



Coalition on the
Academic Workforce



A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members

A Summary of Findings on Part-Time Faculty Respondents
to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce
Survey of Contingent Faculty Members and Instructors

THE COALITION ON THE ACADEMIC WORKFORCE
JUNE 2012

A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members

A Summary of Findings on Part-Time Faculty Respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce Survey of Contingent Faculty Members and Instructors

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

According to data from the United States Department of Education's 2009 Fall Staff Survey, of the nearly 1.8 million faculty members and instructors who made up the 2009 instructional workforce in degree-granting two- and four-year institutions of higher education in the United States, more than 1.3 million (75.5%) were employed in contingent positions off the tenure track, either as part-time or adjunct faculty members, full-time non-tenure-track faculty members, or graduate student teaching assistants. Despite the majority status of the contingent academic workforce, the systematic information available on the working conditions of these employees is minimal. The Department of Education provides some basic demographic data through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and previously collected more detailed information through the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF). After 2003, however, funding for the NSOPF ceased, and the department has not created an alternative instrument to gather information about the characteristics, work patterns, and working conditions of higher education's faculty workforce. As a result, the large and growing majority employed in contingent positions is rendered largely invisible, both as individuals on the campuses where they work and collectively in the ongoing policy discussions of higher education. What little awareness the public has about this group, its crucial contributions, and the considerable obstacles common institutional practice creates for its members is based on anecdotal evidence, aging NSOPF data, or data confined to particular institutions, systems, or states.

The Survey

In an effort to address the lack of data on contingent faculty members and their working conditions, the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) fielded an ambitious survey in fall 2010, seeking information about the courses these faculty members were teaching that term, where they were teaching them, and for what pay and benefits. The survey received close to 30,000 responses, with just over 20,000 coming from individuals who identified themselves as working in a contingent position at an institution or institutions of higher education in fall 2010.

The survey was open to any faculty member or instructor who wished to complete a questionnaire; respondents therefore do not constitute a strictly representative sample of faculty members working in contingent positions. Nevertheless, the response provides the basis for a more detailed portrait of the work patterns, remuneration, and employment conditions for what has long been the fastest-growing and is now the largest part of the academic workforce.

The CAW survey was designed with a particular focus on faculty members teaching part-time at United States institutions of higher education. Numbering more than 700,000, this population represents more than 70% of the contingent academic workforce and almost half the entire higher education faculty in the United States. Faculty members in part-time positions were also by far the largest group of respondents to the CAW survey, providing 10,331 of the 19,850 valid responses from contingent faculty members and instructors who were teaching at least one course in fall 2010. Of these part-time faculty respondents, 9,238 provided data on a total of 19,615 courses they were teaching.

The following report provides initial findings from the survey, looking specifically at the part-time faculty respondents and the data they provided at the course level. The report also raises a series of questions that other researchers might pursue to develop an even richer understanding of part-time faculty in higher education and topics for future reports looking at the other groups of respondents.

Key Findings

While the report provides details on demographics, working conditions, and professional support as reported by the faculty respondents who indicated they were teaching part-time in fall 2010, several key indicators stand out that show how heavily colleges and universities are relying on part-time faculty members while failing to support them adequately.

- ♦ The median pay per course, standardized to a three-credit course, was \$2,700 in fall 2010 and ranged in the aggregate from a low of \$2,235 at two-year colleges to a high of \$3,400 at four-year doctoral or research universities. While compensation levels varied most consistently by type of institution, part-time faculty respondents report low compensation rates per course across all institutional categories.
- ♦ Part-time faculty respondents saw little, if any, wage premium based on their credentials. Their compensation lags behind professionals in other fields with similar credentials, and they experienced little in the way of a career ladder (higher wages after several years of work).
- ♦ Professional support for part-time faculty members' work outside the classroom and inclusion in academic decision making was minimal.
- ♦ Part-time teaching is not necessarily temporary employment, and those teaching part-time do not necessarily prefer a part-time to a full-time position. Over 80% of respondents reported teaching part-time for more than three years, and over half for more than six years. Furthermore, over three-quarters of respondents said they have sought, are now seeking, or will be seeking a full-time tenure-track position, and nearly three-quarters said they would definitely or probably accept a full-time tenure-track position at the institution at which they were currently teaching if such a position were offered.
- ♦ Course loads varied significantly among respondents. Slightly more than half taught one course or two courses during the fall 2010 term, while slightly fewer than half taught three or more courses.

Next Steps

This report is only a beginning. The findings suggest numerous questions for further research. The survey data file is available to qualified researchers, and CAW urges them to probe the data gathered by the fall 2010 survey to produce further reports and insights. CAW will also be exploring how this survey might be regularized to develop trend data on the working conditions of the contingent academic workforce. For information or to request access to the survey data file, please e-mail CAW (contact@academicworkforce.org).

ABOUT THE COALITION ON THE ACADEMIC WORKFORCE

The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) is a group of twenty-six higher education associations, disciplinary associations, and faculty organizations committed to working on the issues associated with deteriorating faculty working conditions and their effect on the success of college and university students in the United States. Specifically, CAW's purpose is to

- ♦ collect and disseminate information on the use and treatment of faculty members serving full- and part-time off the tenure track and the implications of such use and treatment for students, parents, faculty members, and institutions;
- ♦ articulate and clarify differences in the extent and consequences of changes in the faculty in various academic disciplines and fields of study;
- ♦ evaluate both short-term and long-term consequences of changes in the academic workforce for society and the public good;
- ♦ identify and promote strategies for solving the problems created by inappropriate use and exploitation of part-time, adjunct, and similar faculty appointments;
- ♦ promote conditions by which all faculty members, including full- and part-time faculty members serving off the tenure track, can strengthen their teaching and scholarship, better serve their students, and advance their professional careers.

Following are the organizational members of CAW:

American Academy of Religion
American Anthropological Association
American Association of University Professors
American Federation of Teachers
American Historical Association
American Philological Association
American Philosophical Association
American Political Science Association
American Sociological Association
American Studies Association
Association for Library and Information Science Education
Association of American Colleges and Universities
College Art Association
Community College Humanities Association
Conference on College Composition and Communication
Linguistic Society of America
Modern Language Association
National Council for History Education
National Council of Teachers of English
National Education Association
New Faculty Majority: The National Coalition for Adjunct and Contingent Equity
Organization of American Historians
Society for Cinema and Media Studies
Society of Biblical Literature
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
Working Class Studies Association

For more information about CAW, please visit www.academicworkforce.org.

A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members

A Summary of Findings on Part-Time Faculty Respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce Survey of Contingent Faculty Members and Instructors

COALITION ON THE ACADEMIC WORKFORCE

INTRODUCTION

As the United States has shifted from an industrial-based to a knowledge-based economy, the demand for workers with a college degree or at least some postsecondary education has increased. Because of that demand, as well as general population trends, student enrollments have increased dramatically over the past twenty years.¹ At the same time, state and local government support for higher education has steadily decreased, leading to increased college costs for families and significantly increased student loan debt.² The increased financial burden of college attendance has led some to question the value of a college education, spurring policy debates about college financing and cost, calls for greater accountability on the part of colleges and universities, and the development of supposedly more efficient and more economical alternative pathways.

Whether one believes a college education should be measured primarily in terms of earnings potential, intrinsic value to the degree holder, or benefit to society, the wage premium for a college degree persists, and the baccalaureate degree is seen as the “best path to middle-class employment and wages in the United States” (Gonzalez). As noted in *Education Pays 2010: The Benefits of Higher Education for Individuals and Society*, “Individuals with higher levels of education earn more and are more likely than others to be employed. . . . The financial return associated with additional years of schooling beyond high school and the gaps in earnings by education level have increased over time” (Baum, Ma, and Payea 4). Ironically, it appears that those increasingly responsible for educating the undergraduates who reap this earnings premium are themselves excluded from the economic benefits of advanced educational attainment.

As college enrollments have increased over the last several decades, the composition of the faculty has shifted. A faculty teaching corps once made up predominantly of full-time employees eligible for tenure has since the 1970s become a workforce employed in contingent and increasingly in part-time positions. Although most faculty members serving in contingent positions hold a master’s degree or higher and almost all hold at least a baccalaureate degree, their earnings are not remotely commensurate with their training and education, particularly when compared with professionals with similar credentials in other fields. The gap is particularly striking for faculty members serving in part-time positions.

Until now, what we have known about the compensation of contingent faculty members has been based largely on limited national data that has only rarely examined the working conditions of individual faculty members or allowed analysis at the institutional or disciplinary level. The

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)—the federal government’s most comprehensive source of systematic information on higher education in the United States—captures only limited data about the working conditions of faculty members in any employment category, full- or part-time, on or off the tenure track. IPEDS data are especially sparse about part-time faculty members, who, at 49.2% of all faculty members, now constitute the largest single category in the academic workforce. IPEDS also does not collect information on faculty members broken out by disciplinary area. With the end of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), it appears that the United States Department of Education will collect little information about the faculty other than basic head counts, demographic information, and aggregate institutional outlays for salary. While analysis of NSOPF data could show, for example, that the average part-time faculty member at a community college made just under \$2,500 per course, NSOPF data could not reveal how urban community colleges paid in comparison to rural community colleges in a particular region of the country (see *Reversing Course*). Yet without the NSOPF it is no longer possible to know whether that average pay is consistent from discipline to discipline or whether it differs by faculty members’ degree credentials or other qualifications.

The contingent academic workforce now represents close to seventy percent of the faculty and, when graduate student teaching assistants are included, more than three-quarters of the instructional workforce (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, and Ginder 3, 11). The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW), which is committed to improving the working conditions of the whole academic workforce and thereby strengthening the learning environment for students, set out to address the glaring lack of current information about these teachers by collecting data directly from them. In fall 2010, CAW fielded a national online survey targeted to contingent academics across the disciplines, including part- and full-time faculty members employed off the tenure track, graduate student teaching assistants, and postdoctoral researchers and teachers.³ The survey—which asked contingent faculty members about each of the courses they were teaching and the compensation and benefits they received—marks the first time any organization other than the United States Department of Education has attempted to gather these data on a national scale across all sectors of higher education. Given the large and diverse response to the survey, this data set offers a new level of insight into the working lives of contingent faculty members.

