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Abstract

This paper tracks the ratios and numbers of part-time to full-time employees at Portland Community College (PCC) throughout its over 50 years of existence as well as the climate and provisions for faculty, based on the accessible sources. It looks at current efforts to support part-time faculty and projects a positive scenario into the future to ameliorate the situation.
Introduction

This paper will review Portland Community College’s (PCC) history with regard to faculty issues, focusing on the numbers, ratios, and provisions for part-time faculty, consulting various primary and secondary sources; it will observe the current situation with regard to the same.

Context: National Historical Trends in use of Part-Time Faculty

The balance in both numbers and percentages between full-time and part-time faculty members has changed dramatically in the past forty years. In 1969, over the broad spectrum of Higher Education, 78.3% of faculty members were either full-time tenured or tenure-track, and 21.7% were non-tenure-track, often part-time. For a dramatic comparison, in 2009 these respective figures have almost reversed themselves: 33.5% were tenured/tenure track and 66.5% were not (Kezar, A. & Maxey, D., n.d.).

The discrepancies are greatest in the public two-year institutions. These 2009 data show that 17.5% of faculty are tenured/tenure track, 13.8% are full-time non-tenure track, and 68.7% are part-time non-tenure track employees, totaling 86.2% of faculty members as non-tenure-track. These high percentages can partially be explained by the growth in enrollments during the 1960s and 1970s, along with the need to keep tuition low and to maintain flexibility in scheduling. This course of action allowed community colleges to meet the burgeoning need while keeping costs to a minimum. But what may have been seen as a temporary expedient at the time has become the new norm (Kezar, A. & Maxey, D., n.d.). An American Federation of Teachers (AFT) study in 2009 showed that the growth of part-time faculty members is continuing, and that community colleges have, as above-mentioned, the greatest percentages of all higher education institutions (AFT, 2009).
So how does Portland Community College compare with these trends? The following will describe the use of part-time faculty throughout PCC’s existence, based on the available sources. PCC started with much zeal but poor provision for faculty compared to students, but it righted itself and by 1970 the ratios were seemingly reasonable. By the mid-1980s, better provisions had been made for full-time faculty members, but there were many tensions caused by the burgeoning enrollment and corresponding burgeoning population of part-time faculty. After many years with a stable number of full-time faculty and growing numbers of part-time faculty, by the late 90s, formal acknowledgement of the imbalance and accompanying issues were being acknowledged, and efforts were made to hire more full-time faculty to keep up with enrollment. There was a moment around the year 2000 when the ratios were starting to come back to a more reasonable ratio, but by 2005 and into the present, the ratios have slipped again and the issue seems intractable for a number of reasons. Below this trajectory will be explained in more detail. (See Table 1.)

**Early Mission and Implications for Faculty**

PCC’s original vision was articulated by Dr. Amo DeBernardis, the first college president:

- Every person in life should know the feeling of dignity, and education and learning are the parents of self-worth and dignity.
- Education for all should be a lifelong romance, extending well beyond grade school, high school and college.
- Liberal arts and science learning should in no way be considered superior to vocational learning and working with the hands
• Educational institutions should never be allowed to become complacent and fat, because if they do they become dream work fortresses for faculties and administrations. They become academic islands in a sea of need, and neither students nor communities are served.

• It doesn’t matter what a person is learning – as long as it’s legal. When people are learning, they are becoming richer within themselves and more contributing parts of the overall community. (Guernsey, 1989, pp. 40, 41)

Hidden within this dated set of assertions, which do contain the seed of what PCC has become, can be discerned a laudatory focus on students with a subtext of anti-faculty and even anti-administration sentiment – a caution against becoming “complacent and fat,” becoming “dream work fortresses,” an “academic island in a sea of need.” This subtext set the tone with regard to faculty in the early years.

When PCC was first formed as a community college in 1961, it was under the auspices of the Portland School Board, which handed over the vocational classes and space in Benson High School to the fledgling college’s supervision. Dr. Amo DeBernardis was given charge of the endeavor in addition to his current duties as a district school administrator, and it became his personal project. He soon decided that the college, which early on was already informally referred to as “Portland Community College” (PCC), would become a thriving institution, and he gave up his earlier duties, making the bet that PCC would succeed (Guernsey, 1989).

