the doors

closed or in home phone calls or in cafes close to the campus. Flo Smith from DeKalb reported:

> Each of us took a list to contact them in person or call them. We did that the entire semester. One reason we were able to do it so quickly was that we were not working against the university because they did not know about. it. [We had] lots of phone contact, going into buildings and searching in offices. We planted [the staff organizer from the union] in the McDonalds on Lincoln Highway and asked people to see him if they had any questions. ... Many would not talk to me at work. They would call me at home. There is still a fear factor. A lot of people are very happy to have me doing this because I am the front person.

In these discussions, it was important to focus on the fact that the volunteer organizers were faculty here too, not outsiders. Steve Jacobs said:

> We would say, PFAC has been around for three years. You know us. We have been teaching here just like you. We are not some outside agitators who are trying to do something secret. It certainly helped us to rebut the outsider charge.

Once organizers became known, when they used existing gatherings and indirect communications they then had credibility.

Organizers also commented that the content, the “message”, had to respect the importance faculty felt for the educational process, and that it was important how they linked the lack of respect and discrimination against themselves as contingent faculty with their strong desire to do a better job for their students. When expressed properly, these messages could be extremely liberating and could improve the self-image of

contingent faculty to allow them to engage in further collective action. Sam Elder from City Colleges made the point that this was key to organizing contingent faculty as contrasted with organizing in other workplaces:

> Everybody on the organizing committee were people who were deeply committed to the work that we did, that is too say working with other adults, mostly working class people. ... It's different. I have been in other organizing committees. I used to work in machine shops and factories...It changes the situation when people feel that their job is something special, who take joy in it, get a lot of satisfaction out of it. Some of our people have a missionary attitude.

Yet the bottom line, the essentials, were still money and job security: "I would say the big majority wanted to get more money, wanted to get some security." Organizers learned to incorporate this into the message. Tom Suhrbur, IEA organizer at the American Academy of Art, Columbia and Roosevelt, as well as others, said: "Part-timers are insulted by their treatment. They are thoughtful and well educated people and expect better treatment and are not getting it so anything college does insults them more than anything. Even people who do not need the money to survive are insulted by the pay. You can nurture that in an organizing campaign."

Tim Cook also spoke about contingents' felt need to be respected as teachers, and the liberating effect of hearing that message spoken by the organizers: "It really is a goal for an awful lot of our members to be better teachers and take care of the students." Acknowledging that goal is part of the message:

> We insisted that discrimination was a big issue. It was the right thing to do. A lot of members feel that that's liberating. Adds to the expectations of some people

> who have not had the feeling of being proletarianized. There are other people who have gotten used to the notion that they are going to be beaten down and they need that. They need that. They need to think positively about themselves. In a small way there is a kind of psychological liberation that can be involved in thinking this kind of way. I think we did the right thing and we need to keep doing it and keep remembering it.

The form of contact was seen as less important than its frequency and content. Campaigns ranged widely in whether their key communication was one-on-one, face to face contact, phone calls, extensive literature, or more recently, Email and websites. It was noted by many, though, that "faculty will read," if the material is relevant to them. They do not have to be approached on the basis of 100-word maximum leaflets. Faculty, organizers said, can be approached on the basis of extended articles and will read them if they see them as relevant to their lives. Steve Jacobs from Columbia College described their print campaign:

> [You] can actually organize through the printed word... We really had to do everything in terms of print organizing. We created a couple of different publications. One was more newsletter format and the other had longer discussion articles. We could only gauge it by the number of cards we were getting. We did mass mailings, cards in mailboxes, personal contact. We got a lot of cards back this way. A lot was not personal contact. People were ready.

He added: "We are an organization that essentially established ourselves with credible literature. We have to assume that our constituency is intelligent and reads." Given that this campaign was at Columbia, print might appear in unexpected places: "We thought of a petition on the sidewalk outside in chalk, and the artists, and get TV cameras."

Most organizers spoke of the necessity to do written surveys to determine membership desires but those surveys are not only important in constructing campaign and bargaining agendas but also in convincing the committees themselves that they were not alone in their concerns. The collective self-confidence-building function of institution-wide surveys, in some cases, was more important than the content of the survey, since the organizers were clear on what *they* thought the issues were to begin with.

A number of organizers spoke about the need to be politically sensitive and nuanced regarding the institution and its administration and spoke about using a certain kind of organizational judo to deflate administrative rhetoric and to build confidence among contingents. The administration's own mission statements and image as service, educational, and even progressive institutions could be held up against the reality of paying the people who actually did the work merely seven or eleven percent of the tuition revenue that they had generated. Roosevelt University, for example, is named for Franklin and Eleanor, and Olive Light explained how the organizers used that legacy: "All over Roosevelt are quotes from FDR and Eleanor, and we found how to put the thorn in the lion's paw [by using those quotes]. That really worked." One slogan printed on buttons was: "We want a new deal for adjunct faculty." Columbia College also had a liberal past. Tim Cook said:

> At Columbia we figured it was a liberal institution. Until '92 the president was an old lefty. The current Vice President made a speech against the war when he graduated in '68. A lot of people were embarrassed to be on the wrong side of an organizing drive. We always felt we had that going for us and making an issue of that would be to our benefit.

Tom Suhrbur elaborated:

> Columbia and Roosevelt both started from a very liberal left tradition. ... A Columbia College founder was well known in liberal left politics, [supporting] low tuition for city kids to get art, music, dance etc. Roosevelt was founded by a walkout by faculty after WWII at the YMCA college over [the issue of] integration. Faculty formed their own college, and the Y college no longer exists. They adopted Eleanor and Franklin Roosevelt to show their commitment to progressive politics. We used that in each college. Neither college wanted to fight us publicly. We figured we could get an election with minimal resistance and could bargain a decent contract, which we did at both institutions. There was only minimal offensive against out organizing. .. Columbia knew they would have to pay a heavy media price if they fought us. To their credit, it worked out very well. At Roosevelt every piece of [our] literature had quotes about the New Deal from FDR on workers rights. By using that labor FDR tradition we knew the college would have a very difficult time putting on an offense against us.

Political timing had to be part of the strategy as well. Ruth Voss described how this strategy developed at College of DuPage. The full-timers were coming up for negotiations, expected these negotiations to be difficult, and wanted the assurance of the part-timers that part-timers would not cross a picket line should the full-timers go out on strike. Voss was invited to come and speak to the faculty senate, which was also the executive committee of the union. She told them that she personally would not cross a picket line and would ask the members of CODAA , of which she was a leader, to do the same. Several different factors were converging at that time. Campus Equity Week 2001 was just around the corner as were the IBHE (Illinois Board of Higher

Education) hearings on HB1720. Senator Cronin was coming to College of Dupage for these hearings which would be attended by over 100 faculty. Voss said: "The trustees could see that the timing of bad publicity just before the referendum was bad for them if it went to labor board [for unit hearings on our petition]. The referendum was for a bond issue for the college district, always difficult in anti-tax DuPage County and especially so since the FTTT faculty were singularly unenthusiastic after a very unpopular contract settlement. The district did not need any more bad publicity.

Another aspect of what was cited as being done right in this same general area was alliances: outreach to other workers and unions, especially clericals, students, the press, and FTTT's if possible. Steve Jacobs described the outreach at Columbia:

> We put out appeals to students. ... We were able to get a letter from a full-time faculty in support of our drive that we published. We left our newsletters in full-timer boxes too. We talked with some AA's in some departments We felt like we were able to learn for ourselves that there was not a big swell of hostility out there. We found there was a lot of sympathy. There were a lot of students and full-timers who were bitter about this and wanted something to do.

Tom Suhrbur raised the idea of using student newspapers, not only to make students the allies of contingents, and to create a public image of the organizing effort, but also simply as a way of communicating with contingents:

> We put ads in student newspapers, part-timers write in, it was very important to have good relations with student editors and we felt students were very supportive of us. We wanted as much coverage as possible. Administrators are sensitive to public image. Another reason is that is hard to get information to

> part-timers. How do you communicate? Some part-timers don't have boxes or don't check them. We wouldn't get an accurate list until the election... We never know exactly who is working. So the paper was a way to get information to part-timers themselves.

Olive Light talked about finding allies among the clerical and secretarial workers:

> We knew we needed to do a survey and find out who worked there and we did that by writing down names off mailboxes. But [this] left out scads of people. So we asked secretaries, who in many cases were very, very helpful. Maybe that was from their [experience with their] own organization and their less than perfect contract settlement. Their organization was very friendly and we have tried to reciprocate.

The outreach to allies led to a general consciousness of the complexity and reality of the institution as a political body with many parts, a multi-faceted "terrain of struggle," to use Gramscian metaphors.

<u>"What did not work?"</u>

As noted in the previous section, the list of what didn't work is much shorter than the list of what did. In addition, most things that organizers mention not working were omissions of actions they wish they had taken or had been able to devote more time to. Not a single action was mentioned as being negative -- doing more harm than good, even under direct probing on that point. This may be one of the most important findings of the interviewing. If it involved members in activity, it appeared, from the experience in these Chicago campaigns, then it can't be bad, no matter what mistakes

might be entailed in its planning and execution. This is contrary to the received wisdom and practice of organizing in recent decades in the labor movement, which says that campaigns need to be tightly orchestrated and professionally strategized. This finding directly contradicts that traditional belief and instead points in the direction of a strategy that says anything that gets more people in motion is good. Some activities are more worthwhile than others, but all are good and virtually none are bad. This may, of course, be a characteristic of campaigns specific to contingent faculty or contingent casualized workers in general, or this finding may have much broader application in organizing.

One activity mentioned that, in retrospect, contingent organizers themselves assessed as being less worthwhile than the others was the attempt to create large group meetings, especially among units of part-timers, as opposed to full-time temporaries (FTNTT). The very most difficult organizing tactic to execute seemed to be gathering people together in one space at one time. Many organizers commented that this was the least efficient way to communicate with people or draw people into the campaign, despite the fact that organizers from outside the contingent faculty themselves, drawing upon standard organizing procedure, would urge such meetings. Nevertheless, even for this least useful tactic, comments were made that individual contacts were often made at what turned out to be very small meetings and that discussions among the organizing committee themselves, in these semi-social group meeting situations, sometimes bore useful fruit. Steve Jacobs explained that Tom Suhrbur, the IEA organizer, had had the idea that they should have these meetings, but, “We said we don’t know how effective that will be. We held some big meetings. But we had less than ten people each time.”

Some strategic considerations were mentioned also as being of concern. Tim Cook mentioned an idea passed down in the teacher union movement: “Years ago some old-

timer said at an NEA conference that in order to organize you need to talk to everyone in your bargaining unit and you can't organize if you can't do that. That was not our experience." While as a goal it was certainly not denied, the idea that a bottom line requirement for a successful campaign was to talk to everyone simply did not prove to be the case. This is connected to the consistent finding that in the vast majority of cases, even a minority petition would result in a substantial election victory. As the movement progresses into organizing in the more difficult sectors, like for-profits and corporate contexts, this generalization may change.

Another strategic consideration and perhaps more important, that emerged especially in the contexts where strong anti-union campaigns were waged, was the importance of not underestimating the employer's willingness to fight the union and use intimidation as a factor. This is connected to another factor, in this case a difficulty that a number of organizers mentioned: the best and most important way to fight the fear factor was to keeping talking to people, keep contact with people, and that this was difficult, especially if the process was long and drawn out. It was a mistake to assume continued support without constant re-confirmation and it was also a mistake to assume that friendly collegial personal ties in other ways to an organizer would immediately translate into support under employer pressure. The perception of this problem, especially the fear factor, varied between in-unit organizers and outsiders and will be discussed more extensively in a later section. Karl Black from American Academy of Art identified this in retrospect as one of his four mistakes:

> First, one of the biggest departments was computers. [Name omitted] quit just before the first election. They elected a new head who was a supporter and that was the biggest department and I thought that was enough. I should have concentrated on them. In first election they said to a person they would not get as

> much out of the union. I should have had more meetings with them. Second, I relied on friendships rather than treating it like a business. I had known [name omitted] for 20 years in life drawing and she turned on me. Third, I did not convince Tom Suhrbur of the owner's evilness and Tom Suhrbur came out of the public sector and he did not fully understand. We tried to convince him but I do not think we fully convinced him. Finally, the fear factor was a major thing that I did not factor in enough.

One organizer did mention that maintaining other pre-union forms of organization (college committees and other unofficial bodies) after the union drive had begun, and after the election, was not a useful use of time and drew time and energy from other activities that were more valuable. Flo Smith from DeKalb said:

> We kept the Council of Temporary Faculty because we thought it was worthwhile. We had no voice in the University Council and no vote. That wasted a lot of our time… It made us a little bit more visible but it got us no place fast. It continued 'til two years ago, then voted itself out of existence.

A number of organizers commented on their wish that there had been enough human resources to do more outreach earlier, both within the potential bargaining unit and to potential strategic allies. Olive Light identified some regrets:

> Getting more people in earlier probably would have saved me from being so crabby sometimes. Building stronger ties to clerical workers' union might have been useful. It has all stemmed from not having enough people doing the work.

Hal Jones from Metropolitan made a similar comment:

> The main problem was the pace, drawn out for so long. You would get tired after a while and not keep up on the contacts. You have to keep talking to people, constantly.

It was also specifically mentioned that organizing in colleges requires an analysis of the entire political animal and all the actors within the campus community in order to be effective. These include other unions, especially the clericals; the press, especially the student press; student groups; an analysis of the Board and where power actually lies in the Board; the administration and where ties lie connecting them to the political community. Tom Suhrbur, the IEA organizer, compared the campaigns at Harper and College of DuPage:

> Harper and College of DuPage differed even though [the district board had the] same attorney. We were naive [at Harper]. Our politics were wrong. We did not have our alliances. We did not do anything publicly... We did not seek out the press, which is very important. We had no history there, we worked from scratch. At College of DuPage there was history there ...We attended board meetings and had a close alliance with full-time faculty...We told them, "Don't pay any attention to your attorneys. Deal with us. We are the ones who make this place run. We are part of the system. Don't try to just use Harper strategy to defeat us because, while you might be able to do it, it is going to be costly and hurt the college and no one will be a winner."

In sum, then, what is important is to strategically use resources in the best way possible while understanding that almost all activity will have some usefulness, if it involves members.

"How the employer responded"

Very clear patterns emerged in the descriptions by organizers of the employer's anti-union organizing campaigns. First, however, it was clear that top administration in every single case would have preferred "no union. " This is, of course, no surprise. The further responses fell into two general categories, but both seemed to emerge from the same root, namely a serious underestimation of the seriousness, individually and collectively, of the contingent faculty and their attitude toward education and contingent faculty's commitment to use organizational means to improve conditions. Within that general underestimation, employer responses generally fell into two categories. One was largely ignoring the campaign, in some cases not even bothering to find that it existed until the petition was filed and in some cases restricting themselves to a legal strategy even then. Some employers seemed to really not be able to bring themselves to believe that this activity could be serious on the part of contingent faculty. Deb Brown from Oakton described first disbelief, followed by stonewalling:

> The administration did not think much would happen so they didn't oppose [us] actively. We did not meet the same kind of opposition that, say, Harper did, at least initially. At a certain point, though, no more information was forthcoming. [The administration said] we aren't going to talk with you any more.

Flo Smith from DeKalb reported a similar degree of disbelief:

> The administration did not know [we were organizing] until the labor board contacted them... They never called us... I don't think they did anything. I don't know why. I think they thought people were too afraid for their jobs and we did

> not have enough strength to pass it. They thought these people are just teaching on a temporary basis and they don't care if there is a union wage or not...They fund out that that was not true.... We voted in a building across from the administrative office and they stood at the building watching our people come in to vote for the whole day.

Sally Edwards reported that her supervisor called her and another organizer in and suggested that this was not their "wisest career move." But: "Otherwise, they pretty much ignored us… I think he actually just felt that we would just go away. Fizzle and die. He was wrong."

The lawyer in the Harper case made a comment that Barb Polk remembered eleven years later: "Harper's lawyer was not a very pleasant person. He was demeaning and said the adjunct faculty were nothing more than little fish in the big pond."

The second response, also entailing underestimation, was a medium to intense anti-union campaign in which the propaganda that was put out, sometimes on the advice of consultants, was perceived as insulting to the intelligence of the faculty and as condescending and degrading to them and to their seriousness of purposes. Steve Jacobs described a campaign like this at Columbia College:

> What happened was that the administration opposed us in a very stupid way. They hired an anti labor law firm from Washington DC and put out the standard anti labor stuff, which basically said you'll be folded into some large organization that will squeeze people and take your dues, won't give you anything. The are just out for themselves. We were able to combat it very effectively.

The administration made arguments that were easy to counter:

> They argued that you would lose your personal relationship with the college, as if we had one. You'll only be able to deal with the college through the union. You won't be able to talk to you department head about your problems or your courses any more...We were able to turn everything back on them. We asked, do you have a personal relationship with the school right now? There are 800 of us and we were all dealing individually. That is part of our problem. They had said you wouldn't be able to negotiate for your own salary. This again was something we could point out that there is a standard salary that most of us got the same damn thing. There might be a few who could negotiate, but generally we just took what was offered.

Olive Light at Roosevelt also described how administration tactics backfired:

> The administration] sent out letters in response to our card drive. They were pathetic and if anything they antagonized adjuncts further.

These letters addressed the working conditions of adjuncts -- access to copiers, office space, etc. -- an issue which the adjunct organizers effectively owned. Olive Light said:

> I crafted the response letter and basically I said we need a copier to do our job. What do you think we are going to do, pencil these things in or run them off in our basement? Of course you need an office. Are we going to meet students in the bathroom? This is crazy. I think their letters probably helped us. They really pointed out the things that were ludicrous about our work.

Steve Jacobs told about another administrator tactic that was intended to divide people but in fact resulted in an organizing opportunity:

> One young woman on the [organizing] committee... had a side thing where she evaluated other people's classes. So they said she was a supervisor and couldn't be part of the unit and can't take part in the organizing or be part of the union. That made us pretty angry and we wrote articles about it. What happened she would write stuff and have it signed by other people. Our lawyer told us that we could not oppose it legally. But we got around it actually.

Tim Cook told about a threat that backfired at Columbia:

> They did say that if we had to pay $3,000 a course, the board of trustees might not want to hire so many part-time teachers and might make more full-time teachers, as if that was some sort of threat to us.

During the Harper campaign, taking the conflict to the labor board resulted in giving the organizers an opportunity to confront their assertions. Barb Polk told this story:

> One of the reasons Harper said we should not be allowed to organize is they said we're temporary. We are like people who work for a temp agency who are in here one day and gone the next. Our point was to prove that that's not the case. I was the witness at the labor board and I had started teaching January of '80. This hearing was in November of '91 so that sort of blew some holes in their theory of us being here today and gone tomorrow.....One of the things that they asked me to display at the hearing was my faculty ID card. Every semester Harper [had

> given] me a new one of these and I remember I had so many in my wallet.... Here it is 2002 and I am still there teaching part-time.

Together, these experiences suggest that if the fear factor can be overcome, the employer's underestimation can be turned into a strategic advantage for contingent faculty.

Those two cases where elections were lost were both cases where traditional private-sector for-profit intimidation tactics, not cogent arguments, seem to have played the key role. Those two campaigns were clearly exceptions to the general rule, but they do return us again to the consistent factor of fear. Tom Suhrbur, the IEA organizer, spoke to the issue of the harsher tactics at the for-profits:

> For-profit schools are much different from private non-profits. [They have] different histories... At small for-profits it is vicious, like a factory. They fired our leaders and we had the election overturned. It was a full-scale assault and was fairly effective. There is so much intimidation at the private for-profits. At AIT [another for-profit small art college where the campaign never really got off the ground] they started one on one conversations by the administration and offered people things. Several are owned by corporations [that] own schools all over the nation. [We] have to build [our] organizing strategy around the kind of institution you have because each has different history.

Karl Black from the American Academy of Art remembered:

> 1998 was first election. [The president] had a couple of months to present his arguments against the union so he had meetings everyday with individuals and

> groups and a constant campaign he put on. Letters, memos, on why we should not join union... They used the fear factor. "It could affect your job." Told this to people one on one. The outcome was that we lost by one vote...We decided to [challenge] the election because of some illegal things they had done ... Because we won the appeal, they were a little more cautious [in the second election]. They used more psychological fear. "The school may not be profitable if the union [comes in]. We could not sell it, and would just close it down." So they used more psychological fear, and it did work.

The campaign at Metropolitan was equally brutal, as Hal Jones recalls:

> The National Labor Relations Board gave Metropolitan 6 months before they called the election. They launched this campaign against us of half a year.... So we were under intense pressure. We were called into these meetings where no one could talk. They would give you all this propaganda about the union coming in. You'll just be giving them your money, they are corrupt, they will just exploit you. All that crap. Things started to happen. Like someone threw paint all over the car of the president. I never knew who did it. Things started to get tense. They brought in a Black woman [as President] to bust the union, play it really hard. [The staff was all Black except for one person.] The new president would get in people's face, call them in and threaten them. There was one guy who I am sure they were using as spy in the organization. Very two faced...Finally we had the election and we won, but they had whittled us down to 27 votes. In that six months they had scared about 20 people out of voting or the union. [The final vote was] 27-18 or 19.

In addition to the centralized top-level administrative responses, there were some independent responses to the organizing campaign by mid and lower-level administrators. These varied. In some cases, lower-level administrators, especially if they had been long-time faculty members and even, contingent workers themselves, were sympathetic and assisted the union, sub-rosa, or attempted to moderate the central anti-union campaign by not fully following instructions. Sam Elder remembered:

> Where I worked the dean turned her back and let me know where I could get all the information I needed as an organizer. She had been a teacher and she thought it was terrible that we had gone all these years without a raise. And she was happy to see us get a union.

Steve Jacobs from Columbia told how the administration drafted a letter, sent it to department heads with instructions to sign it and send it on to everyone in their departments. Then department heads confided to contingents that the letters had not actually been written by them:

> It was amazing though to see how many just toed the line... Then they would come up to us and say, you know, we are sorry....Some of them privately confessed that, "Well, I didn't really write this. I don't really believe this." We were able to combat this very effectively and say who it had been written by and what the process was. A lot of people who had been hanging back and then, seeing this, it brought them in.

In other cases, however, individual administrators took this as an opportunity to settle old scores and act against individual organizers whom they may have wished to get rid

of anyway. They may have been particularly prodded to act at this time, fearing that if the union drive was successful and some degree of job security was won, they would have to deal with this person into the future. Sam Elder told of this firing:

> One of our key activists was fired by her dean who was the person hired to clear out the radicals. We had picket lines in support of her but were not able to get her job back.. ...I think she was actually fired for using a loudspeaker to make an announcement about a meeting.

Olive Light told about firings during the organizing campaign at Roosevelt:

> Two people were officially led go and one "not reassigned". The university started cleaning house and the two people who specifically lost positions were in composition. Part of it was ... a conflict with a particularly difficult supervisor... He decided he had had enough to of them even though they had been there for 8 and 6 years. One had outstanding qualifications. They had personality conflicts that had reared their heads over three years and she was active. I think she was let go because he had seen the writing on the wall and saw that once the contract was in it would be a lot harder to get rid of her.