This report provides the first analysis of that data set, looking specifically at the subset of respondents who are part-time faculty members, the largest faculty group that responded to the survey.

ABOUT THE DATA

The survey opened on 27 September 2010 and closed on 30 November 2010. The intent was to get a snapshot of contingent faculty members’ teaching responsibilities and conditions of employment during the semester or quarter when the data were collected. The survey was available to any faculty member or instructor. In the end, 28,974 individuals responded ([table 1](#)).

Of the 28,974 total respondents, 3,762 did not adequately identify their position as a faculty member or instructor; their responses were removed, leaving 25,212 valid responses. The 4,292 respondents who identified their employment status as full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty were also removed from the set of records used for analysis. Thus 20,920 respondents identified themselves as working in a contingent employment situation, the vast majority (19,850) in

contingent teaching positions. The remaining respondents were full-time contingent researchers, nonteaching graduate student assistants, or postdoctoral research fellows.

The sample of respondents is self-selected and not necessarily representative of the entire population of postsecondary faculty members teaching off the tenure track. The data, therefore, do not support generalizations about the state of all contingent workers in higher education in the United States. While responses did range across all states, all disciplines, and all types of postsecondary employees defined as instructional staff by the Department of Education, the response was uneven, and therefore the survey produced more data on certain geographic areas, types of institutions, disciplines, and employment categories than others.⁴

Despite limits to some kinds of generalizations, the data set offers important insight into the working lives of members of the contingent academic workforce, particularly part-time faculty members—the number of courses they are engaged to teach, the number of institutions at which they are engaged to teach them, the pay across institutional categories and disciplines, the relation of geography to pay, and the level of professional support. The data become all the more revealing in the light of the remarkable number of extensive comments—over 30,000—respondents provided in the two open-ended questions the survey included.⁵

This report looks specifically at the survey findings for part-time faculty respondents and is organized around the following categories:

- ♦ demographics
- ♦ compensation and benefits
- ♦ professional support

In each section the data are disaggregated by institutional type and, where possible, other variables; various cross-tabulations are used to examine compensation and support against demographic and institutional factors. This report, however, addresses only the basic findings of the survey with regard to part-time faculty members and only scratches the surface of what might be gleaned from the data set. The survey data file is available to qualified researchers for further analysis (e-mail contact@academicworkforce.org).

KEY FINDINGS

Part-time faculty members represent the largest and fastest-growing segment of the postsecondary instructional workforce in the United States; not surprisingly, the 10,331 individuals who identified themselves as teaching part-time in at least one institution were the largest group of respondents to the CAW survey. Respondents in this category were directed to a survey path that invited them to provide information about up to six credit-bearing courses they were teaching in the fall 2010 term—the subject area, curricular level, and delivery mode (face-to-face, online, or hybrid) of the course; the institution offering it; and the salary and benefits received. Part-time faculty respondents reported at least some information for a total of 19,615 courses. Other sections of the survey asked respondents to provide basic demographic information. As a result, some findings presented in this report reflect general information about the respondents (race, gender, educational attainment, area of specialization), while others reflect the conditions associated with teaching a specific course at a particular institution as a part-time faculty member (pay per course, pay as a function of discipline, level of course).

Demographics

While the survey respondents do not constitute a strictly representative sample, the response from part-time faculty members was both robust and diverse on many levels.

Gender and Race

The CAW survey received a much higher percentage of women respondents and a lower minority response rate than is reflected in national IPEDS data. Of part-time faculty respondents who provided information about their gender, 61.9% were women, as compared with 51.6% in the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) 2009 Fall Staff Survey (table 2). Nearly 90% of part-time faculty respondents who reported their race or ethnicity identified themselves as white, as compared with 81.9% in the NCES 2009 Fall Staff Survey (table 3).

These differences may be explained by the disciplinary distribution of respondents to the CAW survey and the concentration of responses in certain geographic areas and institutional types. Gender did not emerge as a determining factor with regard to per-course pay for the part-time faculty respondents, but questions around the impact of race on pay per course in this data set did emerge and are discussed below.

Age

Part-time faculty respondents varied widely by age (table 4). More than 70% of part-time faculty respondents who provided information about their age were in their prime earning years, between the ages of 36 and 65. Only about 9% of respondents were over 65, and only 1% of respondents were 25 or under.

These data raise questions about the common assumption that the part-time faculty ranks are made up of either new, young faculty members taking a first step on the path to full-time employment or older faculty members and professionals who are now teaching as a second, part-time career or avocation. Further analysis would be needed to test this assumption.

Institutional Type

Respondents reported teaching courses at a range of Carnegie institutional types (table 5). Of the 19,615 individual courses reported on by part-time faculty respondents, the institutional type could be determined for 18,449; this number serves as the basis for the following breakdown:

- ◆ 7,111 courses (38.5%) were taught at Carnegie associate's institutions
- ◆ 1,267 courses (6.9%) were taught at Carnegie baccalaureate institutions
- ◆ 5,381 courses (29.2%) were taught at Carnegie master's institutions
- ◆ 4,119 courses (22.3%) were taught at Carnegie doctoral and research institutions
- ◆ 571 courses (3.1%) were taught at Carnegie special focus institutions

For the remaining 1,166 courses (not counted in the percentage calculations) the institutional type could not be determined. Institutional type emerges as perhaps the most significant factor determining the compensation, treatment, and support of part-time faculty members.

Discipline

When asked about their principal field of academic specialization, respondents covered all thirty-five disciplinary category options in the questionnaire, although the participation from some disciplines amounted to less than 1% of the overall respondents (table 6).⁶ Part-time faculty members in the humanities represented the largest set of respondents, accounting for 42.3% (table 7). Part-time faculty respondents from English language and literature alone made up 16.4% (table 6). This distribution may reflect the efforts of the organizations that supported the survey and does not necessarily describe the actual distribution of all faculty members employed part-time.

The distribution of respondents by discipline is also reflected in the disciplinary distribution of the 19,615 courses part-time faculty respondents reported on (table 8):

- ◆ 8,593 courses (44.0%) were taught in the humanities
- ◆ 4,011 courses (20.5%) were taught in professional fields
- ◆ 2,758 courses (14.1%) were taught in the sciences
- ◆ 2,686 courses (13.8%) were taught in the social sciences
- ◆ 279 courses (1.4%) were taught in occupationally specific programs
- ◆ all other programs accounted for 1,205 courses (6.2%)

While the results are skewed to certain disciplines, the response is sizable enough to examine differences and similarities among disciplines. In addition, in many disciplines the response is large enough to enable a closer examination of working conditions within those disciplines.

Credentials

Ninety-four percent of part-time faculty respondents held some level of graduate degree: 40.2% reported a master's degree as their highest level of educational attainment, 30.4% a doctorate, 16.7% a professional degree or other terminal degree, and 7.0% completed all work but the dissertation toward a doctoral degree (table 9).

What is perhaps more important to examine, however, is the level of educational attainment broken out by institutional type, since credential requirements may differ (e.g., a master's degree is the typical degree required for tenure-eligible faculty members at two-year institutions). The vast majority of part-time faculty members teaching at all types of institutions held a master's degree or higher (table 10). At four-year institutions, there is more differentiation with regard to educational attainment. Here slightly more than half (54.2%) of respondents hold a doctoral or other terminal degree that would be considered the common qualification for tenure-track positions in those institutions.⁷ By contrast, among respondents who reported courses only in two-year colleges, 31.0% hold a doctoral or other terminal degree and 53.6% hold nonterminal master's degrees, indicating that nearly 85% of part-time faculty respondents teaching in two-year colleges hold a degree considered the basic qualification for tenure-track positions in those institutions. Respondents who reported courses from both types of institutions fall in between: 47.7% reported holding a nonterminal master's degree, and 42.1% reported holding a doctorate or other terminal degree.

As shown in the analysis of compensation, however, these distinctions in educational attainment result in only modest differences in pay.

Length of Service and Desire for Full-Time Work

The survey results also support the anecdotal evidence that part-time faculty positions are typically temporary only as a matter of how a position is defined, not how long a person occupies a position. Over 80% of part-time faculty respondents reported having taught as a contingent faculty member for at least three years; over 55% taught in that role for six or more years, and over 30% for ten or more years (table 11). These figures suggest that most respondents to the survey see teaching as a long-term, professional commitment rather than as something “adjunct” to another career. In fact, 73.3% of respondents indicated that they considered teaching in higher education their primary employment (table 12). Further, when respondents were asked about courses they were teaching, more than three-fourths reported they were currently teaching at least one course for the third time or more at the same institution; more than half were teaching at least one course for the sixth time or more (table 13).

These findings do not imply that most respondents prefer teaching off the tenure track or part-time. When asked if they were seeking a full-time tenure-track position, only a quarter responded that they preferred a part-time non-tenure-track position over a full-time tenure-track position (table 14). Nearly 30% said they were seeking a full-time tenure-track position, another 20.1% said they intended to seek such a position, and 26.0% said they had sought such a position in the past. Asked if they would accept a full-time tenure-track position at the institution where they were currently teaching, 51.9% said they definitely would, and another 21.8% said they probably would (table 15). Only 8.1% definitely would not take a full-time tenure-track position where they were currently teaching, and 11.4% said they probably would not. These responses suggest a significant desire on the part of part-time faculty respondents to move into full-time tenure-track positions.

Teaching Load

We turn now to the work patterns and pay revealed by the 9,162 part-time faculty respondents who provided information about the specific courses they were teaching and the institutions where they were teaching them in fall 2010. Most do not fit the prevalent stereotype of the “free-way flyer”—the part-time faculty member piecing together a full-time load by teaching at multiple institutions. Rather, these respondents fit into two groups: a large group teaching one course or two courses and a smaller group teaching three or more courses.