The school operated in a crisis mode at the beginning. As the “baby boom” population had nearly finished with elementary school and was moving toward college age, some Portland elementary schools became available for use. The college quickly moved to the former “Failing
Elementary School” and renamed it the “Ross Island Center” – receiving the formal permission on a Thursday or Friday and scrambling with all hands on deck to get ad hoc furniture moved in by the following Monday, when vocational education classes were to start. Within a couple of years, another former elementary school, Shattuck Hall, was appropriated for general education classes, and it quickly filled with college transfer students (Guernsey, 1989).

Faculty and support staff members were hired quickly, and because of the burgeoning student body, many faculty were hired on a part-time basis, with full-time faculty on limited term contracts excepting those who had transferred from the Portland School District (PCC, 1970). According to Guernsey, in the early years many of the faculty were part-time because of economic challenges (1989).

DeBernardis advocated a “shopping center” model where students and faculty had constant contact, and he erred on the side of meeting student needs rather than those of faculty. While faculty, from all accounts, were able, dedicated, and serving with a similar vision to that of DeBernardis, complaints about lack of private office space were consistent, starting from anecdotal information in Guernsey’s book, and continuing throughout accreditation reports (Guernsey, 1989; PCC, 1970; PCC, 1985). But overall the dedication to the PCC mission and vision rings throughout all these formal reports.

1969-70 Faculty and Part-Time Faculty Issues

The first academic year of PCC’s independent operation, 1969-70, PCC submitted its Accreditation Report: A Self Study, 1970 to the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools: Commission on Higher Schools, its regional accrediting agency. In the section titled “Instructional Staff,” the concerns were recruitment, credentials, and the establishment of
personnel procedures. It details course load requirements, provisions for evaluation of instructors, step increments in salaries, the faculty association, the selection of a department chair, and an idea for an “Incentive and Merit Pay Plan.” There were 207 full-time faculty, and 435 part-time instructors at that time.\(^1\) The responding “Evaluation Committee Report” from the accrediting agency inspected the various points listed above, but there was absolutely no mention of part-time faculty, much less any exploration of how policies might have applied to them (Northwest Association, 1970).

Apart from the snapshot concerning part-time and full-time numbers in the 1970 accreditation report, there are very few comments about part-time faculty employees in faculty senate records or other accessible reports.\(^2\)

A PCC Faculty Senate had emerged to represent faculty interests, and PCC’s archives of the 1970s PCC Faculty Senate are dominated by faculty proposals for more inclusion in governance and better communication with the administration, grievances, and then DeBernardis’ corresponding accommodations, adjustments, and rejections of their proposals. In 1973 the faculty senate performed a faculty survey to provide data on the tensions between faculty and administration (PCC Faculty Senate, 1973). Among other things, notable findings

\(^1\) Throughout PCC’s history, the figures for part-time faculty are unclear in that non-credit faculty are apparently sometimes counted and sometimes not counted, and the distinction is not always acknowledged. The non-credit faculty may be community education non-credit instructors, or they may be developmental education faculty. In the 2005 accreditation report a distinction is clearly delineated. In this paper, the assumption of “part-time-faculty” would be those teaching courses for credit, whether college or pre-college courses.

\(^2\) In PCC Board Minutes there are lists of individual part-time faculty hired, with salaries and appointments, but it would take a detailed and time-consuming effort to compile all the records (with the additional issue that the archives room is not organized at the present time) to come up with any comparisons. In addition, among the part-timers in those minutes are included all the community education classes, for which the same credentials are not required and for which the pay is lower.
were 78% showing strong agreement that “Administrators seem to be more concerned about numbers of enrolled students than quality of instructions, and 62% disagreement with the statement, “There are ample opportunities for real participation of faculty in policy determination.” In addition, a list of other concerns included administration/faculty relationships, the feeling that faculty “needs and views” in terms of salary negotiations were minimal, with other such items as teaching loads, parking issues, need for prerequisites, and more (PCC Faculty Senate, 1973).

