

Academic Affairs Task Force on Use of Non-Tenure Line Faculty for Curriculum Delivery

February 24, 2017

Academic Affairs formed this task force in Fall 2016 in consultation with Faculty Senate and FWDC in order to address our use of adjuncts, lecturers, and other non-tenure line faculty. In light of the fact that we have a fixed number of full-time faculty positions available, UNC Asheville has always relied on adjuncts to deliver the curriculum, but we believe that our reliance on adjuncts has become too great. Academic Affairs has considered increasing teaching loads for some non-tenure-track full-time faculty, particularly Lecturers who are not expected to have accomplishments in scholarship or service responsibilities. We are also interested in alternative proposals related to reducing curriculum delivery costs.

The task force was charged with considering the specific proposal to have Lecturers without expectations in service or scholarship teach a higher load (15-16 contact hours) and identifying alternatives to this policy, such as increasing class size, limiting PDL and RAT, reducing curricular requirements, and any others. The task force was encouraged to be mindful of the strategic plan's emphases on academic rigor and student success in this effort, and charged with sharing its findings with Provost Urgo and reporting on them to the Faculty Senate no later than March 1, 2017. This report summarizes our findings and recommendations for future actions to reduce our reliance on adjunct faculty.

The members of the task force were:

Chair: Jeff Konz, Dean of Social Sciences
 Douglas Luke, Director of Academic Budgeting
 Sarah Judson, FWDC Member, Associate Professor of History
 Lora Holland, IDC Member, Chair and Associate Professor of Classics
 Herman Holt, Chair and Associate Professor of Chemistry
 Cathy Whitlock, Lecturer (Mathematics)

The Problem: Describing our use of Adjunct Faculty

Our use of adjuncts has increased dramatically, particularly over the last three years. The following table shows total charges against the Adjunct budget in Academic Affairs; it shows that expenditures have tripled over the last six years, because of increases in our use of adjunct faculty and in our rate of adjunct compensation (as of Spring 2014, \$1300 per contact hour for those with a terminal degree and \$900 for those without):

Total Charges to the Adjunct Budget

Year	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17 (prelim)
Total	\$411,190	\$467,976	\$596,574	\$832,448	\$1,002,652	\$1,276,109

These numbers are not directly comparable from year-to-year, since the items charged against the fund have changed over time; Math Lab and Writing Center support, for example, were

once included but are no longer. In addition, occasional special opportunities such as visiting scholars appear in some years and not others. For comparability, the following chart removes volunteers, applied music instruction, writing center support, Math lab support, and special one-course assignments such as visiting scholars to leave only adjunct and super-adjunct use for regular instruction. In the following chart, headcount is on an annual basis, and contact hours are the total delivered by adjuncts in the academic year:

Usage and Expenditure on Regular Instruction by Adjuncts (adjusted)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Headcount	36	46	42	72	93	92
Contact Hours	239	327	340	610	804	919
Cost	\$217,250	\$308,890	\$401,105	\$748,900	\$926,500	\$1,093,800

The same basic trends are shown in the adjusted data. Note in particular that not only have we increased the number of adjuncts that we hire to nearly 100 individuals in 2016-17, the hours taught by each individual adjunct has also increased from 6.4 to 10 hours per year. This is partially driven by an increase in our use of “super-adjuncts” who teach 12 hours or more in a particular semester (at a higher pay rate) over the last four academic years:

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Super-adjuncts	1	3	7	8	6	8

Finally, our use of full-time lecturers, instructors, and visiting faculty has not changed appreciably over the last several years:

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Lecturers, Instructors	42	46	46	48	51	49
Visiting	0	6	8	2	2	2
Total	42	52	54	50	53	51

In summary, the critical issue that we need to address is our increased reliance on adjuncts, evident in the headcount of adjuncts, the proportion of our teaching that is being delivered by non-full-time faculty, and our expenditures in that area, which prevent us from funding other academic affairs initiatives.

Diagnosis: Understanding the Sources of the Problem

Why has there been such an increase in our reliance on adjunct faculty? We believe that there is no single cause; there have been a number of developments in recent years which have fueled this increase in adjunct utilization. To try to understand why we hire the adjuncts we do, Provost Urgo asked the deans to undertake an analysis of why each Fall 2016 adjunct was used. The results of this analysis:

Adjunct Payroll Fall 2016—Why were adjuncts hired?

