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Executive Summary

Comprising 43% of QUFA faculty, and teaching 41% of bargaining unit registrations, adjunct faculty members are essential to education at Queen’s. They are also among its most precarious and poorly remunerated workers. While adjunct members made significant gains in the 1990s and early 2000s, this trajectory has plateaued in recent years. Moreover, the advances that have been made often go unrealized as the Collective Agreement gets unevenly applied across units and faculties. It should be noted that Queen’s retained its 5th place ranking in the medical doctoral category of the Maclean’s University rankings for 2022. Yet it came in second to last place (14th) with respect to student faculty (full-time) ratio. Queen’s is lagging in the numbers of full-time faculty which it is managing in two ways ... by hiring precariously employed/part time adjuncts and increasing class sizes. This report, the result of six months of research and consultation by the QUFA Adjunct Advocacy Committee, presents a damning picture of the working conditions and morale of adjunct faculty members at Queen’s.

While first-person accounts of unpaid labour, prejudicial appointment processes, and disrespectful treatment make for harrowing reading, the report also represents the profound commitment and determination of adjunct instructors. As dedicated teachers, researchers, and community members, adjunct faculty members enrich the academic mission of the university in immeasurably ways. We ask the QUFA Executive and Bargaining Team to make the recommendations of the Adjunct Advocacy Committee and the Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Indigenization Committee the priorities for this round of bargaining.

To recognize their contributions, guarantee their fair and equitable treatment, and ensure the stability of the university, the Adjunct Advocacy Committee makes the following recommendations pertaining to job security, promotion, pension and benefits, remuneration of service work, funding, leaves and course releases, and communication of information.

1) **Improve the Path to Permanence:**
   a) Simplify the path to permanent employment by abolishing the Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR)
   b) improve the formula for conversion to Continuing Adjunct Status
   c) Recognize Years of Experience not Years of Service in calculations towards General Rights of Reappointment and Continuing Adjunct promotions

2) **Provide Access to Pension and Benefits:**
   a) Provide ALL adjuncts who met the minimum requirements of the benefits provider with access to the same benefits package as full responsibility faculty
   b) Provide option to join the University Pension Plan for Adjuncts who teach at least 3 half courses in each of two consecutive years and who are hired to teach in year three.
3) **FTE Standardization for Service and Overload Work:**
   a) Grant Continuing Adjunct faculty 20% FTE for service (or 5% to 20% depending on individual situations). Create a central fund to compensate adjuncts quickly and efficiently for additional service.
   b) Compensate Continuing Adjunct faculty overload teaching with %FTE

4) **Improve the Promotion Process:**
   a) Ensure that the promotions process recognizes that adjunct contracts are generally teaching-only, and that research and university service performed by adjuncts seeking promotion should not normally form part of the expectations. Mirror for Adjuncts the terms in 30.6.10: “In cases where the applicant’s required responsibilities in scholarship/research (as noted in the letter of appointment) are minimal, **primary emphasis shall be placed on teaching.** Scholarship/research that is undertaken shall be assessed on the basis of whatever information as to quality is available.”
   b) Grant the title of Assistant Professor for ALL Continuing Adjuncts regardless of the attainment of a PhD.
   c) Grant tenured, full responsibility status to all adjuncts upon promotion to Associate Professor with return to previous status, i.e. Assistant and/or Continuing, if unsuccessful.

5) **Improve Support for Teaching:**
   a) Expand the minimum stipends where there is an enrolment supplement beyond the current maximum of 200 or more students (i.e. 300 or more, 400 or more, 500 or more).
   b) Increase support for course preparation.

6) **Improve Support for Research:**
   a) Provide access to sabbatical leave and research course release to adjuncts independent of receiving a grant or promotion to a full responsibility position.
   b) Increase the funds available through the Fund for Scholarly and Creative Work and Professional Development (Adjuncts).

7) **Improve Adjunct Representation on Committees:**
   Mandate adjunct representation on Modified Appointments Committees and Renewal, Tenure and Promotion Committees when adjunct files are under consideration.

8) **Provide Proper Recognition for Term Adjunct Service:**
   a) Streamline the Appendix Q payment process removing the burden from adjuncts, i.e. creating a centralized system through HR.
   b) Appendix Q – expand the language to reflect other types of service, including but not limited to committee work, reference letters, department meetings etc.
   c) Increase the stipends in Appendix Q to be in keeping with the marketplace.

9) **Improve Communication and Training:**
Directed at adjuncts and administration to improve transparency and adherence to the Collective Agreement, specifically terms of contracts, Appendix Q, workload, and years of service calculation

10) Internal Status for Tenure Track Positions: Grant adjuncts who have taught for eight half course equivalents in four consecutive years at Queen’s ‘internal’ status when applying for tenure-track positions

Committee Membership

Valerie Bartlett, Chantal Brunette, Lisa Carver, Melissa Houghtaling (Co-Chair), Samantha King, Susan Lord (Co-Chair), Jordan Morelli, and Ayca Tomac, with extensive research and support provided by Micheline Waring.

Terms of Reference

In June 2021, the Executive Committee authorized the formation of an ad hoc committee to compile research about adjunct terms of work and other concerns in preparation for the 2022 round of bargaining. The terms of reference were as follows:

- This committee will operate for as long as their work is deemed useful and at least until bargaining begins in 2022. The first meeting of the committee will precede September 2021.
- The core committee shall consist of 4-6 members, not including the QUFA Term Adjunct and Continuing Adjunct Representatives to the Executive and the QUFA President as ex officio members.
- QUFA’s representatives to OCUFA’s Contract Faculty/Faculty Complement Committee and CAUT’s Contract Academic Staff Committee will have seats on the core committee.
- General members of the committee shall be drawn from across the campus but must include at least one adjunct from each of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Smith School of Business and at least one current or former Head of unit.
- Micheline Waring will serve as staff support for the committee’s research activities. Other staff support may be provided as needed.
- The primary mandate of the core committee is to produce a report to the Executive by December 2021 outlining areas of the CA that could be productively amended or augmented through bargaining and to suggest the principles that should govern such bargained changes; the committee is not expected to craft CA language or bargaining proposals. To complete this mandate, the core committee may:
  - Gather and analyze data available about QUFA members
  - Analyze available comparative data about contract academics elsewhere
  - Interview or run focus groups to explore key issues facing adjuncts.
- Requests for financial support for the committee, including release time, training, or conference/workshop attendance, purchasing resources or data analysis tools,
providing meeting space or refreshments or other reasonable costs shall be forwarded to the Executive via the President.

- The committee and the Executive shall have the flexibility to refine or redefine the committee’s mandate as work progresses and following completion of the initial report.
- In addition to the core committee, an Adjunct Advisory Group of unlimited size will be formed. The Board may be asked to test-run surveys, attend focus groups or otherwise advise the core committee on its work and mandate.

**Method**

The committee met regularly between June and November 2021. With guidance from the Adjunct Advisory Group, the committee undertook the following research:

- A review and comparison of other Ontario university collective agreements with clauses pertaining to adjunct faculty
- Design and analysis of a 28-question survey to which 268 members responded
- Thematic analysis of the qualitative data collected in the survey
- Review of old bargaining notes, bargaining alerts, and collective agreements to construct of a timeline of key moments in the history of bargaining for adjuncts at Queen’s

**History of Adjuncts and Bargaining at Queen’s**

The history of adjuncts and bargaining is complex, given the ways adjunct categorizations and appointments have changed over the years. Appendix A contains a history of adjuncts and bargaining since QUFA’s certification in 1995, detailing some of the gains, concessions, and overall challenges in bargaining for adjuncts during this period.

The initial bargaining unit known as FLABU (the Faculty, Librarian, and Archivist Bargaining Unit) was established in September 1995 and included two groups of adjuncts: adjuncts 2 and adjuncts 3. **Adjunct 2s** taught the equivalent of two full courses per academic year for less than five years. This group was later recategorized as **Initial Adjuncts** (a renewable, limited responsibilities appointment of 8 months to 3 years with the option to apply for a Renewable Adjunct Appointment in the fourth year). Initial adjuncts were phased out with the 1999-2001 agreement and replaced with **Term Adjunct** appointments, which were very similar to Initial Adjuncts, and from 1999-2007 this was a guaranteed two- or three-year appointment when renewed after three consecutive years of service.

**Adjunct 3s** taught the equivalent of two full courses per academic year for more than five years. They were later recategorized as **Renewable adjuncts**, a group also phased out in the

---

1 These changes happened in part to help establish order and processes/procedures for adjuncts and to “prevent unfair and unjust practices in individual units” (See Appendix A, Greenfield, 2001).
2 See Appendix A, Butler 2017.
1999-2001 agreement and replaced with Continuing Adjunct appointments. The continuing-track appointment was originally for a five-year period and included agreed upon academic responsibilities. In the fourth year, the member could apply for a Continuing (permanent) appointment. Up until 2007, the fourth year became a terminal year with a negative decision. It is important to note here that all Initial and Renewable Adjunct appointments (1997-99) and term and Continuing Adjunct appointments (1999-2008) enjoyed the same benefits as tenured faculty up until 2007, when Term Adjunct appointments were reduced to one- to three-years in duration.

Collective bargaining between 1997-2008 secured many rights and gains for adjuncts, including:

- a calculated Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) percentage with an additional 5-15% for administration and scholarship associated with teaching
- a minimum (stipend) per half course
- a commuting adjunct travel policy
- the creation of the Fund for Scholarly Research and Creative Work and Professional Development (Adjuncts)
- the right of Continuing Adjuncts to have their salary reviewed by an anomalies side-table to ensure a fair FTE and salary for work done
- access to the merit/career development structure
- eligibility for scale increases
- a pathway for renewal for Term Adjuncts, as well as a permanent continuing appointment based on 6 consecutive years of experience
- committee processes for reappointments
- a guaranteed minimum workload for Continuing Adjuncts
- the establishment of the “faint hope clause:” any member who held an adjunct appointment at the University for at least twelve years and who has been promoted to the rank of Professor will be given a full-range tenured appointment.

Adjunct 1s were not (and still are not) included in the bargaining unit. They included a range of professionals, many of whom taught for free as a form of professional service, including faculty from other institutions who brought “emergency expertise,” retired faculty, or PhD students seeking to gain teaching experience, as well as “fully qualified faculty who have chosen for a variety of reasons to pursue a part-time career.” Many adjuncts from this Adjunct 1 group formed their own bargaining unit under QUFA, known as the Sessional Adjunct Bargaining Unit (SABU), for the 2004-2006 and 2006-2008 collective agreements. The inclusion of these adjuncts in the bargaining unit was a significant development in the history of the faculty association, which required extensive organization and mobilization by QUFA.