The one comment concerning part-time faculty those archives contain is a memo from the PCC Faculty Senate to the PCC Faculty Association concerning agreements based on salary negotiations for 1973-74 (1973, February 8). In that document “Point 4” states: “It is agreed that departments should determine teaching loads on a yearly basis and that part-time instructors would then be utilized only for assignments constituting less than a half-time load. A full-time teaching position should not be delegated to several part-time instructors.” At that time, part-time pay rates were raised 10%.

1980s Faculty and Part-Time Faculty Issues

By 1985, 15 years after the first accreditation report, faculty had settled in and had apparently made some gains. The PCC Master Plan, compiled in preparation for an accreditation visit scheduled for 1985, offers a few clues. At the time of writing, PCC had 370 full-time faculty with 13 full-time contracted faculty. There were 1,280 part-time faculty. It claimed that 77% of the faculty had “continuous appointment contracts” —PCC’s language for what correlates to tenure elsewhere. Clearly that percentage referred to only full-time faculty members, not part-time, although it was not qualified as such. It did represent an amelioration of the
faculty situation compared to the very early days of the college (early 1960s), when only the teachers from the Portland School District had three year contracts.

The report then stated that there were a number of issues to be addressed in the next five years, including: “1. The need to increase full-time faculty in direct proportion to student enrollment increases while at the same time stabilizing administrative/administrative support and the utilization of part-time faculty and staff; 2. The need to integrate part-time faculty more fully in the institutional activities of the college” (PCC Master Plan, pp. C-6).

In the 1984-85 PCC “Accreditation Self Study” (for the now renamed Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges: Commission on Colleges), there were 395 full-time instructors and 1,342 part-time. In all the following information, for instance the “Number of Terminal Degrees,” only full-time faculty information is listed. In answering the obligatory question, “Is there evidence to show that adequate teacher security is provided through competitive salaries and benefits, and retention of faculty Members?” (p. 179), the response tacitly acknowledges the imbalance of part-time faculty members to full-time members in the following statement: “Security for faculty is provided by a continuous-appointment contract based on a minimum of three full years to a maximum of five full years of satisfactory performance as a probationary faculty member. The college maintains an adequate number of part-time staff to meet fluctuations in program offerings” (p. 180). The issue of security for part-time faculty is side-stepped in this statement.

The Northwest Association’s response in its “Evaluation Committee Report” of 1985 mentions part-time instructors only in its observations on specific departments or programs. For instance, the Humanities and Fine Arts Department at Sylvania was commended for “foreseeing
the need for part-time faculty evaluation” (p. 34), and a suggestion was offered to the Cascade Campus and the SE center that “careful attention needs to be given to supervision and evaluation of (and regular communication with) the evening part-time faculty so that they know what is transpiring at the campus and the college at large and can feel that they are a valued part of the total picture” (39). These comments seem to be based on actual visits to the departments, as correlating comments cannot be found in the actual self-study.

1990s Faculty and Part-Time Faculty Issues

In PCC’s 1990 Interim Report for (now again renamed) The Commission on Colleges Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, no mention of part-time employees is included. As a new part-time faculty member during that time, I personally recall an attempt to bring the plight of part-time faculty members to the PCC Board of Directors by the president of the PCC Faculty Federation (the union), Michael Dembrow. In that meeting, part-time faculty shared anecdotally the difficulties of making a living with low pay and insecurity of appointments. The board seemed extremely unsympathetic – shockingly so to me, because I witnessed overt rudeness to the faculty members testifying (Board meeting c. 1993 or 1994). In a recent conversation with (currently) Senator Michael Dembrow, I asked him if he recalled that meeting from so many years ago. He said he remembered it clearly, and (in a nutshell) that he thought the board members had felt uneasy because it was uncomfortable to be faced with these awkward realities (Personal conversation with Oregon State Representative Michael Dembrow, 2013, October 24).

But in the 1995 Accreditation Self-Study, the introduction to the section on reporting to Standard VII on faculty states: “While a core of full-time faculty members exists, the ratio of
part-time to full-time faculty continues to grow, to the consternation of full-time faculty members who cite the need for more full-time members in order to allow adequate time for student conferences and for course revision” (p. VII-1). In its comments on “Faculty Rank” it holds that “Faculty ranking is not employed at Portland Community College. . . . Historically, the faculty has been very satisfied with this arrangement. Morale is stronger because everyone is of equal rank” (p. VII-9). In this claim, the part-time faculty are clearly excluded.