Contact Hours	Expenditure	
371	\$447,133.33	Continuing Student Demand
54	\$66,600.00	FMLA (inc. Disability)
60	\$66,100.00	PDL
28	\$35,666.67	Discretionary RAT
9	\$45,000.00	Special Opportunities
56 students	\$27,104.00	Applied Music Adjuncts
522	\$687,604.00	Grand Total

The inclusion of applied music adjuncts, who are paid per student rather than per credit hour, results in total expenditures on adjuncts for instruction of \$687,604. All categories except “continuing student demand” represent one-time needs, either filling gaps left by short-term vacancies of full-time faculty members (FMLA, PDL, and discretionary RAT) or special opportunities for visiting scholars.

Note that some of this expenditure was from non-state sources outside of Academic Affairs, most notably grants and endowed professorships, which provided \$108,300 in support of 65 contact hours, including all teaching labelled as “special opportunities” above. This leaves \$579,304 funded by state appropriations, which could have been used for other purposes in Academic Affairs.

a) FMLA: In the fall semester, we had an unusually large number of faculty members on disability or FMLA, resulting in expenditure on adjunct replacement of \$66,600. This expenditure is largely unavoidable, but even in a semester when it was unusually large, it constituted less than 10% of our adjunct expenditures.

b) PDLs and RAT: It is noteworthy that while the reinstatement of Professional Development Leave is costly, the adjunct budget was increased to accommodate that need with approval of Senior Staff. Notably, though, expenditures for PDL replacement were larger than anticipated. We expected 47 contact hours for Fall 2016 and 20 for Spring 2017, but needed 60 hours in the Fall, using up more than ¾ of the amount budgeted for PDL support (\$87,000). Even so, less than 10% of our adjunct budget goes to meet those needs; the combination of PDLs and discretionary reassigned time cost us \$101,766.67, less than 15% of our adjunct expenditures in Fall 2016.

c) Administrative RAT: The category “continuing student demand” includes all ongoing needs, not only adjuncts required to meet student demand arising from particular expertise and enrollment growth, but also all administrative reassigned time (mostly for department chairs and program directors) and endowed chairs. Although it is not possible to develop a one-to-one correspondence, reassigned time for CPDs, endowed chairs, and other purposes contributes to adjunct demand. In Fall 2016, CPDs took 113

contact hours of RAT, endowed chairs 36, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Asst. Dean of Natural Sciences 11, for a total of 160 hours of continuing reassigned time. Not all of this reassigned time was matched by adjunct replacement, but even if it was, it would account for less than half of this category, leaving some 210 hours of adjunct teaching the result of student demand in excess of full-time faculty resources or specific expertise that does not exist in the full-time faculty. We suspect, however, that adjunct hiring for this purpose is significantly less than 160 hours, so the amount that is due to student demand or faculty expertise constitutes half or more of our expenditures on adjuncts.

In sum, it is important to note that the reinstatement of PDLs and discretionary RAT is not the primary source of the problem, accounting for only 15% of our adjunct expenditures in Fall 2016. Adding in both FMLAs and considering administrative RAT explains less than half of our adjunct reliance. Clearly, other factors are at work.

d) Student enrollment: We recognize that at least a portion of the increase in our need for adjuncts lies in increased student enrollment in 2014-15 and 2015-16 which affected our need for first and second year courses both then and in the current year. This would affect our need for adjuncts overall, since our faculty resources lag enrollment, particularly if the distribution of enrollment increases was uneven, resulting in higher demand for courses in some areas than in others. How has this increase in enrollment translated into adjunct demand by program area?

Contact Hours taught by Adjuncts by Program Area

	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
HUM	117	48.95%	96	29.36%	90	26.47%	220	36.07%	194	24.13%	246	26.77%
NS	69	28.87%	100	30.58%	98	28.82%	182	29.83%	246	30.60%	291	31.66%
SS	36	15.06%	52	15.90%	84	24.71%	83	13.61%	120	14.93%	158	17.19%
UP	17	7.11%	79	24.16%	68	20.00%	125	20.49%	244	30.35%	224	24.37%
TOTAL	239		327		340		610		804		919	

There has been a long-term decrease in the use of adjuncts in the Humanities program area, with a corresponding increase in University Programs (including the Humanities program). All in all, though, there is broad stability in the distribution of adjuncts across program areas, especially over the last three years. It appears that the increase in student enrollment since 2014-15 has not led to a need for adjunct support that is more acute in some areas than in others.