The union filed an unfair labor practice because, "The way he fired them was stupid, with a letter saying things he could not really support specifically." But the ULP was unsuccessful. However, Light commented, "That might be part of why he is not director any more."

In general, these experiences reflect the ways that mid and lower-level administrators occupy a contradictory material and ideological position, especially in the rapidly changing world of employment relations in higher education.

Organizing committee and leadership issues

In this section, I will examine organizer responses to issues of building and organizing the committee and creating the core of leadership for the union in the future. In general, these responses, when taken together over the entire period of organizing, extending up through the bargaining of the first contract and the structuring of a real union in the bargaining unit, supports Markovitz's (Markovitz 2000) contention that how people are organized, and especially how rank and file leadership is built, or not, impacts tremendously on the sort of union, the level of activity, and the attitudes toward the union that emerge even from successful organizing campaigns, as most of these were.

A number of organizers commented on the importance of having some portion of the leadership that had previous political activist experience, though not necessarily union experience, and especially the importance of some of those having a broader, usually radical or leftist, perspective. Without those individuals, it seems likely that some of these campaigns would never have happened at all, and some of them might well have foundered, not because they were "defeated" but mainly because of a lack of energy collectively that could be marshaled over the extended period necessary to win. This is connected to another issue mentioned by a number of organizers, which is that organizers in particular, but the membership in general, were motivated both by the

desire for decent material rewards for their work and also a desire to make this very important work of education function better for them and for their students. Sam Elder attributed this in part to the political experience of the lead activists:

> It was a pretty radical group of people, activists influenced certainly by the 70's and some the 60's. All lot of them were community based and their attitude was that this education exists to serve the community, education is a tool for liberation, so it was a pretty feisty group in the late 70's... Everybody on the organizing committee were people who were deeply committed to the work that we did, that is to say working with other adults, mostly working class people.

Hal Jones also attributed the commitment of the lead activists to their political orientation, including having some experience in, for example, the civil rights movement:

> It is a big factor, the experience, and also the ideological commitment, that this is just not just one more struggle for another dime an hour. It's part of a bigger struggle. Your activist core is key to pursuing anything. The key to the activist core is experience and dedication to a broader social view than just the immediate aim and the immediate frustration.

The failure of the administrations to grant contingent faculty respect in their work and in their person, and the connecting, individually and collectively, of the organizing committee with the broader faculty on that issue, was seen as key to maintaining the campaign and the individual and collective motivation and activity by the organizers.

Another matter that was raised repeatedly, especially by in-unit organizers, was the importance of having developed a collective leadership, however small. People said explicitly that a small core is all right, even if it is substantially less than the ten percent rule that is standard in organizing. However it must function collectively, democratically, work hard and be open to evolving over time, allowing individuals to drop off temporarily and others to join. Deb Brown from Oakton described having two circles: "A very small group doing the majority of the work and then a larger circle. We have always had a wonderful core, but it changes over time." Steve Jacobs from Columbia described a similar inner and outer group: "We had a group that was never more than ten people. Other people who did something were probably ten or fifteen more. It was pretty small -- Columbia was 800 to 900 part-time faculty, then." But the quality of the core was what mattered. Jacobs continued:

> We had a very good organizing committee. A lot of different styles. Lots of difference competencies. We had some sort of back and forth, and struggles. But we basically were able to go out and do it. [There wasn't] anyone who really drove us apart except for maybe one person who sort of split off. I think getting a really good nucleus is a main thing. When we met with [AFT leader] Mitch Vogel before we started organizing, he said, well, it's very obvious that you were going to succeed because you have a good organizing committee. That's key, it seems to me.

This may be a particular function of organizing contingent faculty or contingent workers more generally, that the ten percent committee rule can be finessed, but it seems to be the case, at least with this particular group, if other factors are right. Of course, building a ten percent-plus committee is still a good thing, but perhaps less essential in the world of contingent faculty. Another way to say it may be that in this

context we need to re-define what it means to be part of the organizing committee and the activist core, to include people who almost never see each other face to face but do work on an occasional or more regular basis coordinated only through telephone message machines and Email. This redefinition is related to reports of the Harvard clerical and technical organizing experience (Oppenheim 1991) especially about people who would talk to a few others regularly, but seldom come to an "organizing committee" meeting.

On an individual level, organizers repeatedly made the point that they individually learned or in some cases re-learned that they and other people can rise to the occasion and fulfill the tasks of leadership if they feel supported and appreciated by the rest of the core group and those outside in the membership. People commented that this was an extremely confidence-building experience for them and reaffirmed their faith that "regular people like us can do something to change the world we live in." This was another one of those cases where people's tone of voice altered when they were making these points. Tim Cook from Columbia told his own story about learning to take leadership roles:

> Personally being an organizer was great for me. I was shaking in my boots at the beginning. I learned, after years of writing, or maybe relearned what I learned in the 60's and 70's, that you can do something. That certainly cheers me up. Also that you can exercise some leadership. I don't mean that personally, but that people who are on the right side of things can exercise some leadership when things are bad and you don't have to believe what the pundits say about the way things have to be. Things can happen and a small number of people can exercise leadership and provide a voice for the voiceless.

Flo Smith at DeKalb had to be talked into it:

> Mike at a meeting told me: you need to be the president. I said I can't do that. I have kids at home and I can't give up all those weekends to go to meetings outside DeKalb. He said you don't have to do that. You can get your VP to do that and just run things on the campus. So [the VP] went to the meetings. I had no idea what I was to do. I was given some training, but I was a total novice. I did not know what collective bargaining was. I did not know anything about unions. [But I learned that] if you have enough people helping you taking baby steps along the way, you can do fine with the organization.

On the other hand, those cases where organizing campaigns were conducted largely or exclusively by those outside of the bargaining unit -- staff organizers or full-time tenure track faculty who were elected leaders -- did not result in organization-building among the contingents even though a majority of cards were gathered and elections were won. So, again supporting Markovitz, when joining the union is seen not as coming together with your friends, colleagues and fellow contingent faculty in a collective effort, but rather as joining an existing service organization whose doors have now been opened to you by the gesture of solidarity of the full-time tenure track faculty, contingent faculty will walk through those doors to the extent of signing cards and voting in an election, but they will not, in any numbers, come forward to build an organization and assume leadership on a continuing basis. These were also cases where the number of contingents being organized would not have been enough to change the balance of power within the full-time tenure track-led union. In addition to supporting Markovitz's thesis, I suggest that this also supports the arguments made by Fletcher and Hurd, Eisenscher, Gapasin and others, that in order to effectively organize and integrate new members, unions have to be prepared to engage in internal

transformation. Further, I would suggest that, in the case of contingent faculty, if that possibility does not exist and does not seem to exist, the newly organized will not actively participate and therefore are unlikely to become potential organizers of new members themselves. This is an issue I will return to in the strategy proposal section later.

Finally, attempting to find a pattern in where organizing committee activists tend to come from within the university turned out to be more difficult than I expected. There were examples of volunteer organizers coming from virtually every major segment and discipline. However, there did seem to be some pattern in that those who faced fewer alternative employment opportunities outside of academia seemed somewhat more likely to be involved. That would mean people from the humanities, the social sciences with the exception of economics, and the arts. These were also areas where a particularly disproportionate number of women are employed compared to other disciplines and certainly compared to full-time faculty. However, this was not uniformly reflected in the composition of the organizing committees. There were mostly female organizing committees and individual, self-motivated female organizers. But in other cases organizing committees were virtually all male, despite substantial numbers of female faculty in the proposed unit. I would suggest that this may point to confirmation of some of the findings in *Women in Unions* (Cobble 1993, 364-377) explaining that the personal cost of union activism is higher for women than for men, because of the double shift that many women workers have to carry. That point is certainly supported by my own personal experience in the campaigns with which I had direct contact.

Connected with this issue is the issue of the racial and ethnic composition of the leadership. Steve Jacobs from Columbia acknowledged that the organizing committee

there was representative in some ways, but still white, while the workforce was not entirely white:

> Three from liberal arts, career teachers, two women, mainly male, mostly older, one young woman who was very involved and very central. Everyone else was at least 40. We had a mix of departments. They tended to be from service departments [i.e. general education] rather than the professional departments. The faculty was not all white but the organizing committee was all white.

Hal Jones described consciously strategizing around this at Metropolitan:

> Our organizing committee was pretty collective, [but] I didn't want to take the real strong sole leadership, for two reasons. One was that I always thought that the organizer who does everything is not a very good organizer...And, as the only white person in the workforce, I thought it was better to have Black leadership. In fact [the administration] did try to use that. I had a pretty good relationship to everyone and I was really part of the core but sensitive to not trying to use my experience to take over leadership. So they were not able to use that very successfully.

This sector, contingent higher education faculty, is still overwhelmingly "white," as is full-time tenure track faculty. However, in the Chicago area, there are a substantial number of people of color teaching. My observation is that they have not been proportionately represented in organizing committees in general. I will attempt to address in my strategy proposal.

If the development of a strong, flexible collective internal leadership, however small, is key, one major factor in its success is developing a useful and appropriate relationship with union staff.

Relations with union staff

In this section I propose to examine comments made by organizers regarding their relationships with outside staff perceived as coming "from the union," the larger outside body. These comments fell almost universally into two categories. One was comments about organizers and the other was comments about servicing representatives and outside elected leadership.

Attitudes toward organizing staff delegated to help them initially build their unions and campaigns were almost always positive. Organizers were perceived as being energetic, professional, appropriate (generally), and focused on the same goals as the organizing committee, namely building the campaign via getting as many people actively involved as possible. Even in cases where later relationships with servicing reps and parent unions turned ugly, the memory of the organizer remained a good one and was not poisoned by subsequent bad relations with the organizer's employer. Sam Elder remembered that "AFSCME promised us a full-time organizer, who they gave us, who was very capable." Steve Jacobs remembered, with amusement:

> It was a good thing that [Tom Suhrbur] was such a good guy. Sometimes we would really sideline him a lot. We told him basically that you are here because we need the resources of the large union, but we are going to do this ourselves. He said fine. Sean kept trying to get us to do meetings, and tell us not to write

> too much, but in higher ed, people will read. You just couldn't do a lot of eye--to-eye, so you had to do this. If it's a crucial issue to them, people will read.

Tim Cook also had good words about that particular organizer:

> [One member of the organizing committee] had had experience [name] in the Chicago Teachers Union and [had been] on strike many times. He also said, "This is our union [to Tom Suhrbur] and you can talk when we let you talk." Tom Suhrbur took it OK. We disregarded some of his advice, like about renting rooms for meetings sometimes.

As did Olive Light, who said: "Tom Suhrbur was the man for the job because he had an understanding of academia and we could identify with him.

The transition, though, from relating to an organizer to relating to a staff representative who would help them bargain a contract and then administer it was often difficult and problematic. This is an issue that has been discussed in the labor movement and among organizers for years. The general pattern of unions -- and the teacher unions are no exception to this -- is to pull the organizer out as soon as the election is won and send in a collective bargaining representative or servicing representative and shift the relationship to that person as soon as possible. This often left the organizing committee feeling disorganized, cut their efficiency, and forced them to develop a new relationship with someone whose view of them and of the task at hand was very different from their own experience. This new person had not shared that particular organizing experience, but came in with the organizational imperatives of the parent organization and concerns about dues, organizational structure, and bargaining requirements that in many cases were seriously at odds with the consensus of the leadership committee. The

staff rep often carried a much less participatory, democratic and experimental style. These problems were not universal but they seemed to revolve in the main around issues of respect for autonomy and a continuing focus on the importance of judging tactics by what would generate a high level of activity by members. Sam Elder's experience with AFSCME in the City Colleges provides an example:

> The organizer is gone and they send a council rep to replace the international organizer who is gone. The first thing she did was send a letter out to the membership, unauthorized, telling them what they were going to pay in dues. We had been told you will *negotiate* your dues structure with AFSCME . ...Many of us were outraged. We said," This is no way to communicate with the people who just voted for the union. This is not what you want to do." But it was indicative. The first thing to be negotiated was AFSCME's fair share.

As the Adult Educators (Elder's membership) prepared for negotiations with management, the issue of open versus closed [to membership observation of the interactions at the table] came up. This led to a direct confrontation between the members of the bargaining unit and the staff representative:

> We had had a referendum of our members. Eighty percent of our voting members said they wanted open negotiations. In fact we did have people come down and what happened was the council VP who was there worked out a deal with management and excluded them because he refused to certify that they were part of our bargaining committee. We had a confrontation with him. We said our members want this. This is going to strengthen us. People are going to see how recalcitrant and unfair management is and this is what is going to bring us together. They will see what we are actually dealing with. He said, and I'll

> never for get it, he said, ”That’s what *you* want. I work for the council. We have our own agenda.”

Among the lessons that were related as important out of this experience were the need of the rank and file leadership to take possession of their union, of its direction, and learn to do the organizational tasks that needed to be done, including the relationships with state and national union bodies and with the college administration. The transition could be painful, but the sooner that ownership was taken and the sooner the relationships were established, the better. Related to this was the lesson of the danger of depending too much on one good person from the outside union or within the committee, for if that person left, then serious problems could arise. Hal Jones from Metropolitan told how their organizer and local leader, on whom they had depended, died:

> [He] died right in the middle of our negotiations, of hepatitis. It was a real tragedy . [Then our] local was consumed by another local... [led by a] typical sort of labor bureaucrat.

Deb Brown from Oakton spoke of learning this lesson the hard way:

> I was very naive. [One member of the core group] left. [Another member of the core group] got a full-time job. [A third member of the core group] and I became co-leaders and [William, the Uniserve Director] came in as the expert. We kind of let him assume the leadership role that probably we shouldn’t have. We did not know how to go about all this so we let him tell us. He had a thing with the [district] Board attorney, Fred. They bargained a lot of contracts together. Instead of learning how to do it, it was all, “ I’ll talk to Fred”. It was seldom really positive, talking to Fred. But it was positive enough [in the short run] that

> we continued to let him do this. This continued a lot longer than it should have. I began to get pressure from other people that maybe William was not acting in our best interests.... At the end he was saying all these stereotypes about part-timers, like if you were any good you would have a real job. I don't see how someone can represent you and have those sort of attitudes. He and Fred would get into these things where it was really one-upsmanship between the two of them, just male games with each other. So we got rid of both Fred and William eventually. I finally began to see that this was not the way things should be done. It took an awful long time.... William is now gone. He is out of IEA.

By extension, no one person in the rank and file leadership should monopolize the relationship with the union staff and the organizers, but that relationship should reflect the continuation of a collective leadership through the organizing period, through the development of the first bargaining proposals, through the negotiation of the first contract and through the institutional creation of the union in that bargaining unit. At DeKalb, Flo Smith said that the staff rep is "...never chief negotiator; we always have someone in the chapter so we know what we are doing afterwards." Deb Brown summed up the lessons they learned at Oakton:

> Learn all you can as fast as possible about how to do it yourself and do not overly rely on your Uniserv director...I think it is important to get training from different people who may not say the same thing, different styles, explain things a little differently. Now I talk to others. I talk to Heartland, which is AFT, extensively... and to [Nancy] at College of DuPage.

<u>Negotiating a first contract</u>

The main thing to say about the first contract campaign is that it is part of the organizing process and should be seen as such. Deb Brown explained: “Before you organize and bargain you don’t have a relationship. [Through organizing and bargaining] you establish the rules that you and the administration are going to play by.”

The continuation of organizing into the first contract bargaining phase was explicitly noted by a number of the organizers and clearly assumed by the others. When asked to “tell the story,” all organizers included the first contract negotiations as part of “the story”. In general, in new unit organizing, the first contract negotiations were characterized as being difficult and extended and not consistently in good faith on the part of the employer. Deb Brown said, “ They accepted the results of the election, but bargaining in good faith is a totally different issue. I am not sure the college has ever bargained in good faith.” Administrations sometimes put as much effort into defeating bargaining as they had into defeating organizing. Hal Jones from Metropolitan commented, “ They spent so much more money in trying to ...prevent us from getting a contract, that they could have [met our demands]. “

The pattern that I personally have observed in my years in the teacher union movement was confirmed: when pressed sufficiently, employers were willing to make serious and even substantial concessions on pay, less on health benefits, but to hold very tightly to all issues regarding power, flexibility, or the job security of contingent faculty. Sam Elder from City Colleges corroborated this observation:

> In first negotiations, [the employer’s] position was that you are part-time, at-will employees and we are not going to change that. You are not going to get paid for

> any time you are not in class. We are not going to give you any paid medical benefits. We *are* willing to negotiate your pay. We had to push against that.

In fact, as the years went by, the Adult Educators would be able to make some contractual gains on these issues related to power:

> We have made some breakthroughs despite management saying they would never allow it. We got holiday pay, and we won a weird partial vacation schedule. They said they would never pay us for preparation time but we now get 91 cents [prep pay] for every hour we are scheduled to be in the classroom. ...It is something in the sense that they said you will never get prep time.

Because of this administrative priority [to make concessions on wages but to hold fast to working conditions issues such as job security] the adjuncts at Roosevelt dealt with working conditions first, and took some heat from their members for doing so. Olive Light remembered:

> We got grief from some adjuncts for not getting to money first. We felt we had to do conditions first because once we got to money people will just want to wrap it up and we will not be able to think out all these other things that do matter.

A characteristic argument made by administrators against any kind of job security was that contingents had not been evaluated. Administrators blamed department chairs for this, but this only meant that an evaluation process had to become a bargaining issue. Flo Smith explained:

> They did not want us on continuing contracts because a lot of us were not evaluated at that point. They said chairs were retaining us because they were too lazy to hire someone else for that position...[Now] if you get a bad evaluation you can appeal it. There is now a due process, reconsideration committee and that has worked very well.

Another point regarding the employers in the first contract negotiations was that the employer representatives at the table were often honestly ignorant of what was going on in the treatment of contingent faculty at the base level. This is a heritage of the decentralization, verging on outsourcing, of much of the teaching function of modern higher education. In some cases, a centralized payroll list was virtually the only centralized data that the top administration seemed to have with regard to its contingent faculty. Therefore, the first negotiation process took on, in many respects, characteristics of an educational seminar with contingent faculty asserting various conditions that they desired to change, and employer representatives denying that they existed, then investigating and discovering that in some units these conditions did in fact exist. Flo Smith described how administrators had to learn about the range of pay contingents were receiving:

> They did not believe what we told them about salaries being hugely varied. Some were $12,000 and some $30,000. They did not believe any of that. This [had not been] a concern for them before. They had to get back to the chairs... They found out it was true. When they found out they had some empathy.

Sometimes, employer representatives simply could not understand the bargaining team's priorities, such as those put forward by the union at Metropolitan. Hal Jones remembers: "Our positions was they the biggest raises should go to the lowest paid

workers, receptionists and staff, so that they could get off food stamps...They were just ideologically set against the union."

This process of re-education of administration was extremely tedious and frustrating for the contingent faculty bargainers, since as any teacher knows, it is much easier to teach a student who is eager and enthusiastic about learning than it is to teach one who resists and denies every step of the way. This is especially true when the learners have power over the teacher and fundamentally think that they have nothing to learn.

In a number of situations, it became clear that the more public and publicized the negotiations were, the better for the new union. Whether that communication took place by having rank and filers come to the negotiations, frequent leaflets, mails, web page reports, or other communication means, it seemed to almost always be to the advantage of the union to have what was going on in negotiations be as open and public as possible. Olive Light told what happened when the Roosevelt contingents started putting negotiation updates on their webpage regularly:

> In September we presented our proposal and put it on our web page. One of the best things we did was using our web page. That has been fantastically successful. [One of our members] puts everything up. Throughout the year we had updates on negotiations after every session. Roosevelt's lawyer remarked more than once, "Oh yeah, I was reading your web page." I think no one read it more than them. They were amazed -- why would you put this information out there? Our feeling was, they are there for everyone. And it's good for other adjuncts across the country if they see what we are doing.

Administrations were less than enthusiastic about this perspective and in some cases, higher levels of the union shared that lack of enthusiasm.

Finally, contingent faculty negotiators, negotiating their first contract, reported that the entire experience was a net confidence-builder. For those who have had their professional and intellectual capabilities undermined, questioned, effectively denied and disregarded for much of their professional lives, it is a seriously scary experience to now sit across the table from the administration, and in many cases from one's own boss, as equals, to bargain a contract. Olive Light told the story of the moment at which she realized she was competent to lead the Roosevelt bargaining team to win:

> I remember at our first session [in August] at Harold Washington Library. We were all dressed up. I felt like this is a serious thing and we are going to look serious. I remember I wore my nice maternity dress and my hands were sweating and I was so scared. I had never done anything like this before. Myself and their lawyer were sort of the leaders of the discussion and it went smoothly. I felt good at the end. [Then I] fast forwarded to a March all-day session at Schaumburg and here I am with a baby and their financial guy is yakking on and on. It's beginning to blizzard and heading toward 5 PM. I felt like telling him to stop going on and on about how we would like to help you. I realized my own thoughts were a whole new feeling. So I said, "Let's wrap it up." I am asking him to stop talking. I realized I can handle this whole thing and that was very cool. We got a lot of things.

Successfully negotiating that experience and ending with a result that constituted real improvements in conditions and pay, gave new leaders confidence to go on and do the other sorts of work necessary to build a real union and to inspire others.

Opposite ends of the telescope: contrasting viewpoints of union staff, full- time faculty and contingent self-organizers

One of the clearest patterns to emerge in this entire series of interviews, although the group of interviewees was not selected with this in mind in particular, was the consistent difference in perspective of those volunteer activist organizers who were themselves at that moment contingent faculty in contrast to the perspective of both full-time tenure track faculty who were organizing contingent faculty and to the perspective of full-time staff organizers. The key dividing line was between those who were in fact working in this sector on the job at that moment and those who were not. The differences reflected a general perspective that then expressed itself in a number of specific ways. The general perspective might be characterized as a serious tendency on the part of those not in the situation to share, to a certain extent with the administrations, an underestimation of the potentials of contingent faculty to act, organize, and speak on their own behalf. In its most extreme form, of course, it was reflected in full-time union leadership refusing to organize contingent faculty at all, expressing that disinterest in terms of people "not being serious" either about organizing or as faculty, or even actively opposing the effort. Sam Elder remembers being faced with this response by the AFT:

> ....They basically blew us off. They said you are mostly people who are just in it for spending money and ring money and you're just part timers you're not serious about this and we're not going to bother. [Then} a couple of years later when we had a real committee, some people went back to the AFT and they blew us off again.

But even among those who were committed to organizing contingent faculty, whether as FTTT colleagues or as staff organizers, a clear difference emerged. In general, the organizers who were not contingents themselves tended to view the difficulties of organizing contingent faculty as flowing either from personal motivational problems of the faculty, or from structural difficulties of their casualized state, such as busy-ness, multiple employers, etc. Contingents themselves, on the other hand, always talked about fear as the most important factor. Stan Davis, who was the full-time faculty elected union leader at Elgin, one of the main organizers of part-timers there, offered an illustrative structural account of the difficulties of organizing adjuncts:

> It's an incredible amount of work, an incredibly difficult process, more difficult than anybody would imagine. It doesn't stop with the recognition. That is just the beginning. We had this fantasy like you want to get married and live happily ever after. If you have been married you know that that is just the very beginning. The biggest part-time problem is communication, finding a communications mode. One of our problems was their access to communications. We tried to get them email, office space, mailboxes. We have adjuncts who never check their email, never check their voice mail. In one case, the person is just a technophobe...