Further on, in analyzing the situation, it details the limits on use of part-time faculty members (maximum 60% of a full-time teaching load for an individual instructor) and notes that “many adjunct instructors would like to teach more, but to increase their teaching loads, they must teach at two or more colleges during the same term. The college reliance on adjunct instructors has a detrimental effect on instruction in that these instructors are not always available for office hours, curriculum, planning, and other tasks, thus increasing the load on full-time faculty members. Work space for adjunct instructors is extremely limited, and the problem is compounded when two or three people are teaching a load that could be handled by one full-time person” (p. VII-8). Here is an acknowledgement that there really is a problem.

The “2000 PCC Accreditation Reaffirmation Report” states:

In early 1996 the college developed a full-time/part-time faculty ratio forecast model and set a goal to increase the percentage of instruction (defined by course workload factors) taught by full-time faculty. Its effect is most apparent at the Rock Creek Campus where the percentage of instruction taught by full-time faculty moved from 49% in fall 1995 to 60% in fall 1999. The district-wide full-time faculty percentage increased 2% from 57% in fall 1995 to 59% in fall 1999. (PCC, 2000, p. 26)
Here we see a real change in tone and emphasis, and these figures approach a realistic and healthy balance for a community college.\(^3\) Part-time faculty inservice sessions had been added in a variety of formats on different campuses in 1998, 1999, 2000, and 148 part-time faculty were reported to have attended the sessions – something new.

These claims correspond with the personal statements received from Faculty Federation leaders, that in the late 1990s the percentages were better (Personal Conversations with Frank Goulard, Faculty Federation President, et al., 2013, 2014).

**2000s Faculty and Part-Time Faculty Issues**

In the 2005 *PCC Accreditation Self-Study*, PCC states:

In the late 1990’s, PCC embarked on a plan to increase the percentage of instruction provided by full-time faculty to an administrative goal of 60% by adding ten new full-time hires each year. However, as the plan was implemented, the college began to experience steady enrollment growth, and although full-time faculty positions were added as intended, many more part-time faculty were also added in order to keep pace with increased student demand – making it difficult to improve the ratios. After a period of time, this practice stopped due to budget cuts from the state legislature. It is recognized by all that a core group of full-time faculty is needed for curriculum development, student advising and participation in governance.” (PCC, 2005, pp. 40, 41)

It continues:

---

\(^3\) Note that these figures do not seem to correlate with the head count figures of chart Table 1, possibly because these may be based on percentage of courses being taught. This crucial information is not available.
Many SAC [Subject Area Committees] for this self-study state that the current full-time/part-time ratios are problematic. These SACs believe that the current full-time to part-time ratios have a negative impact on student achievement and retention. While there are many examples of anecdotal evidence to support this, there is currently no empirical evidence to validate this belief. Clearly, curricula are being maintained and programs and disciplines are functioning adequately, but the extent to which reliance on part-time faculty is affecting student achievement and retention is unknown and further study is required. Attempts to address this issue have included better part-time faculty orientations and more part-time faculty mentoring, but a relatively small number of full-time faculty are relied upon to do this work and widespread faculty concern is evident. While there are many dedicated part-time faculty members without whose assistance some programs would not function properly, the fact remains that these are part-time faculty, who may not have the necessary time to attend to student needs. (PCC, 2005, pp. 41, 42)

In the same accreditation study, there is further discussion on goals set in the PCC Educational Master Plan of 2002 in which the administration was encouraged to “‘review the concept of FT-PT faculty ratios and [to] recommend policy regarding the establishment of ratios that are reasonable and appropriate for institutions of similar size and program mix.’” (Quoted by PCC, 2005, pp. 112, 113). However, there was no “specific priority” assigned to this issue and the issue was left to committees and the Faculty Federation to carry out any changes. The report then specifically lists concerns as a result of the high percentage of part-time faculty: lack of orientation, inadequate compensation to perform extra duties, inability to attend relevant meetings, lack of facilities, and lack of access to college services. It ends with the statement:
“While evidence to support the concerns outlined above is largely anecdotal, many SAC templates noted this as a problem, and it warrants further commitment to exploring the impact of full-time and part-time faculty ratios on student achievement and retention” (PCC, 2005, pp. 112, 113).