Sessional adjuncts were appointed to instruct one or more degree-credit courses but less than 2.0 full credit courses per academic year. In these negotiations, Sessional Adjuncts gained

---

3 See Appendix A, Greenfield 2003.
several rights, including a Right of Reappointment to teach a course they had taught at least two times in a minimum of two years; a committee for appointing Sessional adjuncts; a payment in lieu of salary for health benefits and pension for those who were paid the Base Stipend; the commuting adjunct travel expense policy, and an additional duties appendix (now Appendix Q in the Collective Agreement).

In 2007, SABU amalgamated with FLABU, and the 2007-08 bargaining round focused on streamlining adjunct categories and harmonizing and improving salary policies and processes. Sessional adjunct appointments were eliminated in this round of bargaining, and members who had held this appointment became either a Term Adjunct or Continuing Adjunct, depending on their years of service. However, Term Adjunct appointments were now reduced to the duration of one academic term up to 3 years, teaching one or more half-credit (0.5) courses. Language encouraging 2–3-year appointments had disappeared at this point, and with it went the number of 2–3-year Term Adjunct appointments being granted, as well as their eligibility for benefits\(^4\) and pension.

The Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR) and General Right of Reappointment (GRoR) were both introduced in the 2008-2011 collective agreements as pathways for renewal. Since the 2008-2011 collective agreement, the university has made it increasingly difficult for adjuncts to be eligible for promotion and permanent appointments. A Term Adjunct originally achieved Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR) to teach a course if they had taught it two (2) times in a minimum of two (2) years, but that has since been increased to teaching a course at least three (3) times over four (4) consecutive academic years.

The bar for General Right of Reappointment has also been raised: while it was initially earned after three or more consecutive years of service as a Term Adjunct multiplied by the cumulative number of full-course equivalents taught equaling twelve or more\(^5\) (factor 12), the years of service needed has increased to four (4) or more consecutive years and with a factor 16 or more. In the 2008-11 collective agreement, Continuing Adjunct appointments still required least six years of service; however, the factor 72 was added for eligibility (years of service multiplied by the cumulative total of the course-credits taught over those years equals 72 or more).\(^6\) The terminal year in the case of a negative decision was removed.

Negotiations for the 2011-2015 and 2015-2019 agreements saw “efforts by the Administration to reverse protections and guarantees which we had achieved in earlier Collective

\(^4\) From Greenfield (2003): “Benefits provisions for part-time academic staff vary widely across the county. Negotiated provisions range from access to regular benefits through to salary in lieu. At Queen’s, all Adjuncts in the BU are eligible for the same benefits as regular faculty, but the University’s insurance carrier imposes a restriction excluding those who have appointments that are less than 40%.”


\(^6\) As QUFA notes, “it will of course take more than 6 years if the course-credits taught per year have been less than 2.0 course-credits”, which was what Term Adjuncts had been guaranteed prior to the 2008-2011 agreement [http://archive.qufa.ca/publications/know_your_ca_2008/KYCA-1-Adjuncts.pdf](http://archive.qufa.ca/publications/know_your_ca_2008/KYCA-1-Adjuncts.pdf)
Agreements,” especially those pertaining to adjuncts. These efforts included, for example, proposals by the administration to terminate the ability of any Term Adjunct to gain Continuing status, and to increase the workload of Continuing Adjuncts without increasing their pay by manipulating how FTE is calculated.

QUFA came to the bargaining table with several asks for adjuncts that were denied during the 2011-2015, 2015-2019, and 2019-2022 negotiations. These included:

- proposals for academic leaves (sabbaticals) for Continuing Adjuncts
- increases in professional expenses across the board, including for Term Adjuncts
- Continuing Adjuncts with FTEs less than 75% continue to be eligible for the Commuting Adjunct Travel Policy
- making a Term Adjunct’s GRoR independent of having acquired a SRoR (and eliminate SRoR all together)
- an increase in the FTE of Continuing Adjuncts who have been promoted to Associate Professor, granting them a modest research component as part of their appointment

QUFA was successful in negotiating some gains for adjuncts from 2011 forward, including:

- language on eligibility across 2 or more units for GRoR and Continuing Adjunct
- monetary supplements to stipends for Term Adjuncts teaching courses of 100-199 and for 200 or more
- Continuing Adjuncts could receive promotion “on the basis of extraordinary contributions to teaching (or research, but it is teaching that will matter in practice)”
- 0.5 credit teaching release for Continuing Adjuncts who are promoted to associate professor and successful in obtaining an external research grant within three years of being granted promotion.

The last several rounds of bargaining have seen the administration clawing back protections and guarantees secured in previous agreements, as well as making promotion and job security even more difficult for adjuncts to achieve. Richard Greenfield’s (2001) conclusion to the “Significant Changes Concerning Adjuncts through the 1999-2002 CA” holds as true today as it did then, while there have been strides gained there is still much work to be done, adjuncts continue to face tremendous struggles and challenges.

“Things have got better ... BUT there is room for improvement and it is important not to let the momentum slip. We can do better for all these groups and we must try. What we want to know is what priorities adjuncts themselves

---

7 See Appendix A, QUFA 2016.
8 Bargaining for the 2019-2022 collective agreement was quite different from in previous years and dubbed “speed bargaining,” as it lasted approximately 2-3 weeks as opposed to several months. The conversion to the UPP was the main issue on the table, but there were still several adjunct proposals that QUFA brought forward but were denied. It was clear at the bargaining table that the University was largely uninterested in discussing adjunct issues.
9 See Appendix A, Greenfield, 2001
Snapshot of Adjuncts at Queen’s

As of March 2021, there are approximately 134 Continuing Adjuncts and 490 Term Adjuncts (teaching over the fiscal year) at Queen’s for a total of 624 members compared to 818 full-responsibility faculty members. This totals approximately 1442 whereby Adjuncts make up 43% of the bargaining unit and full-responsibility faculty make up the remaining 57%.

In the last decade, as per Article 35 reports, course registrations have increased by 19% while the number of course sections have decreased by 12%. Indicating that enrollment increases are being managed by increasing the size of course sections. This affects everyone who teaches. That said adjuncts are affected disproportionately. In 2020-21 adjuncts taught 41.1% of course registrations within the bargaining unit representing 36.5% of course sections. Full responsibility faculty taught the other 58.9% of course registrations, representing 63.5% of course sections taught within the bargaining unit. Adjuncts are teaching a greater percentage of total course registrations and in increasingly larger sections when compared to full responsibility faculty.

Within QUFA, teaching done by full responsibility faculty (as a percentage of the whole bargaining unit) has decreased by 7.7% over the last 10 years. Over this same period, Continuing Adjunct teaching has increased by 4.7% and Term Adjunct teaching has increased by 3%. The reduction in teaching by full responsibility faculty is being made up on the backs of part-time faculty and precarious work.

There was a steady increase in Continuing Adjuncts both in overall numbers and by percentage of teaching done in the bargaining unit until around 2014 or 2015 at which time numbers stagnated and have remained relatively flat since.10 It was very clear in the Fall 2021 survey that Term Adjuncts want to gain permanency and stability, thus the flat line is not the result of a lack of interest rather it indicates that Term Adjuncts are struggling to reach the thresholds needed to gain SRoR/GRoR and eventually Continuing Adjunct status.

The following tables provide data from the last 10 years, plus information for 2008-09 (the year QUFA amalgamated). This data draws on the Article 35 Report, produced by the University, specifically Part 1, Table 3 which includes all courses (graduate and undergraduate) which tracks the number of registrations (vs. number of half course sections). The percentages by registrations for adjuncts are greater than they are by section, which tells us that adjuncts are teaching a greater portion of the larger classes.

10 Faculty Complement study, Voices, January 2020
Table 1 looks at percentages both in and outside of the bargaining unit, while Table 2 looks at the percentages within QUFA. The tables include overall registrations by year and overall half-course equivalent sections.
Table 1 All Teaching at Queen’s (Graduate and Undergraduate)

|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|        |
| **QUFA Bargaining Unit**       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Tenure/Tenure Track/Special/Non-Renewable | 54%     | 52%     | 53%     | 52%     | 52%     | 53%     | 51%     | 53%     | 53%     | 53%     | 55%     |         |         |
| Continuing Adjunct             | 18%     | 17%     | 17%     | 17%     | 17%     | 17%     | 17%     | 18%     | 16%     | 13%     |         |         |         |
| Term Adjunct                   | 20%     | 20%     | 20%     | 21%     | 20%     | 18%     | 20%     | 19%     | 18%     | 18%     |         |         |         |
| **Sub-Total QUFA Bargaining Unit** | 92%     | 90%     | 90%     | 90%     | 89%     | 89%     | 89%     | 90%     | 86%     | 86%     |         |         |         |
| **Non-QUFA Bargaining Unit**   |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Teaching Fellows               | 3%      | 4%      | 4%      | 4%      | 4%      | 5%      | 4%      | 5%      | 5%      | 4%      |         |         |         |
| Other (Adjunct 1, 2, 3, Post-Doctoral Fellow, Preceptor, Firm, BISC and other/missing) | 6%      | 6%      | 6%      | 7%      | 7%      | 6%      | 8%      | 5%      | 9%      | 10%     |         |         |         |
| **Sub-Total Non-Bargaining Unit** | 9%      | 10%     | 10%     | 10%     | 11%     | 11%     | 12%     | 10%     | 14%     | 14%     |         |         |         |
| **Total**                      | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    | 100%    |         |         |         |
Table 2 QUFA Only Bargaining Unit Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Tenure Track/Special/Non-Renewable</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7.7% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Adjunct</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.7% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Adjunct</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total QUFA Bargaining Unit Teaching</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Registrations</td>
<td>221,748</td>
<td>211,544</td>
<td>213,365</td>
<td>209,036</td>
<td>208,527</td>
<td>205,594</td>
<td>217,228</td>
<td>198,487</td>
<td>201,376</td>
<td>200,009</td>
<td>186,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Half Course Equivalents</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>3,967</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>3,597</td>
<td>3,703</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>4,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2021 Survey Results and Findings

The survey questions can be found in Appendix B while a full analysis of the results can be found in Appendices C and D. The analysis was undertaken by adjuncts L. Carver, C. Brunette and A. Tomac.