Across all part-time faculty members who reported on the specific courses they taught in fall 2010, most reported teaching only one course (43.2%) or two courses (27.5%) during that term (table 16). Seventy-eight percent were teaching at a single institution (table 17). The largest subset—42.6%—was teaching a single course at a single institution in fall 2010. The next largest subset—35.4%—was teaching two or more courses at a single institution. Yet about 30% were teaching larger loads: 15.5% reported teaching three courses, 7.1% taught four courses, and 3.6% and 3.1% taught five or six courses, respectively (table 16).

Part-time faculty members teaching multiple courses at multiple institutions constituted 22.1% of the part-time faculty members who reported on the courses they taught in fall 2010: 17.9% of the group reported teaching at two institutions, and 4.2% reported teaching at three or more institutions (table 17).

Caution should be exercised in assessing these findings, however. Aggregate analysis of respondents’ reports on individual courses shows 70.7% of the 9,162 part-time respondents teach one course or two courses (table 16). By comparison, of the 10,026 part-time respondents who

answered the question, “How many courses are you teaching in fall 2010?” 54.8% said that they were teaching one course or two courses (table 18). One inference we draw is that a significant number of the 9,162 respondents who reported on specific classes they were teaching exited the survey before they had completed questionnaires for all the classes they taught that term, leading to underreporting for courses beyond one or two.

That these data provide a snapshot of the part-time faculty during one academic term may likewise limit the ability to conclude that this distribution is representative—particularly since the survey was conducted in fall 2010, in the middle of a major economic recession that saw some institutions laying off part-time faculty members and others relying more heavily on them. Nevertheless, the distribution in no way suggests that the low compensation and minimal professional support documented later in this report are somehow justified.

Our initial analysis could not delve into distinctions between part-time faculty members with larger and smaller teaching loads, so we could not determine whether those groups correlate to particular institutional types or disciplines and whether working conditions and professional support vary with part-time faculty members’ workload. The answers to such questions could be valuable not only for understanding where and how institutions are more systematically relying on part-time faculty members but also for examining questions of student persistence and success. We encourage other researchers to use the survey data to explore these questions.

Compensation and Benefits

So how are the part-time faculty members who responded to the CAW survey compensated? The core findings are that these part-time faculty members

- ♦ report consistently low compensation rates per course;
- ♦ lag far behind their peers with similar credentials;
- ♦ experience little in the way of a career ladder (i.e., wages do not increase with length of service); and
- ♦ see consistently different levels of pay based on the type of institution that employs them.

Other variables have less conclusive impact on per-course pay rates, although more analysis may uncover other trends. To look closely at the question of compensation, we turn to a series of data based on median pay per course as a function of different combinations of variables.

Median Pay per Course in Terms of Educational Attainment and Length of Service

Looking at all courses part-time faculty respondents reported on, the median pay per course, standardized to a three-credit course, is \$2,700. There does appear to be a wage premium based on credentials among part-time faculty members: those who hold a bachelor’s degree earned a median pay per course of \$2,250, those with a master’s degree earned \$2,400, those with professional or other terminal degrees earned between \$2,800 and \$2,937, and those with a doctorate earned \$3,200 (table 19).

This wage premium, however, reflects differences only within an employment category that is significantly underpaid, not just in comparison with tenured and tenure-track colleagues but also in comparison with similarly credentialed workers across the United States in all professions. If we were to annualize the median per-course salaries of part-time faculty respondents and compare them with the median earnings of all full-time workers, it becomes clear just how underpaid this group of professionals is. We first annualized pay based on an annual load of eight classes

that might be configured in more than one way (i.e., four courses in each of two terms during the traditional academic year, or three courses in fall and spring and two courses in the summer [table 20]). The gap between what a part-time faculty member earns and the median earnings of full-time, year-round workers of equivalent educational attainment is staggering and becomes more dramatic as the level of credential rises.

Some would assert that while eight courses per academic year might be considered a full load for full-time tenure-track faculty members, such a teaching load without any research or service requirements does not truly represent the work of a full-time faculty member. Others would assert that, regardless of outside work, an annual course load of eight courses does not reflect full-time employment. Even if we annualize salaries using an extreme model of a teaching load of five courses in each of three terms during a year, however, we find that the annualized earnings of a part-time faculty member are still dramatically below that of professionals with similar credentials (table 20).

For most Americans, higher educational attainment regularly and predictably leads to higher earnings. The wage premium for an advanced degree for part-time faculty members who responded to this survey, however, is minimal and comparatively lower than the median earnings of other professionals with the same level of education.

Like credentials, length of service often leads to higher earnings for professionals, but not for the part-time faculty members who responded to the CAW survey. Moving from those who have taught only one term to those who have taught thirty or more terms, one sees median pay per course range from a low of \$2,679 per course (for those who have taught twelve to fourteen terms) to \$3,000 per course (for those who have taught twenty terms or more [table 21]). In short, little economic benefit accrues with part-time faculty members' experience in the classroom.

Median Pay per Course in Terms of Institutional Type, Control, and Location

The variable with the clearest correlation to per-course pay rates is institutional type. The lowest pay was at the two-year-college level, where respondents reported a median per-course pay of \$2,235, and the highest was at four-year doctoral and research universities, where respondents reported a median per-course pay of \$3,400 (table 22).

This correlation also holds true when one looks at public institutions versus private not-for-profit institutions. With one exception, pay increases by institutional type within each sector. One clear deviation from that pattern is the pay per course in for-profit institutions, which is significantly lower than pay per course in not-for-profit institutions, public or private. The median pay per course in the for-profit institutions was a mere \$1,560, with little variation by Carnegie institutional type.

The relation of geographic location to pay is an area that deserves further analysis (table 23 and table 24), by institutional type, discipline, educational attainment, and state.

Median Pay per Course in Terms of Union Status

The presence of a union on campus also appears to have a positive impact on wages for faculty members employed part-time. The median pay per course at institutions where part-time faculty respondents were not represented by a union was \$2,475, as compared with \$3,100 at institutions with union representation (table 25). This union wage premium is also reflected across institutional types with the exception of the baccalaureate colleges, where median wages were slightly higher for courses where part-time faculty respondents were not represented by a union.⁸

Median Pay per Course in Terms of Discipline

Responses to the survey show median pay per course for most disciplines hovering around the median pay for all courses (\$2,700), although pay in some disciplines varies considerably from the overall median (table 26). On the high end, engineering has a median pay of \$4,000 per course; on the low end, a few disciplines, including mathematics and developmental education, have a median per-course pay closer to \$2,000. Once the data are aggregated into broad disciplinary clusters, the median pay is consistently around \$2,700 (table 27).⁹

Median Pay per Course in Terms of Course Level and Delivery Mode

Pay per course varied by course level and delivery mode. The median per-course pay was lowest for developmental courses, at \$2,250 (table 28). Pay per course then increased incrementally as course level increased, with graduate courses taught by part-time faculty members having the highest median rate at \$3,375. As for mode of delivery, respondents teaching on-site courses reported median pay per course of \$2,850, those teaching courses online reported \$2,250, and those teaching hybrid courses reported \$2,462 (table 29).

Median Pay per Course in Terms of Gender and Race

Survey responses indicated only a slight variation in median pay by gender: women reported a median per-course pay of \$2,700, while men reported earning slightly more, at a median per-course pay of \$2,780 (table 30).

There is even less variation in pay between men and women when we account for institutional type. The median pay per course reported by female and by male respondents is basically identical in two-year institutions, master's institutions, doctoral and research institutions, and special focus institutions. Of those respondents for whom the Carnegie institutional type could be determined, only those teaching in baccalaureate institutions reveal any disparity in per-course pay by gender—\$2,700 for men, as compared with \$2,800 for women (table 30).

Broken down by race or ethnicity, the data suggest that part-time faculty respondents who identified themselves as black (not of Hispanic origin) earn significantly less than other racial and ethnic groups at a median per-course pay of \$2,083 (table 31). By comparison, median pay ranged from \$2,500 per course for Hispanic or Latino or multiracial respondents to \$2,925 for Asian or Pacific Islander respondents.

Pay rates for part-time faculty respondents who identified themselves as black (not of Hispanic origin) appear to be generally lower even when the type of institution is included in the analysis. Yet the number of respondents in this category is small. Our analysis indicates that black non-Hispanic respondents, relative to other groups of survey respondents, were somewhat overrepresented at two-year colleges and (probably more important) underrepresented at doctoral universities. They were also more likely to be employed in the southeastern United States, where pay rates are generally lower. Further analysis of the difference in pay rates by race may yield a better understanding of the situation, although, given the small number of African American respondents to the CAW survey, it would be important to collect more data, focusing specifically on this question.

Benefits

In addition to collecting data on pay per course, the survey prompted respondents for information about benefits they receive through their employer, including health and retirement.¹⁰ Most part-time faculty respondents who had health benefits from any source received them from a source other than their academic employer: 17.5% from a primary employer other than their academic employer, and 37.3% from a spouse's or partner's employer (table 32). Only 22.6% indicated they had access to health benefits through their academic employer; among those respondents 4.3% indicated that the college or university paid for health care, 14.6% that the cost for health benefits was shared by the employee and employer, and 3.6% that health benefits were provided through the employer but that the total cost was borne by the employee.

In contrast to health benefits, a higher percentage of part-time faculty reported having access to retirement benefits in some form through their academic employer (table 33). More than 40% of part-time faculty respondents indicated they had access to retirement benefits through their academic employer; 5.3% indicated that the employer paid for retirement, 26.9% that the cost of retirement benefits was shared by the employee and employer, and 9.2% that retirement benefits were available through the employer but that the total cost was borne by the employee. The percentage of part-time faculty respondents receiving retirement benefits from a primary employer other than their academic employer was nearly identical to the percentage receiving retirement benefits from a spouse's or partner's employer (16.8% and 17.3%, respectively).

Both types of benefits appear to be more prevalent at public institutions: 23.4% of part-time faculty respondents in public institutions indicated that they had access to health benefits, and 46.9% indicated they had access to retirement benefits, as compared with 16.0% and 20.6% with access to health and retirement benefits, respectively, in private not-for-profit institutions (table 34, table 35).