In this document, the ratio of 47% to 53% part-time ratio (in 2003-04), is considered a “source of difficulty” for the institution. Recommendations concerning part-time faculty include a more streamlined application process; improved processes for ensuring proper credentials; encouragement for administrators to consult full-time faculty in part-time hiring decisions; better training in best practices for supervisors for assessing part-time faculty; support for part-time faculty participation in SAC [Subject Area Committees] and EAC [Educational Advisory Council] activities; collection of data on part-time instructors engaged in other careers; “survey part-time faculty regarding their needs for orientation and mentoring” and make corresponding adjustments (PCC, 2005, pp. 118, 119).

There is notable attention and concern given to the issues of full-time/part-time ratios in this accreditation document. The dependence on part-time faculty is recognized; the unhealthiness of the percentages is acknowledged; the need for better orientation is acknowledged. The main consideration is how the situation affects students, which is, of course, of crucial interest. There is no acknowledgement, however, of the detrimental effects on part-time faculty themselves or on the organization in general.

In the same time period, the Faculty Federation requested and obtained from the administration a list of part-time faculty who were working more than half-time on an ongoing basis, and the union used this data to analyze part-time faculty use, following individuals. The
assumption had been that part-time employees are ad hoc and therefore do not merit or need insurance, contributions to retirement, and other benefits. The union proved that about 800 faculty members fit the profile of consistent, long-term employment, and using that information, the union was able to argue for providing access to health insurance and PERS for this group of part-timers (email from Michael Cannarella, 2014, February 18).

2010s Faculty and Part-Time Faculty Issues

Most recently, PCC’s Year Three Self-Evaluation Report in 2012 does not include figures, percentages, or many comments with regard to full-time and part-time faculty ratios and employment. It does mention part-time faculty with regard to assessment and the union contract, but the issues raised concerning part-time faculty in the 1995, 2000, and 2005 iterations were simply not addressed.

There is now, however, a new state requirement for systematic reporting of the percentage of credit classes taught by full-time faculty members (and by inference, alternatively, by part-time faculty members) to the Department of Community College Workforce Development (CCWD) (HB 2152). The reporting has taken place annually since 2009, and the figures still tell an implacably imbalanced tale (PCC, 2013c). (See Table 2.)

The Present with regard to Faculty and Part-Time Faculty Issues

PCC now serves 94,490 students annually, 59,520 of whom are taking credit courses, with a full-time equivalent of 33,389 students (PCC, 2013b). Teaching these students are 476 full-time faculty and 1226 part-time faculty members (PCC, 2013b); the percentage of classes taught are respectively 35% to 65% (PCC, 2013c).
In 2012, the Educational Advisory Council (EAC) appointed the ACCEPT Task Force (Addressing the Collective Climate and Experience of Part-Timers), unaware that this sort of research had been recommended in the 2005 Accreditation Report (PCC, 2005). The charge for the task force is:

- Explore and examine issues surrounding part-timers and how the current system affects the educational experience at PCC, listing both positives and tension points
- Categorize the issues as:
  - Issues within our control
  - Issues we might influence
  - Issues beyond our control
- Make recommendations to the EAC based on findings

The ACCEPT Task Force Survey of PCC employees in May, 2013, demonstrated that about 50% of part-time faculty would like to be full-time. The second question simply invited comments with no guidance as to what should be addressed. In the c. 300 qualitative comments gathered as a result, many part-time faculty mentioned that they loved teaching or liked PCC (50 comments); that there was poor orientation (44 comments); that they lacked support (32 comments); that they had good support (8 comments); that they felt disconnected from the institution (37 comments); that they needed mentoring (10 comments); that they felt disrespected and devalued (64 comments); that either they hoped to get a full time job or that they were frustrated and discouraged by not being able to get a full-time job (57 comments); that they were under-employed (34 comments); that they felt insecurity in their position (59 comments); that there was inequity of pay for effort (74 comments);
comments); that unpaid volunteer work was expected (16 comments); that they felt
discouragement and exhaustion (24 comments); that there were differences between full-
time and part-time experiences (24 comments); that the system badly affects students (24
comments); and there were other comments that fit purely within the purview of the union
(53 comments). A number of self-identified full-time faculty members commented on the
discrepancies in treatment of part-time faculty and the need for better orientation, treatment,
and pay (ACCEPT, 2013).