e) Failure by full-time faculty to contribute to core LAC Programs: We also wanted to know how many of our faculty members actively teach in core LAC programs, i.e., those requirements offered outside of home departments (178, 478, HUM, ARTS). The Humanities program, which includes 478, is the largest of these programs; the following, provided by the Humanities program, shows the reliance of the Humanities program on

Humanities lecturers and adjuncts relative to full-time faculty members from other departments and programs:

Instructors in the Humanities program (including 478/479)

Academic Year	Courses by adjuncts	Courses by HUM lecturers	Courses by other faculty	Grand Total	Percentage by adjuncts
2011-2012	4	27	87	118	3%
2012-2013	23	24	65	112	21%
2013-2014	15	23	82	120	13%
2014-2015	26	20	77	123	21%
2015-2016	53	21	52	126	42%
2016-2017	41	26	59	126	33%
Grand Total	162	141	422	725	22%

During the budget crisis, we very intentionally restricted our use of adjuncts in Humanities, maximizing the number of sections offered by full-time members of the faculty. We continued to use relatively few adjuncts for a few years thereafter, but in 2015-2016 (coinciding with the reinstatement of PDLs and RAT and the shift of four departments to a 4ch curriculum), the number of sections offered by full-time faculty members dropped by 25 and the number offered by adjuncts increased by 27, resulting in 42% of Humanities courses being offered by adjuncts; for comparative purposes, adjuncts constituted about 16% of our teaching resources that year. While this shift toward adjuncts abated slightly in 2016-17, we still have 1/3 of our Humanities courses taught by adjuncts.

More broadly, consider the proportion of our full-time faculty who teach in 178, 478, HUM, or ARTS 310 (all LAC core courses which cannot fulfill major requirements). While we would not expect every faculty member to contribute to these programs, or for each program area to contribute to the same degree (the Natural Sciences program area, for example, contributes to LAC substantially through Lab Science, Math, and Scientific Perspectives courses in addition to core LAC programs), we believe that this data is instructive:

Faculty teaching in core LAC programs, by program area:

	2015-16			2016-17		
	Taught in LAC Core	Total Faculty	%	Taught in LAC Core	Total Faculty	%
HUM	38	80	47.50%	39	81	48.15%
NS	9	69	13.04%	13	70	18.57%
SS	15	73	20.55%	15	71	21.13%
UP	8	12	66.67%	11	14	78.57%
TOTAL	70	234	29.91%	78	236	33.05%

Fewer than 1/3 of full-time faculty members teach in core LAC programs; an increase in faculty participation in these programs would reduce our dependence on adjuncts, particularly in Humanities and Arts. We encourage Academic Affairs to discuss this issue, including the reasons which lie behind this level of participation (faculty interest, evaluation and personnel review, department curricular inflexibility, overall student demand) and perhaps the development of targets for each program area.

f) Shifting to a 4ch curriculum: In principle, a shift to a 4 credit-hour curriculum should be neutral in its impact on adjunct needs, since students still need the same amount of hours to graduate and the overall faculty teaching load stays at 12 contact hours. In fact, though, the need for adjuncts may be affected for two reasons. First, when faculty members from departments with 3ch curricula teach Humanities, they often did so as a slight overload (teaching 13 hours per semester); overall, we lose teaching power when fewer faculty members do so. Second, when departments make this shift, they should proportionately reduce the number of distinct sections offered in the major; if they do not, the result is more credit hours offered in the major than before, with smaller class sizes but also increased adjunct need, whether in the department or elsewhere. We expect that this impact will be most felt in teaching outside of the department, particularly in the Humanities program. To investigate this premise, we took a look at offerings to the Humanities program, including LS 479/LA 478, by departments which have shifted to a 4ch curriculum over the last six years:

Sections offered to Hum by departments with a 4ch curriculum (in those years in red).

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
ART/ARTH	0	0	0	0	0	1
CLAS	7	5	5	4	4	2
ENG	16	7	10	5	7	8
HIST	13	13	24	22	11	14
MCOM	2	2	2	2	1	1
MGMT	2	5	3	1	2	0
ML	0	0	2	2	3	4
NM	0	0	0	0	0	0
PHIL	11	8	9	6	2	4
POLS	7	3	4	2	1	2
RELS	2	2	5	7	4	3
SOC/ANTH	2	2	3	4	3	2
TOTAL	62	47	67	55	38	41

While causality cannot be assumed, there appears to be a clear connection between a shift toward a 4ch curriculum and a reduction in sections offered toward Humanities, particularly in three departments with historically significant contributions (English, History, and Philosophy). Note that other departments with smaller historical levels of

contribution did not see a similar decrease. In total, the offerings to Humanities from the 12 departments which have shifted to a 4ch curriculum over the last six years has dropped by 21 sections, accounting for 84 credit hours of adjunct instruction, and 75% of the decrease in sections offered by full-time faculty (in (e) above).