This difference may be due to the far greater presence of unions in the public sector, since part-time faculty respondents who identified having union representation also reported having greater access to both health and retirement benefits (table 36, table 37). Of the part-time faculty respondents who reported having no union on campus, only 13.8% indicated they had access to health benefits through their academic employer, and 27.5% reported access to retirement benefits through their academic employer. By comparison, 34.3% of the respondents covered by at least one union indicated they had access to health benefits through their academic employer, and 60.1% indicated having access to retirement benefits through their academic employer.

Institutional Support

The survey also asked respondents about various forms of support provided by their employers. Access to such resources and benefits is a good indicator of the level of commitment an institution has toward part-time faculty members and the extent to which the institutions treat part-time faculty members as integral parts of the instructional staff who must be engaged in the life of the institution.

The respondents paint a dismal picture, one that clearly demonstrates how little professional commitment and support part-time faculty members receive from their institutions for anything that costs money and is not related to preparing and delivering discrete course materials. The findings also reflect a lack of processes and resources to include part-time faculty members in the academic community of the college or university.

Available resources and support differ modestly by institutional type. Interestingly, respondents indicate that most forms of support are offered more commonly at two-year institutions than at four-year institutions (table 38). This difference may be due to the heavy reliance on part-time faculty in two-year institutions, resulting in more attention to these issues, or it could be due to the higher rate of unionization in this sector, since that variable also correlates with an increased availability of resources and support (table 39).

Respondents who reported the presence of a union on at least one of the campuses where they teach were consistently more likely to receive resources and support, particularly on matters of compensation (table 39). Respondents with a union present on at least one campus where they taught indicated the following levels of support:

- ◆ 17.9% indicated they are paid for class cancellations, as opposed to only 9.9% of respondents without a union present.
- ◆ 9.7% indicated being paid for attending departmental meetings, as opposed to only 5.4% of respondents without a union present.
- ◆ 14.5% indicated being paid for office hours, as opposed to only 3.8% of respondents without a union present.
- ◆ 33.9% indicated receiving regular salary increases, as opposed to only 12.1% of respondents without a union present.
- ◆ 19.4% indicated having job security, as opposed to only 3.9% of respondents without a union present.

Support for professional-development activities was also reported more frequently by respondents teaching on at least one campus where a union was present. Yet the overall low percentage of institutions providing such support represents another indicator that institutions are not investing in maintaining and improving the quality of instruction. Respondents teaching on at least one campus where a union was present reported greater access to various kinds of administrative support as well, but the difference between unionized and nonunionized settings was not as great on these items as on other forms of workplace support.

The data on professional support gathered in this survey imply an institutional assumption that part-time faculty members will for the most part appear on campus only to deliver a discrete course and not to participate with students or colleagues in any other structurally supported way.

CONCLUSIONS

Part-time faculty members' responses to the CAW survey confirm much of what has been reported anecdotally. Part-time faculty members demonstrate a level of commitment to teaching and to the institutions that employ them, but this commitment is not reciprocated by those institutions in terms of compensation or other types of professional support. Pay per course is strikingly low, especially in the light of the professional credentials and length of service of many of these faculty members. It is therefore not surprising that more than half of part-time faculty respondents reported an annual personal income of less than \$35,000, and two-thirds reported an annual income of less than \$45,000 (table 40). A significant number of these faculty members were part of a household that fell below the 2009 median household income in the United States: 21.6% reported a household income under \$35,000, and 30.2% reported a household income under

\$45,000. That said, household income for part-time faculty respondents was fairly evenly distributed from under \$25,000 to over \$150,000.

The income distribution reported by CAW survey respondents might seem to suggest that most part-time faculty members regard income from their academic employment as a non-essential subsidy to their household income. But most respondents—particularly those who had household incomes under \$65,000—reported that the pay received for part-time teaching was essential to their total income (table 41). And regardless of the significance of such income to the employee, the low compensation levels and absence of professional support stand in stark contradiction to higher education’s claims about the value—including the economic value—accruing to both individuals and the wider society from more advanced educational attainment. Rather, the levels of compensation and support reflect short-sighted employment practices in a labor market where colleges and universities are able to find qualified professionals and pay them significantly lower wages than their credentials and training warrant.

That course of action may make sense for institutions as a short-term economic calculation; it allows states to continue cutting support for public higher education and institutions to continue making undergraduate instruction a low priority. As a coalition, however, CAW does not believe current institutional practice for the employment of part-time faculty members represents good education policy. CAW believes that it is time for institutions to turn their attention to those who work day in and day out to ensure that students succeed—to give the highest priority to investment in the members of higher education’s academic workforce, across all segments and statuses. As the conclusion of the CAW issue brief *One Faculty Serving All Students* states:

There is much debate about the current state and future of higher education in the United States. A major focus of that debate is whether the system we now have is helping enough students attain their goals, which may be an academic degree, employment, retraining, or the advancement of knowledge. That debate must include the very people most responsible for helping students achieve their goals: the faculty. If we are to maintain a world-class system of higher education and help all students achieve success, we must have a strong faculty with the support necessary to carry out its professional responsibilities. (5)

Having a strong faculty, in turn, will require that our higher education institutions address the weak institutional support for part-time faculty members so clearly indicated by the findings presented in this report.

Notes

1. The National Center for Education Statistics reports, “Enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions increased by 9 percent between 1989 and 1999. Between 1999 and 2009, enrollment increased 38 percent, from 14.8 million to 20.4 million” (“Fast Facts”).

2. According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2011 marked “a new low point in state funding for public colleges and universities. Hundreds of millions of dollars in funding cuts, combined with increasing student enrollments, resulted in per-student funding reaching a 30-year low. . . . For many, 2011 seemed to have marked a somber turning point in which the major stock owner of the American public university switched hands—from that of the collective taxpayer, through funding allocated by the state, to that of students and their families, through funding paid for via tuition payments” (*Top Ten Higher Education State Policy Issues* 1).

3. A copy of the survey instrument can be found on the [CAW Web site](#).

4. This uneven distribution is certainly due, in part, to the makeup of CAW. While the survey was not limited to members of CAW organizations, those organizations were the most active in publicizing the survey. Thus the disciplines represented by CAW and the geographic areas where CAW organizations' members are concentrated are most frequently represented in the universe of responses.

5. While the responses in the open comment fields informed this report, they were not formally coded or analyzed; these passionate and descriptive comments remain a rich area for exploration. Interestingly, one of the most frequent comments on the surveys not related to working conditions was "thank you," since many respondents recognized the tremendous information and data gap that exists about the working conditions of contingent faculty members.

6. The taxonomy of disciplines used in the survey is based on the "principal field of teaching" categories developed for the 1988 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF). Respondents were allowed to categorize both their area of education and specific teaching subjects into either a broad field (e.g., humanities, social sciences) or into a specific category (e.g., English language and literature, sociology). A few additional categories were added to the taxonomy, such as anthropology, art history, and teaching English to speakers of foreign languages.

7. This category includes respondents who reported holding an MFA or MLS as well as those who reported holding a JD, MD, or MBA.

8. The number of courses reported from baccalaureate colleges where part-time faculty members are represented by unions is very low, so this result may be an anomaly.

9. The median per-course pay reported for mathematics is \$2,200, significantly lower than the \$2,700 median per-course pay across all disciplines. It would be valuable to explore the data to determine if course level, institutional type, or a series of other variables are creating that difference or if, in fact, mathematics as a field pays a lower rate per course.

10. The survey asked respondents about benefits in two different ways. Respondents were asked about benefits in general, which is what is reported here. Respondents were also asked about benefits from the institution for each course they reported on. Those data were fairly consistent with the overall benefits data, although this report does not delve into the course-level benefit data. In addition, the survey included questions about life insurance, child care, and social security that are not reported on here. Consequently, access to benefits is an area open for considerably more research.

Works Cited

- Baum, Sandy, Jennifer Ma, and Kathleen Payea. *Education Pays 2010: The Benefits of Higher Education for Individuals and Society. Trends in Higher Education*. Coll. Board, 2010. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.
- "Fast Facts: Enrollment." *National Center for Education Statistics*. Natl. Center for Educ. Statistics, Dept. of Educ., n.d. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.
- Gonzalez, Jennifer. "Bachelor's Degree Is Still Best Path to Middle-Class Jobs and Earnings, Report Says." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Chronicle of Higher Educ., 14 Nov. 2011. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.
- Knapp, Laura G., Janice E. Kelly-Reid, and Scott A. Ginder. *Employees in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2009, and Salaries of Full-Time Instructional Staff, 2009–10*. NCES 2011-150. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Natl. Center for Educ. Statistics, Dept. of Educ., Nov. 2010. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.
- One Faculty Serving All Students*. *Coalition on the Academic Workforce*. Coalition on the Acad. Workforce, Feb. 2010. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.
- Reversing Course: The Troubled State of Academic Staffing and a Path Forward*. 36-08001. *American Federation of Teachers*. Amer. Federation of Teachers, 2 Dec. 2008. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.
- Top Ten Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2012*. *Policy Matters*. Assn. of State Colls. and Univs., Jan. 2012. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.

Methodology

The coalition organized the survey to draw information directly from academics employed in various types of contingent appointments. A subcommittee of seven organizational representatives (Kathleen Terry-Sharp, American Anthropological Association; John Curtis, American Association of University Professors; Craig Smith, American Federation of Teachers; Robert B. Townsend, American Historical Association; David Laurence, Modern Language Association; and Kent Richards and Charles Haws, Society of Biblical Literature) drafted the questionnaire, which was then reviewed by all members of the coalition and tested by the relevant committees on the contingent faculty in each of the sponsoring organizations.