**Basis for Future Projections with Regard to Vision and Faculty**

How does this bode for the future? State funding diminished greatly beginning in 2008,
while the population of students burgeoned. Since that last allotment, funding from the state has
improved somewhat, and it appears hopeful that some of the previous funding from the state will
be restored in the near future (PCC, 2013-15). On the other hand, PCC succeeded in having
substantial bonds for building projects approved in an election, both for renovating old buildings
and building new ones (PCC, 2014a). If a projection can be offered based on the current status,
the future does look bright for PCC and at the very least, the organization seems to have made a
stable place for itself in the community.

In the last year and with the currently improving economy, enrollment has begun to dip
slightly, and although the newest information is not yet accessible on the website, this year’s
enrollment (2013-14) has dropped by about 7%. (PCC, 2014c; PCC, 2013a; personal
conversation with Christine Chairsell, Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, January,
2014).
But thinking into the future, there should be plenty of students. In the recent *Projections of Education Statistics to 2022* by the National Center for Education Statistics, nationwide even more students will be working toward their associates degrees or certificates. They project a rise of 49% between 2010-11 and 2022-23 (2014). Since degrees are still considered a route to “personal advancement,” students will continue to come (Cohen, Brawer & Kisker, 2014). In Oregon, Senate Bill 253 was passed in 2011, setting an ambitious goal, commonly referred to as “40/40/20”: that by 2025, 40% of Oregonians will have a bachelor’s degree; 40% will have an associate’s degree or certificate, and 20% will have a high school diploma (*Oregon learns*, 2013-14). If this effort is supported monetarily, it will send more students to the community colleges. Efforts to reach this goal are also discernable in Oregon’s pilot “Pay it Forward, Pay Back,” help for students with tuition up front that can be paid back on terms based on their salaries after graduating (State of Oregon, 2013). There is also a pilot program recently approved by the legislature that would consider paying for the first two years of college for students matriculating directly from high school with certain limitations (State of Oregon, 2014). And where there are students, there will be faculty.

The mission for PCC right now is stated as “Portland Community College advances the region’s long-term vitality by delivering accessible, quality education to support the academic, professional, and personal development of the diverse students and communities we serve” (PCC, 2014b). Its vision is “Building Futures for our Students and Communities” (PCC, 2014d). This is a grounded, hopeful mission and vision, and the very momentum of PCC argues for its continued service to the larger Portland Community.

So based on this information, what are the projections for faculty, and in particular, part-time faculty at PCC? Before launching into the following scenarios, it must be acknowledged
that there is clearly a role for a certain limited use of part-time faculty. In particular, for vocational, technical, business, and management programs, it is to the advantage of students to have some faculty as instructors who are engaged in the field and can bring their expertise to the classroom. But just as clearly, even those fields require stable instructors who are grounded in the institution and can serve as pillars, overseeing the respective programs. In addition, there are some whose life situations make it preferable to teach part-time, examples being retired professors who would just like to keep one foot in their academic field, or faculty whose home situations, such as need to also be caregivers, would make it preferable to teach part-time. From the institutional viewpoint, the flexibility supplied by part-time instructors is in the short run economically preferable.

But from the standpoint of part-time faculty in general, the problems are manifold. “Freeway flyers” have become symbolic of this group of faculty who are serving because they really do believe in the mission of their college, and who are also trying to live on what they earn. The recent survey of PCC part-timers illustrates the many problems for those caught in this situation: lack of basic information about the institution and policies; lack of connection to the colleagues; feelings of disrespect; lack of stability of employment; lack of a career path in spite of long dedication (ACCEPT, 2013). These problems are not new and are echoed throughout the country. This is the underbelly of Higher Education institutions, or one might argue, a gaping wound that has been ignored for too long.