While there are other factors at work in particular departments during this time period (PDLs, FMLA, administrative assignments, Senate EC), shifting to a 4ch curriculum appears to have had an impact on some departments' ability to contribute to Humanities. If these other factors do not fully explain the above decline, the implication is that when these departments shifted, they did not correspondingly reduce the number of sections of courses offered within their departments. This is not to suggest that these departments should not have shifted to a 4ch curriculum, but instead simply that we need to better account for this apparent consequence. While we are extremely grateful to these three departments for their historical contributions to the program, we encourage them to take a look at their course offering patterns in light of this information.

In sum, we conclude that our increased reliance on adjunct faculty over the last few years cannot be ascribed to a single source, but that instead, all of the above factors play a role. In particular, we believe that our increased reliance on adjunct faculty is a consequence of both administration of faculty time (FMLA, PDLs, RAT, etc.) and our curriculum (course offering patterns, major requirements, and course structure). As a result, multiple solutions must be employed to address this issue, some curricular in nature. In the next section, we propose a set of possible solutions for Academic Affairs to consider implementing, none of which will on its own fully address the problem.

Prescription: Possible Solutions

One member of the Task Force characterized the set of factors which contributed to the increase in expenditures on adjuncts as a "perfect storm." Because the origins of the problem are manifold, so too must our approach to addressing the issue include multiple components. These possible solutions are not listed in order of priority.

1) Better manage course offerings by departments with 4ch curricula

In facilitating the transition, we have done pretty well at ensuring that degree requirements for students do not increase, by reducing the number of distinct courses that are required for the major. However, we have not monitored the number of courses offered in particular semesters. The task force suspects that in some cases, the strategy which was followed was to take the existing curriculum and add an hour to many existing courses, allowing for more depth in these courses, but not significantly impacting the range of offerings from a department over time.

In order for this shift to a 4ch curriculum to have had no impact on the ability of departments to contribute to interdisciplinary and core programs, there should have

been a proportionate decrease in the number of sections offered in the major. For example, a department which had offered 24 3ch sections, equivalent to 3 full-time faculty members, should now be offering 18 4ch sections. We suspect that in the interests of maintaining student choice and honoring faculty expertise, some departments failed to reduce their offerings in this way, particularly in upper-level courses.

We recommend that the Deans of Humanities and Social Sciences work with the appropriate Department Chairs to take a look at the course offering patterns of departments which have transitioned to a 4ch model in their respective areas to check whether offerings have been reduced in this way, and, if appropriate, to work with department chairs to adjust course offering patterns in order to restore their ability to contribute to interdisciplinary and core programs to the same level as before the transition to a 4ch curriculum.

2) Match the number of upper-level courses offered each semester to that necessary to enable students to meet graduation requirements.

We suspect that the inflexibility described above is not particular to those departments which have transitioned to a 4ch curriculum, but that some majors may offer more upper-level courses than necessary, whether out of student or faculty interest, with the result being that there are enough empty seats in these classes to suggest that not all courses offered were necessary. This is potentially a problem in degree requirements as well; there may be departments which have too much inflexibility in the courses required for graduation, so that they find themselves offering low-enrolled courses repeatedly. This recommendation addresses both the preparation of course schedules and the requirements for the degree.

We recommend that each program area dean take a close look at course offerings and enrollments in their program area over the last few years to identify patterns of low-enrolled courses and work with their chairs and programs to recommend changes in offering patterns or degree requirements, as appropriate. This has the potential to free faculty members to teach more courses in core LAC programs, consistent with the following recommendation.

3) Develop strategies to encourage more full-time faculty to teach in core LAC programs

As noted above in (e), less than 1/3 of the full-time faculty participated in core LAC programs in 2015-16 and 2016-17. To be sure, many other faculty members may have participated in earlier years, and intend to do so again, but we believe that part of the problem is that too few of our full-time faculty members do so on a regular basis. In recent years, Academic Affairs has worked to instill an expectation among new hires that they participate in teaching outside of the department, but this is a long-term solution at best. As also seen in (e), reliance on adjuncts is a particular resource issue for the Humanities program, but we have seen increased use of adjuncts in Arts and Ideas

and in other interdisciplinary programs that are not part of LAC, such as WGSS and MLAS.