The **survey questionnaire** ran to almost 160 questions and was administered in *Survey Monkey*. Within the limitations of the *Survey Monkey* software, survey respondents were channeled into separate sets of questions, depending on whether they were teaching a credit-bearing course in fall 2010 and on their current category of employment (“employed part-time at one or more institutions,” “employed full-time off the tenure track at one institution,” “employed full-time at one institution and part-time at another,” “graduate student instructor or teaching assistant,” “postdoctoral fellowship,” and “employed full-time with tenure or on the tenure track”). The **survey path** shows how these categories directed the respondents into different paths of questions intended to parse out their particular work patterns and working conditions. For instance, faculty members employed part-time at one or more institutions were taken into a loop that allowed detailed responses about as many as six courses. Faculty members employed only in research positions or in tenured or tenure-track positions were asked only a few demographic questions.

Reaching out to colleagues in the contingent academic workforce presented significant challenges, since the contingency of their employment and their status within the disciplines made it impossible to precisely define the population or create a strictly representative sample of our intended subjects. The CAW organizations e-mailed their members classified as working in part-time and adjunct positions and also distributed links to the survey through a wide variety of social media and print advertisements.

In the end, 28,974 individuals responded to the survey. Of those, 3,762 did not adequately identify their position as a faculty member or instructor, leaving 25,212 valid responses. In addition, 4,292 of the respondents identified themselves as full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members, leaving 20,920 responses from academics in contingent positions as the base set of data for analysis. The data were then reviewed by the members of the subcommittee and prepared for analysis. A particular challenge arose in coding institution-specific responses. Because of the limitations of the software used, respondents entered institution names in open text fields. These entries were coded by the subcommittee using United States Department of Education ID codes, which were then matched with institutional characteristics data collected through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. Before the data set is released for further analysis, institutional names and ID codes will be removed to protect the identity of respondents. Researchers interested in pursuing further analysis of the CAW data set are encouraged to e-mail the coalition (contact@academicworkforce.org) for more information about the data usage agreement and confidentiality protections.

Table 1**Survey Respondents, by Primary Employment Status**

	Number of Respondents
Part-time faculty	10,331
Full-time non-tenure-track faculty	7,533
Graduate student employees (teaching)	1,797
Postdoctoral employees (research)	501
Full-time researchers	332
Graduate student employees (research)	237
Postdoctoral employees (teaching)	189
Subtotal contingent academics	20,920
Full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty	4,292
Unclassified	3,762
Total respondents	28,974

Table 2**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Gender**

	2010 CAW Survey		2009 Fall Staff Survey	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Female	5,233	61.9	375,335	51.6
Male	3,216	38.0	351,763	48.4
Other	9	0.1		
Valid responses	8,458	100.0	727,098	100.0
Missing				
Prefer not to answer	144			
No response	1,729			
Total missing	1,873			
Total respondents	10,331			

Note:

Figures for the 2009 Fall Staff Survey are from table 8 of the IPEDS Winter 2009 Compendium Tables.

Table 3**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Race and Ethnicity**

	2010 CAW Survey		2009 Fall Staff Survey	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
White (not of Hispanic origin)	7,220	89.5	527,818	81.9
Hispanic or Latino	236	2.9	29,784	4.6
Black (not of Hispanic origin)	216	2.7	55,441	8.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	183	2.3	26,674	4.1
Multiracial	178	2.2	1,350	0.2
Native American / First Nations	38	0.5	3,622	0.6
Valid responses	8,071	100.1	644,689	100.0
Missing				
Prefer not to answer	536			
No response	1,724		66,330	
Total missing	2,260		66,330	
Total part-time faculty members	10,331		711,019	

Notes:

Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Figures for the 2009 Fall Staff Survey data are from table 13 and table 16 of the IPEDS Winter 2009

Compendium Tables. The number of part-time faculty members is calculated as the difference between the number of total faculty members (table 13) and the number of full-time faculty members (table 16).

Table 4**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Age**

	Number	Percentage
25 or under	82	1.0
26–35	1,649	19.3
36–45	1,854	21.7
46–55	1,992	23.3
56–65	2,205	25.8
66–75	676	7.9
76 and over	102	1.2
Valid responses	8,560	100.2
Missing		
Prefer not to answer	107	
No response	1,664	
Total missing	1,771	
Total respondents	10,331	

Note:

Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 5**Courses Taught by Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Carnegie Institutional Type and Control of Employing Institution**

	All Institutions		Public		Private Not-for-Profit		Private For-Profit	
	Number	Percentage at All Institutions	Number	Percentage at Public Institutions	Number	Percentage at Private Not-for-Profit Institutions	Number	Percentage at Private For-Profit Institutions
Associate's	7,111	38.5	7,033	52.1	30	0.7	48	0.3
Baccalaureate	1,267	6.9	379	2.8	830	18.8	58	0.3
Master's	5,381	29.2	3,202	23.7	1,936	43.9	243	1.3
Doctoral and research	4,119	22.3	2,855	21.2	1,224	27.8	40	0.2
Special focus	571	3.1	26	0.2	390	8.8	155	0.8
Valid responses	18,449	100.0	13,495	100.0	4,410	100.0	544	100.1
Missing (not available)	1,166							
Total courses	19,615							

Note:

Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 6**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Primary Academic Specialization**

	Number	Percentage
Agriculture and home economics	19	0.2
Anthropology	423	4.1
Art education	149	1.5
Art history	362	3.5
Biological sciences	308	3.0
Business	491	4.8
Communications	321	3.1
Computer sciences	176	1.7
Developmental education	115	1.1
Economics	69	0.7
Education	406	4.0
Engineering	93	0.9
English language and literature	1,678	16.4
First-professional health sciences	47	0.5
Health sciences, other	151	1.5
History	682	6.6
Humanities	187	1.8
Law	107	1.0
Mathematics	409	4.0
Modern languages and literatures other than English	547	5.3
Nursing	112	1.1
Philosophy and religion	496	4.8
Physical sciences	308	3.0
Political science	140	1.4
Professional fields	110	1.1
Psychology	298	2.9
Sciences	28	0.3
Social sciences	68	0.7
Social sciences, other	131	1.3
Sociology	202	2.0
Studio art and design	591	5.8
Teaching English to speakers of foreign languages	241	2.3
Occupationally specific programs	167	1.6
All other programs	628	6.1
Valid responses	10,260	100.1
Missing (no response)	71	
Total respondents	10,331	

Note:

Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 7**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Discipline Cluster**

	Number	Percentage
Humanities	4,342	42.3
Professional fields	2,253	22.0
Sciences	1,539	15.0
Social sciences	1,331	13.0
Occupationally specific programs	167	1.6
All other programs	628	6.1
Valid responses	10,260	100.0
Missing (no response)	71	
Total respondents	10,331	

Table 8**Courses Taught by Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Discipline Cluster**

	Number	Percentage
Humanities	8,593	44.0
Professional fields	4,011	20.5
Sciences	2,758	14.1
Social sciences	2,686	13.8
Occupationally specific programs	279	1.4
All other programs	1,205	6.2
Valid responses	19,532	100.0
Missing (no response)	83	
Total courses	19,615	

Table 9**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Educational Attainment**

	Number	Percentage
Less than baccalaureate	52	0.6
Baccalaureate	386	4.5
Certification or licensure	49	0.6
Master's	3,487	40.2
MFA or MLS	872	10.1
JD, MD, or MBA	572	6.6
ABD ¹	606	7.0
Doctorate	2,638	30.4
Other	12	0.1
Valid responses	8,674	100.1
Missing (no response)	1,657	
Total respondents	10,331	

Notes:

Institutional types refer to the Carnegie 2010 basic classification.

Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

1. "ABD" is a candidate for a doctorate who has completed "all but dissertation."

Table 10

Carnegie Institutional Types Where Part-Time Faculty Respondents Were Teaching in Fall 2010, by Highest Degree Respondents Hold

	Two-Year Only		Four-Year Only		Two-Year and Four-Year		Specialized Institutions ¹		Multiple Types ²		Not Specified		Total
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Less than baccalaureate	37	1.4	12	0.3	2	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	52
Baccalaureate	190	7.3	157	3.4	10	1.5	15	4.7	0	0.0	14	3.9	386
Certification or licensure	22	0.8	21	0.5	4	0.6	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.3	49
Master's	1,388	53.6	1,571	34.0	325	47.7	66	20.5	33	35.1	104	29.3	3,487
MFA or MLS	199	7.7	412	8.9	80	11.7	129	40.1	18	19.1	34	9.6	872
JD, MD, or MBA	198	7.6	316	6.8	30	4.4	6	1.9	3	3.2	19	5.4	572
ABD ³	149	5.8	353	7.6	54	7.9	16	5.0	5	5.3	29	8.2	606
Doctorate	408	15.7	1,776	38.5	177	26.0	88	27.3	35	37.2	154	43.4	2,638
Valid responses	2,591	99.9	4,618	100.0	682	100.1	322	100.1	94	99.9	355	100.1	8,662
Missing	207		235		30		21		5		1,171		1,669
Total responses	2,798		4,853		712		343		99		1,526		10,331

Notes:

Institutional types refer to the Carnegie 2010 basic classification.

Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

1. "Specialized institutions" are those classified by Carnegie as "special focus" and include all combinations with other types.
2. "Multiple types" indicates that the respondent taught at three or four different institutional types.
3. "ABD" is a candidate for a doctorate who has completed "all but dissertation."

Table 11
Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Years Teaching as a Contingent Faculty Member

	Number	Percentage
Less than a year	744	7.3
1–2 years	1,171	11.5
3–5 years	2,513	24.7
6–10 years	2,468	24.2
10–20 years	2,198	21.6
More than 20 years	1,093	10.7
Valid responses	10,187	100.0
Missing (no response)	144	
Total respondents	10,331	

Note:
The response categories reflected in this table are those provided in the questionnaire.