*Figure 1 Appointment Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Respondents by Adjunct Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term adjunct</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing adjunct</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 268

**Term Adjuncts** (see full analysis in Appendix C)

There was a wide range in the length of appointments for Term Adjuncts (see Figure 2), with 64% reporting that they have been working at Queen’s as a Term Adjunct for four years or less with the remaining 36% (n= 62) have been Term Adjuncts for five or more years.
When asked about which type of courses they are assigned, Term Adjuncts responded as follows:

- 35 Term Adjuncts teach first year classes
- 48 Term Adjuncts teach classes with more than 100 students
- 69 Term Adjuncts teach a required undergraduate course
- 62 Term Adjuncts teach a graduate course

Of 178 Term Adjuncts who responded to the survey, the majority (56%) surveyed have no job security (see Figure 4). Only Twenty-three percent have specific right of reappointment (SRoR), a tenuous type of job security that depends on the offering of a specific course. Furthermore, a mere 14% have general right of reappointment (GRoR), which, although it may not be associated with benefits or pension, it does mean there is a reasonable likelihood that they will have stable employment. (see Figure 3).
Many Term Adjuncts expressed frustration and concerns about the process of obtaining permanent status with comments such as:

“This is the 4th year I have taught the course (full year), but have had to reapply each time.”

“I have no right of reappointment, though I am on a 3-year contract”

“I have a three year contract to teach specific courses. My supervisor kept me as a post-doc nullifying my ability of SRoR”

“I have it for one course but it has not yet been offered again”

Of the very small percentage of Term Adjuncts who have SRoR (23%), eight adjuncts obtained SRoR in less than three years, and 18 adjuncts obtained SRoR in the ‘expected’ window of three to four years, the remaining 15 adjuncts (nearly 37%) reported achieving SRoR – which is only the first step on the ladder to permanent employment – after five to ten plus years of teaching service to Queen’s University.

Thirteen participants identified their right of re-appointment as “Other” to highlight the peculiar conditions they are in regarding their re-appointment. While few members are gaining the SRoR this year, a few others indicated that they hold Specific Rights only for one course.
they are teaching but not for other courses. **It is important to note, however, a trend in these answers: Several members indicated that they are not aware/ not sure of the process of renewal and/or their rights of re-appointment.** This disconnection between members and their rights as outlined in our Collective Agreement repeats itself in many other questions, which will be discussed further individually below. There were few members who were hired to teach specific courses with a three-year contract. Although this provides a certain level of job security for a Term Adjunct, their right of re-appointment is bound to the renewal of their contract given the SROR requirements (three years in the last four years).

**Research**

The issue of unpaid research work came through strongly in the survey, with forty-one percent of Term Adjuncts stating that they currently conduct research. Yet respondents to a question about applying for tenure-track positions at Queen’s overwhelmingly pointed to an urgent need for structural change. Members indicated a feeling of “hopelessness” about the possibility of being hired for tenure-track positions and identified the culture around hiring for these positions as “dangling a carrot” rather than offering a “genuine” option. Members’ observations included the following comments: “Committees will never hire adjuncts;” “This is a unicorn in my department. It doesn’t happen;” “Currently our applications are often tossed aside - ah, we know this person, they are ok as is...;”, and "It seems to be a hopeless situation for most Queen's adjuncts applying to internal tenure-track positions.” As one member put it: “I would value transparency and fair opportunities. An adjunct is not a second-class citizen.”

When **Term Adjuncts** were asked “**If you could have a specific type of permanent employment, at Queen’s, what would you prefer?**” (Table 3), the vast majority (91%) of Term Adjuncts want some type of permanent academic employment at Queen’s. Sixty-nine percent want that employment to be full-time, with the remainder preferring part-time permanent or an option tailored specifically to their needs (see the ‘Other’ options listed below). Only three percent of Term Adjuncts wanted to remain Term Adjuncts.

**Table 3 Term Adjuncts’ preferred employment status at Queen’s University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be a tenure-track/tenured professor with teaching, research, and service responsibilities</td>
<td>33.73%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a <strong>permanent full-time (100% FTE) faculty</strong> member with only teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>17.75%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a <strong>permanent part-time faculty</strong> member with only teaching responsibilities (Continuing Adjunct)</td>
<td>39.64%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - please explain</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many Term Adjuncts would like to see the route to promotion and/or permanence addressed in the next round of bargaining. Forty-seven percent embraced the automatic awarding of tenure to adjuncts who make it to associate professor. And 43% thought SRoR should be removed from the promotions process (so that Term Adjuncts are awarded GroR after a certain number of courses and/or years and proceed from there to continuing). Many (53%) thought that there should be an equalization of years of service and years of experience (53%). Most interesting was how many adjuncts were unsure of which of these choices would be preferable (see Table 3). However, one thing was clear – on average, less than 10% of adjuncts said changes to the promotions process weren’t important to them.

In fact, many Term Adjuncts took the opportunity to express serious concerns about the misuse of the SRoR process (more details on this provided below, in the Qualitative analysis) - here are just a few of the many comments on the way SRoR can be manipulated to prevent adjuncts from even starting the climb to permanence:

"Number of years of employment with Queen's so that departments can't get around SRoR by changing the course number of a course you teach."

“all of these alternatives to SRoR sound good. The ability to secure the same course 3x in 4 yrs completely depends on the department and the Head, so it seems in some departments it's very easy to secure and in other departments it's almost impossible to obtain.”

“I would prefer for SRoR not to be required because it allows departments to exploit loopholes in which they hire Term Adjuncts over and over but never allow them to teach the same course 3 times”

“I’m not really interested in tenure but would like to have benefits and a pension. One should be eligible for benefits and a pension after so many years of work and I have put in over ten years of work”

“The university has the ability to cancel a course without consulting the teacher. So we lose our SROR very quickly.”

When asked what is most important to them - and considering only the two highest rankings (extremely important (7) and (6)) - over three quarters (77%) of Term Adjuncts rated access to medical and dental benefits, closely followed by access to a pension (74%) as extremely or very important. High importance was also attributed to longer term appointments/contracts (69%),
teaching focused TT positions (63%), better compensation (61%) and clearer track for promotions (59%).

When asked if they would like to teach the same courses year to year, almost 75% said yes, they would. However, that number increases when we look at the ‘Other’ answers, where 30 adjuncts said they want to teach the same courses plus others.

“I don’t mind variety and am qualified to teach several courses, but teaching a variety of courses has prevented me from earning SRoR on any one particular course.”

**Continuing Adjuncts** (see full analysis in Appendix C)

There are many different types of workload arrangements for Continuing Adjuncts at Queen’s. Some of them are happy with a part-time (% FTE) permanent position with teaching only. Others have teaching and service compensated in % FTE. Many are doing free service work and would like to be compensated for it. Some Continuing Adjuncts do research and are interested in going through the promotion process and becoming tenured full-time professors. The flexibility of this type of appointment is a strength for the university and for adjuncts. However, the different treatment throughout the university for FTE calculation and for compensation (or lack thereof) of service work needs to be addressed in the next collective agreement to achieve equity amongst all Continuing Adjuncts.

Of the 90 Continuing Adjuncts who responded to the survey, 74 reported their length of appointment. Over one third of Continuing Adjuncts (38%) had held continuing status for over ten years. Only 10 adjuncts (13.51% of Continuing Adjuncts) reported that they had transitioned from term to continuing in the last 23 months. When considering the reports of the Continuing Adjuncts who responded to the survey it seems that across the entire university, only 5 people per year have transitioned from term to continuing status.

Continuing Adjuncts, overall, had different career preferences than Term Adjuncts, 90+% of whom want permanent faculty type employment (as discussed in the next section of this report). When Continuing Adjuncts were asked about types of employment or employment options at Queen’s, the largest proportion (40%) want to become permanent full-time teaching only faculty (as shown in Figure 4). Approximately one third (34%) indicated that they would be happy to remain a Continuing Adjunct. However, 22% indicated that they want to move on to be tenure track professors with a balance of teaching, research and service responsibilities.
Teaching

When asked if they are involved in discussions or consulted about their teaching assignments, Continuing Adjuncts answers were divided between yes, yes to a degree, and no. Some mentioned a priority given to tenured faculty for course selection.

When asked how many hours they spend on course creation for course taught for the first time, the answers varied greatly, but the majority mentioned weeks and months of preparation. For course preparation for each course taught, week by week during a semester, answers varied as well, but everyone agrees with many hours, hard to quantify, all-consuming."

Continuing Adjuncts are often teaching over their fixed load. The way this work is compensated is not clear to everyone. These calculations should be transparent and part of a letter detailing teaching overload. For some, this overload is paid at the % FTE rate; for other, at the basic stipend for Term Adjuncts from the collective agreement, or from Appendix L basic stipend for Term Adjuncts.

The survey asked Continuing Adjuncts what could be improved in the process of applying to tenure-track appointments. Some answered to have a prior internal search or that adjuncts be given priority over external candidates. Others preferred the Continuing Adjunct appointment as it provides job security or would like to keep that job security if offered the tenure track appointment.

Continuing Adjuncts who go through the promotion process with the goal to reach the tenured full-time position responded that it is unrealistic and practically impossible to achieve.

“Why can my application to full not be based upon only my performance on the work I expected to do rather than on an unrealistic assumption that beyond
the 87.5% FTE I can somehow also be as research productive as a 40/40/60 TT member? Seems unrealistic and frankly impossible to me.”

“It seems horribly unfair to go through the same review process of promotion to associate but to have no tenure or renumeration for research as a result.”

“It would be nice if there was some recognition that many adjuncts do the very same, sometimes more than tenure-track faculty in order to set ourselves up for tenure after achieving associate professor, but we do so for many years at half the salary as other faculty.”

Research

When asked if they are a published researcher and if they have been able to maintain an active research record while employed as an adjunct at Queen’s, 41% of adjuncts answered “yes” and 51% answered “no” (7% other) Many Continuing Adjuncts stated that their research activities are hard to maintain because of their heavy teaching load.

“I am published, but it is difficult to maintain active while I teach so much”

“Yes, Many publications, although fewer as I get closer to retirement age and less incentive since it seems impossible that I will be promoted to full given the expectations of our promotion process.”

“I am published, yes, but the all-consuming work involved with teaching has curtailed further research.”

“It is very difficult with my teaching load, but I don’t think I can be an effective teacher unless I am also writing.”

Continuing Adjuncts who do research or are interested in building research projects need more support, more time and recognition. They gave ideas of support the university could provide, such as protected research time, right to sabbatical, merit points for research, and income for research work.

“Same sabbatical that tenured people get. I am currently trying to use article 37.4.4 and 37.4.5 to do an "adjunct sabbatical" but it would be nice to have the same options as my tenure/tenure track colleagues, given that I am as active a researcher as most of them”
“Recognition of research in Head's evaluations”

“Yes, but it is hard, knowing it gains me no formal recognition or any additional reward as a Continuing Adjunct apart from the Adjunct Creative Award fund”

“Access to income support for research and writing projects.”

“permit adjunct faculty members to negotiate a research pay if they have a research profile. Their research effectiveness can also be assessed.”

“yes- protected research time would be valuable”

Service

Many Continuing Adjuncts are doing service work, but some are not compensated. Compensation is treated differently throughout the university. Service work from Continuing Adjuncts is varied and may include sitting on various departmental committees such as appointment, area chair, undergraduate studies chair, headship search, reader for admission awards, referee, outreach and recruitment, senate, faculty board, and QUFA, among others.