Kathy Moon, the full-timer faculty activist at Governor's State, similarly offered a structural explanation for the difficult of organizing contingents:

> They are struggling. They may be at three different schools, so which one do you become active in? [They have] no loyalty to the community of interest because they are not part of the community.

It led full-time faculty and outside organizers to assess fear as less important as an obstacle to building collective activity among contingent faculty. Tom Suhrbur, the full-time IEA organizer who worked in the Columbia, American Academy of Art and Roosevelt campaigns, discounted the fear factor in favor of a structural explanation for the difficulty of organizing contingents:

> At Columbia one of our guys said, "I'm not scared. What are they going to do, fire me? I can make more money flipping burgers." Fear not a major factor. In general fear plays a role, but not a major role in education [because adjuncts] have such a loose connection with the college, running around. So getting people to commit the time is the biggest problem, more than fear. Semester to semester, jobs might change -- so how much do they want to commit? It's very difficult, [because they are] pressed for time.

Contingent faculty themselves, however, almost never focused primarily on either the structural barriers or the divergent attitudes of the people they were trying to organize as the main obstacle. Almost without exception, and sometimes silently assumed as obvious until prodded to say it explicitly, these contingent faculty organizers saw fear, and linked to that fatalism, as the main obstacle to be overcome, individually and collectively. Deb Brown, contingent at Oakton, said: "Tremendous amount of fear. I can't emphasize enough the fear. Even now, because our positions are so tenuous, because we have no just cause [discharge language in our contract]." Steve Jacobs, contingent at Columbia, said: "Fear, of course, is the biggest thing. I think it is in any workplace organizing, fear of losing the job." Sally Edwards, from Chicago State, said: "Folks fear retaliation, especially with the tremendous history here. But I always said, look at me, 20 years and I'm still here. I use myself as an example." Karl Black,

contingent at the American Academy of Art, said: “The fear factor was a major thing that I did not factor in enough.”

Fear is closely related to isolation, as Deb Brown pointed out:

> There was no literature that we knew about the part-time situation. We felt we were alone. People did not know what was happening anywhere else. We had gotten contracts from Washington and Oregon, [but] that was it and that was pretty far away. We had no one in the immediate area to identify with. People in general knew they were in a bad situation, but we not aware this was a national situation.

Tim Cook related isolation to the fatalism that some contingents express: “Isolation is at top of the list: the sense that nothing can happen; hopelessness.”

This difference between contingents themselves and other, outside, organizers, represents a quite significant different in perception and assessment, and has strategic and tactical implications for organizing this sector, which I will examine in the proposal following. This difference might suggest that people outside the sector are too quick to focus on those aspects of contingency that are different than regular employment, and also too quick to disregard those factors -- i.e. fear -- that have been demonstrated to be key to impeding union organization in most of the regular workforce. Call it the “tenured blind spot.” Consistent with this point is the fact that many of these same outside organizers expressed surprise at various moments that contingent faculty rose to the occasion in ways that they would have conceived as impossible, whether it was respecting a picket line, building an organization that they felt they owned, or

otherwise rising to the occasion. Stan Davis, the full-time faculty who was an organizer at Elgin, expressed this surprise:

> I was surprised about half of the adjunct union faculty picketed with us. I really had no idea. I was quite surprised. I [also] find it amazing that we are able to get 90% of the eligible people to actually become members. [as opposed to agency fee payers only]

This degree of disregard and underestimation is also reflected by the fact that the outsiders in many cases do not know, or find it essential to know, essential facts about the group of contingent faculty as a whole, not just that smaller group that is or was being organized. Repeatedly, outsiders who were union leaders could not say with any degree of specificity, how many total contingent faculty there were on that campus, or what percentage of those were organized, even in the baldest round numbers. Some, in my experience and not just these interviewees, will admit to never having asked themselves the question.

Another difference in perception was that the contingent faculty universally advocated a variety of communication modes and were unconstrained by the received wisdom. Some campaigns used extensive literature with long articles and newsletters. Others were almost completely literature-free. The point was that the contingent organizers seemed to be much more flexible in their approach than the outsiders who seemed to have more of a pattern of “proper organizing work” that they wished the campaign to fit in to.

A lesson repeated by the contingent organizers was the importance of keeping fighting, not let up, continue doing organizational activity, and not be distracted by the

bureaucratic forms that arise both in relationships with administrations or higher levels of the union. To the extent that these necessary new forms need to be "serviced" by the organization, they need to be controlled so that the central focus remains on mobilizing the base and doing the sort of thing that led to successful organizing in the first place.

These interviews, and the resulting organizations that came out of these campaigns, seem to strongly suggest that, in this regard, contingent faculty need to be seen as primarily the same as other workers rather than primarily different. I would further suggest that there is an aspect of condescension in the attitudes expressed even by the most sympathetic outsiders. Deb Brown, who is the only higher education person as well as the only part-timer on some IEA bodies, made a point of this aspect in her comment on FTTT involvement in Campus Equity Week:

> The situation at Oakton is still problematic [with full-timers]. Even where both [FTTT and contingents] are organized, if the rep on the state committee is a full-timer, the part-timers are still "the others". It is a very pervasive feeling. I saw this last summer in Los Angeles (at the national NEA convention]. Full-timers were saying about Campus Equity Week that they didn't think they could do anything. The full-timers in their locals would not go along with it.

<u>Building a real union</u>

In discussing building their organization after their election victory, certain issues were repeated by a number of contingent organizers. One was the need to fight for democracy and power over one's own decision-making in the union, in the broader affiliate organization, and, as noted in a previous section, in relations with union staff. The fight to make the new organization "theirs" does not come automatically. Sam

Elder looked back on the difficult period immediately following their first contract fight:

> Now that I have been in this for a dozen years I have seen different AFSCME staff reps play the same ... political role, to squelch the democratic, mobilizing, participatory, unionism that the majority of the organizing committee organized for. This started immediately as soon as the council stepped in and started to run things. And the contract is between the council and the employer, on behalf of itself and the local. We have the right to vote on it, but they are the lead signatory. After the election and the contract, we were deeply, even viciously divided....Many, many, many of the original people gave up [being active] in disgust. But we won some autonomy. We were not totally smothered by this stuff.

Connected to this was mentioned the importance of maintaining a militant posture toward the employer after the election and after the first contract was signed, and not fall back into the routines of bureaucratic administration of either the contract or of relationships within the union. Steve Jacobs from Columbia College looked back on that period of time with these comments:

> The period after the contract was signed has been a hard period for us. I think we have fallen into a lot of lassitude. You get so drowned in damned administrative stuff in administering the contract. The school seemed like they threw in every roadblock they could. Things they were supposed to do they weren't doing. We had to come up with the list and keeping track of all this number of part-timers and who is in the unit and when, people coming and going, what the dues should be and whether they had paid. We decided not to negotiate something to

> have ourselves paid although our rep thought we should, to have course release time. We should have and we are going to do it this time in negotiations. I don't know why we didn't want to then, but we really need to.
>
> We were really in a big swamp with all kinds of stuff. I know I had a problem as newsletter editor with the newsletter becoming dull. You know, get your dues in blah blah blah. I actually quit for a year. It's hard to adjust to that no-struggle situation. In retrospect I believe we should have kept the struggle heat on and been much more feisty with the administration because they fucked us over in a lot of little ways. We kind of didn't fight and didn't mobilize our ranks. They tried to suck us into an old boys network and also stab us in the back at the same time, and they did it. That's a lesson.

Tim Cook also from Columbia, expressed similar reservations:

> One of the things I worry about is that we spend half of our time collecting dues and sending out notices for elections in Springfield and things like that, forgetting about these things [that we originally organized about]. Or we'll talk about percentage increases and forget about these things. The union is more than just a money grubbing organization. There is a lot of bureaucracy. I know because I have to do these elections for councils etc.. They seem remote to me.

A number of organizers also mentioned that it was hard to come into an organization dominated by people who were not contingent faculty and, by omission, it was difficult to gain and maintain activity among contingents in full-time-led local unions that had not undergone any real transformation. Kathy Moon, the FTT activist at Governor's State, described trying to bring contingents into their existing structure:

> Since they were joining an existing group, no new implementation of rep so I'm trying to get them active in what already exists. I have tried to encourage them to join Executive Board. Currently there is one from ASP...and then we have a full-time lecturer on the Executive Board but she is not active; she is ill.

Stan Davis, the full-time elected union leader at Elgin, noted the difficulty of this period and characterized it from the perspective of someone who was not a contingent himself:

> Probably the hardest thing [was] what I call the post-organizing period. Once the bargaining unit is formed, what is the reality of life, day to day? We have found it's been -- people need to understand -- it's very hard trying to get adjuncts, because of their varying levels of commitment, varying levels of availability and orientation to life, it is difficult to get them involved. We have had for almost a year now one of the five Executive Board adjunct seats vacant. We could not find anybody to do it even if we appoint them.

One organizer mentioned how important it was to demonstrate the willingness to fight, in order to gain and maintain the respect of administration. Deb Brown related the story of having voted down a contract twice.

> In one of our contracts we got very little and the membership voted it down twice. The administration said, "You have to take this back and tell your membership to vote for it. " When we voted it down the second time even after the college threatened us, it showed them... and changed bargaining for the future. I like to think that the administration had come to see us more positively. They had a dinner for the part-timers for the first time.

Sam Elder echoed the need to continued to earn respect throughout the institution through ongoing or increasing militancy:

> Now we have a new leadership and we are organizing the membership to prepare for a strike and damn the council if they get in our way. ...Our activists, especially some very strong women, have won a lot of respect among the credit teachers, [although] not their union leadership, who have refused to collaborate with us. We also have respect from the new leadership of the clerical workers. In that sense we have more allies and strength than we used to have.

Maintaining respect was also a theme mentioned in terms of building leadership, namely, that if leaders keep at it, honestly relate to the members, even if they make mistakes, they will build respect among the members, full-time faculty and even ultimately the administration to a certain degree.

The need for paid negotiated release time and for fair share, also known as “agency fee” or “union shop”, was mentioned more than once as a basis for maintaining a strong union among this relatively unstable group. Tom Suhrbur listed this among the lessons he believed should be learned from these campaigns:

> Lessons: the biggest long-term concern is the viability of organization because of the nature of part-time work. There is high turnover so constantly training and building leadership is crucial. to success. You can get a contract but can you sustain the organization over the years? So fair share is crucial. It is in the college’s interest to do it too .

And finally, the issue that often dominates organizing continues, after a contract is signed and a union is being built: namely, fear. Olive Light expressed guarded concern over the level of participation at Roosevelt: “There is some fear,” she said. But building a real union can help overcome that fear of becoming active. At the same time the fear of retribution for being active is a very real barrier to building a real activist union.

Future strategies, visions and goals

Inevitably, in the course of these interviews, the question of how to deal with the conditions of contingents on a scale that would adequately address the realities of the situation arose. Therefore, each of the interviewees was particularly asked about their perspective on larger strategy, especially the metro labor force-based strategy that would both support bargaining unit organizing at particular institutions and try to go beyond it to speak to the needs of the entire effective labor force. All of the contingent organizers had been previously exposed to some aspects of this idea and some had read a paper on it. It should probably be added that nearly all of the interviewees had had some relationship to Campus Equity Week activities and subsequently to Chicago COCAL and had some exposure to the idea of the metro strategy.

Kathy Moon, the tenured faculty union leader from Governor’s State, formulated the dispersion of contingents across many institutions throughout the metro area as the problem:

> They are struggling. They may be at three different schools, so which one do you become active in? They have] no loyalty to the community of interest because they are not part of the community.

But contingents themselves saw this very dispersion as foreshadowing a solution: all saw potential in a metro-wide organization.

Nearly all the organizers spoke positively of the strategic vision of the metropolitan strategy to some extent. Some saw it as mainly useful in gaining health insurance, publicity and a sense of a movement that could encourage further organizing. Steve Jacobs, for example, said:

> The most important thing now is to get enough schools organizing in order to form a Chicago organization. That is where you can tap the issue of health insurance. We tried to get that Adjunct Advocate [a national magazine with a linked membership group that offered a health plan] thing and that did not work. That has been our biggest bargaining failure, we have to find some way to get something set up that will work. Then say we want the administration to pay for part of it. If we could have a joint IEA-IFT thing and set up a group that would include all the Chicago area part-timers, then we could do something. I really think that's crucial right now.

Tim Cook expressed reservations:

> I feel mixed toward a metro strategy. It has some uses but I can't see using it to getting to a contract. It's a strategy that is useful for doing health insurance...A hiring hall, potentially, and retirement makes sense and publicity and education on a metro level make sense. There are a lot of connections to be made. We all know lots of other institutions and we probably cover them all and maybe there are ways to sort it , but I can't see organizing on a metro level on the same level

> [as health insurance, hiring, retirement...etc.] But when I think about the sense of isolation and the sense of not being able to do anything, we really need that sort of thing and models.

Some saw a metro strategy as a more visionary way to build a membership organization that could go beyond the limitations of bargaining unit unionism. Tom Suhrbur, the IEA organizer, made the following points:

> Tremendous momentum can be built up because people work in other places. Every victory can lead to more. You have to have a long-term strategy to commit to do that and create an area wide organization than can sustain the part-time effort. You have to look at some sort of hiring hall that can set up a website, [keep track of or establish] credentials, rate colleges, maybe even [offer] a Taft-Hartley health care program. Build critical mass to force colleges to work together. The building trades have done it. In the building trades they forced employers into organizing themselves. Before, the contractors said, "I would love to give you more but if I do my competitor will under bid me and I go out of business." ... The carpenters then organized all the carpenters and said, "You'll have no one if you don't organize and bargain with us." This is the same kind of strategy. Organize as many as possible to get health care and pensions, public and private employers both. If you could get the Chicago City Colleges, Harper, College of DuPage, other community colleges plus a couple of universities like De Paul, Loyola, University of Illinois, you could really start to have an impact, much bigger than we have now. The key is continue to organize and have commitment to it. The key is always momentum, either moving ahead or moving back. Momentum is crucial.

Tim Cook in particular spoke about the need for unions to fight to make the distinction between contingent faculty and regular faculty "look silly":

> Part-time faculty can be brought into the middle class in the economic sense and that's important. [Unions] should ... ultimately break down the barriers between part-timers and full-timers. I think that is a proper goal...The goal is to build unions, and a level beyond unions. They exercise power on behalf of lots of things beyond their narrowest interests. They aren't a force for revolution, but to make society reorganized in a more democratic way we need a lot more of them. They are part of that. I am very impressed by the former Columbia president's comment that if all part-timers were paid $3,000 per course the board of trustees might have another look at the issue of use of part-time faculty... What unions can do is put some muscle in to moving in that direction. We can move to a point where the distinction between part-time and full-time starts to look really silly. After that, I don't know. Maybe then we have to step outside the union... There might be some way to bring part-time and full-time together without the union becoming obsolete. I am still enamored of the participatory and syndicalist idea and democratic possibilities. The academic guild that includes only some people at the top is essentially exclusionary, a sort of parliament [as it was in] 1450 or something, not a real democracy. To create a real democracy seems to me a reasonable goal.

Infused with the vision of strategy, however clear or unclear, was the conviction expressed in a number of different ways by a number of organizers that "We can do it." The lesson of the experience was, "You are better off if you stand up for yourselves, even though you may lose sometimes." This rock-bottom antidote to the fear and

fatalism that most saw as the key obstacles is perhaps the most important strategic building block for any future movement. Hal Jones said:

> I have found out throughout my working life that the more you stand up for yourself, the more they leave you alone... They go after weak people, people on the fence. You have to be strong about it and you have to be sure you are doing your job...but when you stand up to them, they back off more than not.

Sam Elder said:

> I have been part of crowds of 25,000 or 100,000 people who asserted ourselves and forced changes that nobody would have predicted two or three year before that. I was part of an antiwar group at Roosevelt University of seven people in 1964 , and by 1966 we had spearheaded a movement that forced the university not to collaborate with the government in releasing class ranks for students to be drafted. I have every confidence that around work issues, class issues, anti-racist issues, that there is no limit to what we can do.

Specifically, two other strategic points were mentioned. One was the importance of recognizing the tremendous potential in black and women workers, both in this sector and for the union movement in the future in general. Hal Jones cautioned against overlooking this potential:

> Black workers and women workers are the most...solid political support for a union. Their whole lives [involve] dealing with racist power and institutions. They look to unions as something to defend them. Some unions have understood this. There is still a huge pool of low paid minority and women workers in the

> country who have not been organized. That is where so much of the future of the labor movement is.

Another strategic lesson repeated throughout the interviews was the importance of keeping a focus on the classroom and the welfare of students and the educational process. This was seen as important both for functionalist reasons, because our colleagues whom we wished to organize see this as important (and we need to meet them where they are), but also because it's right, and only from those of us who teach the majority of classes can come a real effective concern and protection for quality in education. Even after having been fired and now unemployed at 50 years of age, this is what Karl Black chose to end with: not personal complaints, but with comments and concerns on the quality of education:

> [This is the main] problem I see in the whole education system. This whole system encourages incompetence. The public does not know this. We need [to have a hands-on look at what people are really doing in the classroom.

That is what really matters to him.

Lessons from interviews

From these interviews some summary lessons for future organizing work can be drawn:

1. Attract and build upon activists with organizing experience and a broader, often radical, social and political perspective.

2. Raise issues that connect concern for education with personal economic needs and job security, all under the general heading of “respect.”

3. Fighting for oneself can be good, not necessarily “selfish” if done collectively.

4. Remember the importance of setting an example of modeling good bold organizer behavior.

5. Project a welcome to new recruits unlike the history of many full-time led unions, and a sufficient autonomy combined with real assistance and support.

6. Value every tactic that involves rank and file activity. Then prioritize resources but remember that activity itself increases the resources available.

7. Exercise honesty, consistency, perseverance, and attentive listening. Value all direct contacts as precious and utilize all gatherings no matter who calls them.

8. For the future development of the union, insider organizers are always best. They must be nurtured and trained to be the real decision makers.

9. The fear factor is massive and must be strategized for and never underestimated, no matter what people themselves say.

10. All kinds of communication can work. The key is flexibility, perseverance, and regularity.

11. Learn the politics and political context of the institution and then use all levers, internal and external, to effect power.

12. Alliances are essential, on the campus especially, including students, full-time tenure track faculty, clericals, service workers, and even some lower-level administrators.

13. Use the employer's predictable underestimation of us to our strategic advantage. Answer all of his/her insulting and condescending arguments.

14. Build collective leadership. There is always a need for a committee, even if only of two, but a small committee can accomplish a lot.

15. Successful organizing requires the transformation of the union people are being organized into.

16. Outside staff should be advisors, not the leaders. Keep a rank and file activist orientation even after the election. Members must own their union.

17. Keep fighting even after a victory. The administration never quits.

18. Don't make the mistake of underestimating ourselves, the way the administration and too many FTTT faculty do. We *can* make a difference, even just a few of us.

19. Be constantly conscious of the added potential of women, Black and other minority workers to be leaders and activists, and understand that this will often necessitate internal transformation of the organization.

20. Remember that if we can bring up the pay, conditions and job security of contingents toward that of FTTT, (close the gap) we both improve our conditions directly and make the overuse of contingents less attractive to administrators.

A Chicago Area Proposal

This proposal flows from both the general strategic considerations discussed in previous sections and the specifically metro Chicago material in the immediately preceding sections covering the history of organizing, the map of the sector, and the experiences of the organizers as revealed and interpreted in the narrative. However, this proposal does not represent the work of the organizers or directly the work of anyone besides myself. Therefore, given its limited albeit informed authorship, it must be seen as a proposal in process that would obviously be revised, refined and further specified if it does, in fact, make it ultimately into the cold, hard light of practice. At that point, by definition, it would be a much more fully collective proposal and part of an ongoing collective process. With that said, it remains important for me as the author to acknowledge both specific and general assistance in the creation of this Chicago Area Proposal: Paul Johnston, Eileen Schell, Richard Moser, and Gary Zabel all have written on strategic issues of contingent faculty organizing and I have drawn from all of them, both personally and from their writings. Even more specifically, Richard Packard, Tom Suhrbur and Tom Johnson have all written specifically about strategies for organizing in the contingent faculty sector in Chicago, and to all three of them I owe a great deal. Packard and Suhrbur have also been direct colleagues in the struggle with me and have influenced my thinking in ways that I probably do not fully understand. Despite varying levels of agreement and difference with each of these authors and activists, they

all played a role in this work in progress, as have my direct colleagues in the movement in California, Iowa, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, and throughout the U.S. and Canada.

What I intend to do in this limited proposal, then, is the following: first, to repeat in summary form the strategic principles drawn from the general national strategy and the connected, but more specific, lessons to be drawn from the interview material. Both of these, of course, are also informed by and interpreted through the lens of my own personal participation in the national movement in general, in a number of sites, and in some of the events described by the interviewees. This is both a strength and a danger and I endeavor in constructing this proposal to use this experience as a strengthening resource rather than a dogmatic or pre-conceived set of limitations.

Following these principles and lessons, I will attempt to describe the core elements that I believe can be usefully applied in the specific situation of Metro Chicago. The umbrella under which this core strategy is being expressed is basically the metropolitan labor force organizing perspective, sometimes called the metro strategy, also referred to as a variety of "community unionism," or "new unionism." It also presumes that what is built is a variety of "social movement unionism" as opposed to purely "business" or "service model" unionism.

After describing the core elements, I will then attempt to sketch out a series of multiple scenarios as to how this core strategy might be implemented, depending upon which sort of organization, funding source, or sponsor might choose to accept this particular proposal. Obviously these multiple scenarios in practice will inform the specific strategic proposal that might be made to a particular organization as part of the continuing activity after the completion of this PDE.

Strategy conclusions

This proposal will be informed and guided by the general strategic points listed at the end of the general strategy discussion in a previous section and also by the conclusions drawn from the interview data based on the Chicago experience specifically. For ease of reference, I repeat both lists here.

Guides for a national strategy

1. A national strategy must be focused primarily but not exclusively on movement-building, not organizational growth. This is properly reflective of the stage we are in now when movement-building should be primary.

2. A national strategy must take into account the importance of both the lack of job security and the lesser economic power of contingent faculty relative to FTTT and the resulting fear and fatalism as a factor in contingent faculty consciousness and behavior.

3. A national strategy must recognize that the "new majority" faculty are now part of the working class and that their concerns include both economic and job security equity as well as the desire to defend and improve education for their largely working class students.

4. A national strategy must understand that contingent faculty are part of a casualized workforce and must be organized as a whole workforce and that can have a particularly important role in opening the door to essential coalitions on and off campus because of the social and ideological nature of their work.

5. The organizational forms that the movement should create must be allowed to be varied, fluid and not necessarily reflective of only the present trade union structures.