Table 12
Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Primary Occupation

	Number	Percentage
Contingent teaching	7,449	73.3
Other	2,714	26.7
Valid responses	10,163	100.0
Missing (no response)	168	
Total respondents	10,331	

Table 13
Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Greatest Number of Terms Teaching a Course

	Number	Percentage
Zero terms	118	1.3
One term	1,280	14.0
Two terms	707	7.8
Three terms	798	8.8
Four terms	653	7.2
Five terms	587	6.4
Six terms	622	6.8
Seven to nine terms	988	10.8
Ten to eleven terms	662	7.3
Twelve to fourteen terms	537	5.9
Fifteen to nineteen terms	611	6.7
Twenty to twenty-nine terms	805	8.8
Thirty or more terms	752	8.2
Valid responses	9,120	100.0
Missing (no response)	1,211	
Total respondents	10,331	

Notes:

For each course reported, the respondent was asked to provide "number of terms you have taught this course at this institution." Unfortunately, because the word "previously" was omitted from the question, it is unclear whether the responses refer to previous or total terms.

Respondents were asked to complete a separate questionnaire for each course they were teaching. The responses as categorized in the table are based on the one course with the highest number of terms; they are not an average high across all courses a respondent answered about.

Table 14**Part-Time Faculty Respondents Seeking a Full-Time Tenure-Track Position**

	Number	Percentage
No, but I have sought such a position in the past.	2,618	26.0
No, but I intend to seek such a position in the future.	2,031	20.1
No, I prefer part-time non-tenure-track employment.	2,447	24.3
Yes, I am currently seeking such a position.	2,984	29.6
Valid responses	10,080	100.0
Missing (no response)	251	
Total respondents	10,331	

Table 15**Part-Time Faculty Respondents' Interest in Accepting a Full-Time Tenure-Track Position**

	Number	Percentage
Yes, definitely interested	5,274	51.9
Probably interested	2,218	21.8
Probably not interested	1,163	11.4
Definitely not interested	828	8.1
Unsure	688	6.8
Valid responses	10,171	100.0
Missing (no response)	160	
Total respondents	10,331	

Table 16**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Number of Courses Reported for Fall 2010**

	Number	Percentage
One course	3,960	43.2
Two courses	2,522	27.5
Three courses	1,421	15.5
Four courses	647	7.1
Five courses	330	3.6
Six courses	282	3.1
Valid responses	9,162	100.0
Missing (no response)	1,169	
Total respondents	10,331	

Note:

Percentages in this table and in table 17 are based on aggregate analysis of the reports respondents gave on individual courses taught in fall 2010. Percentages in table 18 reflect answers respondents provided to a direct question, "How many courses are you teaching in fall 2010?"

Table 17**Part-Time Respondents Teaching at Various Numbers of Institutions, by Number of Courses Reported for Fall 2010**

	Any Number of Institutions		One Institution		Two Institutions		Three to Six Institutions	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
One course	3,785	42.6	3,785	42.6				
Two courses	2,470	27.8	1,910	21.5	560	6.3		
Three or more courses	2,634	29.6	1,233	13.9	1,031	11.6	370	4.2
Valid responses	8,889	100.0	6,928	77.9	1,591	17.9	370	4.2
Missing (no response)	1,442							
Total respondents	10,331							

Notes:

The basis for all percentages is the total number of valid responses (8,889).

Percentages in this table and in table 16 are based on aggregate analysis of the reports respondents gave on individual courses taught in fall 2010.

Percentages in table 18 reflect answers respondents provided to a direct question, "How many courses are you teaching in fall 2010?"

Table 18**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Number of Courses Taught in Fall 2010**

	Number	Percentage
No courses	42	0.4
One course	2,486	24.8
Two courses	3,006	30.0
Three courses	1,949	19.4
Four courses	1,158	11.5
Five courses	591	5.9
Six courses	347	3.5
Seven or more courses	447	4.5
Valid responses	10,026	100.0
Missing (no response)	305	
Total respondents	10,331	

Note:

Percentages in this table reflect answers respondents provided to a direct question, "How many courses are you teaching in fall 2010?" Percentages in table 16 and table 17 are based on aggregate analysis of the reports respondents gave on individual courses taught in fall 2010.

Table 19**Median Pay per Course, by Educational Attainment of Respondent**

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Less than baccalaureate	\$2,500	63
Baccalaureate	\$2,250	540
Certification or licensure	\$2,438	78
Master's	\$2,400	6,620
MFA or MLS	\$2,937	1,830
JD, MD, or MBA	\$2,800	953
ABD ¹	\$2,805	1,248
Doctorate	\$3,200	4,845
Other	\$2,085	19
Educational attainment not provided	\$2,700	839
All courses	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Note:

1. "ABD" is a candidate for a doctorate who has completed "all but dissertation."

Table 20**Earnings for Part-Time Faculty Members, Annualized, and Median Annual Earnings of Full-Time Workers in All Occupations, by Employee Educational Attainment and Teaching Load**

	Part-Time Faculty, Median Pay (Fall 2010)	Full-Time Year-Round Workers Ages 25 and Older (2008)	Difference in Terms of Dollars (and as a Percentage)
Baccalaureate			
8 courses	\$18,000	\$55,700	\$37,700 (209%)
15 courses	\$33,750	\$55,700	\$21,950 (65%)
Master's			
8 courses	\$19,200	\$67,300	\$48,100 (251%)
15 courses	\$36,000	\$67,300	\$31,300 (87%)
Doctorate			
8 courses	\$22,400	\$91,900	\$69,500 (310%)
15 courses	\$48,000	\$91,900	\$43,900 (91%)

Note:

Median annual earnings for full-time workers in all occupations are from Baum, Ma, and Payea 11.

Table 21**Median Pay per Course, by Number of Terms Taught**

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Zero terms	\$2,780	276
One term	\$2,700	3,381
Two terms	\$2,700	1,598
Three terms	\$2,700	1,635
Four terms	\$2,706	1,213
Five terms	\$2,700	1,117
Six terms	\$2,800	1,050
Seven to nine terms	\$2,800	1,592
Ten to eleven terms	\$2,733	1,049
Twelve to fourteen terms	\$2,679	905
Fifteen to nineteen terms	\$2,680	915
Twenty to twenty-nine terms	\$3,000	1,127
Thirty or more terms	\$3,000	1,056
No response	\$2,500	121
All terms	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Note:

For each course reported, the respondent was asked to provide "number of terms you have taught this course at this institution." Unfortunately, because the word "previously" was omitted from the question, it is unclear whether the responses refer to previous or total terms.

Table 22**Median Pay per Course Reported by Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Institutional Control and Carnegie Institutional Type**

	Total			Public		Private Not-for-Profit		Private For-Profit	
	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Associate's	\$2,235	6,263	6,190	\$2,250	6,190	\$2,238	28	\$1,450	45
Baccalaureate	\$2,800	1,198	353	\$2,511	353	\$3,000	772	\$1,625	56
Master's	\$3,000	4,869	2,844	\$3,000	2,844	\$2,904	1,788	\$1,498	237
Doctoral and research	\$3,400	3,717	2,584	\$3,200	2,584	\$3,800	1,095	\$1,270	38
Special focus	\$3,000	533	16	\$3,571	16	\$3,500	373	\$2,078	144
Not available	\$2,750	455	1		1		4		1
All responses	\$2,700	17,035	11,988	\$2,610	11,988	\$3,075	4,060	\$1,560	521
Pay not specified in response		2,580							
Total courses		19,615							

Notes:

Institutional types refer to the Carnegie 2010 basic classification.

Total includes courses where the institutional control was not available (17 baccalaureate and 449 unspecified institutions). Median pay is not calculated for categories with fewer than ten responses.

Table 23**Median Pay per Course, by Urban or Rural Location of Institution**

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Large metropolitan (250,000 or more)	\$2,800	9,439
Midsize metropolitan (100,000–249,999)	\$2,667	2,271
Small metropolitan (less than 100,000)	\$3,000	2,253
Town	\$3,000	1,422
Rural	\$2,100	1,079
Not available	\$2,700	571
All courses	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Note:

Urban or rural location is based on an institution's physical address. United States Census Bureau categories are reported as interpreted by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Table 24**Median Pay per Course, by Geographic Region**

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
New England	\$4,000	1,406
Mid East	\$3,000	4,014
Great Lakes	\$2,497	2,720
Plains	\$3,000	1,041
Southeast	\$2,100	2,067
Southwest	\$2,350	1,492
Rocky Mountains	\$2,595	509
Far West	\$3,000	3,264
Not available	\$2,800	522
All courses	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Notes:

New England: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont

Mid East: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania

Great Lakes: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin

Plains: Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota

Southeast: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia

Southwest: Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas

Rocky Mountains: Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming

Far West: Alaska, California, Hawai'i, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington

Table 25
Median Pay per Course, by Carnegie Institutional Type and Union Representation

	Union Representation													
	No			Yes			Not Sure			No Response			All Responses	
	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Associate's	\$1,900	2,481	3,255	\$2,700	3,255	475	\$2,111	475	52	\$2,175	52	6,263	\$2,235	6,263
Baccalaureate	\$2,800	992	84	\$2,700	84	113	\$2,700	113	9		9	1,198	\$2,800	1,198
Master's	\$2,500	2,458	1,982	\$3,600	1,982	373	\$3,000	373	56	\$2,700	56	4,869	\$3,000	4,869
Doctoral and research	\$3,100	2,389	930	\$3,984	930	360	\$3,200	360	38	\$3,475	38	3,717	\$3,400	3,717
Special focus	\$3,000	479	24	\$5,000	24	23	\$3,800	23	7		7	533	\$3,000	533
Not available	\$2,550	276	137	\$3,000	137	32	\$2,900	32	10	\$2,250	10	455	\$2,750	455
All courses	\$2,475	9,075	6,412	\$3,100	6,412	1,376	\$2,700	1,376	172	\$2,650	172	17,035	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		940	1,044		1,044	193		193	403		403	2,580		2,580
Total courses		10,015	7,456		7,456	1,569		1,569	575		575	19,615		19,615

Notes:

Institutional types refer to the Carnegie 2010 basic classification.

Median pay is not calculated for combinations with fewer than ten responses.