Answers about compensation included but are not limited to:

- unsure
- not compensated
- course releases and stipend
- %FTE specifically for service
- part of their FTE
- were refused service work for budgetary reasons or because committees were only opened to tenured faculty

“service should be made part of a contract if an adjunct wants to do service.”

“When I converted to Continuing Adjunct I was doing as much- if not more service than tenure track/tenured colleagues so I asked for 20%FTE to be included in my letter of appointment.”

“I am paid for 20% service”, “It is treated as 15% of FTE.”, “as 10% of course load”

“It is calculated based on our workload standard, which gives credit equivalents to each service work.”
“it was a stipend that was roughly (less than) equivalent to teaching a course. The preparation and work required made this unsustainable.”

All Adjuncts

Research

Just over half (53%) of the adjuncts are involved in teaching only. However, 41% do have their own research program (see Table 4), even though for many it is unfunded and not financially supported by their adjunct contracts.

Table 4 Do you have an active research program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.85%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53.05%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I am published with a strong record. Since becoming an adjunct, I haven't been able to keep up with my productivity.”

“[Published], but my production has diminished as preparing new courses constantly saps my time.”

“[Published] Queen’s actively limits my access to external funding, which requires a 3-year appointment to be eligible.”

When asked to consider their research program, the majority of adjuncts (62%) confirmed that it was primarily for academic purposes (e.g. knowledge, publication, etc.), thirty-one percent did research primarily for course preparation and six percent used research for supervision of students. Twenty-one percent reported that their research was for ‘Other’ purposes, which included clinical, creative (e.g. film), and other applied purposes as well as 17 people who used the other category to explain that they did not have a research program, see Figure 5.

Figure 2 Purpose of research program
Service

In terms of service work – the majority (68.30%) have never had the opportunity to supervise a student or even sit on a supervisory committee or thesis or comprehensive exam committee (see Figure 6). The majority of those who replied ‘Other’ said they had “never been invited to,” “would love to,” “I have offered, but my offer is always refused.”

Figure 3 Have you ever served on an academic committee or supervised a student?

When asked whether the members have ever supervised or sat on a supervisory committee for a 4th yr Honours thesis, Master’s MRP or thesis, or PhD thesis or a comprehensive exam, the majority of term adjuncts said they haven’t. For those who do have service experience, four points are important to highlight:
1. Majority of members who have ever served on committees did so once or twice. Those who have more experience than that are extremely rare showing even for those who responded positively to the question, it is not consistent.

2. Some members mentioned that they do serve on committees in other universities (such as external reader) but not at Queen’s, showing it is not the members’ incompetency of service work but the university’s to include term adjuncts in service work.

3. Of those who have service experience, 7 members have GRoR, 7 members have SRoR, and 16 members have no RoR, signaling yet again those who provide service work are also the most precarious. And finally, of the small minority of adjuncts who do have consistent service work (they served more than 10 occasions), 1 holds GRoR, 3 hold SRoR, and 2 have no RoR.

4. Multiple members who don’t have service experience consistently indicated that they are not permitted to serve on committees in their units even if students requested them as a committee member. They were prevented from service work as they were considered “ineligible” due to being “not a full faculty member” or “a recognized professor.”

As a follow up, the survey asked the members whether they were aware of the Appendix Q, astonishingly, out of 158 term adjuncts who responded to the question, only 14 stated in the affirmative, that they were aware, with one of them saying “vaguely.”

Here are a few quotes that summarize these findings:

“I have not been denied and have not been offered - but I am a Term Adjunct so we are pretty much at the bottom of the barrel.”

“Yes, but a tenure or tenure-track prof is required to be on the committee. This is degrading.”

“Have not been denied. But also told they would be unpaid.”

“Yes require Adjuncts, both Term and Continuing, to be present on all committees and paid for their work.”

Health and Safety

The majority of adjuncts (72%) were not provided with personal protective equipment. When asked if the agreement between QUFA and the University on a number of matters related to teaching during the pandemic was adequate to protect their health and safety as an adjunct, they didn’t answer about the LOU, but rather about the university’s preparation for in-
person teaching. The most common problematics mentioned were class and room size, additional work not recognized, lack of protective equipment, and lack of ventilation data.

“Class size and room size are not always compatible with safety requirements. A percentage of the class has to meet in person while the rest of the class participates via Zoom.”

“The pivot to online teaching creating a great deal of additional work which was not recognized.”

Recommendations and Rationale

1. Improve the Path to Permanence
   a. Simplify the path to permanent employment by abolishing the Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR)
   b. Improve the formula for conversion to Continuing Adjunct Status
   c. Recognize Years of Experience not Years of Service in calculations towards General Rights of Reappointment and Continuing Adjunct promotions

It is abundantly clear that Term Adjuncts are seeking a permanent, ongoing, and stable relationship with Queen’s. This type of relationship would also serve students and administration well. The results of the survey indicate that the SRoR is a major hurdle to achieving this kind of relationship, as such, it is recommended that this be removed as a requirement of the collective agreement. Another recommendation to improve the path to permanence is to lower the minimum number of years and credits necessary for conversion to Continuing Adjunct Status.

2. Provide Access to Pension and Benefits
   a. Provide ALL adjuncts who met the minimum requirements of the benefits provider with access to the same benefits package as full responsibility faculty
   b. Provide option to join the University Pension Plan for Adjuncts who teach at least 3 half courses in each of two consecutive years and who are hired to teach in year three.

The survey has also shown the incredibly strong desire of adjuncts to have access to the same benefits package as their full responsibility colleagues, as well as access to the University Pension Plan. Therefore, it is recommended that ALL adjuncts who meet requirements be granted this access.
3. **FTE Standardization for Service and Overload Work**

   a) Grant Continuing Adjunct faculty 20% FTE for service (or 5% to 20% depending on individual situations). Create a central fund to compensate adjuncts quickly and efficiently for service.

   The survey indicated that service compensation of Continuing Adjuncts is treated differently throughout the university. Some units already offer %FTE dedicated to service work. We should use this example and compensate all Continuing Adjuncts for their service work in the same manner.

   b) Compensate Continuing Adjunct faculty overload teaching with %FTE.

   The survey indicated that overload compensation of Continuing Adjuncts is treated differently throughout the university. Some units already pay teaching overload with %FTE. We should use this example and compensate all Continuing Adjuncts for their overload in the same manner, to create more equity.

4. **Improve the Promotion Process:**

   a) Ensure that promotions process appropriately recognizes that adjunct contracts are generally teaching-only and that research and university service performed by adjuncts seeking promotion should not normally form part of the expectations. Mirror for Adjuncts the terms in 30.6.10: “In cases where the applicant’s required responsibilities in scholarship/research (as noted in the letter of appointment) are minimal, **primary emphasis shall be placed on teaching.** Scholarship/research that is undertaken shall be assessed on the basis of whatever information as to quality is available.”

   Continuing Adjuncts letter of appointment contains teaching-only responsibilities. Many of the survey respondents indicated that they are teaching much more than the normal teaching load of their unit in order to have a decent salary. For Continuing Adjuncts engaged in huge teaching load, it is impossible to meet the same requirements in research and service than TT faculty who have a balanced workload in teaching/research/service. RTP Committees and Referees should put emphasis on teaching accomplishments when assessing Continuing Adjuncts’ promotion files.

   b) Grant the title of Assistant Professor for ALL Continuing Adjuncts regardless of the attainment of a PhD as the years of experience as Term Adjuncts are evidence that the members merit the rank of Assistant Professor. (change in article 32.6.3)

   c) Grant tenured, full responsibility status to all Adjuncts upon promotion to Associate Professor, with return to previous statues, i.e. Continuing and/or Assistant if unsuccessful.
When Continuing Adjuncts show the same level of achievement in teaching, research and service as a TT faculty member, it is even more impressive. Members indicated that the process is unfair and almost impossible to achieve. They should be offered the same as their TT colleagues, a tenured position with full range of responsibility at the Associate Professor level. Then they would have the equitable means and time to pursue their work in the following years in teaching, research and service in order to eventually access the Full Professor rank. These promotions will help the University grow their student/faculty (full-time) ratio and research profile, two critical aspects of university life.

5. **Improve Support for Teaching:**

   a) Expand the minimum stipends where there is an enrolment supplement beyond the current maximum of 200 or more students (i.e. 300 or more, 400 or more, 500 or more)
   
   b) Increase support for course preparation

Increases in large classes ranging from 200 to more than 500 students at Queen’s have affected the university’s performance in student/faculty ratio. Larger sections are increasingly taught by Adjuncts (see Snapshot, p. 10) who have to absorb this increased workload in teaching and in accommodating a large number of students. Adjuncts should be compensated for their extra work in maintaining teaching excellence in these challenging situations.

6. **Improve Support for Research:**

   a) Provide access to sabbatical leave and research course release to adjuncts independent of receiving a grant

Adjuncts are teaching a greater percentage of total course registrations and increasingly larger course sections when compared to full responsibility faculty. Many also teach online courses in the spring/summer session and thus are teaching year-round, often for several years in a row without any break between terms. Adjuncts are necessarily engaging in research as they develop, enhance, revise, or tweak/update their courses. Principal Deane recently acknowledged that “growing the interdependence between research and teaching” is one of the six goals in the new strategic framework. Giving adjuncts access to sabbatical leaves or research course releases would allow them time to focus on their research as it relates to their teaching but also their research programmes in general – whether they currently have an active programme or would like to develop one, as many adjuncts noted in the survey. Having this time to focus on research would also further contribute to “advancing the student learning experience” and “increase[ing] the university’s research impact” – two other goals of the strategic framework. Given the steadily increasing reliance on adjuncts for teaching and the clear
interdependence between teaching and research, adjuncts should have access to sabbatical leaves and research course releases.

b) Increase the funding available through the Fund for Scholarly and Creative Work and Professional Development (Adjuncts)

For many adjuncts doing research, this Fund is the main source of funding available. Since its creation in 1999, the Fund supported important research projects throughout disciplines at Queen’s, ranging from presentations at conferences, articles and books publications, research travels, collaborations, artistic creations and performances, and professional development projects. The support of adjuncts’ research has a profound impact on teaching and learning at Queen’s and on the research profile of the university. The amounts available to applicants have not been re-evaluated since the creation of the fund, more than 20 years ago. In order to maintain the success of this Fund in supporting adjuncts research, the funding needs to be increased to meet today’s costs.

7. Improve Adjunct Representation on Committees:

Mandate adjunct representation on Modified Appointments Committees and Renewal, Tenure and Promotion Committees when adjunct files are under consideration.