6. A national strategy must be democratic in form, content and activity, as participatory as possible, and with a leadership that reflects the base in all aspects.

7. A national strategy must be “inside-outside”, recognizing the need for independent organization, in whatever form, of contingent faculty, as well as the need for solidarity with FTTT, reflected in as high a level of organizational unity as possible.

Lessons from Interviews

Here, the lessons drawn from the experiences of the organizers interviewed in the previous part are repeated:

1. Attract and build upon activists with organizing experience and a broader, often radical, social and political perspective.

2. Raise issues that connect concern for education with personal economic needs and job security, all under the general heading of “respect.”

3. Fighting for oneself can be good, not necessarily “selfish” if done collectively.

4. Remember the importance of setting an example of modeling good bold organizer behavior.

5. Project a welcome to new recruits unlike the history of many full-time led unions, and a sufficient autonomy combined with real assistance and support.

6. Value every tactic that involves rank and file activity. Then prioritize resources but remember that activity itself increases the resources available.

7. Exercise honesty, consistency, perseverance, and attentive listening. Value all direct contacts as precious and utilize all gatherings no matter who calls them.

8. For the future development of the union, insider organizers are always best. They must be nurtured and trained to be the real decision makers.

9. The fear factor is massive and must be strategized for and never underestimated, no matter what people themselves say.

10. All kinds of communication can work. The key is flexibility, perseverance, and regularity.

11. Learn the politics and political context of the institution and then use all levers, internal and external, to effect power.

12. Alliances are essential, on the campus especially, including students, full-time tenure track faculty, clericals, service workers, and even some lower-level administrators.

13. Use the employer's predictable underestimation of us to our strategic advantage. Answer all of his/her insulting and condescending arguments.

14. Build collective leadership. There is always a need for a committee, even if only of two, but a small committee can accomplish a lot.

15. Successful organizing requires the transformation of the union people are being organized into.

16. Outside staff should be advisors, not the leaders. Keep a rank and file activist orientation even after the election. Members must own their union.

17. Keep fighting even after a victory. The administration never quits.

18. Don't make the mistake of underestimating ourselves, the way the administration and too many FTTT faculty do. We *can* make a difference, even just a few of us.

19. Capitalize upon the added potential of women, Black and other minority workers to be leaders and activists.

20. Remember that if we can bring up the pay, conditions and job security of contingents toward that of FTTT, (close the gap) we both improve our conditions directly and make the overuse of contingents less attractive to administrators.

Review of the Chicago Context

In order to apply these key elements of the metro strategy to Chicago, we must briefly revisit the current situation among contingent faculty in Chicago. Briefly, my estimate is that there are minimally between 16,000 and 30,000 contingent faculty working in over

100 institutions in the Chicago area, of which roughly sixty per cent work in the public sector and forty percent in the private sector, with the private sector numbers being especially minimal estimates. Less than twenty per cent, and perhaps less than ten per cent, are currently unionized and those are divided between locals of three unions: AFSCME, NEA and AFT. They are further divided among over half a dozen separate bargaining units, and only in two of them are a clear majority of contingent faculty represented. The history of organization ranges back to the eighties but more importantly, some serious momentum has developed in the last four years since the victory at Columbia College in 1998 after a long dry spell in contingent faculty organizing. There exists a recognizable and substantial network of activists, currently, emerging from Campus Equity Week efforts of 2001 as well as other sources, and both major faculty unions, AFT and NEA, are now expressing increased interest in organizing contingent faculty. Currently there is a campaign going on in the City Colleges of Chicago among the two to three thousand part-time faculty there, and at present this is a contested organizing effort between IFT Local 1600 and the City Colleges Contingent Labor Organizing Committee, affiliated now with IEA. Finally, as of spring 2002, one of the major legal roadblocks to contingent faculty organizing in the public sector has been removed, with the passage of House Bill 1720, eliminating the need for "reasonable assurance" for re-employment, in order to gain coverage under the Illinois Labor Relations Act. However, the 6-unit per semester rule for community college credit part-timers still remains as an obstacle, although not an insurmountable one.

Elements of a Chicago Metro Strategy and the Metro Strategy Organization (MSO)

One way to visualize the application of the metro strategy and the above principles and lessons to the current situation among contingent faculty in Chicago is to view it as a

circle, with the top of the circle labeled “movement-building,” or “the movement” and an arrow pointing clockwise with the bottom of the circle labeled “organization” with an arrow continuing clockwise back up. The idea here is that to be effective, the strategy must take the existing movement, build it, encourage it and out of it create organizational forms that can have more stability and institutional heft long-term than a movement by itself. These organizational forms should be structured and judged largely by how well they will build and rebuild the movement itself, hence the arrow back up clockwise. Therefore this is a relationship that is both symbiotic and dialectical.

Movement-Building

Institution-Building

Diagram 2.

Relationship between Movement-Building and Institution-Building

In a broader strategic sense, the proper movement building-organization building relationship can be seen as a part of a broader set of relationships in organizing that might be drawn as in the diagram below.

Service

Movement-building

Institution-building

Advocacy

Relation to rest of world:
other contingents, working class,
international, etc.

Diagram 3.

Organzing model of a metro strategy organization

In this diagram, the movement-institution relationship is seen as a spectrum, with a second spectrum crossing it that is labeled service - advocacy at each end. It might also be labeled “individual” service - “collective” advocacy, though in real life these lines are not at all clear and there is usually collective service and individual advocacy as part of the functioning of a labor organization as well. The point is to highlight the spectrum of activities on the vertical axis and the future orientation on the horizontal axis. If one draws a circle around these axes, with an arrow pointing both inside and outside, we have the symbiotic relationship of solidarity to be built between the specific organizing context and the outside world, including all the potential allies from the campus to the community, from the local labor movement to the broader international working class.

Connected to the above models is the question of “message”. Since most of the following proposal will be largely functionalist in orientation, this is probably the place

to briefly discuss content of communication. Naturally, the most important thing is that decisions, on which issues are to be raised and how they are to be communicated, be the result of decision making that is as democratic and bottom up as possible. That said, the suggested emphasis should be on issues that can unite people, such as respect, job security, living wages and benefits, equity (with FTTTT) in all things. For instance, creation of FTTT jobs and priority for them for present contingents is a demand that is not of great concern to some contingents, but very important to others. It should be raised, but not as the primary demand coming from contingents themselves. It should be encouraged for FTTT faculty and their organizations to especially raise and fight for this since it is very much in their interest to retain and grow back the ranks of FTTT faculty. Finally, the message should be projected very broadly, to the whole sector, public and private, by the Metro Strategy Organization (MSO). Slogans such as: "Does any adult call you 'teacher'? Join the MSO," might be useful for broad outreach.

Research

One of the first but also continuing tasks to implement a regional strategy would be to build upon the existing research -- including this research in this PDE -- to produce a clearer and more complete picture of the workforce, the employing institutions and the political economic context. Overall the research function should be seen as the kernel of the development of a contingent faculty think-tank that could conduct all of the aspects of research detailed below on a continuing basis, both for internal uses and for external public release of "white papers" and other publicity. This research should be conducted using a combination of professional researchers, probably including people from the local labor education programs, and participant action research done by activists in the movement at the various employing institutions. As noted in a previous section, contingent faculty have a great many research skills already that can be mobilized for

this task if the organizational structure and goals are clear, especially if there is some funding for expenses, and preferably stipends to allow activists to defer acceptance of borderline additional courses and still be able to make their basic customary living expenses. This could have the effect of both getting better research data, "better" defined as more directly useful for organizing, as well as building the movement by the involvement on a substantive level by a great many more people. Another movement - building aspect of this practice would be that it would be a chance for contingent faculty to utilize hard-won skills and painfully gained knowledge, knowledge gained through experiences felt as injuries, in a context in which this same knowledge becomes a positive contribution to a respected collective effort.

This would include, on the labor force, more accurate counts of existing part-time faculty, especially in the private sector where information is most limited. It would include information on existing pay, benefits and other conditions of employment. This should include a contract bank of existing collective agreement provisions covering contingent faculty. Also important would be any institution-specific unique characteristics of the contingent faculty labor force, such as informal levels of organization, concentrations of activists, turnover rates, particular disciplines or fields and programs (credit transfer, vocational, adult education, continuing education, contract ed, corporate ed, etc.) that employ many or few contingents. Further demographic data would also be useful, to better give a picture of how contingent faculty vary and are alike across the area and within institutions.

Another area of necessary research would be corporate or employer research, looking at each employing institution as well as those associations and links between them. This corporate research would include both the informal and formal power structures of these institutions; profile of the student body; student organizations or history of

student activism; legal ownership and control; funding sources; major contractors and vendors; major sources of contracts; institutional history; past and present industrial relations, past and present other unions and personal histories of leading administrators, "owners" and board members. The general question is: "What are the levers of power, and who holds them?" This could be considered reverse strategic planning, or SWAT analysis. Luckily, there has developed in recent years a considerable literature on corporate campaigns and corporate campaign research so that this effort would not have re-invent the wheel methodologically. The unusual aspect of this employer-research effort would be that we would be researching employers in all three major economic sectors: public, both state and local and receiving federal money as well; private non-profit, again though receiving substantial public money in various ways; and third, direct corporate for-profit institutions, both those institutions that are primarily educational institutions as well as those institutions whose main business may not be education but who employ a substantial number of teachers as part of their overall business.

Another focus of research would be to assemble collections of journalistic and other published pieces that have been done on contingent faculty, their work and the implications of the change in employment situation in higher education. Such a collection would have a number of values. First, various assortments of these pieces could be assembled as orientation packets for new activists, sympathetic full-time faculty and other potential allies, journalists, legislators and others. This collection, which also could include some of the book literature and monographic literature on the subject, could be the core of a contingent faculty library or resource room that would be of value to the movement internally as well as a resource that could be advertised externally. Such a resource center would also be linked to any labor education efforts that were developed later on, providing some of the raw material that could be used for

curriculum. This resource might expand into examination of contingent workers generally and come to play a direct role in a broader coalition, perhaps as a local node of the North American Alliance For Fair Employment (NAFFE) network, of which there already multiple Chicago affiliate groups.

Obviously, another major area of research, both initial and continuing, would be to assemble lists of contingent faculty with as much complete personal data as possible, both home and employment data, and to update that list to a high level of accuracy over an extended time. This list would have two major separate characteristics and uses. One would be the coding of activists or potential activists who would be called upon for assistance in various ways when a need or activity arose that matched their availability and interest. In other words, this would be the data base of a network of organizers and activists. Second, the more general list would include all of those actually working in the sector and, as time passed, those who had worked in the sector and might well return. The obvious usefulness of both these lists hardly needs to be explained in the context of organizing.

While this document attempts to represent the most complete work to date on the history of organizing campaigns in the Chicago area, undoubtedly there are important aspects of that history that have been omitted. A continuing effort, through interviews and documents, to develop a more complete and balanced view of the history of organizing campaigns and the people who led them would have a number of important values. One: many of those people are re-activatable if approached in the right context, even if they have not been active recently. Second, the mining of this data can further produce and refine information, knowledge and ultimately perhaps even wisdom (lessons) to help guide subsequent organizing at those and other institutions. Third, the compilation of such a history, in various forms -- perhaps ultimately as a short book or

pamphlet and / or video, could serve a number of useful organizing and educational purposes, especially in conjunction with the other resources gathered in the resource center mentioned above.

Finally, yet another area of research necessary is political / legal. It would be necessary to bring together the best information existing on the legal status not only of bargaining rights and organizing protections for contingent faculty in all of the various subsectors, but also legal and political research on their other individual and collective rights as employees. This should include keeping up on the changing legal climate regarding the rights of contingents to "concerted activity for mutual aid and protection" in the NLRA, even for those not currently represented by board certified unions. This would be both an initial project and an ongoing one, since a number of different legal universes overlap in defining the status of this contingent labor force. This research would need to continue because the legal environment both for organizing in this sector and for the rights of employees within it, individually and collectively, is a matter of active litigation and legislation at various levels at the present moment, and there is little evidence that the momentum of re-examination and potential change will slow any time soon. Further, based upon the demographic data assembled, legal research should investigate possible civil rights claims based upon discrimination against contingents constituting actual discrimination against women or other protected groups.

In all of these research functions, in addition to utilizing principles of coordinated participant action research, the project should also utilize the research function so as to build alliances and relationships that will be needed in other aspects of the work. Included especially within this are other contingent worker groups, national and local; all unions and other organizations of any employees at any institutions employing contingent faculty. These are just the two most obvious examples. The general rule here

is that research should be approached not primarily as a technical function, but as organizing function in itself, subject to the same goals, constraints and allocation of resources as any other aspect of organizing and that it should be viewed *itself* as organizing. If data is gathered at the expense of hurting future sources of solidarity internally or externally, then the research is counterproductive.

A "Contingent Faculty Center": virtual and actual

One of the aspects of recent organizing research and practice that has been most encouraging and successful in the United States has been the rise of the Workers' Center concept as a focal point for organization of workers not merely vis a vis their immediate employer of the moment but also as a way for them to come together and collectively speak to a much wider range of their needs as working people in their communities. In some ways, this is a recapitulation of the role that was once played much more commonly by union halls in the building trades and in other hiring hall unions, as well as working class fraternal associations often based on ethnicity as well as trade and linked to working class political organizations. What is being proposed here is an updated version of a workers' center for contingent faculty that can play a variety of roles in communication and social interaction as well as being a site for organizing, the building of solidarity, education and provision of services.

The virtual center

Given the realities of life of many contingent faculty, combined with the technological possibilities that come with computerized communications, the internet, etc., one of the

most important aspects of this center would be its virtual reality as well as its physical reality. Recent organizing in Chicago, especially the examples of Roosevelt and College of DuPage, and the emerging experience in the City Colleges of Chicago have shown that web pages, Email, a cyber version of a printed newsletter, and listserve communications can fill communications gaps that otherwise might be, if not insurmountable, at least certainly very difficult to overcome. The fact that nearly all contingent faculty today possess Email accounts, many of them personal accounts as well as accounts through their employer(s), gives us the opportunity to conduct virtual participatory democracy organizationally as well as informationally to a level that simply was not logistically possible before. Perhaps this is the completing of the circle from the days decades ago when most workers lived within walking distance of their work, within walking distance of their meeting halls, and people could meet together in person to make the decisions that were necessary to further their organization. In the decades since, especially since the second World War, with the spread of suburbanization, with the long-distance commuting by working people, not to mention professionals, the possibilities for physically coming together in the sort of direct democracy that the old craft and some later industrial unions exemplified at their best, was lost, sometimes for an entire generation or two, to the labor movement and to the working class. That is a loss that I propose is now partially recoverable on the basis of computerized communications and by taking advantage of both the mobility and the need for a continuous regular center of contingent faculty. It could be also used to mobilize support for actions, via the listserve, to take polls, to have discussions, to provide class resources for people like guest speakers or emergency substitutes in class. This virtual center could also be a vehicle for many direct services that I will discuss in the next section.

The physical center

The other aspect of this center would be a physical location, probably near downtown Chicago initially and perhaps with satellites in other places as the movement progresses. Perhaps in one of the vacant union halls on the Near West Side near both University of Illinois at Chicago and Malcolm X College. This would be a combination service, social, organizing and educational center. Possible services that could be physically present at this center would be basic office services (fax, computers for secure Email and web access, voicemail and phones, printers, copy machine, a place where people could receive packages like books that only get delivered during the day and have to be signed for). Many contingent faculty do not have free and easy access to such facilities and in fact, some are on extremely short leashes with regard to the use of these, and that it is a real economic sacrifice for many contingents to maintain full home offices. This aspect of the service at the center would be significant and probably would serve to draw people physically into the facility who might not otherwise come by.

Another aspect of the physical center would be to serve as an office for the organization, a place that files could be kept centrally, databases maintained and updated, phone calls made, and generally provide a physical organizational center, which while not absolutely necessary for a living, breathing organization, is very advantageous. However. this aspect of the center should never become primary. If it becomes mainly the “office “ of the organization and the habitation of staff people, then it has lost its most important character.

It could be a place for the production of a periodic newsletter, both in print and electronic forms, along with other literature. Other aspects of the center would be as a site for meetings of medium or small size, in a comfortable, clean, respectful meeting room, with requisite facilities and hopefully capabilities for light cooking or at least a

refrigerator. The center should also have some provision for childcare since many contingent faculty, especially women, are harried parents.

Yet another aspect for the center would be as a social center, using "social" in the broadest possible term, meaning a physically safe place where contingent faculty can come together and talk without fear. Very little of the literature on contingent faculty seems to fully acknowledge this aspect of their lives and needs, with the exception of the memoir horror story genre written by contingent faculty themselves. This would be a place where refreshments would routinely be kept and an open door to socializing would be maintained along with a facility for more organized and formal social events.

Another use of this center would be as a physical location for the information and resources accumulated by the research function mentioned above. This would then dovetail into another function of the center which would be as a site for labor education. It is one thing to go to on campus professional development workshops based on subject matter areas, the requirements of curriculum or the particular administrative needs of a particular institution. It is another thing altogether to assemble a group for discussion and learning based on their status as workers and a workers' organization, and to do that in an employer's facility, even if it were available. Experience with this very fearful group as well as general experience as a labor educator, teaching in many different physical locations, confirms to me that a physical location like this center as a site for labor education, broadly defined, is essential, both to stimulate broad discussion and to provide an opportunity for much-needed leadership to emerge from the ranks. This could be a place where information about the whole movement locally and nationally was centralized. Included could be not just unionizing information, but also information about activity in and by professional and disciplinary organizations. Likewise, information here could serve to connect contingent faculty to the broader

labor movement through literature and the use of local labor education programs, contributing to broader solidarity and consciousness.

Finally, this site would be a physical location that would be a node of solidarity, for meetings and as a meeting place for planning actions by the organization but also as a physical location that others in the community, in the labor movement, on campuses and the press would come to know as the place where the new majority college teachers, as a whole metropolitan group, could be contacted for information, for assistance, or for any other purpose.

As the movement develops, there are undoubtedly other aspects and functions that a center such as this will perform but without the location, both on line and in a physical place, those new ideas and uses might never emerge.

Services

One of the principles of successful mass organization and especially union organization is the necessity to integrate individual and collective services in an immediate and direct sense with the organizing of people to engage in advocacy and struggle for changes in the system in which they find themselves. This is particularly important if the goal is to have a membership and an activist core that is fully representative of the workforce as a whole. This proposal suggests that the organization developed should strive to engage in a variety of services falling into generally two categories: professional services and personal services.

Professional services

One of the most important professional services would be regarding employment itself. This could initially be a job bank created by soliciting, and pressuring, as many employers as possible to list all their openings, contingent and tenure track, with the organization, to be accessed by members. As strength is gained, and leverage is accumulated, such a bank could evolve into an actual hiring hall with referral agreements with employers under various kinds of contractual arrangements. The general legal bar to pre-hire agreements outside the building trades is not an absolute barrier to the development of this sort of strategy but would require research and planning. However, the main point here is to begin to develop the organizational strength necessary to make such a hiring hall even conceivable. One of the ways to begin to develop that strength is to provide as many employment services as possible as soon as possible. Another employment service that could be provided would be a collection of ratings and reports on the conditions in various schools and departments as a guide for applying for work where conditions were best.

Other aspects of professional services that could be developed might be the sponsorship of professional development classes, especially those that focused on various aspects of pedagogy (or andragogy), teaching on an interdisciplinary basis that would be of interest to a whole range of contingent faculty. Much of the recent work in adult education and related fields remains hidden from the vast majority of college teachers and this organization could provide a vehicle to really enrich people's professional lives, enhance their teaching, and secondarily provide a coming together that could result in more collaborative teaching and pedagogy for many of the members. It could result in the creation of a teaching network from the base up rather than controlled by FTTT faculty and employers. Other professional services could include assistance in preparing portfolios and CV's/resumes, a listing to employers of people available for

work, along with credentials and fields, listing of people available for substituting, a member directory and assistance in attending conferences in one's field.

Personal services

Under the category of personal services, clearly the most pressing is to collect a sufficiently large group to try to gain health and retirement benefits and then other traditional supplements to salary that are enjoyed by regular employees. In the short term, up to date listings and referrals to free, inexpensive or sliding scale health services would be an assist to a great many of our members, but in the long run, the effort to directly provide health insurance, either through a Taft-Hartley trust with multiple employers signing on or through other sorts of provisions, is a major service goal. This would also be a major organizing focus, both as a magnet to draw people in to membership, as unions such as the National Writers Union (UAW), Graphic Artists Guild, and the performers' unions have found. Additionally, by bringing people together around this issue and their own personal needs, this can well be a spark to help in the organizing of political pressure for national health care and a close and continuing relationship with the existing movement for universal health care which already has organizational expression here in Chicago and some history of alliance with contingent faculty struggles.

Another personal service that can be both an organizing magnet as well as a very valuable economic assist is help with filing for unemployment and in assisting members on unemployment appeals when that is necessary. In Illinois, contingent faculty, since they are "without reasonable assurance of reemployment" by definition are eligible for unemployment insurance based on their previous employment. This eligibility exists any time they are between semesters or if they have no work over a period of time, like

a summer or a regular semester. They are also eligible if due to “lack of work” they are only minimally employed during a particular term and are making less than they would be eligible for in unemployment compensation. They then have the opportunity to collect the difference based on a formula. The vast majority of contingent faculty, not surprisingly given their unorganized state, are completely ignorant of their eligibility to collect unemployment. The experience in California, where the majority are unionized, has been that the organized union supported collective and individual struggle for unemployment insurance has both brought many into active participation in unions as well as gaining these members literally millions of dollars in benefits over the last 20 years. The same model could be applied, at least as far as legal referrals, for worker compensation problems. Likewise other employment law rights could be better enforced if the MSO center assisted, such as OSHA, civil rights laws, ADA, FMLA. Unfortunately FLSA mainly does not apply to contingent faculty at this time, but there may be other laws at the state level that do, as further research could reveal.

There are, without a doubt, other personal services such as discounts, buying clubs, group legal and child care services, credit union, and the whole assortment of member services that many unions offer their members that could be provided through the organization, either through affiliation with a larger union or by direct negotiation by the MSO. Locally these could include discounts on computers and software, office supplies and equipment, books and subscriptions, access to fee-based on line data bases and research tools, and other items contingent faculty typically have to purchase. Treated in the right context, these can be union-building services and not merely the development of consumerism or “clientistic” relations. Perhaps, though, the most important “service” that the center and the organization can perform is concrete assistance for efforts to organize on the campuses. That is the subject of the next section.