Table 26
Median Pay per Course, by Discipline (All Disciplines)

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Agriculture and home economics	\$3,300	31
Anthropology	\$3,000	665
Art education	\$2,765	212
Art history	\$3,000	539
Biological sciences	\$3,000	473
Business	\$2,850	805
Communications	\$2,600	529
Computer sciences	\$2,500	267
Developmental education	\$2,074	223
Economics	\$3,550	108
Education	\$2,500	449
Engineering	\$4,000	108
English language and literature	\$2,500	3,100
First-professional health sciences	\$1,800	39
Health sciences, other	\$2,535	212
History	\$2,600	1,102
Humanities	\$2,500	658
Law	\$2,600	73
Mathematics	\$2,235	697
Modern languages and literatures other than English	\$3,000	808
Nursing	\$3,153	112
Philosophy and religion	\$2,850	822
Physical sciences	\$3,000	438
Political science	\$3,000	197
Professional fields	\$3,300	152
Psychology	\$2,500	456
Sciences	\$2,800	51
Social sciences	\$2,450	236
Social sciences, other	\$2,700	171
Sociology	\$2,500	407
Studio art and design	\$3,000	1,026
Teaching English to speakers of foreign languages	\$2,400	276
Occupationally specific programs	\$2,850	229
All other programs	\$2,900	1,166
Discipline not specified	\$2,700	198
All courses	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Table 27**Median Pay per Course, by Discipline (Clustered)**

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Anthropology	\$3,000	665
Art history	\$3,000	539
Business	\$2,850	805
Communications	\$2,600	529
Education (cluster)	\$2,400	1,160
English language and literature	\$2,500	3,100
Health and natural sciences (cluster)	\$3,000	1,325
History	\$2,600	1,102
Humanities	\$2,500	658
Mathematics	\$2,235	697
Modern languages and literatures other than English	\$3,000	808
Philosophy and religion	\$2,850	822
Studio art and design	\$3,000	1,026
Other occupational and professional programs (cluster)	\$3,000	860
Other social and behavioral sciences (cluster)	\$2,625	1,575
All other programs	\$2,900	1,166
Discipline not specified	\$2,700	198
All courses	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Note:

Disciplines noted as "cluster" are groupings of the original response categories; other disciplinary designations are listed as they were in the questionnaire.

Table 28**Median Pay per Course, by Course Level**

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
Developmental	\$2,250	1,689
Lower-division undergraduate	\$2,600	10,843
Upper-division undergraduate	\$3,075	3,470
Graduate	\$3,375	964
No response	\$2,700	69
All courses	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Table 29**Median Pay per Course, by Mode of Delivery**

	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses
On-site	\$2,850	14,513
Distance	\$2,250	1,657
Hybrid	\$2,462	719
No response	\$2,613	146
All courses	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		2,580
Total courses		19,615

Note:

"Hybrid" was defined in the questionnaire as "scheduled with both on-site and distance components."

Table 30
Median Pay per Course, by Carnegie Institutional Type and Gender

	Respondent's Gender																						
	Female			Male			Other			No Response			Prefer Not to Answer			All Responses							
	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses	Median Pay per Course	Number of Courses	Number of Courses					
Associate's	\$2,200	3,609	2,141	\$2,200	2,141	7	\$2,418	450	\$2,275	56	\$2,235	6,263	\$2,800	711	432	\$2,700	0	\$2,100	44	\$2,500	11	\$2,800	1,198
Baccalaureate	\$2,800	711	432	\$2,700	432	0	\$2,100	44	\$2,500	11	\$2,800	1,198	\$3,000	2,794	1,775	\$3,000	238	\$3,000	238	\$2,700	55	\$3,000	4,869
Master's	\$3,000	2,794	1,775	\$3,000	1,775	7	\$3,000	179	\$3,300	41	\$3,400	3,717	\$3,493	2,147	1,347	\$3,500	3	\$3,000	179	\$3,300	41	\$3,400	3,717
Doctoral and research	\$3,493	2,147	1,347	\$3,500	1,347	3	\$3,000	25	\$3,000	11	\$3,000	533	\$3,000	319	176	\$3,000	2	\$3,000	25	\$3,000	11	\$3,000	533
Special focus	\$3,000	319	176	\$3,000	176	2	\$3,000	46	\$2,000	29	\$2,750	455	\$3,000	246	134	\$2,500	0	\$2,800	46	\$2,000	29	\$2,750	455
Not available	\$3,000	246	134	\$2,500	134	0	\$2,800	46	\$2,000	29	\$2,750	455	\$2,700	9,826	6,005	\$2,780	19	\$2,663	982	\$2,700	203	\$2,700	17,035
All courses	\$2,700	9,826	6,005	\$2,780	6,005	19	\$2,663	982	\$2,700	203	\$2,700	17,035	\$2,700	1,478	780	\$2,780	2	\$2,663	982	\$2,700	203	\$2,700	17,035
Pay not specified in response		1,478	780	\$2,780	780	2	\$2,663	251	\$2,700	69	\$2,700	2,580		11,304	6,785	\$2,780	21	\$2,663	1,233	\$2,700	272	\$2,700	19,615
Total courses		11,304	6,785	\$2,780	6,785	21	\$2,663	1,233	\$2,700	272	\$2,700	19,615											

Notes:

Institutional types refer to the Carnegie 2010 basic classification.

Median pay is not calculated for combinations with fewer than ten responses.

Table 31
Median Pay per Course, by Carnegie Institutional Type and Race or Ethnicity

	Associate's	Baccalaureate	Master's	Doctoral and Research	Special Focus	Not Available	All Courses	Pay Not Specified in Response	Total Courses
White (not of Hispanic origin)									
Median pay per course	\$2,204	\$2,800	\$3,000	\$3,500	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$2,775		
Number of courses	4,878	1,012	3,998	3,038	424	297	13,647	1,864	15,511
Hispanic or Latino									
Median pay per course	\$2,225	\$2,350	\$2,895	\$3,000	\$2,250	\$2,250	\$2,500		
Number of courses	176	28	90	86	8	18	406	75	481
Asian or Pacific Islander									
Median pay per course	\$2,095	\$4,000	\$3,000	\$3,850	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$2,925		
Number of courses	114	22	87	70	5	14	312	52	364
Black (not of Hispanic origin)									
Median pay per course	\$1,688	\$2,013	\$2,350	\$2,500	\$3,000		\$2,083		
Number of courses	150	22	100	60	12	8	352	67	419
Multiracial									
Median pay per course	\$1,900	\$3,775	\$2,450	\$3,500	\$2,949	\$428	\$2,500		
Number of courses	132	22	80	67	20	10	331	36	367
Native American / First Nations									
Median pay per course	\$2,667		\$2,500	\$3,000			\$2,684		
Number of courses	38	2	27	13	0	0	80	13	93
No response									
Median pay per course	\$2,475	\$2,574	\$2,903	\$3,000	\$2,800	\$2,800	\$2,700		
Number of courses	462	44	249	195	25	45	1,020	265	1,285
Prefer not to answer									
Median pay per course	\$2,500	\$2,800	\$3,000	\$3,300	\$2,667	\$2,500	\$2,900		
Number of courses	313	46	238	188	39	63	887	208	1,095
All responses									
Median pay per course	\$2,235	\$2,800	\$3,000	\$3,400	\$3,000	\$2,750	\$2,700		
Number of courses	6,263	1,198	4,869	3,717	533	455	17,035	2,580	19,615

Notes:
 Institutional types refer to the Carnegie 2010 basic classification.
 Median pay is not calculated for combinations with fewer than ten responses.

Table 32**Part-Time Faculty Respondents with Access to Health Benefits, by Source**

	Payment for Benefit Covered Entirely by Source		Payment for Benefit Shared with Source		Employer Provides, but Employee Pays		Total Receiving Benefit from Source	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Academic employer	4.3	379	14.6	1,290	3.6	318	22.6	
Other employer	3.9	344	11.7	1,030	1.9	171	17.5	
Spouse's or partner's employer	5.7	502	28.4	2,504	3.2	279	37.3	
Valid responses		8,810						
Missing		1,521						
Total respondents		10,331						

Notes:

The total number of valid responses (8,810) is the basis for all percentages.

Some respondents indicated that they received health benefits from more than one source. In total, 68.0% indicated that they received health benefits from at least one source.

Table 33**Part-Time Faculty Respondents with Access to Retirement Benefits, by Source**

	Payment for Benefit Covered Entirely by Source		Payment for Benefit Shared with Source		Employer Provides, but Employee Pays		Total Receiving Benefit from Source	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Academic employer	5.3	466	26.9	2,373	9.2	808	41.4	
Other employer	3.0	263	11.0	969	2.8	244	16.8	
Spouse's or partner's employer	2.1	189	12.6	1,106	2.6	225	17.3	
Valid responses		8,810						
Missing		1,521						
Total respondents		10,331						

Notes:

The total number of valid responses (8,810) is the basis for all percentages.

Some respondents indicated that they received retirement benefits from more than one source. In total, 60.3% indicated that they received retirement benefits from at least one source.