We recommend that Academic Affairs adopt policies composed of carrots rather than sticks and, instead of imposing a quota on program areas or departments, develop incentives to encourage faculty members to participate in teaching 178, Humanities, 478, and Arts and Ideas. Such policies could include:

a) Humanities Faculty Fellows Program. Academic Affairs has been discussing the development of a Humanities Faculty Fellows program, oriented to new faculty members, which would provide adjunct replacement for one course of reassigned time to enable interning in the program in exchange for a commitment to teaching Humanities for several years; we recommend that these discussions be completed and a program of this kind be established. While this program has a short-term cost in adjunct use, its long-term benefits are greater.

b) The consideration of a similar program for long-time members of the faculty who wish to participate but are deterred by the interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum, outside their professional expertise. This could involve formal internship, as in (a), but could involve other kinds of incentives.

If these or other possible incentive-based approaches fail to bring full-time faculty members to teach in our core programs, then Academic Affairs should consider stronger measures, perhaps including quotas for each department/program, to be negotiated with the Dean and the Provost, for sections offered to core LAC programs.

4) Seek more balanced use of adjuncts

As noted above in (e), the Humanities program has become increasingly reliant on adjuncts to deliver the curriculum, even with full-time faculty lines (four active at this time), with 42% and 33% of sections being taught by adjuncts in the last two years, a disproportionately heavy reliance. Furthermore, there has been an increase in the use of adjuncts in interdisciplinary programs outside of the LAC. Particularly given the stated importance of the Humanities program in our liberal arts mission and our institutional history, we believe that this is an inappropriate imbalance in the allocation of faculty resources. Consider that in 2015-16, the Humanities program generated 9.6% of credit hours at the university, but it utilized more than 25% of adjunct contact hours. We are hopeful that recommendations 1-3 help address this problem, but believe that more attention needs to be paid to this issue by considering the use of adjuncts in major courses instead of in Humanities.

In most departments, constraints in available teaching resources are more likely to be met by reducing offerings in interdisciplinary programs, including core LAC programs, than by using adjuncts in the delivery of courses for the major. Anecdotally, this

sometimes leads to faculty members who wish to teach in these programs being told that the department cannot afford it. The result is that our use of full-time faculty is disproportionately oriented toward majors and away from Humanities and other core LAC and interdisciplinary programs.

Similarly, there may be imbalances in departments in their use of adjuncts in introductory rather than upper-level courses. While we recognize that it may be easier to identify adjuncts able to teach introductory courses, and that our full-time faculty has expertise in particular fields, this practice is potentially problematic, especially if it results in our first-year students being taught mostly by adjuncts.

We recommend that, in addition to the initiatives discussed in (6) above, program area deans review proposed class schedules each semester and identify full-time faculty members who have taught in the Humanities program but are scheduled to teach courses in the major that could be taught by an adjunct instead. These faculty members should be asked to switch to teaching a section in Humanities, replacing an adjunct there with an adjunct in the home department. Likewise, deans should review department schedules to make sure that departments are not relying on adjuncts to deliver introductory courses to the major. This proposal would not reduce our overall reliance on adjuncts, but would result in better balance in our reliance on adjuncts.

5) Consider allowing increased teaching loads for some lecturers and super adjuncts

The origins of this task force lie in a proposal from Academic Affairs in 2015-16 to increase teaching loads for some lecturers, notably those whose only responsibilities are in teaching, without any expectation of scholarship or service. Many members of the faculty expressed misgivings about this proposal in two broad areas—equity of workload, and concern about the impact on teaching quality, working against our strategic plan emphasis on academic rigor. Note that this proposal is not wholly new to our campus; many of the same issues were discussed in 1999 when Academic Affairs proposed creating teaching-only lecturer positions, albeit without increasing their teaching load; see Faculty Senate minutes from October, November, and December 1999 for more details about faculty concerns, resulting in the decision to not move forward with the proposal.

In addition to concerns about equity and the impact on academic rigor, the task force recognizes that this approach would not really address the scale of the solution; even if ten lecturer positions were converted to higher teaching loads, it would replace only ten adjuncts, not nearly enough. In addition, in reviewing both COPLAC members and UNC system universities, we found that while some campuses expect non-tenure line faculty to teach more than tenure-line faculty, few expect lecturers to teach more than 12 hours. Nationally, those campuses which have lecturers teach 15-16 hours are not comparable to us in terms of either mission or faculty expectations.