Adjuncts must be represented on the Modified Appointments and RTP Committees to ensure there is fair review and assessment of adjunct files. It is clear from the participants in this survey that support for adjunct appointments and renewals varies across units. Having only tenure-track or tenured faculty review and assess adjunct applications is problematic because many do not understand or cannot relate to the working conditions under which adjuncts work to perform the same or similar work. These committees can turn into “gatekeepers” (and in some cases, they have) in units that have shown little support for adjuncts and are reluctant to appoint or renew them on a more permanent basis. Having some adjunct representation on these committees will ensure that adjunct voices are included in the evaluation of adjunct files and will make for a more fair assessment process.

8. Provide Proper Recognition and Compensation for Term Adjunct Service:

a. Make all Appendix Q/Service payments pensionable
b. Streamline the Appendix Q payment process removing the burden from Adjuncts, i.e. creating a centralized system through HR
c. Appendix Q – expand the language to reflect other types of service, including but not limited to committee work, reference letters, department meetings etc.
d. Increase the stipends in Appendix Q to be in keeping with the marketplace
Most of the duties listed in Appendix Q refer to supervisory duties, however, as this report shows, there are many other types of service work and additional duties that adjuncts are performing that mirror that of tenured/tenure-track faculty but for which they are not paid (or not paid well). The vast range of service work that adjuncts do must be recognized and fairly compensated, and the process through which to access this compensation must be improved and streamlined so that it is accessible to all adjuncts in the bargaining unit. Creating a centralized system through HR, for instance, would allow adjuncts to submit their requests for compensation for a range of service work without going through individual department heads or running into departmental budget constraints, and it would ensure that all adjuncts are paid fairly and equally for their service work.

9. **Improve Communication and Training:**

   a. Directed at adjuncts and administration in order to improve transparency around contracts, Appendix Q, workload, and years of service calculation.

Many members answered that they did not understand how their workload is calculated, how overloads are calculated, when FTE should be recalculated, how their service work should be compensated. There needs to be transparent information on workloads and compensation.

10. **Internal Status for Tenure Track Positions:**

   a. Give adjuncts who have taught 8 half courses accumulated over 4 consecutive years at Queen’s, ‘internal’ status for applications to tenure-track positions.

Adjunct professors who have shown a commitment to the university, through continuous employment on adjunct contracts, deserve to have that commitment recognized by being provided with internal status for academic positions they qualify for. As has been discussed elsewhere in this document, adjunct salaries are extraordinarily low when compared to other professions that require the same length of training and working hours (Harzing, 2018)\(^\text{11}\). And, for many adjuncts, the experience of repeated rejections (for articles, grant applications, and permanent positions) can lead to a rejection of an academic career or a departure to an academic position in another institution (ibid.) – resulting in the university losing excellent teachers and talented researchers.

Granting internal status to adjuncts applying for tenure track academic positions can provide them with an incentive to remain at the university, despite the precarity of employment and low wages. And, it has fiscal advantages for the university - for

\(^{11}\) Anne-Wil Harzing (2018) Internal-vs-external-promotion. 
example: adjuncts are already familiar with the systems, policies and, most importantly, the courses they have been teaching and have established collaborations in place at Queen’s – which means shorter orientation periods and quicker transition to successfully functioning as independent professors.
Appendix A Key moments in Bargaining for Adjuncts

The Early Years (1995-2008)
The history of adjuncts and bargaining is complex, given the ways adjunct groups and appointments have changed over the years. In Sept 1995, the bargaining unit known as FLABU (the Faculty, Librarian, and Archivist Bargaining Unit) was defined to consist of “tenure-track, tenured, special appointee with academic rank, adjuncts 2, adjuncts 3; and librarians and archivists” (Butler 2017:fn107). Adjunct 2s taught the equivalent of two full courses per academic year for less than five years, and Adjunct 3s taught the equivalent of two full courses per academic year for more than five years. Adjuncts 1 were not (and still are not) part of the bargaining unit. At this time, most Adjunct 1s were professionals who taught for free as a form of professional service, faculty from other institutions who brought “emergency expertise,” retired faculty, or PhD students seeking to gain teaching experience. They had very short-term contracts, usually per course per term taught, but always less than two full courses in any given year.

QUFA was certified on November 7, 1995. The bargaining unit for first collective agreement (1997-1999) was referred to as the Faculty, Librarian, and Archivist Bargaining Unit (FLABU), and it had within it two different adjunct appointments. The Initial Adjunct appointment (a re-organization of Adjunct 2s) was a renewable, limited responsibilities appointment of 8 months to 3 years, where the member could apply for a Renewable Adjunct Appointment in the fourth year. The Renewable Adjunct appointment (a re-organization of Adjunct 3s) was an appointment for 3 years, after which a member could be considered for renewal of that Renewable appointment for another 3 years. Members could apply for appointments that may lead to tenure and were judged on the same basis as other applicants. These adjuncts enjoyed the same benefits as tenured faculty.

For the 1999-2002 collective agreement, adjuncts in FLABU were re-organized into three categories, in part to help establish order and procedures for adjunct appointments and to “prevent unfair and unjust practices in individual units” (Greenfield 2001), as well as to phase out the Initial and Renewable adjunct appointments.

The first group of adjuncts included both Initial and Renewable Adjuncts as part of their phasing out. Despite great pressure from the University, QUFA was able to maintain the status quo for this group, so they continued to have the same benefits, duties, responsibilities, and protections during the phase out. Unit heads were “encouraged to offer [adjuncts] two and three year contracts where possible (instead of a one year contract),” and these adjuncts were

---

12 A special THANK YOU to Richard Greenfield for providing documents on adjunct issues in bargaining from 1999-2003, which played a vital role in piecing together this history.
13 “An Adjunct’s inclusion in the Bargaining Unit is determined by the number of courses taught or the salary received. All Adjuncts who teach the equivalent of at least two full or four half-courses in a year or whose appointments pay more than half the Assistant Professor salary floor ($24,571 per annum in 2002-03; $25,186 in 2003-04), are Members of the Bargaining Unit and, as such, are covered by the Collective Agreement.” (“What everyone should know about adjuncts,” KYCA Dec 2002)
also able to apply for any continuing-track adjunct position that became available “before it is opened to external competition” (QUFA/Greenfield 1999). The Renewable Adjunct could be renewed for another three years at the start of the final year of the appointment. Under a transitional arrangement, all members designated Renewable Adjuncts or eligible to apply for Renewable as of Apr 30, 1999 became Continuing Adjuncts as of May 1, 1999.

The second category of adjuncts established under the 1999-2002 collective agreement were Term Adjuncts. These adjuncts were appointed after May 1, 1999 and were similar to Initial Adjuncts “in just about every respect” (QUFA/Greenfield 1999). Term adjunct appointments were intended to be short-term hires and, again, “all efforts shall be made to offer Term Adjunct faculty a contract of 2 or 3 years” (ibid), rather than a 1-yr contract. Term adjuncts were not eligible for a Renewable Adjunct appointment but could apply for any Continuing-track adjunct position available before it was opened for external competition. Under this agreement, the salary guidelines for Term Adjuncts also established a minima stipend per half course and added a necessary 5-15% to their Full Time Equivalency (FTE) calculation for administration and scholarship related to teaching.

The third category of adjuncts established under the 1999-2002 agreement were the Continuing-track/Continuing Adjunct appointment. The continuing-track appointment was for five years in duration with appropriate rank and an agreed upon range of academic responsibilities. In the last year, the member would normally apply for a Continuing Appointment, which would be a permanent appointment, but it would be a terminal year if a negative decision was reached. The aim in creating this appointment was to “produce a career path in some ways parallel to the continuing-track and tenure-track paths of, respectively, librarians and regular faculty” (QUFA/Greenfield Apr 1999). As Greenfield writes in a communication on the changes in the 1999-2002 Collective Agreement affecting adjuncts:

“It is hoped that this new type of appointment will assist in the full integration of Adjuncts in the normal working of the departments and Units to which they belong, enhancing both the understanding and valuation of their roles by their colleagues and their own ability and willingness to make valuable contributions in the areas of expertise and competence which they have to offer but which have not always been appreciated or utilised in the past.”

Continuing-track/Continuing Adjunct appointments had a guaranteed minimum workload set out in their appointment letter. They could also increase their workload “in appropriate areas” up to the full-time standard of one’s department, with agreement from Head/Dean. Continuing adjuncts were denied access to regular academic leaves in this round of bargaining, however, they did have access to negotiated leaves “under the terms of the Agreement with provisions to help ensure that access to this is a reality and not simply a technicality (Article 27)” (QUFA/Greenfield 1999).

Continuing adjuncts also gained a calculated Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) percentage and would have their salary reviewed by a side-table, to ensure a fair FTE for work done and a fair salary on an individual basis. It was agreed that for figuring one’s FTE with the side table that “5-15%
would be added to the weighting accorded to teaching in a departmental workload in recognition of the necessary administration and research involved in carrying out that teaching to the highest possible standards” (QUFA/Greenfield 1999).

Other gains that occurred during the 1999-2002 collective agreement negotiations included: adjuncts members could apply for appointments that led to tenure; a commuting Adjunct travel policy; the creation of the Fund for Scholarly Research and Creative Work and Professional Developments (Adjuncts); the use of one’s academic rank (e.g., Assistant Professor) for their title, rather than “adjunct” (used now for internal administrative purposes), and access to the merit/career development structure.

In concluding his communication with members on the significant changes concerning adjuncts through the 1999-2002 CA, Greenfield writes:

> What you have to do is to think back both to the 1st collective agreement and the days prior to it when almost no Adjunct had more than a one-year appointment and thus no security at all, whether they had been around for two or twenty years. Where pay and conditions was determined at the most local possible level so that there was absolutely no fairness or consistency. Where there was no eligibility for pensions or benefits. Where there was such chaos the university didn’t know or care about the existence of people who had been working hard for it for decades in some cases.

Bargaining for the 2002-2005 collective agreement also saw a number of gains for adjuncts. In terms of monetary gains, all adjuncts in FLABU became eligible for scale increases. Continuing adjuncts were eligible for the Anomalies side table and for merit points with the same increases in salary by same percentage figure as scale. Adjuncts also gained the right to include all relevant activities on their Annual Report forms, regardless of whether they are part of their appointed duties.

In terms of job security, QUFA was unable to secure a pathway to permanent employment for Term Adjuncts; however, they “would be guaranteed appointments of two or three years when renewed after three consecutive years of service, instead of facing the possibility of an endless sequence of eight-month appointments” (Greenfield 2002). Initial and Renewable Adjuncts with six consecutive years of service would be appointed to Continuing Adjunct when promoted to the rank of Adjunct Associate Professor “instead of being trapped in, at best, a series of three-year appointments” (ibid 2). It is important to note that this promotion to Associate was based on appointed duties alone (ibid 2) and not duties that mirror full responsibility appointments. Finally, it was in this collective agreement that the “faint hope clause,” as it has been called, was introduced: Any member who held an adjunct appointment at the University (except adjunct 1s) for at least twelve years and who has been promoted to the rank of Professor will be given a full-range tenured appointment.