Assistance for organizing

The previous research in this document demonstrates clearly that some of the main obstacles to self-organization among contingent faculty on the campuses are fear, fatalism, and ignorance, which of course are deeply related to each other. The experience of the 1997 Teamster / UPS strike with its ringing public demand of "A Part-Time America Won't Work" and more importantly, its generation of clear majority public support for this basic equity demand, probably did more to revitalize the contingent faculty movement than anything else in the last decade. It did this in two ways. One, it generated massive positive publicity for the struggle against the inequities of casualized part-time labor. How to continue and build on that positive publicity is the subject of the section following this one. The other way that strike assisted organization in this sector was by breaking down the feelings of fear and fatalism, especially fatalism, by showing a massive national popular victory, and one that involved many of our own working-class students directly, to boot. Even without the documented (Wolf 2002) example that the strike was a direct inspiration for the Columbia College campaign in Chicago, it would still be a key event to learn from. Drawing from this, the assistance for organizing that the MSO can try to provide should be directed toward giving people on the campus the confidence to overcome fatalism, the courage to act in spite of their fear, and solid information and previous examples to dispel their ignorance. In a word, what the MSO should do is give people a sense that they are part of a movement that is growing, developing, and welcoming.

Concretely, what that could mean is the following: Obviously, one thing is a safe, comfortable, accessible and confidential place for people to meet and begin the process of getting to know each other and forming viable campus committees. It is also a place where people could bring the specific problems that emerge, collective and individual,

that need to be acted upon if possible, as the local committee begins to act like a union, even long before bargaining rights can be achieved. This would be easier for those committees to do if they have the backing of the MSO supporting, advising and educating them. Some of these committees may well remain essentially minority unions for a good long time. Others may be able to move toward direct bargaining campaigns relatively quickly, but all need to be nurtured, assisted, and their activists supported and educated in the metropolitan wide social unionism embodied in this strategy. Only in that context can they survive the extended period that may be necessary before legal bargaining status can be achieved. In this we have many precedents but we have to look no further than many of the education union locals themselves who survived and grew gradually in non-bargaining unit status for many years, in many states, led by a minority of activist faculty committed to "acting like a union" in the service of a long term vision. Similar activities, already underway, could be fostered in various professional organizations (MLA, AHA, etc.)

Other aspects of concrete assistance to organizing, besides a physical place to meet and general inspiration and support of being in a movement, would be collective access to the services and resources mentioned above: labor education, legal resources, other information in the resource center gathered about contingent faculty, samples of materials used in other schools, information on the state of contingent faculty elsewhere -- all of these are key assistance to organizing. Discussion of how the services being provided can be used to build organization would be an important part of assistance to organizing. The development of brochures, for instance, that said, "Join the college X contingent labor organizing committee and gain access to a job bank, discount buying plans, assistance in filing for unemployment, a listserve discussion including hundreds of your colleagues, etc..." And hopefully, in the future, health insurance, pension plan,

etc. General worker rights and labor law help could be available, as well as help in contract campaigns and other collective bargaining fights.

Another concrete assistance for organizing and one in which the metropolitan strategy has already demonstrated its effectiveness, in Boston COCAL, is its ability to provide actual activists on site to staff picket lines, pass out leaflets, and do other initial public activities that might be difficult for the committee itself to do or do by itself in the early stages of the campaign. The ability to put a couple of dozen people on a picket line in front of an administration building might well make the difference between a movement taking off on a campus or not, and that was the experience in Boston. This is taking a page from the Jobs With Justice formula of "being there for someone else so they will be there for me later". It also harkens back to the Unemployed Councils' anti-eviction actions in the 1930's, which were particularly common and effective here in Chicago. The capacity to bring people could also be used in support of direct action tactics if they are utilized on a campus.

Another form of assistance for organizing would be freeing initial organizing committees from total dependence on outside staff organizers from major unions, and would give them greater autonomy, freedom of motion and ability, as it were, to have a little more bargaining power when the time came to decide on union affiliation. The history of organizing in Chicago demonstrates that committees would be strengthened with this kind of assistance. Materially, this sort of assistance could take the form of being able to produce leaflets cheaply, on their own; being able to assemble a database independently, being able to create letterhead, logos and buttons, and run phone banks. All of these are things that demand resources and the need for them is a significant factor in making people feel that they have to affiliate right away with a national union. If the MSO can give local committees the sense that they can take their time a little

more, and function on their own legitimately and effectively, without immediately moving toward affiliation, this will strengthen the movement by allowing local leadership a chance to develop, grow, learn and build respect among their own base before giving up the amount of authority that is always compromised by the affiliation agreement in exchange for the resources that such an agreement brings. Enlightened state and national union leadership should see this independent movement and leadership building collective "union learning" really (Martin 1995) as advantageous in the long run since it makes for stronger local unions who are more likely to help with organizing and other later efforts elsewhere.

Regional publicity

As mentioned above, generating a constant stream of publicity about contingent faculty, positive attention to the organizing movement, and a critical pro-"new majority" faculty view toward what is going on in higher education, would be another major function of the organization. As it stands today, if an honest progressive reporter wants to pursue this story, they either have to talk to an accidental friend, acquaintance or relative who is in this situation, or they have to remember which of the regional schools was in an organizing campaign, or the name of the union, and call them up for a comment. Either that, or they are left with calling the central offices of one of the major teachers' unions which may or may not be responsive or well-informed, depending on who they talk to and when. So the first requirement for publicity is that the organization be a steady beacon light in the community that says, "Contingent faculty information HERE, " and includes our take on higher education and all the issues surrounding it.

Clearly, though, that is a minimal publicity function, and much more is both needed and possible. When events occur that impact contingent faculty, whether budget cuts,

tuition increases, administrative restructuring, privatization, contracting out, proposed mergers, etc. the organization should be in a position to issue press releases effectively to a network of known media contacts throughout the community and also throughout the network of organizations that constitute the broader labor and progressive movement in Chicago. Further, the organization should be in a position to put its own spin, as it were, on events that are caused by the actions of contingent faculty, whether organizing campaigns, contract negotiations, job actions, particularly egregious actions by administrators that demand response, and legislative activities. In other words, the organization should be in a position to effectively comment authoritatively -- not in a sectarian fashion in competition with other existing organizations -- but with the particular slant that no one else specifically has, common to contingent faculty, on all issues that arise.

Besides the obvious value of helping to build public support and alliances, this sort of activity has a major role in breaking down the fear and fatalism felt by contingent faculty. To see their own issues reflected back at them in the public sphere, with their own pro-faculty, pro-working-class twist, is still rare enough that it causes instant comment among contingent faculty, and the evidence is frequently immediately posted upon office doors and walls. Just as in political campaigns, when the purpose of lawn signs is not so much to change people's minds as to activate those who are favorable to act on their opinions, likewise one of the key reasons to inform generate public publicity is to encourage, solidify and embolden the ranks.

Final point on publicity: This function, along with internal communications, is frequently an area where unions find their democratic processes at their weakest. The fear of having a self appointed "loose cannon" spokesman say the wrong thing or go off-message is deep in most organizational leader's hearts. I would argue that the MSO

should try and avoid that fear by encouraging, and training, every activist to be a spokesperson -- everyone who can find a platform from their classroom to their churches and other organizations, to their extended family, to their neighborhood and community newspapers. If any group of workers ever existed who had the capacity, if educated on the issues and techniques, to speak for themselves and be self-activated, contingent faculty have got to be the one. We must aspire to that classic moment when a reporter or an administrator come to a picket line or other action and asks, "Who is the leader?" and receives the reply, "All of us are leaders" (Lynd 1996).

Direct demands and advocacy

Along with being a center for publicity and organizing, the function where those two aspects would come together most pointedly would be when the organization is mature enough to begin to make direct demands upon area employers and upon the political system (which in some cases is also the employer, especially in mayoral Chicago). The regional publicity generated could gradually create a change in public climate, already begun, that would make it possible to not just publicize struggles at particular campuses or the "plight" of contingent faculty in general, but also make regional demands, as with SEIU's Justice for Janitors, on groups of employers, such as perhaps the private sector colleges in the Loop in Chicago. The dream of having a mass picket line walking through the Loop, hitting the dozen colleges within five blocks of each other, making common demands and drawing faculty from all dozen colleges, is something that doesn't have to remain a dream but could be subject to fulfillment through the MSO. This could be linked to a basic Bill of Rights for contingent faculty, such as that already developed by Boston COCAL, AFT, and others.

These regional demands of employers could start with basic services, such as a demand that they all send all of their job announcements, full-time, part-time, temporary and permanent, to the organization. The next step would be, of course, to get them to agree to entertain referrals from the organization directly. And of course from then the next step is on to a hiring hall. Other issues as well could be subject to the standard-setting pressure of such organizational activity. These regional demands could of course be connected to regional publicity campaigns and coordinated with existing organizing efforts going on particular campuses at any given time. The capacity to strategically plan such efforts, and then execute them, would be one of the major advantages of the MSO and which no existing organization is capable of locally at this time or in the foreseeable future. Campus Equity Week in Chicago gave a glimmer of what might be possible.

The same vehicle, used in different ways perhaps, could be a form for placing demands upon the political system. Publicly elected boards, other local officials, state government, and through participation in the national movement, even the federal government through local Senators and Representatives could be pressured. Given the difficult legal and political environment for organizing contingent workers in general and contingent faculty in particular, this is an arena that has to be exploited as greatly as possible. Up until now, political activity on behalf of contingent faculty in Illinois and in the Chicago area has been serious weakened by the absence of a single organization or coalition that could speak with one voice, and not just a voice in assent, but a voice that was part of a prioritizing and strategizing process. One example is the difficulty of getting the recent HB 1720 bill (on labor board coverage) passed with only one of the two major teacher unions actively pushing it. Many other examples exist of simply no activity taking place because there was no pressure or no agreement. This pressure, and this agreement for solidarity in action in the political realm, will only come when

there is sufficient pressure from the base among contingent faculty themselves to force existing political and union organizations, with their lobbyists and staff, to drop their sectarian divisions and move together. This is the lesson of over twenty years of activity in the community colleges in California, the largest single system of higher education in the United States, and one of the most (and multiply) unionized. This also has the advantage of being a political strategy that is not tied to a particular party or candidate, but is inherently issue-driven and dependent on mass activity at the base. It could easily be implemented through some of the vehicles used to pass 1720: petitions, mass card campaigns, public meetings on campuses, media opportunities, etc., all with lots of access to rank and file contingent faculty to be visible and heard.

Alliances, coalitions and external solidarity

One of the elements repeated by organizers in their interviews as something they wished they had done more of, or had the resources to do more of, was building ties with other potentially supportive groups on campus and off. The metro strategy organization could play a key role in accomplishing this. One of the limitations of even the best local union that includes contingent faculty at a particular institution is that they get so taken up with the minutiae of daily operations, with their own administration, their own members, and their own affiliate relationships, that the need to develop and nurture relationships with allies goes unmet. Then the crisis comes and the need becomes crucial, but many of the seeds may have died for lack of water in the intervening period. The MSO can play an ongoing coalitional role as a beacon of contingent faculty interests in the broader labor and progressive movement, even when individual organizations and local unions may have to drop back from this sort of activity periodically. This could be an aspect of delegated movement democracy at its best, rather than at its most bureaucratic.

These alliances like all good alliance strategies, need to start close to home, with the other unions and organizations on the campuses themselves. Here again the more advanced experience in Boston provides some examples. Their University Organizing Project has brought together campus labor groups with student labor support and political organizations to support organizing on campuses all over the Boston area among workers of all sorts, not merely contingent faculty. Likewise, the metro strategy embodied in Boston COCAL, has led to participation by contingent faculty in the regional Campaign on Contingent Work (CCW) which is a coalition body of contingent worker organizations and advocacy bodies. (Zabel 2000)

On the campuses, efforts should be made to especially create the best possible relations with FTTT faculty and their unions, if organized. This may often be difficult but experience has shown that persistence, even over a period of years, can pay big results. Alliances with other campus unions are often easier and those with clerical, service workers and technical workers are worth cultivating. Alliances with students are especially important in this period because of the growing need and demand for higher education among students and potential students, given the state of the economy, and at the same time, the increased tuition and budget cuts resulting in less actual accessibility to higher education. This is one context in which Paul Johnston's concept of public service unionism especially in its anti-corporate, anti-commercial characteristics, can be important. It can help to unify contingent faculty and at the same time place potential alliances with students, other workers on the campus and elements off the campus on a more principled basis. Another aspect particular to contingent faculty in this regard is the need to make explicit the inherent feminist, pro-woman and anti-sexist content of contingent faculty demands, given the disproportionate number of women occupying contingent positions as opposed to

tenure track positions. This means pointing out at every opportunity that discrimination that differential treatment of contingent faculty is, among other things, discrimination against women, economically and otherwise. This opens the door to alliances with women's groups on campus and off.

Another special characteristic of contingent faculty, also noted by Johnston, that can be exploited to build alliances, is our placement as a bridge between working class students, especially vocational students, and the jobs that they are going to assume, which in many cases instructors have come from themselves, or still perform. Especially now, with the proletarianization of contingent faculty, this strategic position opens up possibilities for alliances throughout the regional labor force that the students will go into.

Yet another area for alliances that could be exploited and assisted by the MSO is the emerging national network, not only of contingent faculty activists and organizations, but of contingent worker activists and organizations, especially under the umbrella of the North American Alliance for Fair Employment (NAFFE).

In summary, the MSO can play an important role maintaining, developing and initiating necessary alliances for the movement that any local union would have difficulty doing itself.

Alternatives in sponsorship and organizational structure

One of the key problems in any effort to organize an entire geographic area, even within a single employment sector, are the varying organizational interests in and around the labor movement that already exists. The difficulties of making one's way through the

minefield of jurisdictional claims, historic prejudices, and simple parochialism and careerism are well known. In fact, these difficulties were part of the reason for the rise of the CIO in the 1930s. The failure of cooperative organizing projects such as the effort in Los Angeles in the 1960s, or L.A. M.A.P (Los Angeles Manufacturing Action Project) more recently, are merely two examples of the difficulty in assembling and maintaining organizing coalitions of various unions. One goal in making this proposal to any organization or group of organizations is to maintain to the maximum extent possible positive relations with existing groups and still sustain a sufficient degree of relative autonomy for the project so as to maintain the essential character of the proposal. The previous discussion on the question of competitive unionism is relevant, and the hope is that within this proposal the MSO could help make that threat/promise in competitive unionism come out in the best way possible. Any union or group of unions accepting this proposal or a version of it would need to be prepared for some degree of transformation, since the successful organization of this large number of people in Metro Chicago would definitely alter the balance of forces in the unions involved and in the labor movement locally. The history of relationships here in Chicago between relevant organizations has been briefly outlined previously and won't be repeated here. Any sponsorship or combination of sponsorships would impact questions of staffing, budget, organizational structure, dues, affiliations, and other organizational matters for the MSO.

In spite of the foregoing, of the possible sponsorships imaginable, clearly the preferable one would be a coalition or consortium of unions, probably the IFT and IEA and both of their national affiliates, perhaps under the umbrella of their national higher ed joint project agreement that now stands in the place of the failed merger proposal of some year ago. Added to that could be, optimally, the Chicago Federation of Labor and the Illinois Federation of Labor. A consortium of unions could then appoint trustees for the

project, but then allow sufficient autonomy for operational leadership to emerge democratically from the base with the understanding that ultimately, as bargaining units were formed, there would be joint agreement as to who got the affiliation where, or joint affiliation, which is becoming more common in educational unionism anyway. Given enough political will, this idea is the most attractive because it provides the basis for the most substantial allocation of funds for a sufficient period of time to really test the model. This would probably be a minimum of two years, but preferably longer.

A second scenario could very easily be combined with the first or might be forced to stand on its own. This would be would be for the existing Chicago COCAL to constitute itself as the kernel of a new MSO and, through the auspices of NAFFE, and its foundation funding and other contacts with foundations, establish itself financially on that basis. This would not necessarily imply that the MSO was going to become an independent union, but rather, through the exercise of ongoing solidarity, the project would hope to develop positive relations with both individuals and organizations to make effective movement building throughout the sector possible. This would, certainly, result in the growth of existing unions and in new units being created.

Less attractive alternatives, of course, are that this project would be taken on independently by IEA / NEA or by IFT / AFT. (I assume that AAUP is not a possibility since it has a little organizational strength in the area and no CB units.) This would probably mean less funding, more sectarian inter-organizational difficulties, and would virtually ensure contested elections down the road and organizational activities that were not geared toward broader movement-building.

It is possible that the national AFL-CIO might, through its organizing department, be prevailed upon to exercise some influence here given the substantial size of this sector

nationally and its potential for organizing in the relatively near term. Serious AFL-CIO support would make a crucial political difference, not only with the state and local federations of labor, but perhaps in being an "honest broker" vis a vis the teachers' unions.

One structural question, though, that will require changes by whoever sponsors this, will be the acceptance of organizational membership by individuals long before collective bargaining is achieved. Whether that membership is in MSO alone or also in affiliate unions, how much the dues would be, how they would be collected, are all matters subject to negotiation. But as Joel Rogers has recently indicated (Rogers 2002), along with others in the past (Summers 1990, Hyde et al 1993,) what he calls "open source unionism" or "minority unionism" is one way for the labor movement to rebuild itself. If we wait until we can clear the legal barriers to majority-status exclusive representation as the only way to organize this, or many other sectors of contingent and other unorganized workers, then it is very unlikely that it will happen in our lifetimes. In education especially, the heritage of minority unions is explicit and strong and we should build on it and learn from it.

Calendar

The following proposed calendar is meant to be an example of what might be done. Obviously, both the timing of various activities as well as which ones are even implemented at all in this initial period, would depend on the funding, sponsorship and affiliations that might be obtained as well as upon the prioritizing done by the democratic decision making structures that the MSO would develop itself. Therefore, many particular activities might "ramp up" faster or slower than indicated here.

Year 1, First 6 months

Proposal accepted and sponsorship established

Initial budget adopted

Initial staff hired: lead organizer, full-time, others as possible financially, especially webmaster/communications person and lead researcher.

Individual and small group meetings held with activists to brief on proposal, gain feedback and build for first activist meeting.

Search for site for MSO Contingent Faculty Center and short list of possibilities established.

Initial test website, basically a billboard, goes on line.

First activists meeting of MSO, made up of people from various institutions, both unionized and not. Agenda to include possible tour, virtual or real, of short list of Center sites. Proposal presented to them for initial collective discussion, questions, prioritizing and revisions. Initial temporary leadership body established/supplemented depending upon activist meeting as well as requirements of sponsorship.

Initial work on structure of MSO, again depending upon sponsorship etc., including basis for membership, dues, and initial committee structure for prioritized first tasks.

Site secured and Center opened and services start up gradually.

First literature done (brochures) as well as development of web site, launch of listserve, computer billboard, etc.

Research begun, initially by recruiting activists to be participant action researchers.

Research strategy specifically drafted.

Basic publicity begun and formal opening of Center made media event, with modicum of services begun. Focus also upon any actual struggle or organizing campaign going on at any location in the region.

6-8 months

Once the evolving leadership body is clarified, perhaps at two levels (such as trustees and functional leaders), one-two day strategic planning and training session held, facilitated by outside facilitator, perhaps from labor education program.

Re-examine level of staffing post-strategic planning

Further development of committee structure to implement prioritized services (both personal and professional).

Center functioning as node for organizing assistance, including labor education and training.

Area-wide publicity developed linked to MSO program and any specific campaigns in progress.

Continual development of coalition work.

Work, in coalition where possible, on legislative priorities developed (such as ending 6 unit rule for community college adjuncts under IELRB and others as developed by research) as well as broader issues with coalition partners (i.e. universal health care, other contingent worker issues, budget cuts, etc.)

Year 2

Full Functioning of all services or active research and implementation program underway for their development (such as health insurance).

Mass convention to confirm program and structure as it has evolved and to kick off first projected area-wide demand and public campaign. Could be issue such as “Higher ed employers, join the health care plan”, “A living wage of all contingent faculty”, “Fair and open hiring for all positions” or “Repeal the 6 unit rule”.

Budget

Like the calendar above, the budget would vary depending upon funding received and its timing. This, in turn, would depend upon the sponsorship and affiliation

relationships established for the project. These figures therefore could be readjusted, and would be in the process of developing a proposal to be made to a specific organization or group of organizations. This, then, is a generic budget, primarily to give relative costs and list of the needs of such a project. It is also optimum. The program could be usefully begun with a budget as low as 30% of this initially, with plans and commitment to ramp up as time progressed. As noted in the calendar, some of the ongoing expense, especially staff, would be phased in gradually over the first tow years. The key here is long-term commitment, not initial figures. It should also be remembered that these are projected budget figures, not income. It is expected that dues income would cover a sizable portion of this budget after the first year and this percentage would increase as time went on.

Table 6: Itemized Budget

Amount	**Purpose**	**Detail**
10,000-20,000	Start up costs	rental deposits, furniture and equipment (office machines, phones, etc.), utilities installation, other one-time costs
monthly	**Center facility**	
1,000-2,000+ rent	Rent	
200-300+	utilities	phone, internet, heat, lights, etc.
100	cleaning and maintenance of office and machines	
500	office supplies and refreshments	paper, postage, constant refreshments for members...
200+	Parking spaces	for staff and members visiting
200	outside printing	letterhead, brochures,

		posters, business cards
2,200-3,300+ monthly total	**Center Facility**	
26,400-39,600+ annual total	**Center Facility**	
annual	**Staff**	salaries, benefits and expenses
50,000	lead organizer - ft	
20,000	lead researcher - pt	
20,000	webmaster / communications director / editor - pt	
40,000	additional organizer(s) ft or pt	
20,000	clerical / bookkeeper pt	
20,000-40,000	possible additions second year or later: benefits person, librarian / resource specialist pt	
170,000-190,000 annual	**Staff**	
annual	**Outside Services**	as contractors, many might be members partially donating services
5,000	legal services	
5,000	labor education	
5,000	professional / continuing education presenters	
1,000	graphic arts / design services	
16,000 annual	**Outside Services**	
annual	**Organizational operations**	
5,000	meeting expenses	on and off site
10,000	travel	conferences related to struggle, lobbying, etc.
10,000	expenses for volunteers	
5,000	research and resource center expenses	books, materials, etc.
5,000	promotional	T shirts, buttons, etc.
10,000	affiliations and solidarity donations	coalition expenses
45,000 annual	**Organizational Operations**	
257,400+ annual grand	**All Expenses**	

total		

Part IV: Conclusions

Significance

The significance of this study flows from two bases: the first is the importance of this sector at this time for the labor movement and for the society itself. The second has to do with the particular approach of this PDE, as not merely a descriptive or analytical piece but rather as an attempt at a strategy document.

The success or failure of organizing among contingent faculty will be important for both the labor movement and for higher education for a number of reasons. Higher education is among the heaviest users of contingent labor and it is a sector that crosses the lines of public, private non-profit and for-profit modes of operation. As such, it is an important example to the labor movement of what can be done among various contingent workers especially in situations where they work side by side doing virtually identical work with "regular" traditional workers, namely FTTT faculty. A growing movement among them can demonstrate to the rest of the labor movement that these people can be organized and give some idea how it might be done.

Another reason for the inherent importance of this sector is that it is one of the largest groups of professional workers in the labor force and has suffered as rapid a proletarianization as almost any group. It also was not traditionally unionized and is disproportionately female compared to regular workers in the sector. In some geographic and disciplinary areas, it is also disproportionately people of color and/or immigrants. Thus, the organization of this sector can point the way toward the organizing of "non-traditional workers" into the labor movement which is crucial for

the survival, growth, and transformation of unions, and the labor movement generally, in the United States.