As long as institutions simply consult short-run economics, as if there were no other aspects to the issue, it will continue. But work is being done to raise the profile of the problem, and much research is now being done to argue for a change in practices. For example, in February, 2014, Portland State University’s union highlighted the issue of the over-reliance on
part-time and contingent instructors (OPB, 2014). Also in February 2014, there was a two-day strike in at University of Illinois, Chicago, to raise the profile of part-time mal-treatment (Esposito, 2014). There is new research being pursued on the issue, led in part by the Delphi Project under the guidance of Adrianna Kezar showing the detrimental effects of over-reliance on part-time faculty members and the need for better support (Kezar and Maxey, 2013; Kezar, Maxey & Badke, 2013). The recent CCCSE report on contingent faculty powerfully underlines the detrimental effects of over-reliance on part-time faculty for students (2014).

**A Possible and Better Scenario**

A truly possible future scenario would be an awakening to the moral injustices, the negative impacts, and the risks of relying on contingent faculty in the way that has become a norm (Kezar, Maxey & Badke, 2013). PCC would look at the vision and mission with new eyes, including its own part-time employees in the effort to “support the academic, professional, and personal development of the . . . communities we serve.” It would include its own part-time employees as members of the “communities” in “Building futures for our Students and Communities” (PCC, 2014b, 2014d).

In the most recent full negotiations with administrators, the PCC Faculty Federation proposed a kind of third status for faculty – one where a long-serving part-time faculty member would be automatically granted a full-time status on a three-year contract basis, with a lesser degree of expectations for extra-classroom activities than those expected of full-time faculty. Assuming this proposal is brought up in the next union negotiations, it has potential to ameliorate the situation for part-time faculty and for the college at large. The union has for many years been concerned about the discrepancies between full-time and part-time faculty and has chipped
away around the edges, gradually improving the situation. The part-time faculty salaries have somewhat improved over the years. If part-time faculty were paid on the same scale as full-timers, pro-rated according to the hours they teach, the incentive to rely on part-time faculty from a merely economic standpoint would be diminished. The situation would gradually right itself.

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) is focusing its efforts on addressing these nationwide issues. In the most recent *On Campus* publication containing two provocatively titled articles, “Dirty Secrets,” and “Occupy Higher Education,” with one diagram titled “Institutions are Starving their Faculty,” it asks the question, “How do we build alliances outside the university at a moment when every other part of the nonprofit and public sector world is burdened with intensifying austerity?” It suggests that a movement for ameliorating the issue will involve joining with other movements “to expand campaigns into a social movement” based on the understanding that “job insecurity, declining wages, cannibalization of public services and heightened vulnerability are widely shared experiences. The attack is not simply on the academy or even the public sphere, it is on every worker” (Fabricant, 2014, p. 12). While daunting, this action is a real possibility in the near future.

While the momentum of the problem argues for the status quo, systems can change. I will project based on these possibilities that efforts will continue to raise awareness and pressure for improvements, and that not only at PCC, but nationwide, the pure economic argument will be seen as immoral and impractical, and that the system will gradually right itself to a more viable 70/30% of full-time faculty to part-time faculty. Benefits will be pro-rated. The environment and even such mundane things as parking issues will be ameliorated since there will be fewer instructors driving from one campus to the next. A new respect and inclusion of part-time
faculty will become a part of the culture. Students will benefit from better-supported faculty, and this will in turn result in a better college experience for students with increased success and completion rates.
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Table 1: Numbers of Full-Time Faculty and Part Time Faculty by Headcount, 1970-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Part-time Faculty, credit only (assumed)</th>
<th>Undistinguished credit and non-credit part-time faculty</th>
<th>Percentage of full-time to part-time faculty by headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-5</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>32%-68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>25%-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>33%-67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>37%-63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>24%-71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1386</td>
<td>21%-79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 Fall</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>24%-71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>37%-63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>35%-65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>36%-64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>37%-63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>32%-68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>28%-72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>24%-76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Throughout PCC’s history, the figures for part-time faculty are unclear in that non-credit faculty are sometimes counted and sometimes are not counted, and this is not distinguished for the reader. The non-credit faculty may be community education non-credit instructors, or they may be developmental education faculty. Only in the 2005 accreditation report is a distinction delineated. Nevertheless, general trends can be ascertained.

Table 2: Percent of Credit Sections Taught at PCC by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PCC’s Percent of sections (w/credit hours) taught by full-time faculty, 2013.*