---

14 In this collective agreement, a Special Term Adjunct appointment was established to manage the 2004 double-cohort. These positions were non-renewable, limited in term from 8 months to 3 years, and had to be terminated by Apr 30, 2005.
In this round of bargaining, the proposal for academic leave for adjuncts was once again denied. As Greenfield writes, “It proved impossible to secure access to regular Academic Leave for Adjuncts, but they will continue to have the possibility of paid or unpaid negotiated leave, which was secured in the last agreement” (Greenfield 2002).

In the 2005-08 Collective Agreement, the Term Adjunct Appointment continued as a limited term appointment of 8 months to 3 years, teaching an equivalent of 2 or more full courses per year (or teaching and related academic activities which comprise an annual workload equivalent to this teaching load). Term Adjuncts who taught for more than 3 consecutive years would be eligible for reappointment for a 2 or 3 year term, and a reappointments committee was established for this process.

Two historical arrangements happened in this agreement affecting term adjuncts. First, a Term Adjunct who held an Initial Adjunct or Renewable Adjunct appointment as of January 1, 2005; who had a minimum of 6 years of consecutive service; and who has been promoted to Associate was appointed a Continuing Adjunct. Second, a Term Adjunct who held an Initial Adjunct or Renewable Adjunct appointment as of January 1, 2005 would be eligible to be considered for reappointment for a 3 year term. After a minimum of 6 years as Adjunct faculty, the member could apply for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and Continuing Adjunct; however, a negative decision results in a terminal year. After 12 years, adjunct members could apply for promotion to Professor and be granted tenure (excludes time as a Sessional). In the case of a Term adjunct, applications for Continuing and Promotion to Associate proceeded together; if the member failed to gain the rank of Professor, they still continued to hold their current adjunct appointment.

Organizing Adjunct 1s/Sessionals in the Bargaining Unit
Up until this point, an Adjunct’s inclusion in the Bargaining Unit was determined by the number of courses taught (at least two full or four half-courses) or the salary received (appointment pays more than half the Assistant Professor salary floor). Adjunct 1s were not in the bargaining unit, but there was growing interest to organize some of them into QUFA, first as their own bargaining unit. The Dec. 2002 edition of “Know Your NEW Collective Agreement” focused specifically on “What Everyone Should Know about Adjuncts.” The opening lines read:

Thirty-three percent of all undergraduate courses offered at Queen’s in 2001-02 were taught by Adjuncts, up from 23% three years before. Of these Adjuncts, fewer than half were in the Bargaining Unit; most were Adjunct 1’s, who are not represented by QUFA and to whom the protections of the Collective Agreement do not apply.

This communique recognized four groups from which most Adjunct 1’s were hired: experts from the business, legal, or professional world; faculty from other universities; retired Queen’s faculty; and recent Queen’s Ph.D.’s who are gaining teaching experience” (QUFA/Greenfield 2002) Yet increasingly, this group also included “fully qualified faculty who have chosen for a variety of reasons to pursue a part-time career” (Greenfield 2003).
The University did not keep track of the number of adjunct 1’s they employed at the time, so QUFA began to count and compile a list of Adjunct 1 faculty (names, numbers, departments, amount of teaching) in preparation for organizing some of these contract faculty into the bargaining unit. They found that in 2002-3, Queen’s employed more than 400 Adjunct 1s and that “many had worked without security or benefits for a long time, many relied entirely on teaching for their income” (Butler 2017:50). A number of Adjunct 1s were working at multiple universities and colleges to earn enough income, and it became clear that “collectively, their contribution to undergraduate teaching was neither casual nor part-time, but severely underpaid and completely insecure” (ibid 50).

QUFA recognized many of the problems some of these Adjunct 1s faced at the time. They had very short-term contracts (usually per course/per term, even if they had been at the University for many years) and “no job security, no benefits, limited access to facilities, and little support in carrying out their obligations” (Greenfield 2003). There was also noticeable growth in the amount of teaching performed by Adjunct 1s at the University at this time. QUFA’s “view of the Adjunct situation at Queen’s” is captured in the last lines of this Dec 2002 communique on “What Everyone Should Know About Adjuncts”:

“We are worried that Adjuncts continue to engage in research and service that is of benefit to the University without being compensated for doing so; indeed that the Agreement may actually encourage them to do so in the hope of gaining greater security.

We are worried that Queen’s, like so many other universities, is being forced to rely increasingly on non-tenure stream instructors who come more cheaply and are let go more easily than regular faculty. These people may be highly qualified and excellent teachers, but they cannot be expected to have much interest in the long-term well-being of their Unit or the University. And they may actually increase the workload of the remaining regular faculty, since they are not usually employed to do any service. Some would see here also the seeds of a two-tier faculty system in which the teachers would be increasingly disadvantaged in relation to the researchers. The fact that Adjuncts teach 10% more of the undergraduate courses offered at Queen’s than they did three years ago should sound many warning bells.

And we are also worried about the situation of the Adjunct 1’s. Why should people who do the same type of work as Bargaining Unit Adjuncts, often for many years, not have the same protections and rights simply because they teach a half course less? In excluding these people from the Bargaining Unit, the current Agreement lags behind the provisions that are in place at many Canadian universities.”

Many adjuncts from this Adjunct 1 group were organized into their own bargaining unit under QUFA, known as the Sessional Adjunct Bargaining Unit (SABU), for the 2004-2006 and 2006-2008 collective agreements. The inclusion of these adjuncts in the bargaining unit was a

---

15 With regards to benefits: “At Queen’s, all Adjuncts in the Bargaining Unit are eligible for the same benefits as regular faculty, but the University’s insurance carrier imposes a restriction excluding those who have appointments that are less than 40%.” (Greenfield 2003)
significant development in the history of the faculty association, which required extensive organization and mobilization by QUFA. Sessional adjuncts were appointed to instruct one or more degree-credit courses but less than 2.0 full credit courses per academic year. In these negotiations, Sessional Adjuncts gained several rights, including a Right of Reappointment to teach a course they had taught at least two times in a minimum of two years; a committee for appointing Sessional adjuncts; a payment in lieu of salary for health benefits and pension for those who were paid the Base Stipend; the commuting adjunct travel expense policy, and an additional duties appendix (now Appendix Q). A Sessional Adjunct Appointment Committee was also created as a mechanism for appointing sessionals. Finally, sessional adjuncts could apply for an appointment that may lead to Tenure.

In 2007, the sessional adjunct bargaining unit amalgamated with FLABU, and the 2007-08 bargaining round focused on streamlining the categories of adjuncts and harmonizing and improving salary policies and processes. In these negotiations for the 2008-2011 Collective Agreement, sessional appointments were eliminated and one became either a Term Adjunct or Continuing Adjunct, depending on their years of service. A Term Adjunct appointment was still a limited term appointment, but now it was for 1 academic term to 3 years in duration to teach one or more half-credit (0.5) courses or course sections. It was at this point that language encouraging 2 to 3 year term adjunct appointments seemed to disappear as per course/per term contracts increased, which has negatively affected a term adjunct’s eligibility for benefits and pension.

Both Specific and General Rights of Reappointment were introduced in the 2008-2011 collective agreements as pathways for renewal. A term adjunct could achieve Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR) to teach a specific course if they had taught it two (2) times in a minimum of two (2) years. They could achieve a General Right of Reappointment after three or more consecutive years of service as a Term Adjunct and whose years of service times the cumulative number of full-course equivalents they have taught equals twelve or more (factor 12). Under this appointment, a Member has the right to a particular FTE and teach any course(s) they are demonstrably qualified to teach (Fitzgibbons 2008).

In the 2008-11 collective agreement, Continuing Adjunct appointments were still based on having at least six years of service, however, the factor 72 was added for eligibility (years of service multiplied by the cumulative total of the course-credits taught over those years equals 72 or more). But as Fitzgibbons (2008) observes, “it will of course take more than 6 years if the course-credits taught per year have been less than 2.0 course-credits,” which many term adjuncts with a per course/per term contract would experience as a major obstacle in gaining permanent employment. At the same time, the terminal year was removed if a negative

---

16 From the ‘Organizing Adjunct 1s’ pamphlet (2003): “Benefits provisions for part-time academic staff vary widely across the county. Negotiated provisions range from access to regular benefits through to salary in lieu. At Queen’s, all Adjuncts in the BU are eligible for the same benefits as regular faculty, but the University’s insurance carrier imposes a restriction excluding those who have appointments that are less than 40%.”
decision was made, meaning a continuing adjunct could only be terminated by retirement, resignation, dismissal, cause, or layoff.

The Administration Claws Back
As noted on Page 1 of the “Summary of Changes…” (2011) for the 2011-15 collective agreement, “QUFA’s challenge in this round of bargaining was to resist various efforts by the Administration to reverse protections and guarantees which we had achieved in earlier Collective Agreements.” The 2011 negotiations saw a concerted effort on the part of the administration to degrade members’ terms and conditions of employment, often on the backs of adjuncts, despite the fact that “in 2009 just under half (almost 46%) of Queen’s courses were taught by contract academic staff (CAS)” (Christie 2010). This effort included a proposal to terminate the ability of any Term Adjunct to gain Continuing status, as well as to increase the workload of Continuing Adjuncts without increasing their pay by manipulating how FTE is calculated. QUFA was able to maintain both the ability of Term Adjuncts to become Continuing Adjuncts and the FTE calculation for Continuing Adjuncts.

QUFA had also rejected the Administration’s proposal for a new continuing teaching appointment which would not involve research. The reason for this rejection was because at the time, QUFA viewed this type of appointment as “a misguided step which would open the door to appointments to teach an inordinate number of courses for low pay” (QUFA 2011.)

While QUFA successfully fought off the worst of these proposals, the bar to gain SRoR was raised so that term adjuncts now had to teach at least three (3) times in three separate academic years over four (4) consecutive academic years (rather than two (2) times in two (2) years). The bar to gain GRoR was also raised: an adjunct with SRoR must serve four (4) or more consecutive years and whose years of service times the cumulative number of full-course equivalents taught during that time equals 16 or more to be eligible for GRoR (rather than 3 years of service and a factor 12). Once again, QUFA bargained for but did not succeed in gaining academic leaves for continuing adjuncts (QUFA 2011.).

The 2011-2015 collective agreement did add language requiring that RTP committees take into consideration that the length of time over which an adjunct develops their scholarly record may be affected by the nature of their working conditions. As well, the Modified Appointments Committee replaced the Adjunct Appointment Committee, and language was added with respect to eligibility across 2 or more units for GRoR and Continuing Adjunct.