Table 34**Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Respondents with Access to Health Benefits, by Type of Institutional Control**

	All	Private	Public	Not Identified
Benefit paid entirely by source				
Academic employer	3.7	2.1	4.8	1.5
Other employer	3.3	3.2	4.0	0.9
Spouse's or partner's employer	4.9	5.6	5.3	1.8
Payment for benefit shared with source				
Academic employer	12.5	10.5	15.2	4.3
Other employer	10.0	11.1	11.5	2.0
Spouse's or partner's employer	24.2	31.3	26.1	6.3
Employer provides, but employee pays				
Academic employer	3.1	3.3	3.5	1.1
Other employer	1.7	1.8	1.9	0.6
Spouse's or partner's employer	2.7	3.8	2.8	0.8
Have benefit from academic employer	19.2	16.0	23.4	7.0
Have benefit from any source	68.0	68.0	68.3	63.7
Valid responses	8,810	2,246	6,156	408
Missing	1,521			
Total respondents	10,331			

Table 35**Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Respondents with Access to Retirement Benefits, by Type of Institutional Control**

	All	Private	Public	Not Identified
Benefit paid entirely by source				
Academic employer	4.5	2.2	6.2	1.1
Other employer	2.5	3.0	2.9	0.5
Spouse's or partner's employer	1.8	2.5	1.9	0.4
Payment for benefit shared with source				
Academic employer	23.0	13.9	30.3	6.2
Other employer	9.4	9.6	11.1	2.0
Spouse's or partner's employer	10.7	13.6	11.6	2.9
Employer provides, but employee pays				
Academic employer	7.8	4.6	10.4	2.0
Other employer	2.4	2.8	2.6	0.6
Spouse's or partner's employer	2.2	3.4	2.1	0.6
Have benefit from academic employer	35.3	20.6	46.9	9.3
Have benefit from any source	60.3	47.6	65.6	51.2
Valid responses	8,810	2,246	6,156	408
Missing	1,521			
Total respondents	10,331			

Table 36**Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Respondents with Access to Health Benefits, by Union Status and Source**

	All Valid Responses	No Union Present	At Least One Union Present	Not Sure
Benefit paid entirely by source				
Academic employer	4.3	2.2	7.2	2.4
Other employer	3.9	3.8	4.0	7.1
Spouse's or partner's employer	5.7	5.3	6.2	7.1
Payment for benefit shared with source				
Academic employer	14.6	8.9	22.4	9.5
Other employer	11.7	12.5	10.6	14.3
Spouse's or partner's employer	28.4	30.5	25.7	21.4
Employer provides, but employee pays				
Academic employer	3.6	2.7	4.7	7.1
Other employer	1.9	2.0	1.9	0.0
Spouse's or partner's employer	3.2	3.7	2.4	4.8
Have benefit from academic employer	22.6	13.8	34.3	19.0
Have benefit from any source	68.0	63.5	74.2	57.1
Valid responses	8,810	2,246	6,156	408
Missing	1,521			
Total respondents	10,331			

Table 37**Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Respondents with Access to Retirement Benefits, by Union Status and Source**

	All Valid Responses	No Union Present	At Least One Union Present	Not Sure
Benefit paid entirely by source				
Academic employer	5.3	3.5	7.7	7.1
Other employer	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.0
Spouse's or partner's employer	2.1	2.3	1.9	4.8
Payment for benefit shared with source				
Academic employer	26.9	16.4	41.1	19.0
Other employer	11.0	11.8	9.8	19.0
Spouse's or partner's employer	12.6	13.6	11.2	7.1
Employer provides, but employee pays				
Academic employer	9.2	7.6	11.3	7.1
Other employer	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.4
Spouse's or partner's employer	2.6	3.1	1.8	4.8
Have benefit from academic employer	41.4	27.5	60.1	33.3
Have benefit from any source	60.3	52.0	71.5	52.4
Valid responses	8,810	3,756	6,439	42
Missing	1,521			
Total respondents	10,331			

Table 38

Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Respondents Receiving Various Forms of Workplace Support, by Carnegie Institutional Type

	Associate's	Doctoral and Research	Master's	Baccalaureate	Specialized and Tribal	Carnegie Type Not Known	All Responses
Compensation for work outside the classroom							
Paid for work other than course work	10.3	7.9	7.1	8.0	11.6	3.3	7.9
Office hours							
Paid	15.7	3.5	6.0	3.7	4.3	2.8	7.8
Unpaid	54.4	77.7	71.8	75.4	65.0	24.4	60.6
Private office space							
Private office space	4.0	15.0	9.5	20.5	6.7	4.2	8.7
Shared office space	66.5	64.2	66.2	61.2	59.8	23.4	59.0
Department meetings							
Paid	12.0	4.0	4.6	3.7	9.4	2.5	6.6
Unpaid	47.1	39.1	42.6	50.1	57.7	17.1	40.4
Payment for class cancellation	13.2	12.3	15.0	11.8	12.1	5.7	12.2
Job security and career ladder							
Job security / seniority	15.1	6.8	9.1	4.0	3.8	4.0	9.3
Regular salary increases	26.6	14.7	19.4	15.6	19.4	8.6	18.8
Priority for tenure-track openings	3.2	0.8	1.4	1.7	2.7	0.7	1.8
Professional development							
Tuition assistance	20.6	16.7	16.9	14.0	17.0	4.7	16.0
Teacher-development workshops	37.6	24.3	27.1	19.3	23.5	10.3	26.7
Professional travel support	15.0	11.9	12.4	17.7	10.8	5.5	12.4
Institutional research grants	9.0	14.5	13.7	11.8	14.3	4.4	10.9
Administrative support							
Computer access							
Single-user	6.9	17.5	14.0	26.5	7.5	5.7	11.8
Multi-user (shared)	68.4	48.3	53.9	44.9	52.3	19.5	51.5
Mailbox	87.7	82.2	81.3	82.7	80.9	31.5	76.1
Telephone access in office	57.5	57.0	58.1	63.7	46.1	21.0	52.2
Department-supported copying	82.4	80.7	80.2	85.9	79.5	29.7	73.8
Library privileges	72.8	81.7	81.4	84.4	78.7	30.4	71.3
Secretarial assistance	33.6	40.6	44.3	49.5	27.0	14.0	35.5
Parking	67.2	33.6	49.0	63.8	38.8	17.9	47.4
Number of responses (basis for percentages)	3,942	2,646	3,025	752	371	1,876	12,612

Notes:

Carnegie institutional types were drawn from respondent reports on courses.

Part-time respondents who taught courses at more than one type of institution were counted separately for each type of institution.

Respondents who did not provide information about specific courses but who did answer questions about workplace supports they receive are included under "Carnegie type not known."

Table 39**Percentage of Part-Time Respondents Receiving Various Types of Workplace Support, by Union Status of Employing Institutions**

	All Valid Responses	No Union Present	At Least One Union Present	Not Sure
Compensation for work outside the classroom				
Payment for work other than course work	8.5	8.0	9.3	7.5
Office hours				
Paid	8.2	3.8	14.5	6.3
Unpaid	66.2	69.5	62.2	65.2
Private office space	9.8	11.2	8.0	9.4
Shared office space	64.0	60.3	68.7	64.7
Department meetings				
Paid	7.0	5.4	9.7	4.3
Unpaid	43.8	41.9	46.8	41.9
Payment for class cancellation	13.2	9.9	17.9	11.8
Job security and career ladder				
Job security / seniority	10.0	3.9	19.4	3.9
Regular salary increases	20.8	12.1	33.9	12.8
Priority for tenure-track openings	1.9	1.4	2.6	1.7
Professional development				
Tuition assistance	17.7	15.0	21.8	15.0
Teacher-development workshops	28.7	27.2	30.5	29.4
Professional travel support	13.6	10.7	18.3	9.5
Institutional research grants	12.2	10.6	14.8	10.3
Administrative support				
Computer access				
Single-user	13.3	14.8	11.8	12.2
Multi-user (shared)	55.5	51.3	60.2	58.3
Mailbox	83.2	80.7	86.1	84.2
Telephone access in office	57.4	55.2	61.2	53.6
Department-supported copying	81.1	80.1	82.0	83.0
Library privileges	78.3	79.2	77.5	76.1
Secretarial assistance	39.1	39.0	38.7	41.2
Parking	51.1	48.8	53.8	51.8
Number of responses (basis for percentages)	9,957	5,125	3,925	907
Missing	1,591			
Total reports	11,548			

Note:

Part-time respondents who taught courses at more than one institution were counted separately for each institution.

Table 40**Part-Time Faculty Respondents, by Personal and Household Income, 2009**

	Personal Income		Household Income	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Less than \$15,000	1,460	17.8	350	4.5
\$15,000–\$24,999	1,816	22.2	651	8.3
\$25,000–\$34,999	1,368	16.7	695	8.8
\$35,000–\$44,999	911	11.1	672	8.6
\$45,000–\$54,999	732	8.9	698	8.9
\$55,000–\$64,999	484	5.9	652	8.3
\$65,000–\$74,999	362	4.4	594	7.6
\$75,000–\$84,999	277	3.4	583	7.4
\$85,000–\$94,999	205	2.5	574	7.3
\$95,000–\$124,999	321	3.9	1,101	14.0
\$125,000–\$149,999	125	1.5	545	6.9
\$150,000 and over	119	1.5	742	9.4
Valid responses	8,180	99.8	7,857	100.0
Missing				
Don't know	251		470	
No response	1,900		2,004	
Total missing	2,151		2,474	
Total respondents	10,331		10,331	

Note:

Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Table 41**Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Respondents Who Reported Importance of Income from Teaching, by 2009 Household Income**

	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Marginally Important	Not Important	Total	Valid Responses	Missing	Total
Less than \$15,000	82.1	11.3	3.8	2.3	0.6	100.0	346	4	350
\$15,000–\$24,999	83.8	12.2	2.9	0.9	0.2	100.0	647	4	651
\$25,000–\$34,999	77.7	15.0	5.1	1.7	0.4	100.0	692	3	695
\$35,000–\$44,999	71.9	16.6	7.3	3.6	0.6	100.0	669	3	672
\$45,000–\$54,999	62.2	22.8	11.1	2.9	1.0	100.0	694	4	698
\$55,000–\$64,999	55.0	21.8	13.0	7.6	2.6	100.0	646	6	652
\$65,000–\$74,999	47.2	24.6	15.3	8.7	4.2	100.0	589	5	594
\$75,000–\$84,999	51.5	24.7	13.1	8.1	2.6	100.0	579	4	583
\$85,000–\$94,999	41.1	29.2	15.9	11.0	2.8	100.0	572	2	574
\$95,000–\$124,999	33.9	25.3	23.0	13.6	4.2	100.0	1,093	8	1,101
\$125,000–\$149,999	24.1	25.8	22.3	19.5	8.3	100.0	539	6	545
\$150,000 and over	15.1	18.9	21.5	28.5	16.0	100.0	736	6	742
Don't know	40.3	23.8	16.2	14.4	5.4	100.0	390	1,614	2,004
No response	39.1	27.1	17.6	12.3	3.9	100.0	465	5	470
Total respondents	50.7	21.5	14.0	9.9	3.9	100.0	8,657	1,674	10,331

Note:

Percentages are based on the number of valid responses.