However, we believe that there are conditions under which individual departments or programs should have flexibility in defining the expected responsibilities of lecturers or super-adjuncts. There may be circumstances where the most critical need of a department is for short-term teaching power, perhaps during a tenure-track faculty search, for example. We recommend that departments have the ability to request that a position come with the expectation of teaching 15-16 hours, but only if the following conditions are met:

- The teaching expectations should be clearly articulated to the faculty member, appearing in the contract for both super-adjuncts and lecturers.
- This teaching should never include 178, because these courses come with advising responsibilities.
- There should be three or fewer distinct course preparations in a particular semester.
- This expectation should be of limited duration; no person should be expected to teach more than 12 hours for more than three years.
- There should be no administrative, scholarly, or service expectations.

In sum, we believe that increasing teaching loads for some lecturers may be a solution for a local problem, i.e., for departments and programs in short-term need of teaching power, but is not a global solution for the university as a whole.

6) Increase class sizes as appropriate

While an across-the-board increase in class sizes would solve the problem of over-reliance on adjuncts, it is not warranted, nor is it desirable for our liberal arts mission. However, we believe that many introductory courses which rely on a lecture-based format for information delivery could be delivered in larger sections, allowing other faculty members to teach other courses, either in the major or in other programs. This does not apply to all disciplines, but there are many who could reasonably consider such a change.

We recognize that we are constrained by available classrooms, a constraint that will only increase during the renovations of Carmichael and Owen halls, in that we have few rooms that have more than 50 seats. However, we do have 29 general classrooms that can seat 35 students, 17 of which will remain available during these renovations. We encourage departments to consider offering their introductory courses with higher course limits, as appropriate to pedagogy and content area. Academic Affairs should also consider ways to incentivize faculty members and departments to offer some larger classes without reducing our overall teaching capacity.

7) Cap available Professional Development Leaves

While the reinstatement of PDLs is not the primary cause of the increase in adjunct expenditure, it is a contributing factor. After awarding 17 in 2016-17 and 18 in 2017-18, we believe that much of the unmet need for PDL after several years without has been

met. As a result, limiting PDLs to 10% of eligible tenured members of the faculty should be sufficient to maintain faculty vitality and allow for more PDLs than we have historically been able to offer. PDLs are ordinarily limited to tenured members of the faculty, and at the moment, we have 122 tenured faculty members who are not serving administrative roles (excludes Chancellor, Provost, Deans, etc.), which suggests that we would have 12 discretionary PDLs available each year, enough to meet the need. Note that prior to the suspension of PDLs (formerly known as Off-campus Scholarly Assignments) in 2011, the restriction was to 3% of the full-time faculty. This recommendation thus represents an increase in PDL availability relative to institutional history.

CONCLUSIONS

While the original cause for the formation of this task force was to consider whether or not we should create teaching-only lecturers with higher teaching loads, the task force quickly realized that while this proposal would create more teaching power, it would not be a solution to the larger problem, the increase in our reliance on adjuncts to deliver the curriculum that we have seen in the last few years. Our adjunct budget is out of control, and steps should be taken to rein in our reliance on adjuncts, freeing resources for other initiatives and needs in Academic Affairs.

The origins of this problem cannot be attributed to any one single cause, but instead to a confluence of factors, some of which are related to release of full-time faculty members from teaching (PDLs, discretionary RAT, FMLAs), but not all. The structure and delivery of our curriculum are also factors which need to be addressed, including rigidities and inflexibilities in program requirements, growing pains related to transitioning to a 4ch curriculum in many departments, and offering patterns of upper-division courses. Because the origins of the problem are manifold, so too must a range of solutions be employed to address the issue of adjunct use. We have identified a set of possible solutions which function as carrots rather than sticks, but we also recognize that if these solutions fail, Academic Affairs may want to consider more drastic solutions, such as required commitments to Humanities and other core LAC programs from each department. At a minimum, each department should be more cognizant of both their own adjunct usage and the implications of their class schedules on adjunct usage in other programs; it is our hope that this awareness, along with more oversight from the program area deans as specified above, will be sufficient.

Finally, to return to the specific proposal to require Lecturers without expectations in service or scholarship to have higher teaching loads, this task force believes that this practice does not provide a solution to the larger problem, and that the concerns that many faculty members have expressed about equity and the long-term impact on teaching quality are valid. This practice should be restricted in its use, as identified in solution 5 above, and should be viewed as only a small part of the broader actions that should be taken to reduce our reliance on adjuncts.