Both as a future major part of the union movement and as a strategic political sector in society, those who teach the majority of classes in higher education occupy a pivotal position, especially in a society now where something approaching a majority of the population is exposed to post secondary education. Just as winning the teachers outside of the major cities to Bolshevism at the time of the Russian revolution was crucial to consolidating the victory of the Soviet Union and spreading the ideas of socialism in the countryside, higher education faculty in the U.S., the first nation to have mass higher education, do and will play a crucial political function in determining the future direction of the nation on many levels, not merely the training of the elite leadership. For just as the teachers were key to the Soviets, they were also key to the consolidation of power of the Nazis in Germany in the 1930s. Educators, and now post-secondary and adult educators in the U.S. are a crucial swing group politically; crucial because they are not merely numerous and spread across the country, in every city and many small towns, but also because their job is to influence other people at a moment in those people's adult lives when they are very open to influence and change in their ideas.

For the labor movement in particular, this group could easily come to play a disproportionately influential role. We have organizational skills, bureaucratic skills, public speaking skills, other communication skills, wide personal networks, comfort functioning in groups, and in most cases, when organized, we are attached to broader teacher unions which have come to be, in many metropolitan areas, the single largest unions in the local labor movement, whether in the AFL-CIO (the AFT) or not (the NEA and AAUP). Depending upon how they are organized and led, they could become an

influence in the next generation comparable to the building trades in their numbers, parochialism, narrowness, elitism and even racism, though not likely sexism. Alternatively, they could become, especially if deeply linked to a broader rising campus labor movement, encompassing service workers, clericals, student labor support groups, and all others in and around the campuses, a progressive broadening, militant and self-actualizing influence in the labor movement harkening back to the early days of the rise of industrial unionism.

This PDE represents an attempt to influence which of these futures comes into being through suggesting a strategic perspective for organizing. Perhaps nowhere else in the economy or the labor movement can one find a group that has been so written about and has written so much about itself with so little concrete strategizing in a way that links it to the rest of the labor movement and to the political economy of the sector. Much that has been written, as noted in previous chapters, has been of high quality, instructive, and essential. However much has also been written that appears to be a substitute for action on the part of the authors. This PDE is an attempt to do in public (or at least the semi-public form of a dissertation equivalent) what is usually done only partially and in private within the labor movement itself. It is my hope, by exposing a proposal for strategic organizing to the light of day outside of the strictures of a particular organization or an immediate campaign, to spark a level of discussion that can contribute to the building of an actual grassroots movement. This reflects my conviction that this sector has the capacity for self-knowledge and self-actualization resulting in self-organization that can profit from this semi-public discussion and thereby make the risks of exposing previously proprietary information worth the potential gain.

Evaluation criteria

As an interdisciplinary work of labor studies, hopefully with application potential by labor educators and organizers, some mention needs to be made of what are appropriate evaluation criteria for a document of this sort. It is much easier to say what it is not: it is not a history, it is not ethnography, it is not a sociological snapshot, nor a social-psychological monograph. It is also not a work of cultural studies, nor a full political economy, though it draws, in its application of techniques and in my own thinking, from all of these and others as well. As an applied work of interdisciplinary labor studies, I would suggest two general criteria for evaluation. One is an assessment of the likelihood that this document, or portions thereof, or works drawn from it, will actually be read, integrated and applied in some way by other labor educators, organizers and activists in the field. This criterion of course is speculative but it is real. If I have succeeded in producing a document that appears to be relevant, accurate, and accessible enough to attract the attention and the time of the people actually doing the work, then that is an important measure of success and is a contribution to the discourse of practice.

The second evaluation criterion hinges upon whether the ideas for strategy and the manner in which they are arrived at are actually largely correct or not. This criteria is of course even more speculative than the first, but no less important. In other words, one: was the strategic perspective arrived at through an intellectually defensible process? And two, would the application of this strategy appear to be likely to achieve a measure of success in practice?

If the answer, as best can be determined at this early date to both of these questions, is more yes than no, then this PDE will have been successful in my primary goals, besides partially fulfilling the requirements for a Ph.D.

Suggestions for future work

It is customary, at the end of substantial intellectual documents, to make another nod in the direction of the general existing discourse by suggesting future paths upon which researchers might walk. In many cases these are merely nods to link the final section to the literature review at the beginning. In this case, however, these suggestions are more serious than that. I feel privileged to be writing this document at the first time in thirty years when there is an active and public discourse in union organizing research that is both developing itself intellectually, deepening its ties to the labor movement, and organizing itself into networks, conferences and ongoing communications vehicles. Probably the most important suggestion for future work that I or any other researcher in the area of union organizing can make is that this collective process be pushed forward in every possible way.

Specifically, with regard to the organizing of higher education contingent faculty, research that can draw a more accurate, complete statistical map of the entire sector including all of its relevant sub-sectors is very much needed. This will require funding and human resources well beyond what any individual dissertation can marshal. It also requires a critical perspective toward the existing sources of data that, frankly, has been sorely lacking though not completely absent in the existing literature. In all likelihood this funding will have to come either through the union movement or through sympathetic foundations or political organizations, with the government a more distant possibility and corporations unlikely in the extreme.

Another need for future work is for serious specific studies of metropolitan labor forces within this sector. Again, these need to include all of the sub-sectors that this labor

force flows through. This work has hardly begun and could be a subject for individual dissertations realistically framed.

Another useful contribution in the future would be a serious and critical yet committed study of the development of the national movement to organize contingent faculty from its origins in the 1960s and 1970s to the present. There exists presently no general survey, and those partial surveys that exist, while valuable, are deeply marred by their omissions.

Finally, and perhaps most obviously, there needs to be a strategic assessment of the present and future direction of the contingent faculty movement. In other words, I would hope that somewhere in the future some scholar-activist would find some of the ideas in this document important enough to evaluate them strategically from the future practice of the movement. Any writer of a strategy would, of course, hope for as much.

Bibliography

Abel, Emily. *Terminal Degrees: The Job Crisis in Higher Education.* New York: Praeger, 1984.

Adjunct Mailing List <adj-l@listserv.gc.cuny.edu> thread on contested organizing among adjuncts. August -October, 2001.

Adjunct Mailing List <adj-l@listserv.gc.cuny.edu> thread on part-timers' bill of union rights. Sept. 8-10, 2001.

AFL-CIO. *Communities @ Work: A Guide to Restoring Our Right to Organize.* Washington, D.C.: Author, [1998?].

_____. *Labor Law Handbook for Organizing Unions Under the National Labor Relations Act*. Washington, DC: Author, 1995.

_____, Organizing Institute. *3 Day Training Session Materials.* Washington, DC: Author, 1997.

_____, Organizing Department. *Organizing for Change: Changing to Organize.* Washington, DC: Author, nd, est 1996.

_____, Department for Professional Employees. *The Professional and Technical Workforce: A New Frontier for Unions.* Washington, DC: Author, 2000.

_____, Department for Professional Employees.*Current Styatistics on White Collar Employees.* Washington, DC: Author, 2001.

_____, Department for Professional Employees. *Salaried and professional Women: Relevant Statistics.* Washington, DC: Author, 2001.

American Association of University Professors. "Graduate Students Today: Working for Academic Renewal; A Kit for Organizing on the Issues of Part-Time and Nontenure Track Faculty; Faculty Rights; AAUP Guidelines to Protect Nontenured Faculty Rights." *Pamphlets.* Washington, D.C.: Author, 1999.

_____. "Uncertain Times: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession." *Academe* (April / May 2001).

_____."Quite Good News -- For Now: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession." *Academe* (March / April 2002).

_____. "General Summary of the Boston Area Part-Time Faculty Survey -- Working Conditions and Professional Standards." AAUP homepage.

American Federation of Teachers Higher Education Department. *The Vanishing Professor*. Item 587. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, July 1998.

_____. reports at URL<http: / / www.aft.org / higher ed / reports / >

_____. *Marching toward Equity*. Item 36-0695. Washington D.C.: Author, October 2001.

_____. *Standards of Good Practice in the Employment of Part-Time/ Adjunct Faculty: A Blueprint for Raising Standards and Ensuring Financial and Professional Equity*. Item 36-0698. Washington, DC: Author, July 2002.

American Federation of Teachers Higher Education Program and Policy Council Task Force on Part-Time Employment (Lou Stollar, Martin Hittleman, and Karen

Schermerhorn). *Statement on Part-Time Faculty Employment*. Item 640. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1996.

Arnold, Gordon B. *The Politics of Faculty Unionization: The Experience of Three New England Universities*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 2000.

Aronowitz, Stanley. "Academic Unionism and the Future of Higher Education." In *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis,* edited by Cary Nelson, 181-214. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

_____. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*. Boston: Beacon, 2000.

_____. "The Last Good Job in America." In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 202-224. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Bacon, David. Interview with Bill Fletcher. *Progressive* (March 2000): unedited version from private INTERNET communication.

_____. *Florida Farmworkers Take on Taco Bell: an interview with Lucas Benitez of the Coalition of Immokalee Workers.* < ccds_labor@yahoogroups.com> April 16, 2002.

Baldwin, Roger G., and Jay L. Chronister. *Teaching Without Tenure: Politics and Practices for a New Era*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Banks, Andy. "The Power and Promise of Community Unionism." *Labor Research Review* (18, 1991).

Barker, Kathleen, and Christensen, Kathleen, eds. *Contingent Work: American Employment Relations in Transition*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1998.

Barker, Kathleen. "Toiling for Piece Rates and Accumulating Deficits: Contingent Work in Higher Education." In *Contingent Work: American Employment Relations in Transition,* edited by Kathleen Barker and Kathleen Christensen, 195-220. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1998.

Basinger, Julianne. "For Presidents and Boards, A Handshake I No Longer Enough." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 24, 2002).

Benjamin, Ernest. "Variations in the Characteristics of Part-Time Faculty by General Field of Instruction and Research." *New Directions for Higher Education* (Winter 1998):45-59.

Benko, Debra A. "Climbing a Mountain: An Adjunct Committee Brings Change to Bowling Green State University's English Department." In *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education*. edited by Schell, Eileen E., and Patricia Lambert Stock, 245-258. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Benson, Herman. *Democratic Rights for Union members: A Guide to Internal Democracy*. Brooklyn, NY: Association for Union Democracy, 1979.

Bernard, Elaine. "Shaking Things Up: Unions in a Rapidly Changing World." *Our Times*. (October / November 2001):15-17.

Bezemek, Robert. "Why We Won't Allow the District to Monitor Faculty Communications." *Advocate*, AFT Local 1493 (April 2000): 6-7.

Berry, Joe. "Campus Equity Week's Offspring Takes a Few Steps: Contingent Faculty Organizing in Metro Chicago." *Working USA* (forthcoming).

_____. "In a Leftover Office in Chicago." In Cogs in the Classroom Factory, edited by Herman, Deborah and Julie Schmid. (Westport, CN: Greenwood Publishing Group, in press.

_____. "Campus Equity Week: Contingent Faculty Make News." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor* (2002).

_____. "Organizing the New Majority Faculty: A Report from the Front." *Perspectives on Work* (2001).

_____. "American Council on Education Annual Meeting, March 2000: Visiting the Royal Court of Higher Education or a Faculty Organizer in the Presidents' Court." *Sunrise: Journal of the Organizing Resource Group* (November, 2000).

Bezkorovainy, Gregory. "Fuel for the Fire: Survey Data Confirm What We've Known All Along." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor* (Issue # 7, 2001) URL<www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue7/bezkorovainy.html>

Bina, Cyrus, Laurie Clements, and Chuck Davis. *Beyond Survival: Wage Labor in the Late Twentieth Century.* New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1996.

Bob, Tammie and Lauren Hahn. "'Pin the Tail on the Donkey' Hiring and Scheduling Practices: One Reason part-time Faculty are Devalued by Administrators and Full-Time Colleagues." *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998): 101-108.

Bobo, Kim, Jackie Kendall, and Steve Max. *Organizing for Social Change: a manual for Activists in the 1990's.* Santa Ana, CA: Seven Locks Press, 1996.

Braverman, Harry. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradion of Work in the Twentieth Century.* NY: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Brecher, Jeremy, and Tim Costello. *Building Bridges: The Emerging Grassroots Coalition of Labor and Community.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990.

_____. *Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000.

_____. "'A New Labor Movement' in the Shell of the Old?" *In A New Labor Movement for the New Century*, edited by Gregory Mantsios, 24-43. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Breneman, David W. *Alternatives to Tenure for the Next Generation of Academics.* Washington: Ameican Asociation for Higher Education, 1997.

Brenner, Joanna. "On Gender and Class in U.S. Labor History." In *Rising from the Ashes? Labor in the Age of Global Capitalism* ." edited by Ellen Meiskins Wood, Peter Meiskins, and Michael Yates, 41-56. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Bromell, Nick. "Summa Cum Avaritia: plucking a Profit from the Gorves of Academe." *Harpers* (February 2002). 71-76.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate. "Changing to Organize." *Nation* (September 3, 2001): 16-20.

_____. *Changing to Organize: Anational Assessment of Union Organizing Strategies.* Paper presented at ILE Research Conference on Union Organizing, May 17, 2002, University of California at Los Angeles.

_____. *Union Organizing in the Public Sector: An Analysis of State and Local Elections. ILR Bulletin 70.* Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, Cornell University Press, 1995.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate and Tom Juravich. "It Takes More than House Calls: Organizing to Win with a Comprehensive Union-Building Strategy." In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies,* edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Freeman, Richard Hurd, Rudolph Oswald, and Ronald Seeber. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1998.

Bronfenbrenner, Kate, Sheldon Freeman, Richard Hurd, Rudolph Oswald, and Ronald Seeber, eds. *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1998.

Brunnage, Leslie and Judith Stepan-Norris. *"Outsiders" Inside the Labor Movement: An Examination of Youth Involvement in the 1996 Union Summer Program.* Paper presented at ILE Research Conference on Union Organizing, May 17, 2002, University of California at Los Angeles.

Burawoy, Michael et al. *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

_____. *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000

Burton, Alice. "Dividing Up the Struggle: The Consequences of 'Split' Welfare Work for Union Activism." In *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in in the Modern Metropolis,* eited by Buroway Michael, 85-107. Berkely:University of California Press, 1991.

California Part-Time Faculty Association website. URL<http://www.cpfa.org/cpfahistory.html>

Campaign on Contingent Work. *A Workplace Divided: Understanding Contingent Work for Activists.* Boston: Author, undated, approx. 1999-2000.

Campus Equity Week website. CEWaction.org. codes of conduct.

Carroll, Jill. "Adjunct Track" continuing column. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 2001-June 2002).

Carr, Robert K, and Daniel K. Van Eyek. *Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1973.

Carré, Françoise, and others. *Nonstandard Work: The Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements*. Champaign: IRRA, 2000.

Chaison, Gary. "Union mergers and Union Revival: Are We Asking Too Much or Too Little?"In *Rekindling the Labor Movement: labor's quest for relevance in the 21st Century* edited by Lowell Turner, Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd. Ithaca: ILR Press, 238-255.

Chase, Bob. "Higher Education and the New Unionism." interview in *Thought and Action* (Spring 1997).

Chavez, Cesar. "Money and Organizing." *Social Policy* (Fall 2001 [1966]).

Chomsky, Noam. "Assaulting Solidarity: Privatizing Education." 2001. Available from LLNews@igc.topica.com; INTERNET.

Chomsky, Noam, and others. *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years.* New York: The New Press, 1997.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "What I'd Do with a Billion Dollars." Author (June 28, 2002): B13-B15.

_____. "The Chronicle Index of For-Profit Higher Education." Author (August 9, 2002): A31.

Coalition for Consumer Rights. "The 2001 Annual Survey of Illinois Voters: Survey Results on the Continuing Trend Toward Part-time, Temporary Faculty." Chicago:author, October 2001.

Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (Boston Chapter). *Adjuncts Unite* (#2 2001-2002).

_____.website. URL< http://omega.cc.umb.edu/~cocal/>

Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (Chicago Chapter). URL <http://www.chicagococal.org>

Coalition of Graduate Employee Unions. *Casual Nation*. Author. URL <http://www.cgeu.org>. nd, app. 2000.

Coalition on the Academic Workforce. *Who is Teaching in U.S. College Classrooms? A Collaborative Study of Undergraduate Faculty, Fall 1999.* URL <www.theaha.org/caw/press/release.htm> November 22, 2000.

Cobble, Dorothy Sue. "History, Women's Work and the New Unionism." *Thought and Action.* 15, no. 2 (1999): 19-24.

_____. "Historical Perspectives on Representing Nonstandard Workers". In *Nonstandard Work: The Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements,* edited by Carré, Françoise, and others. Champaign: IRRA, 2000.

_____. "Lost Wasys of Unionism: Historical perspectives on Reinventing the labor Movement." In *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the 21st Century,* edited by Lowell Turner, , Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press, 2001.

Cobble, Dorothy Sue, ed. *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership.* Ithaca, New York: ILR Press, 1993.

Collins, Patricia Hill. "Learning from the Outside Within: The Sociological Significane of Black Feminist Thought." In Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research, etdited by Fonow, Margaret and Judith A. Cook, 38-57. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1991.

Coleman, Margaret. "Undercounted and Underpaid Heroines." *Working USA* (January/February 2000): 37-65.

Columbia College, and Part-time Faculty Association At Columbia College. "Agreement Between Columbia College and Part-time Faculty Association at Columbia College/IEA/NEA." (March 15, 1999).

Cook, Christopher. "Temps Demand a New Deal." *Nation* (March 27, 2000): 13-20.

Cooper, Bruce S., ed. *Labor Relations in Education: An International Perspective.* Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1992.

Costello, Tim. "The Once and Future of Steady Work." *Working USA* (winter 2000-2001): 86-99.

Cowen, Tyler, and Sam Papenfuss. "The Economics of For-Profit Higher Education." unpublished paper, Department of Economics, George Mason University (November 13, 1999).

Croft, Barbara. "Road Scholar." *MS* (February / March 2000): 39-54.

Crump, Joe. "The Pressure is On: Organizing Without the NLRB." *Labor Research Review*. (No. 18, 1991): 33-44.

Currie, Jan and Lesley Vidovich. "The Ascent Toward Corporate Managerialism in American and Australian Universities." In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 112-146. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Dall, Carey and Jonathon Cohen. "Salting the Earth: Organizing for the Long Haul." New Labor Forum (Spring / Summer 2002):36-41.

Devinatz, Victor. "Unions, Faculty, and the Culture of Competition." *Thought and Action* 17, no. 1(2001): 87-98.

Diamond, Virginia. *Guide to Organizing White Collar Workers.* Silver Spring, MD: George Meany Center for Labor Studies, 1994.

_____. *Organizing Guide for Local Unions.* Silver Spring, MD: George Meany Center for Labor Studies. 1992.

Dilks, Stephen. "Building a Foundation for Academic Excellence: Towards a Blueprint for the Professional Treatment of Disempowered Faculty." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*. URL<http: / / www.louisville.edu / journal.workplace / dilks.html>

Downs, Peter. "Unsung Heroes of Union Democracy: Rank and File Organizers." In *The Transformation of U.S. Unions: Voices, Visions, and Strategies from the Grassroots*, edited by Ray M. Tillman, and Michael S. Cummings, 117-136. Boulder, Colorado: Lynn Reinner Publishers, 1999.

Dubeck, Leory W. "Beware Higher Ed's Newest Budget Twist." *Thought and Action* (Spring 1997).

DuBois, W.E.B. *The Souls of Black Folk.* New York: Avon, 1965 [1903].

Dolgon, Corey. "Justice for Janitors: Organizing Against Outsourcing at Southhampton College." In *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, edited by Geoffry D. White, 342-357. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2000.

Dubson, Michael. *Ghosts in the Classroom: Stories of College Adjunct Faculty--And the Price We All Pay*. Boston: Camel's Back Books, 2001.

"Education for Liberation". *Social Policy* (winter 1991): entire issue.

Gwaltney, John Langston. *Drylongso: A Self-Portrait of Black America.* New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, 1981.

Early, Steve. "Membership-based Organizing." *In A New Labor Movement for the New Century*, edited by Gregory Mantsios, 82-103. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Education International. *The WTO and the millenium round: What is at stake for public education?* Brussels: Author, 1999.

Ehrenberg, Ronald G. "Studying Ourselves: The Academic Labor Market." Presidential Address for the Society of Labor Economists, May 3-4, 2002.

Engler, Robert Klein. "The Adjunct Professor's Manifesto." unpublished paper. 2001

_____. *Lies that Bind: Myths and Realities at the City Colleges of Chicago.* Chicago: Alphabeta Press, 2001.

Eisenscher, Michael. *Critical Juncture: Unionism at the Crossroads: The Role of Union Democracy and Labor-Community Collaboration in Labor Revitalization*. Boston: University of Massachusetts, Center for Labor Research, 1996.

_____. "Renewing Labor: A Report from the Field." *Working USA*. (Fall 2001).

_____. "Is the Secret to Labor's Future in Its Past?" *Working USA* (Spring 2002) 8-40.

_____. "Labor: Turning the Corner Will Take More Than Mobilization." In *The Transformation of U.S. Unions: Voices, Visions, and Strategies from the Grassroots*, edited by Ray M. Tillman, and Michael S. Cummings, 61-86. Boulder, Colorado: Lynn Reinner Publishers, 1999.

Ellison, Ralph. *Invisible Man.* New York: Vintage, 1972 [1947].

Evelyn, Jamilah. "Dimished Power: Faculty members lose department chairmanships at some community colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 16, 2002) <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i02/02a02001.htm>

Evelyn, Jamilah. "Nontraditional Students Dominate Undergratuate Enrollments, Study Finds." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 14, 2002).

Fairfield, Roy. *Person-Centered Graduate Education*. Buffalo: Prometheus, 1977.

Feagin, Joe R., Anthony M. Orum, and Gideon Sjoberg. *A Case for the Case Study*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Featherstone, Liza. "The New Student Movement." *Nation* (May 15, 2000): 11-18.

Feinblum. Katherine de Azevedo. "How a Cancelled Class Effects a Part-timer." *Advocate*, AFT Local 1493 (April 2000): 3.

Fiala, Mindy and Kate Kline. "Titles, Terms, and Meaning: The Exploitation of Part-Time Faculty and What One Group is Doing About It." Dilks, Stephen. "Building a Foundation for Academic Excellence: Towards a Blueprint for the Professional Treatment of Disempowered Faculty." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*. URL<http://www.louisville.edu/journal.workplace/fiala.html>

Fine, Janice. "Community Unionism in Baltimore and Stamford: Beyond the Politics of Particularism." *Working USA* (winter 2000-2001): 59-85.

_____. "Moving Innovation from the Margins to the Center." In *A New Labor Movement for the New Century*, edited by Gregory Mantsios, 119-146. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Fletcher, Bill Jr., and Richard Hurd. "Is Organizing Enough? Race Gender and Union Culture." *New Labor Forum* no. 6 (2000) number 6: 59-69.

_____. "Seizing the Time because the Time is Now: Welfare Repeal and Union Reconstruction." In *Audacious Democracy: Labor, Intellectuals, and the Social*

Reconstruction of America, edited by Steve Fraser and Joshua Freeman.. Boston: Mariner Books, 1997.