In bargaining for the 2015-2019 collective agreement, QUFA proposed increases in professional expenses across the board, including for Term Adjuncts, as well as asking that Continuing Adjuncts with FTEs less than 75% continue to be eligible for the Commuting Adjunct Travel Policy. The University declined to engage in QUFA’s proposals.

---

17 According to the May 12/2011 Bargaining Alert, the administration wanted to be able to “control the process” and make “new teaching only” appointments.
There were some gains achieved for adjuncts in this round of bargaining. For Term Adjuncts, there was now a process for expanding the list of courses to which they have a GRoR. Term Adjunct stipends for courses of 200 or more were supplemented by 18.75% (courses with enrollment of 100 to 199 maintained a 12.5% supplement). Term Adjunct appointments would also include adjuncts hired to perform course development or course revision for online courses. Finally, Term Adjuncts who were commuting Adjuncts would retain their Commuting status and receive reimbursement if their FTE, upon conversion to Continuing, is 50% or less and they continue to reside 75 kilometres away from where they teach (QUFA 2016).

Continuing Adjuncts gained language and a process for increasing FTE: when a continuing adjunct teaches a course on overload in three consecutive years and is assigned to teach an additional course again in a fourth year, their FTE would automatically increase to reflect this. They also continued their right to report on activities not included in their appointment letters; the Head may comment on these activities but shall not formally assess them (QUFA 2016). As well, continuing adjuncts could receive promotion (including to Professor) “on the basis of extraordinary contributions to teaching (or research, but it is teaching that will matter in practice)” (ibid). Also in this CA, language was removed in Article 32 that had considered Continuing Distance Studies as a Unit.

Bargaining for the 2019-2022 collective agreement was quite different from previous years and was dubbed “speed bargaining,” as it lasted approximately 2-3 weeks as opposed to several months. The conversion to the UPP was the main issue on the table, along with some other normative and housekeeping issues, but there were several Adjunct proposals that QUFA brought forward. It was clear at the bargaining table that the University was largely uninterested in discussing Adjunct issues at that time. QUFA had proposed making a Term Adjunct’s GRoR independent of having acquired a SRoR, in an effort to eliminate SRoR altogether. They also proposed an increase in the FTE of Continuing Adjuncts who had been promoted to Associate Professor that would grant them a modest research component as part of their appointment. Both these proposals were rejected. In place of these proposed asks, QUFA settled for a 0.5 credit teaching release for continuing adjuncts who were promoted to associate professor and successful in obtaining an external research grant within three years of being granted promotion. Bargaining unit employees legally eligible to participate in the UPP under the terms of the Pension Benefits Act, including Adjuncts, would be enrolled in the UPP.

The last several rounds of bargaining have seen the administration clawing back protections and guarantees secured in previous agreements, as well as making promotion and job security even more difficult for adjuncts to achieve. Richard Greenfield’s conclusion of the “Significant Changes Concerning Adjuncts through the 1999-2002 CA” holds as true today as it did then.

---

18 mkh notes, Dec 4, 2018
19 “It is...QUFA’s intention that adjunct faculty who meet the Ontario government’s Pension Benefits Standards Act (1985) threshold (a lower salary-level bar than the current bar set by the Queen’s-QUFA CA) will become part of the UPP if conversion takes place.” [There is more in this document on pension eligibility for part-time employees and the PBSA (1985).] https://qufa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/6-QUFA-Alert-Adjuncts.pdf
while there have been strides gained there is still much work to be done, adjuncts continue to face tremendous struggles and challenges.

Things have got better ... BUT there is room for improvement and it is important not to let the momentum slip. We can do better for all these groups and we must try. What we want to know is what priorities adjuncts themselves have. What things bother them most about their situations. What they would most like to see change. Then we can try for those things...”

References


Appendix B Survey Questions

Letter of Information - please click 'consent' at the bottom if you wish to complete the survey.

QUFA established the Adjunct Advocacy Committee to conduct research and write a report about adjunct terms of work and other concerns in preparation for bargaining in 2022. The Committee’s Terms of Reference states: The primary mandate of the core committee is to produce a report to the Executive by December 2021 outlining areas of the CA that could be productively amended or augmented through bargaining and to suggest the principles that should govern such bargained changes; the committee is not expected to craft CA language or bargaining proposals. To complete this mandate, the core committee may: Gather and analyze data available about QUFA members; Analyze available comparative data about contract academics elsewhere; Interview or run focus groups to explore key issues facing adjuncts. In order to gather some of the data we need for the report, we have developed a survey. There are no direct benefits associated with completing this survey and there are no known risks. We hope the survey will give the Executive and the Bargaining Team a better sense of a) the precarity of adjunct work itself at Queen’s, b) the various types of work adjuncts are doing, and if/how it is being recognized, and c) what avenues of change would you like to see QUFA pursue.

We will also be asking demographic questions in order to understand the possible impact of systemic bias in the experience of working as an adjunct. You may skip any questions you are uncomfortable answering.

The data will be collected using a secure platform called ‘QUALTRICS’ that Queen’s University prefers researchers use.

Participation is voluntary and you can withdraw at anytime prior to submitting this anonymous survey by simply closing your browser window. Your name will not be on any answers or survey results we get from you. After submission of the interview/survey it is not possible to identify the data so withdrawal of data is not possible.

Your answers to the questionnaire will be stored on a password protected and encrypted. A password is needed to use the USB, so your information will stay private. Only the Adjunct Advocacy Committee will have access to your data. The results of this study will not be published in an academic journal. These results are intended only to inform the Adjunct Advocacy Committee’s report. In this report we won’t discuss individual people. We will permanently delete the data immediately after it has been used for the Adjunct Advocacy Committee report.

You have not waived any legal rights by consenting to complete this survey. If you have any questions about the survey, please email LC105@Queensu.ca. If you have any questions about the Adjunct Advocacy Committee please contact Susan Lord, PhD atlords@queensu.ca.
By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your completion of this survey is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the survey at any time during the completion of the survey and for any reason. Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device.

I consent to complete the survey
I do not wish to complete this survey

How do you describe your gender? What is your gender identity?

How do you describe your race/racial identity?

Do you identify as someone with a disability?

Are you a term or continuing adjunct?

Term adjunct
Continuing adjunct

TERM ADJUNCTS

How long have you been a term adjunct?

less than 12 months
12 to 23 months
two to four years
five to six years
six to 9 years
ten or more years

Do you have Right of Reappointment?
Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR) occurs when a member has had full responsibility for teaching one more course(s) at least three times over four separate Academic Years. This is the right to teach the same specific course(s) in the same course delivery format in subsequent Academic Years. See article 32.2 and 32.4 for more detailed information.
A Term Adjunct with a SRoR who is eligible can apply for a General Right of Reappointment (GRoR). The GRoR is a right to a reappointment for a period of not less than one (1) year and not more than three (3) years to teach any course that the Member is demonstrably qualified to teach within a Unit in which they acquired the GRoR. See articles 32.3 and 32.4 for more information.

I have Specific Right of Reappointment
I have General Right of Reappointment
I have no right of reappointment, I am hired on a term by term basis.
Other

**SRoR**

How long did it take from your initial appointment for you to receive Specific Right of Reappointment?

- less than three years
- three to four years
- five to six years
- seven to eight years
- nine to ten years
- more than ten years

**Permanent**

If you could have a specific type of permanent employment at Queen’s would you prefer:

- To be a tenure-track/tenured professor with teaching, research, and service responsibilities
- To be a permanent full-time (100% FTE) faculty member with only teaching responsibilities
- To be a permanent part-time faculty member with only teaching responsibilities (Continuing Adjunct)
- Other - please explain

**Bargaining Issues for Adjuncts**

What do you want to see QUFA bargain for in the next round of negotiations on the Collective Agreement?

- definitely would like this
- Not sure
- No, this isn't important

Tenure-track appointment is granted when you achieve the rank of Associate Professor?

- SRoR removed as a prerequisite for permanent employment?

Equalize years of service and years of experience (at Queen’s)?

- Other, please explain
Appendix C Qualitative Survey Analysis

Of 268 members who participated in this survey, 178 / 66.42% are term adjuncts, reflecting the current ratios of the term to continuing adjuncts (524 to 136 / 69%) at the time of this survey.

Term Adjuncts

Of 178 term adjuncts, the majority (54.55%) has no right of re-appointment (No ROR) and is hired term by term basis, only 22 (14.29%) has the General Right of Reappointment (GRoR), and 35 (22.73%) has the Specific Rights of Reappointment (SRoR).

Thirteen participants identified their right of re-appointment as “Other” to highlight the peculiar conditions they are in regarding their re-appointment. While few members are gaining the SRoR this year, a few others indicated that they hold Specific Rights only for one course they are teaching but not for other courses. It is important to note, however, a trend in these answers: A number of members indicated that they are not aware/ not sure of the process of renewal and/or their rights of re-appointment. This disconnection between members and their rights as outlined in our Collective Agreement repeats itself in many other questions, which will be discussed further individually below. There were few members who were hired to teach specific courses with a three-year contract. Although this provides a certain level of job security for a term adjunct, their right of re-appointment is bound to the renewal of their contract given the SROR requirements (Three years in the last four years). One member brought up the often undisputed issue: holding both a post doc and an adjunct position simultaneously at Queen’s:

“I have a three year contract to teach specific courses. My supervisor kept me as a postdoc nullifying my ability of SRoR”

Another member highlighted, “This is the 4th year I have taught the course (full year), but have had to reapply each time,” showcasing even those who should already have an SRoR were not granted their right.

Another member mentioned that they do have an SRoR for one course; however, that specific course has not yet been offered again in their unit, which leaves this member without a right of re-appointment.

For members who hold SRoR, the majority of them (66.66%) got their SRoR less than 4 years, which is not surprising given the fact that it is granted almost automatically if a member teaches the same course 3 times in the last 4 years – although it is already established that it not always the case. However, for other members who were not able to get their SRoR in the same time frame, it is important to correlate their answers to the question “Do you teach the same course(s) each year? Or do the courses change each year?” Some of them indicated that they teach the same courses, however even with teaching the same courses their SRoR took more than 5 years to achieve. This further establishes that the SRoR process, which should be
almost automatic, does not proceed as intended. For others, however, the case is more alarming as their courses constantly change. One member, who waited for more than a decade for their SRoR, indicated that which courses they would teach are “Unknown until 4 to 6 weeks before the start of semester”.