_____. "Beyond the Organizing Model: The Transformation Process in Local Unions." In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Freeman, Richard Hurd, Rudolph Oswald, and Ronald Seeber. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1998.

_____. "Overcoming Obstacles to Transformation: Challenges on the Way to a New Unionism."In *Rekindling the Labor Movement: labor's quest for relevance in the 21st Century* edited by Lowell Turner, Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd. Ithaca: ILR Press, 182-208.

_____. "Political Will, Local Union Transformation and the Organizing Imperative." In *Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and Internal Transformation*, edited by Bruce Nissen, 191-216. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999.

Fletcher, Bill Jr.. "Whose Democracy? Organized Labor and Member Control." *In A New Labor Movement for the New Century*, edited by Gregory Mantsios, 16-23. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

_____. " Labor Education in the Maelstrom of Class Struggle." In *Rising from the Ashes? Labor in the Age of Global Capitalism* ." edited by Ellen Meiskins Wood, Peter Meiskins, and Michael Yates, 110-126. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Foerster, Amy. "Confronting the Dilemmas of Organizing: Obstacles and Innovations at the AFL-CIO Organizing Institute."In *Rekindling the Labor Movement: labor's quest for relevance in the 21st century* edited by Lowell Turner, Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd. Ithaca: ILR Press, 155-181.

Fogg, Piper. "A College Drops Tenure to Stay Alive: Mitchell professors have few regrets over what they gave up." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 26, 2002).

Fornow, Mary Margaret, and Judith A. Cook, eds. *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Fraser, Steve and Joshua Freeman. *Audacious Democracy: Labor, Intellectuals, and the Social Reconstruction of America.* Boston: Mariner Books, 1997.

Freeman, Richard B., and James L. Medoff. *What Do Unions Do*? New York: Basic Books, 1984.

Freeman, Richard B. and Joel Rogers. "Open Source Unionism: Beyond Exclusive Collective Bargaining." *Working USA* (Spring 2002) 8-40.

Gamson, Zelda F. "The Stratification of the AcademyIn *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 103-111. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Gapasin, Fernando. "Beyond the Wage Fight." *Colorlines* (Summer 1999): 1999.

Gapasin, Fernando, and Michael Yates. "Organizing the Unorganized: Will promises Become Practices?" *Monthly Review*. (July / August 1997): 46-62.

Gapasin, Fernando and Howard Wial. "The Role of Central labor Councils in Union Organizing in the 1990's". In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*,

edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald Seeber, 54-68. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Gappa, Judith M., and David W. Leslie. *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.

_____. *Two Faculties or One? The Conundrum of Part-Timers in a Bifurcated Workforce.* Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1997.

Garcia, Raymond. "Part-Time Instructors and the Political Economy of Higher Education." *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998): 73-80.

Geoghegan, Thomas. *Which Side Are You On? Trying To Be for Labor When It's Flat on Its Back.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1991.

Georgakas, Dan and Marvin Surkin. *Detroit: I Do Mind Dying, A study in urban revolution.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Ghilarducci, Teresa. *Pension Plans for Casual Labor Markets: lessons from the Operating Engineers Central Pension Fund.* Westport. CT: Quorum Books, 1995.

Ginsburg, Mark, and Philip K. Wion. "Organizing University Faculty for Collective Action in the U.S.: Corporatization, a Divided Professoriate, and the Possibility of Community." *Contemporary Education* 69, no. 4 (summer, 1988).

Glenn, David. "Labor of Love: Milwaukee's Homecare Workers Dicsover Each Other." *Nation* (September 3, 2001): 30-31.

Glass, Fred, ed. *A History of the California Federation of Teachers, 1919-1989.* California: California Federation of Teachers, 1989.

Gluck, Sherna Berger and Daphne Patai, eds. *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Goldfield, Michael. "Race and Labor Organization in the United States." In *Rising from the Ashes? Labor in the Age of Global Capitalism* ." edited by Ellen Meiskins Wood, Peter Meiskins, and Michael Yates, 87-99. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Gonos, George. "The Interaction between Market Incentives and Government Actions." Chap. 8 in *Contingent Work: American Employment Relations in Transition,* edited by Kathleen Barker and Kathleen Christensen. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1998.

_____. "'Never a Fee!' The Miracle of the Postmodern Temporary Help and Staffing Agency." *Working USA* (winter 2000-2001): 9-36.

Gordon, Jesse, and Knickerbocker. "The Sweat Behind the Shirt." *Nation* (September 3, 2001): 14-15.

Gottfried, Barbara. "Equal Pay Matters." Testimony Before the U.S. Department of Labor Hearing on Pay Equity for Women. Boston, May 8, 2000.

Gray, Lois. "Entertainment Unions and Higher Education." *Thought and Action* 15 no. 2(1999): 25-30.

Greenhouse, Steven. "Dues Ruling is Favorable to Unions." *New York Times* (March 26, 2002).

Grubb, Norton, and Associates. *Honored but Invisible: An Inside Look at Teaching in Community Colleges.* New York: Routledge, 1999.

Gursky, Daniel. "The Benefits Gap: Unequal Pay for Equal Work is a Growing Problem in Today's Economy." *On Campus* (February 2000).

Hanley, Larry. "Educational Technology and Academic Labor." *Radical Teacher.* (No. 63 Spring 2002): 25-28.

Harding, Sandra G. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking From Women's Lives.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Harney, Stefano and Frederick Moten. "Doing Academic Work." In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 154-180. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Heaney, Thomas W. "If you Can't Beat'Em: The Professionalization of Participatory Research." *In Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada,* edited by Peter Park, 41-46. Westport, CT: Greenwood publishing Group, 1993.

Heckscher, Charles. "HR Strategy and Nonstandard Work: Dualism versus True Mobility". In *Nonstandard Work: The Nature and Challenges of Changing Employment Arrangements,* edited by Carré, Françoise, and others. Champaign: IRRA, 2000.

_____. "Living With Flexibility." In *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the 21st Century,* edited by Lowell Turner, , Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd. Ithaca: ILR Press / Cornell University Press, 2001.

Henry, Laurie. Interview with Laura Palmer Noone. *Adjunct Advocate* (May / June 2000): 32-33.

Henson, Kevin. *Just a Temp.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.

Hendricks, Bill. "Making a Place for Labor: Compositon and Unions." *Workplace: a Journal for Academic Labor* (February 2002). URL<http: / / www.louisville.edu / journal / workplace / wp42.html>

Herzenberg, Stephen, Howard Wial, and John Alic. *New Rules ofr a New Economy: Employment and Opportunity in PostIndustrial America.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Hirsch, W., and W. Luc. *Challenges Facing Higher Education at the Millennium*. Phoenix: The Onyx Press and the American Council on Higher Education, 1999.

Hochschild, Arlie. *Managed Heart.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Hoffman, Helen. "Response: From Dilettantism to Professionalism." *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998): 109-113.

Hollins, Mary. "Beaten in Election, They Form a Union Anyway." *Labor Notes.* (September 1993):7.

Hopkins, Jim. Universities Hire More Executives to Lead. More Taking Slots Once Reserved for Academics." *USA Today*. (April 22, 2002).

HoSang, Daniel. "'All the Issues in Worker's Lives': Labor Confronts Race in Stamford." *Colorlines* (Summer 2000) 20-23.

Huber, Beth. "Homogenizing the Curriculum: Manufacturing the Standardized Student." Dilks, Stephen. "Building a Foundation for Academic Excellence: Towards a Blueprint for the Professional Treatment of Disempowered Faculty." *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*. URL<http: / / www.louisville.edu / journal.workplace / huber.html>

Huber, Sonya. Faculty Workers: Tenure on the Corporate Asembly Line." In *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, edited by Geoffry D. White. 119-139. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2000.

Hunter, Anne L. "Organizing Adjunct Faculty: Obstacles and Alternative Routes by Law." *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998): 87-90.

Hurd, Richard and Jenifer Bloom with Beth Hillman Johnson. Directory of Faculty Contracts and Bargaining Agents in Institutions of Higher Education, Vol. 24. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, CUNY, 1998, hand updated 2002.

Hyde, Alan, Frank Sheed and Mary Deery Uva. "After Smyrna: Rights and Powers of Unions that Represent Less than a majority." *Rutgers Law Review*. (Spring 1993):637-669.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *Enrollments in Illinois Higher Education (Item#II-4).*Springfield, IL: Author, December 11, 2001.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *Directory of Higher Education 2002.* Springfield, IL: Author, July 2, 2002.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *All Faculty Matter! A Study of Nontenure-Track Faculty at Illinois Public Colleges and Universities.* Springfield, IL: Author, April 2002.

Illinois Education Association. *A Look at Our Past: History Highlights of the Illinois Education Association, 1853-1999.* Springfield, Ill.: Author, 1999.

Industrial Workers of the World, Education Workers Industrial Union 620. *Organizing in the Knowledge Factory.* Cambridge: author, [1998?].

Institute for Higher Education Policy. *What's The Difference: A Review of Contemporary Research on the Effectiveness of Distance Learning in Higher Education.* Washington, DC:Author, 1999.

Jacobsohn, Walter. "The Real Scandal in Higher Education." In *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education.* edited by Schell, Eileen E., and Patricia Lambert Stock, 159-184. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Jacoby, Daniel. *Is Washington State an Unlikely Leader? Progress on Addressing Caoningent Work Issues in Academia.* unpublished paper, 2000.

Johnson, Ben, and Tom McCarthy. "Graduate Student Organizing at Yale and the Future of the Labor Movement." *Social Policy* (summer 2000): 11-19.

Johnson, Tom. "Our Time Has Come: A Proposal to Organize Non-Tenured Faculty." *Against the Current.* (January / February 1992): 23-27.

Johnson, Kimberly Quinn, and Joseph Entin. "Graduate Employee Organizing and the Corporate University." *New Labor Forum* no. 6(2000): 99-107.

Johnston, Paul. "Public Service Unionism and the Coming Fiscal Crisis." unpublished paper. URL<www.newcitizen.org>

_____. *Success while Others Fail: Social Movement Unionism and the Public Workplace.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1994.

_____. *The New Academic Underclass Confronts the Lean, Mean University in the Information Age.* unpublished paper. August 1999.

_____. "Organize for What? The Resurgence of Labor as a Citizenship Movement."In *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the 21st Century*, edited by Lowell Turner, , Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press, 2001.

Johnston, Robert. "Where Have All the Tenured Radicals Gone?" *Social Policy* (summer 2000): 19-22.

Joravsky, Ben. "New Deal or No Deal." *Chicago Reader (November 19, 1999).*

Juravich, Tom and Kate Bronfenbrenner. "Preparing for the Worst: Organizing and Staying Organized in the Public Sector." In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald Seeber, 261-282. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Kaplan, Dan. "Education is Not a Commodity: Fighting the Privatization of Higher Education Worldwide." Report presented on Berlin Conference Against Deregulation in San Francisco, March 25, 2002.

Kartus, Lisa. "*Organizing Temporary Faculty: Taking a Seat at the Table*." Academe (November-December 2000)

Kavanagh, Patrick. "A Vision of Democratic Governance in Higher Education: The Stakes of Work in Academia." *Social Policy* (summer 2000): 24-30.

Kaye, Larry. "How to Become a Successful Activist." Boston: Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor,nd. URL< http://omega.cc.umb.edu/~cocal/activ.htm>

"Keene State Trims Load of Activist Adjunct." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (February 19, 1999): A14.

Keiser, Arthur. "Benchmarking in Private Career Schools: A Preliminary Empirical Investigation in the Establishment of Quantitative Strategic Indicators in This Specialized Post-Secondary Education Sector." Unpublished Ph.D. diss., The Union Institute, 1998.

Kelber, Harry. *A Training Manual for Union Organizers.* New York: The Labor Educator, 1997.

Kerchner, Charles. "Knowledge Workers: Trade Unionism's New Frontier." *Thought and Action* 15 no. 2 (1999): 11-17.

Kerchner, Charles Taylor, Julia E. Koppich, and Joseph Weeres. *Taking Charge of Quality: How Teachers and Unions Can Revitalize Schools, An Introduction and Companion to United Mind Workers.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers, 1998.

Kerlinger, Jane and Scott Sibary. Protecting Common Interests of Full- and Part-Time Faculty." *Thought and Action* (Fall 1998).

Kiser, Kim. "When Those Who 'Do" Teach." *Training* (April 1999): 42-48.

Kniffin, Kevin. Give Me an $: Moonlighting in the Company Boardroom." In *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, edited by Geoffry D. White, 157-172. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2000.

Kriesky, Jill, ed. *Working Together to Revitalize Labor in Our Communities: Case Studies of Labor Education-Central Labor Body Collaboration*. Orono, Maine: University and College Labor Education Association, 1998.

Kusnet, David. *Finding Their Voices: Professionals and Workplace Representation*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute, 2000.

Labor Research Review. entire issue."Lets Get Moving: Organizing for the 90s." (no. 18, 1991).

LaBotz, Dan. *A Troublemaker's Handbook: How to Fight Back Where you Work -- and Win!* Detroit: Labor Notes, 1991.

Larson, Simeon, and Bruce Nissen, eds. *Theories of the Labor Movement*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

Leatherman, Courtney. Part-timers Continue to Replace Full-timers on College Faculties: Education Department Report Says Adjuncts Now Make Up Over Half of the Professoriate." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 28, 2000): page.

_____. "Tenured Professors Show Willingness to Walk Out Over Use of Lecturers." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Spetember 22, 2000): A16.

LeBeau, Josephine and Kevin Lynch. "Successful Organizing at the Local Level: The Experience of AFSCME District Council 1707." *In A New Labor Movement for the New Century*, edited by Gregory Mantsios, 104-118. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Lerner, Stephen. "Taking the Offensive, Turing the Tide." *In A New Labor Movement for the New Century*, edited by Gregory Mantsios, 69-81. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Lesko, P.D. "Colleges Fudge F/T Faculty Numbers on *U.S. News and World Report* Rankings." Adjunct Advocate (July/August 2001):20.

Leslie, David W. *Part-Time, Adjunct, and Temporary Faculty: The New Majority*. Williamsburg, VA: College of William and Mary, 1998.

Leslie, David W., Samuel E. Kellans, and G. Manny Gunne. *Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education*. New York: Praeger, 1982.

Levitt, Martin Jay. *Confessions of a Unionbuster*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1993.

Light, Richard J., Judith D. Singer, and John B. Willett. *By Design: Planning Research on Higher Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Lightman, Marjorie, Esther Katz and Dorothy O. Helly. "The Litrature on Part-Time Faculty." *Thought and Action* (Spring 1987).

Loeb, Paul Rogat. *Soul of a Citizen: Living with Conviction in a Cynical Time*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Lofland, John, and Lyn H. Lofland. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1995.

Lopez, Steven H. *Overcoming Legacies of Business Unionism: Why Grassroots Organizing Tactics Succeed."* Paper presented at ILE Research Conference on Union Organizing, May 17, 2002, University of California at Los Angeles.

Lovas, John C. "How Did We Get in This Fix? A Personal Account of the Shift to a Part-Time Faculty in a Leading Two-Year College District." In *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education*. edited by Schell, Eileen E., and Patricia Lambert Stock, 196-217. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Ludlow, Jeannie. “Priorities and Power: Adjuncts in the Academy.” *Thought and Action* (Fall 1998).

Lundy, Katherine, Karen Roberts, and Douglas Becker. “Union Responses to the Challenges of Contingent Work Arrangements.” Paper presented at the Collective Bargaining Conference, Michigan State University, May 2000.

Lustig, Jeff. : ”How a Faculty Union Blocked and Unfriendly Takeover.” In *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, edited by Geoffry D. White, 319-341. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2000.

Lynd, Alice and Staughton Lynd. *Rank and File: Personal Histories by Working-Class Organizers.* Boston: Beacon, 1974.

Lynd, Staughton. *Living Inside Our Hope: A Steadfast Radical’s Thoughts on Rebuilding the Movement*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

_____. “The Local Union: A Rediscovered Frontier.” In *The Transformation of U.S. Unions: Voices, Visions, and Strategies from the Grassroots*, edited by Ray M. Tillman, and Michael S. Cummings, 191-202. Boulder, Colorado: Lynn Reinner Publishers, 1999.

_____. *Solidarity Unionism: Rebuilding the Labor Movement from Below*. Chciago: Charles H. Kerr, 1992.

_____. *We Are All Leaders: The Alternative Unionism of the Early 1930s.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996.

Lyons, Richard E., Marcella L. Kysilka, and George E. Pawlas. *The Adjunct Professor’s Guide to Success: Surviving and Thriving in the College Classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.

Maguire, Patricia. “Challenges, Contradictions and Celebrations: Attempting Participatory Research as a Doctoral Student”. *In Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada,* edited by Peter Park, 157-176. Westport, CT: Greenwood publishing Group, 1993.

Maitland, Christine. “Part-time Faculty: Old Myths and New Realities.” Unpublished paper, nd [1994?]

Mantsios, Gregory, ed. *A New Labor Movement for the New Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Margolis, Eric, ed. *The Hidden Curriculum of Higher Education.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

Markowitz, Linda. *Union Activism After Successful Union Organizing*. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2000.

Marshall, Eric. “A Tale of Two City Universities: Internal and New Unit Adjunct Organizing in New York City.” *Workplace: a Journal of Academic Labor* URL,www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/marshall.html> (February 2002).

Martin, D’Arcy. *Thinking Union: Activism and Education in Canada’s Labor Movement*. Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 1995.

Martin, Randy, ed. *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Matson, Kevin. “The Academic Labor Movement: Understanding Its Origins and Current Challenges.” *Social Policy* (summer 2000): 4-11.

McClure, Budd A. “Tenure at Minnesota: A Postmortum.” *Thought and Action* (fall 1999) 97-104.

McDonald, Kathlene. “Same Goals, But Another Way of Getting There.” *Social Policy* (summer 2000): 23.

McGee, Micki. “Hooked on Higher Education and Other Tales From Adjunct Faculty Organizing.” *Social Text*. (Spring 2002):61-80.

Mc Hugh, Rick, Nancy E. Segal, and Jeffrey B. Wenger. “Laid Off and Left Out: Part-Time Workers and Unemployment Insurance Elgibility: How States Treat Part-Time Workers and Why UI Programs Should Include Them.” Washington DC: Washington College of Law, American University, 2002

Mehta, Chirag, and Nik Theodore. “Winning Union Representation for Temps: An Analysis of the NLRB’s M.B. Sturgis and Jeffboat Division Ruling.” *Working USA* (winter 2000-2001): 37-58.

Meiksins, Peter. “Same As It Ever Was? The Structure of the Working Class” In *Rising from the Ashes? Labor in the Age of Global Capitalism* .” edited by Ellen Meiskins Wood, Peter Meiskins, and Michael Yates, 28-40. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Mejia, Silvija. “Will Work for Food: The Forgotten Professiponals in Higher Education.” *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998): 95-100.

Meister, Jeanne C. *Corporate Quality Universities: Lessons in Building a World-Class Workforce.* New York: Irwin Professional Publishing, 1994.

Merwitz, Stanley. *Education and Corporate Training Industry Overview: Revolution or Evolution?* New York: Morgan Stanley-Dean Witter, June 20, 2000.

Meyers, Burt. “In Defense of CUNY.” In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 236-248. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Miller, S.M. “Labor’s Missing Organizational Revolution.” *Working USA* (November-December 1999): 9-23.

Mishel, Lawrence, Jared Bernstein, and John Schmitt. *The State of Working America 1998-1999.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1999.

_____. *The State of Working America 200-2001*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 2001.

Moberg, David. “Temp Slave Revolt: Contingent Workers of the World Unite.” *In These Times* (July 7, 2000): 11-13.

Montgomery, David. “Education for Public Life.” In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 147-153. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

_____. “Planning for Our Futures”. *Audacious Democracy: Labor, Intellectuals, and the Social Reconstruction of America*, edited by Steve Fraser and Joshua Freeman.. Boston: Mariner Books, 1997.

Moody, Kim. *An Injury to All: The Decline of American Unionism*. London: Verso, 1988.

_____. *Workers in a Lean World: Unions in the International Economy*. London: Verso, 1997.

Mort, Jo-Ann, ed. *Not Your Father's Union Movement*. New York: Verso, 1998.

Moser, Richard. "The AAUP Organizes Part-Time Faculty." Academe (November-December 2000)

_____."The New Academic Labor System and the New Academic Citizenship." *Radical Historian Newsletter* 80 (May 1999): 1.

Mulenga, David. "Reflections on the Practice of Participatory Research in Africa." *Convergence* (1999): 33-46.

Mulhauser, Diana. "U. of Arizona Employees Discuss Joint Union for Faculty Members, TA's and Staff." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. (August 22, 2001).

Munger, Frank, ed. *Laboring Below the Line*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002.

Murphy, Danny, Madeline Scammell, and Richard Sclove, eds. *Doing Community-Based Research: A Reader*. Amherst, MA: The Loka Institute, 1997.

Murphy, Marjorie. *Blackboard Unions: The AFT and NEA 1900-1980*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.

National Alliance for Fair Employment. *Contingent Workers Fight for Fairness*. Boston: Author, 2000. Available from URL www.fairjobs.org/report; INTERNET.

National Center for Education Statistics. *Fall Staff in Postsecondary Institutions, 1995*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, March 1998.

_____. *Fall Staff in Postsecondary Institutions, 1997*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, November 1999.

_____. *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 2001 Fall Staff*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, unpublished, nd. Accessed for Illinois institutions through Illinois Board of Higher Education.

_____. *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:93):Part-Time Instructional Staff: Who they are, What They Do, and What they Think (NCES2002-163)*.
Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, March 2002.

_____. *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:93. New Entrants to the Full-Time Faculty of Higher Education Institutions (NCES 98-252)*
Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, October 1998).

_____. *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Background Characteriistics, Work Activities, and Compensation of Faculty and Instructional Staff in Postsecondary Institutions: Fall 1998 (NCES 2001-152)*
Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, April 2001.

_____. *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Supplemental Table Update for Part-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff: Who Are They...)* Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, April 2002.

_____. *1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Institutional policies and Practices: Results from the 1999 National Study of postsecondary Faculty, Institution Survey (NCES 2001-201)*Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, September 2001.

National Education Association. *Entering the Profession: Advice for the Untenured.* Washington: Author, 1988.

_____. *Report and Recommendations on Part-Time, Temporary, and Nontenure Track Faculty Appointments*. Standing Committee Report. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 1986-1987.

_____. *A Survival Handbook for Part-Time and Temporary Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 1989.

_____. *The NEA 1999 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 1999.

_____. *The NEA 2000 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 2000.

_____. *The NEA 2001 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 2001.

_____. *The NEA 2002 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 2002.

_____. "Part-time Faculty." *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update*. Washington, DC: Author, September 2001.

_____. "Faculty Satisfaction." *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update*. Washington, DC: Author, May 2002.

_____. "Tenure." *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update*. Washington, DC: Author, June 2001.

_____. Special issue of *Thought and Action (*Fall 1998).

Nelson, Cary. "What Hath English Wrought: The Corporate University's Fast Food Discipline?" *Against the Current* (May / June 1998): 9-14.

Nelson, Cary, ed. (1997). *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Nelson, Cary, and Stephen Watt. *Academic Keywords: A Devil's Dictionary for Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Ness, Immanuel, ed. Interview with Barbara Judd. "Organizing High-Tech Permatemps in the Pacific -Northwest." *Working USA* (winter 2000-2001): 100-113.

_____. "Organizing Immigrant Communities: UNITE's Workers Center Strategy." In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald Seeber, 87-101. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

New Directions for Higher Education special issue, "The Growing Use of Part-Time Faculty: Understanding Causes and Effects." (Winter 1998).

Newfield, Christopher. "Recapturing Academic Business." In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 69-102. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Nissen, Bruce. "Building a Minority Union: The CWA Experience at NCR." unpublished paper (March 2000).

_____. "Utilizing the Membership to Organize the Organized. In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald Seeber, 135-149. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Nissen, Bruce, ed. *Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and Internal Transformation*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999.

Nissen Bruce and Seth Rosen. "Community Based Organizing: Transforming Union Organizing Programs from the Bottom Up." In *Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and Internal Transformation,* edited by Bruce Nissen, 59-74. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999.

Noble, David F. *Digital Diploma Mills. New York:* Monthly Review Press, 2002.

Norris, Lachelle. "*Throw Away Workers:" The Rise of Part-time, Temporary, and Contract Jobs. An Annmotated Bibliography and Everview of the Contingent Workforce Issue.* New Market, TN: Highlander Research and Education Center, 1992.

Olney, Peter. "The Arithmetic of Decline and Some Proposals for Renewal." New Labor Forum (Spring/Summer 2002):7-19.

Olson, Ruth. *Columns, Cathedrals and Classrooms: Approaches to Change in Higher Education Administration.* Dissertation. Cincinnati: The Union Institute, 1994.

O'Neill, James. "Academic Temps." *Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine* (May 7, 2000): URL www.phillynews.com/sunmag/0507/feature1.html; INTERNET.

Oppenheim, Lisa. "Women's Ways of Organizing: A conversation with AFSCME organizers Kris Rondeau and Gladys McKenzie." *Labor Research Review* (18, 1991) 45-60.

Ornelas, Arturo. "Pasantias and Social Participation: Participatory Action-Research as a Way of Life." In *Nurtured by Knowledge: Learning to Do Participatory Action-Research,* edited by Smith, Susan and Dennis G. Willms with Nancy A. Johnson, 138- . New York: Apex Press, 1997.

Packard, Richard. *IFT Organizational and Strategic Plan.* Unpublished paper. November 2001.

Palmer, James C. "Part-Time Faculty at Community Colleges: A National Profile." *The NEA 1999 Almanac of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 1999.

"The Part-Time Faculty Paradox" [Special report]. *Community College Week,* January 25, 1999.

Pan, David. "The Future of Higher Education: A Conference Report." *Telos* (spring 1998): 3-20.

Pannapacker, William. "Ten Reasons Why the Use of Adjuncts Hurts Students." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (December 1, 2000).

Park, Peter et al. eds. *Voices of Change: Participatory Research in the United States and Canada.* Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey, 1993.

Parker, Mike. "Organizing on the Internet: The Possibilities and Some Cautions." *Labor Notes* (March 2000): 8-9.

Parker, Mike and Martha Gruelle. *Democracy is Power: Rebuilding Unions from the Bottom Up.* Detroit: Labor Notes, 1999.

Parsons, Michael, ed. *New Directions for Community Colleges: Using Part-Time Faculty Effectively.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1980.

Patton, Michael Quinn. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990.

Peled, Elena, Diana Hines, Michael John Martin, Anne Stafford, Brian Strang, Mary Weingarden, and Melanie Wise. "Same Struggle, Same Fight: A Case Study of University Students and Faculty United in Labor Activism." In *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education.* edited by Schell, Eileen E., and Patricia Lambert Stock, 233-244. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Penney, Robert. *Counter Mobilizations: Management and Anti-Union Activists.* Paper presented at ILE Research Conference on Union Organizing, May 17, 2002, University of California at Los Angeles.

Pereles, Kathleen. "The Union Commitment of Adjunct Faculty." paper presented at Industrial Relations Research Association Annual Conference, 2001.

Peters, Ron and Theresa Merrill. "Clergy and Religious Persons' Roles in Organizing at O'Hare Airport and St. Joseph Medical Center." In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald Seeber, 164-178. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Peterson, Bob and Michael Charney, eds. *Transforming Teacher Unions: Fighting for Better Schools and Social Justice.* Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, 1999.

Phillippe, Kent A., ed. *National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends and Statistics, 1995-1996.* Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, American Association of Community Colleges, 1995.

_____. *National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends and Statistics, 1997-1998.* Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, American Association of Community Colleges, 1997.

Pratt, Linda Ray. "Disposable Faculty: Part-time Exploitation as Management Strategy." In *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*, edited by Cary Nelson, 264-277. Mineapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Press, Eyall, and Jennifer Washburn. "The Kept University." *Atlantic Monthly* (March 2000): 39-54.

Press, Julie E. "Child Care as Poverty Policy: The Effect of Child Care on Work and Family Policy." *In Prismatic Metropolis: Inequality in Los Angeles,* edited by Lawrence D. Bobo, 338-413. New York: Russell Sage, 2000.

Pyrch, Timothy. "PAR Alive". *Seeds of Fire* (winter 2000): 16.

Rachleff, Peter. "Learning from the Past to Build the Future." In *The Transformation of U.S. Unions: Voices, Visions, and Strategies from the Grassroots,* edited by Ray M. Tillman, and Michael S. Cummings, 87-96. Boulder, Colorado: Lynn Reinner Publishers, 1999.

Rathke, Wade. "Letting More Flowers Bloom Under the Setting Sun." In *Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and Internal Transformation,* edited by Bruce Nissen, 75-94. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999.

Reed, Adolph, Kim Moody, Andrew L. Stern, Jorge Mancillas, Jennifer Gordon, Bruce Colburn, and Nelson Lichtenstein. "Forum: Replies to Bronfenbrrenner." *Nation* (September 3, 2001).

Reinharz, Shulamit, with the assistance of Lynn Davidman. *Feminist Methods in Social Research.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Rhoades, Gary. *Managed Professionals*: *Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*. New York: SUNY Press, 1998.

Rhoades, Gary and Sheila Slaughter. "Academic Capitalism, Managed Professionals and Supply-Side Higher Education." In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 33-68. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Richardson, Lynda. "A Union Maid? Actually a Nanny Organizing." New York Times (April 4, 2002).

Roberts, Helen, ed. *Doing Feminist Research.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Robinson, Perry. *Part-Time Faculty Issues.* American Federation of Teachers Higher Education Department. Item 607. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, June, 1994.

_____. "Transnational Higher Education and Faculty Unions: Issues for Discussion and Action." Presentation at Education International conference, Budapest, 1999.

Rogers, Jackie Krasas. *Temps: The Many Faces of the Changing Workplace.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 2000.

Rooks, Daisy. *Sticking it Out or Packing it In?: Organizer Retention in the New Labor Movement.* Paper presented at ILE Research Conference on Union Organizing, May 17, 2002, University of California at Los Angeles.

Rossman, Gretchen B., and Sharon F. Rallis. *Learning in the Field: An Introduction to Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1998.

Ruckelshaus, Catherine and Bruce Goldstein. *From Orchards to the Internet: Confronting Contingent Work Abuse.* New York: National Employment Law Project, 2002.

Saltzman, Gregory M. "Union Organizing and the Law: Part-Time Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants." *The NEA 2000 Almanac of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: NEA, Office of Higher Education, 1999.

Samuel, Leah. “Grievance Campaign Helps Housekeepers Organize a Union.” *Labor Notes*. (April 1998):12.

Scarff, Michelle. “The Full-time Stress of Part-time Professors.” *Newsweek* (May 15, 2000): URL http://newsweek.com/nw-srv/printed/us/dept/my/a19556-2000may7.htm;INTERNET.

Sharpe, Teresa. *Excercising Leadership and Developing Leaders: The Evolution of Worker Participation in a New Organizing Campaign*. Paper presented at ILE Research Conference on Union Organizing, May 17, 2002, University of California at Los Angeles.

Schell, Eileen E., and Patricia Lambert Stock, eds. *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Schell, Eileen. “Toward a New Labor Movement in Higher Education: Contingent Faculty and Organizing for Change.” *Workplace: A journal for academic labor*. (no.7) URL <http;//www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue7/schell.html>.

_____. *Gypsy Academic and Mother-Teachers: Gender, Contingent Labor and Writing Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Heinemann, 1998.

Schneider, Alison. “Part-time Faculty Members in Washington State Win Key Battle over Benefits.” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (February 25, 2000): A18.

_____. “Part-timers at Roosevelt University Vote to Unionize.” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 15, 2000): chronicle.com/daily; INTERNET.

Schor, Juliet. *The Overworked American: the unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Schmidt, Jeff. *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System that Shapes their Lives*. Lanham, MD: Bowman and Littlefield, 2000.

Schrecker, Ellen W. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

_____. “Will Technology Make Academic Freedon Obsolete.” In *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*, edited by Cary Nelson, 291-299. Mineapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Sciacchitano, Katherine. “Unions, Organizing and Democracy: Living in One’s Time, Building for the Future.” *Dissent* (spring 2000): 75-81.

Schmidt, Jeff. *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System that Shapes Their Lives*. Lanham,MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.

Service Employees International Union (SEIU, AFL-CIO). *Part-Time, Temporary, and Contracted Work: Coping with the Growing “Contingent” Workforce*. Washington, D.C.: SEIU Research Department, May 1993.

Sheeks, Gina L. and Philo A. Hutcheson. “How Departments Support Part-Time Faculty.” *Thought and Action* (Fall 1998).

Shostak, Arthur B. *Robust Unionism: Innovations in the Labor Movement*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 1991.

Sickler, David. “Multi-Union Organizing.” *Labor Research Review* (#24) 101-110.

Silverstein, Stuart and Rebecca Trounson. Tough Times Force Cuts at 2-Year Colleges: Education : Aplications increase as budgets shrivel. Campuses are turning students away." *Los Angeles Times* (July 22, 2002)

Slaughter, S., and L. Leslie. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

_____. "Professors Going Pro: The Commercialization of Teaching, Research, and Service." In *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, edited by Geoffry D. White, 140-156. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2000.

Slaughter, Shiela, and Gary Rhoades. "The Neo-liberal University." *New Labor Forum* no. 6 (2000): 73-79.

Slavin, David H. "Part-Time Labor and the Profession in Crisis." *Radical Historians Newsletter* (December 2000).

Smallwood, Scott. "American Federation of Teachers Approves Standards for Treatment of Adjuncts." Url<Chronicle.com / daily / 2002 / 07 / 2003072203n.htm> (July 22, 2002).

Smallwood, Scott. "UAW Wins Union Election to Represent Part-Time Faculty Members at New York University." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (July 10, 2002).

Smith, Susan E., Dennis G. Willms, and Nancy Johnson. *Nurtured by Knowledge: Learning To Do Participatory Action Research.* New York: Apex Press, 1997.

Social Policy Special issie, "Shaking the Ivory Tower". (Summer 2000).

_____. "Organize". (Fall 2001).

Social Text. entire issue. (Spring 2002).

Soley, Lawrence C. *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia.* Boston: South End Press, 1995.

Stake, Robert E. *The Art of Case Study Research.*Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995.

Steck, Henry, and <ichael Zweig. "Take Back the University: Only Unions Can Save Academic Life." Huber, Sonya. Faculty Workers: Tenure on the Corporate Asembly Line." In *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, edited by Geoffry D. White. 297-318. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2000.

Stevenson, John. "Contracted, Contingent, Part-time: Coming Soon!" *Thought and Action* (Fall 1998).

Stewart, Julie Pearson, and Barbara M. Brizuela. "Symposium on Habits of Thought and Work and the Disciplines and Qualitative Research." *Harvard Education Review* 70, no. 1 (spring 2000).

Stoll, Patricia. "Response: Good Advice Not Taken." *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998): 91-93.

Strauss, Anselm L., and Juliet Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1990.

Suhrbur, Tom. "Adjunct Faculty Association of Chicago, IEA / NEA." unpublished paper (revised version January, 2002)

_____. "The IEA and the IFT: Organizational Warfare in Illinois." unpublished paper (May, 1991)

Sullivan, James D. “The Scarlet L: Gender and Status in Academe.” In *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*, edited by Cary Nelson, 254-263. Mineapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Summers, Clyde. “Unions Without a Majority: A Black Hole?” *Chicago-Kent Law Review*. (v. 66, 1990):531-531-548.

Swartzlander, LuAnn. “The Adjunct Situation: Exploitation, Dilettantism, and the Downsizing of Academia.” *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998) : 65-72.

Sweeney, Marilyn and Barbara Dayton. “Are Unions the Answer for Part-Time Faculty?” *Joural of the Midwest Modern Language Association*. (Spring 1998): 81-87

Tasini, Jonathan. *The Edifice Complex: Rebuilding the American Labor Movement to Face the Global Economy*. New York: Labor Research Association, 1995.

Thompson, Karen. “Alchemy in the Academy: Moving Part-time Faculty from Piecework to Parity.”In *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*, edited by Cary Nelson, 278-290. Mineapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

_____. “Faculty at the Crossroads: Making the Part-Time Problem a Full-Time Focus.” In *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education*. edited by Schell, Eileen E., and Patricia Lambert Stock, 185-195. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Tillman, Ray M., and Michael S. Cummings, eds. *The Transformation of U.S. Unions: Voices, Visions, and Strategies from the Grassroots*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynn Reinner Publishers, 1999.

_____. “Conclusion: Union Democracy and Social Unionism.” In *The Transformation of U.S. Unions: Voices, Visions, and Strategies from the Grassroots*, edited by Ray M. Tillman, and Michael S. Cummings, 267-274. Boulder, Colorado: Lynn Reinner Publishers, 1999.

Tilly, Chris. “Part-time Work: A Mobilizing Issue.” *New Politics* (24,Winter 1998)

Tingle, Nicholas and Judy Kirscht. “A Place to Stand: The Role of Unions in the Devbelopment of Writing Programs.” In *Moving a Mountain: Transforming the Role of Contingent Faculty in Composition Studies and Higher Education*. edited by Schell, Eileen E., and Patricia Lambert Stock, 218-232. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2001.

Tirelli, Vincent. “Adjuncts and More Adjuncts: Labor Segmentation and the Transformation of Higher Education.” In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 181-201. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Tokarczyk, Michelle M. and Elizabeth A. Fay, eds. *Working-Class Women in the Academy: Laborers in the Knowledge Factory*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.

Trudeau, Garry. *Doonesbury*. URL<www.doonesbury.com/strip/dailydose/index.cfm> 1996 and November 25-December 5, 2000.

Turner, Lowell, Harry C. Katz, and Richard W. Hurd, eds. *Rekindling the Movement: Labor’s Quest for Relevance in the 21st Century*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press, 2001.

Truner, Lowell. "Rank and File Participation in Organizing at Home and Abroad." In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald Seeber, 123-134. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. *Temps and Contract Workers Have Rights Too: Fact Sheet of the "Protecting Workers Who Exercise Rights" Project of the National COSH Network.* Washington, D.C.: Author, undated. USDOL/OSHA Grant #46A7-HT51.

Unger, Donald N.S. "Academic Apartheid: the Predicament of Part-time Faculty." *Thought and Action* (Spring 1995).

University of Maine. *Developments and Trends in the Academic Workplace.* Orono, Maine: University of Maine, Bureau of Labor Education, 1999.

University of San Francisco, and University of San Francisco Faculty Association, Part-time Faculty. "Collective Bargaining Agreement between University of San Francisco and University of San Francisco Faculty Asociation, Part-time Faculty." (January 1, 1999-December 31, 2001).

Vaughn, William. "Need a Break from Your Dissertation? Organize a Union!" In *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* edited by Randy Martin, 264-303. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.

Waldinger, Roger, Chris Erickson, Ruth Milkman, Daniel J.B. Mitchell, Abel Valenzuela, Kent Wong, and Maurice Zeitlin. "Helots No More: A Case Study of the Justice for Janitors Campaign In Los Angeles." In *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*, edited by Kate Bronfenbrenner, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald Seeber, 102-120. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Wallace, M. Elizabeth, ed. *Part-Time Academic Employment in the Humanities.* New York: Modern Language Association, 1984.

"Washington Part-timers Achieve Major Legal Victory." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 2000): 3.

Wells, Judy. *The Part-Time Teacher.* Willits, CA: Rainy Day Woman Press, 1991.

White, G., ed. *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2000.

White, William Foote. *Participant Observer: An Autobiography*. Ithaca, New York: ILR Press, 1994.

Wial, Howard. *Employment and Wages of Part-Time Workers in Pennsylvania and the United States, 1979-1996*. Briefing paper, Keystone Research Center. Harrisburg, PA, February 1998.

Weinbaum, Eve and Gordon Lafer. Outside Agitators and Other Red Herrings: Getting Past the 'Top- Down/Bottom-Up' Debate. New Labor Forum (Spring/Summer 2002): 26-35.

Weinbaum, Eve S. "Orgnizing Labor in an Era of Contingent Work and Globalization." In *Which Direction for Organized Labor? Essays on Organizing, Outreach, and Internal*

Transformation, edited by Bruce Nissen, 37-58. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999.

Weiner, Lois. "Albert Shanker's Legacy." Contemporary Education (Summer 1998).

Wertheim, Margaret. *Pythagoras' Trousers: God, Physics, and the Gender Wars.* New York: Times Books / Random House, 1995.

Whitfield, Keith, and George Strauss. *Researching the World of Work: Methods in Studying Industrial Relations.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Williams, Lee, ed. *An Annotated Bibliography for Participatory and Collaborative Field Research Methods.* Knoxville, TN: Community Partnership Center, University of Tennessee, 1996.

Williams, Lee. *Grassroots Participatory Research: A Working Report from a Gathering of Practitioners.* Knoxville, TN: Community Partnership Center, 1997.

Willis, Ellen. "The Post-Yeshiva Paradox: Faculty organizing at NYU." *Social Text.* (Spring 2002):11-26.

Wilson, Robin. "Georgia State University Cuts Some Part-Time Positions To Add 65 Full-Time Faculty Jobs." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 11, 1999).

Wilson, Tom. " The Proletarianization of Academic Labour." *Industrial Relations Journal* 30, no. 1 (1991): 250-62.

Wood, Ellen Meiskins, Peter Meiskins, and Michael Yates. *Rising from the Ashes? Labor in the Age of Global Capitalism.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.

Wood, James. "Part-Time Faculty and Strategic Plans in Higher Education." Presented at Annual Meeting American Sociological Association, 2000.

Wolf, Barbara. *Degrees of Shame.* video, Barbara Wolf Video Work, Cincinnati, OH. 1999.

_____. *A Simple Matter of Justice.* video, Barbara Wolf Video Work, Cincinnati, OH. 2002.

Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor entire issue. (February 2002) URL<http://www.louisville.edu/journal.workplace/wp42.html>

Worthen, Helena. "The Problem of the Majority Contingent Faculty in the Community Colleges" In *The Politics of Writing in the 2-Year College,* edited by Barry Alford and Keith Kroll. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2001.

_____. "Studying the Workplace: Considering the Usefulness of Activity Theory." Unpublished manuscript (March 2000).

Worthen, Helena, and Joe Berry. *Contingent Faculty in Public Higher Education in Pennsylvania, Spring 1999: Focus on the Community Colleges.* Harrisburg, PA: Keystone Research Center, 1999.

_____. "Bargaining for 'Quality'in Higher Education:

A Case Study from the City Colleges of Chicago". *Labor Studies Journal* forthcoming.

Wright, Erik Olin. "Intellectuals and the Class Structure." *In Between Labor and Capital,* edited by Pat Walker, 191-212. Boston: South End Press, 1979.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989.

Zabel, Gary. "A New Campus Rebellion: Organizing Boston's Contingent Faculty." *New Labor Forum* (spring / summer 2000): 90-98.

_____. "A New Labor Movement in the Academy." *Dollars and Sense* (March / April 2000): 33-35, 44.

Zweig, Michael. *The Working Class Majority: America's Best Kept Secret*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, ILR Press, 2000.

Appendix

List of terms used for contingent faculty

A Note on Vocabulary

A barrier in the way of successfully dealing with the issue of contingent labor in academia (and in the society generally) has been the constantly growing and changing vocabulary used to describe these workers. We have chosen to primarily use the terms contingent and regular because we think they best capture the essence of the differences embodied in the two- (or multi-) tiered workforce. We argue that the key point is not how *much* someone works, but under what conditions and for what pay.

These are definitions used by the National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement:

- **Adjunct faculty**: A faculty position where one has an occasional or temporary affiliation with an institution or another faculty member in performing a duty or service in an auxiliary capacity.

- **Part-Time Staff**: Persons on the payroll of the institution (or reporting unit) and classified by the institution as part-time. Students in the College Work-Study program or casual employees (e.g. persons who are hired to help at registration time or to work in the bookstore for a day or two at the start of a session) are not considered part-time staff.

- **Tenure**: Status of a personnel position, or a person occupying a position or occupation, with respect to permanence of position.

- **Tenure Track**: Positions that lead to consideration for tenure.

The following terms refer to academic rank: **Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer.** Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor positions are typically tenure or tenure-track unless they are **"Visiting."** Sometimes Instructor and Lecturer are the same.

In hopes of clarifying the discussion, on the next page we list all of the various terms we have seen or heard used to describe the two main employment statuses in academia, which we label contingent and regular. Some terms have been known to cross columns depending on who is talking, which only adds to the confusion.

Regular	**Contingent**
Full-time	Part-time
Tenured or tenure-track	Nontenure-track
Permanent	Visiting ... (various ranks)
Senate	Temporary
Ranked (as in academic rank)	Occasional
Voting	Non-Senate
Department member	Unranked (as in academic rank)
Faculty	Adjunct
Professor:	Instructor
Full	Lecturer
Associate	Casual
Assistant	Limited term
Core	Dean's appointment
Presidential appointment	Student (graduate)
Traditional	Peripheral
Standard	New model
Salaried	Non-traditional
Teacher-of-record	Non-standard
Hard money	Hourly
Line (as in having a budget line)	Section leader
Continuing	Sessional
Continuing contract	Yearly
Standing	Soft money
Internal	Grant-funded
Academic	Non-line (as in not having a budget line)
Ladder	Fixed term
Contract	External
	Community-based
	Clinical
	Applied
	Non-regular
	Extension
	Continuing Education
	Non-academic
	Non-remunerated
	Non-ladder
	Wives or faculty wives
	Emergency wife
	Emergency hire
	Ad hoc
	Assistant

	Graduate assistant Teaching assistant Teaching associate specialist Nonvoting Contract Limited contract

From: Worthen, Helena, and Joe Berry. *Contingent Faculty in Public Higher Education in Pennsylvania, Spring 1999: Focus on the Community Colleges*. Harrisburg, PA: Keystone Research Center, 1999.

Lists of Metro Chicago institutions of higher education