For members who hold GRoR – a minority in the larger term adjunct population-, the majority of them (70%) got their GRoR less than 7 years, with 35% of them getting it 5 to 6 years. For the members who waited more than 7 years to gain their GRoR, a similar trend can be observed with the members of S Ro R. Most members have one or two stable courses, while the remaining of their courses vary from year to year. Even for the members who have been teaching the same courses over the years, they weren’t able to collect enough credit for the ? GRoR calculation formula. Although the reasons for this delay can be multiple, one member who got their GRoR between 7-8 years highlighted one issue they faced stating: “give adjuncts credit toward SRoR for "co-teaching" courses.” This showcases that credit-based formula gets further complicated in cases such as co-teaching for both the SRoR and GRoR processes.

Another member who got their GRoR between 7-8 years stated, “I have another contract with another unit at the university. I get paid separately, and it does not have any impact on my teaching at my home unit,” which indicates another complication for reaching GRoR and initially Continuing Adjunct position for members who teach across multiple units. Although teaching in multiple units is covered in the Collective Agreement, it is clear from this member’s experience that the process does not work as intended. Another member who got their GRoR between year 9-10 indicated they also serve as Undergraduate Chair, which is an indication how service work, as will be discussed further in detail below, does not count towards the GRoR calculation—an erasure which in turn prevents members from attaining to GRoR and consequently Continuing Adjunct status.

Another question posed to the members is their preferences if they could have a specific type of permanent employment at Queen’s. While 41.45% of participants preferred “To be a permanent part-time faculty member with only teaching responsibilities (Continuing Adjunct)” 34.21% of term adjuncts marked “To be a tenure-track/tenured professor with teaching, research, and service responsibilities.” Of those who expanded on their answers with the provided “other” option, two trends are clear: 1) Members would prefer any option as long as they have “secure work (tenured or not)” and they are supported for their research. 2) Although the numbers are smaller for this trend compared to the first one, it is significant how working conditions of Term Adjuncts at Queen’s University push the members out of university and the academic staff profession as some members indicated that they no longer “desire to be receive permanent teaching employment at Queen’s.”

Members were also asked to reflect on what improvements would be most beneficial for adjuncts when applying for tenure-track appointments at Queen’s. Some members responded to this question considering the advancement of term adjuncts to continuing then tenured positions as described in Collective Agreement Article 32. In regards to these advancement
options, members clearly indicated that there should be more clarity and information. For instance, one member said:

“I would like to be able to apply for tenure without risking my continuing adjunct position as I will have worked for almost a decade to receive it. I am not at that point yet so my information is limited, but I think I will lose my continuing adjunct position if I apply for tenure and do not qualify. If that is the case, I do not think I will risk it.”

Similarly, another member mentioned:

“For me, the biggest benefit would be given a clear understanding of how the process works to move from adjunct track to tenure track. As it stands now, I feel like the change is difficult to make and at the mercy of the dean or department head. This may not be the case, but I don't know because I don't have good information.”

Another member criticized the overall existing paths of advancement for adjuncts:

I'm in an early career phase and I'm just shocked at how few rights/how little respect the university treats adjuncts with. It seems like there are so many systems built to prevent advancement.

Members who responded to questions based on applying to newly established tenure-track positions at Queen’s overwhelmingly pointed to an urgent need for structural change. First of all, some members indicated a “hopelessness” of adjuncts to be hired for tenure-track positions and identified the culture around adjunct-hiring for these positions as a “dangling a carrot”: “It genuinely being possible instead of a carrot that is dangled by a senior leadership.” Members included multiple statements like “Committees will never hire adjuncts,” “This is a unicorn in my department. It doesn't happen.”, “currently our applications are often tossed aside - ah, we know this person, they are ok as is...”, “It seems to be a hopeless situation for most Queen’s adjuncts applying to internal tenure-track positions.”, “I would value transparency and fair opportunities. An adjunct is not a second class citizen”. Similarly, another member highlighted how precarity of adjuncts affects the hiring committees:

“External candidates seem to often be more enticing to hiring units, especially when they assume they will still benefit from adjunct labour whether they hire them permanently or not.”

Second, members provided multiple ways to re-imagine newly established tenure-track positions including: taking years of service into consideration, creating a database of hiring opportunities open to adjuncts across units, prioritizing adjuncts with SRoR in hiring, and “Having advanced standing for an interview”. They also suggested two structural changes: one is considering adjuncts as internal candidates. One member stated:
“I honestly think there should be more of a path for converting regular adjuncts to tenure-track or full-time teaching stream positions. Why does internal status apply to everything else at Queen’s but not adjunct faculty?”

Another member echoed:

“Similar to staff roles, if there is an adjunct at Queen’s who applies, I believe they should be considered internal candidates (QUFA Adjuncts) and given priority.”

Another member indicated a similar suggestion, but added incentives for departments to hire adjuncts:

“Special consideration because if an adjunct is already working for the dept, may actually be hard for adjunct to get hired as then someone else needs to replace what the adjunct done. So keeping adjunct in current role and hiring outside person gives the dept more person power. There is no inceptive on part of dept to take adjunct on permanently.”

Similar to the previous member, this member highlighted why these positions are created for starters:

“The tenure-track appointments are designed with the goal of reducing the need to have adjuncts so adjuncts have the expertise to apply to the postings”

Another structural change members indicated is to change the job postings and requirements. Specifically, they mentioned the conundrum of adjuncts whose research portfolio gets affected by their precarious condition. For instance, one member mentioned:

“Loosening the expectations for research, as adjuncts don’t have the funds or dedicated time in their contracts to conduct research”

Another member echoed:

“Seeing more teaching-only or clinical type appointments, as opposed to the draconian 40/40/20 research/teaching/service type.”

On a similar note but from a different angle, a member considers “the draconian 40/40/20 research/teaching/service type” unsustainable for people who have other commitments in life such as children:
“The reputation of tenure-track being crazy busy/stressful the first couple of years makes me think this lifestyle is unsustainable for someone with young children who wants to be present (and have mental capacity) for them.

Members who repeat similar suggestions and demands also complain that their teaching experience is overlooked when it comes to hiring. One member mentioned:

“I would base my selection on the experience rather than only publications or credentials. I believe in knowledge and experience.”

Another member included their experience where their unit hired an external candidate although the unit had more suitable adjunct candidates indicating adjuncts actually do not have the same opportunity when it comes to hiring:

“The same opportunity should be given to the adjunct as long as they have the qualifications. I have seen at Queen's someone has been hired without any substantial publication as a tenure-track assistant professor when other adjunct members have been teaching in the same department with good teaching evaluations and publications. I do not know if there would be any improvements without solving the most fundamental issue which is "preferential treatment". Therefore, the most beneficial improvement would be to make sure there is no preferential treatment.”

Members were also asked to describe their ideal working relationship or appointment with the university. Overwhelmingly but not surprisingly, members signaled precarity as the main issue and asked for permanency, stability, and continuity. While some preferred tenure-track positions, an almost equal number of members indicated continuing adjunct positions. In any case, the majority described an arrangement that has teaching and service responsibilities with additional opportunities of research. Regardless, the overwhelming majority of term adjuncts indicated stability as the major demand. One member said: “Security of some sort - not having to apply for the same job year in and out.”. Another mentioned:

“Stable, full-time teaching employment (continuing status) that recognizes and values my longstanding commitment to Queen’s, my Faculty, and my students. It is demoralizing and stressful to have to apply to teach the same set of courses term after term. I go above and beyond to contribute to my Faculty and my students’ learning, yet am faced with being 2nd choice to instructors who are less engaged and have poor QSSETs but happen to get SRoR because they have taught the same course repeatedly. (I speak for myself and many of my adjunct colleagues.)”
Another member indicated:

“I would like permanence. As a term adjunct I have very little stability. If I design a course I don’t want to have to hand it over to a teaching fellow (graduate student) when the unit decides to block my advancement. They are stealing my academic work and using my teaching forms/course development resources.”

Another member highlighted consistency and predictability:

“I would like to know from year to year how much work I will get in an academic year. Ideally this would be full time, but if not then a consistent/predictable amount so that I can plan my life.”

Another member further described what it means to have stability:

“Clear on what course to be delivered and when, right now they seem to wait till a few weeks / days before something is offered before finalizing who teaches it.”

Another member - like many others - also included benefits - which will be discussed separately below:

“I would like stability and benefits. It would be great if my children went to the dentist on a regular basis and if I predict my income for the future.”

On top of stability, many members also highlighted a need for change in the workplace culture, which currently does not consider adjuncts as equals. When asked about their ideal relationship with the university, one member, for instance, simply asked for “respect”, another for “recognition of their contribution,” and another for “feeling that my work is valued - through employment security, for example.” Another member stated:

“I would like to have had a PROFESSIONAL relationship where I am treated as an equal to the tenured faculty. I have not had that relationship as we are treated as convenient people to fill gaps. Too much power in the hands of heads of schools and departments.”

Similarly, another member described their ideal relationship with the university as follows:

“That I am an adjunct faculty member afforded the same rights and supports as a tenure track faculty member. That there be a process for non-tenure track adjuncts to remain in meaningful employment at the University to support students and the research ecosystem.”
And finally, another member further described the need for recognition of term adjuncts:

“Tenure-stream professor. If not that, then some way of recognizing the research and event organization I do that benefits the university, its budget, and its students. Better compensation would be a start as currently, I do all the work of colleagues who are tenure-track and am paid less than half their salaries. While I am grateful to be on a 3-year contract, many adjuncts have very little job security and even 3 years passes quickly. More job security would be very helpful.”

This demand for stability is also interesting when correlated to the questions whether their course offerings are stable and whether the classes they teach vary. Almost half of the members do have both stable offerings and their courses do not change from year to year. However, even they do not feel they have job security as they know that it can change any minute. One member, for instance, mentioned that their course was cancelled at the last minute due to COVID-19 emergent teaching measures, although they have been teaching the same course over the years. Another member mentioned that: “So far, I have taught the same courses, but it is never guaranteed, and I have to reapply each year to teach them.” Another mentioned that they have been teaching the same course for more than 5 years. However, it is never confirmed whether they are teaching the course or not “until 4 to 6 weeks before start of semester”. Another member, who does hold GRoR, mentioned their relatively stable workload was cut dramatically over a recent curriculum change: “from 6 0.5 credit sections in an academic year to 3 0.5 credit sections in the 2021-22 academic year” showing that even GRoR does not guarantee stability and job security. Multiple members indicated that they recently lost their classes to tenured/tenure track faculty, so their course load is no longer stable. One member mentioned: “It was quite stable until this last (Fall 2021) term. Apparently a new rule came into play?” which not only echoes the lack of stability but also how the member is not part of the discussion about the changes of their course load.

On that note, members were also asked whether they are being consulted or whether their course assignments are discussed with the ??? in their units. Although there are some members who have been involved in the discussions about their teaching assignments, the majority indicated that they do not get consulted even if they have somewhat stable teaching assignments. One member mentioned: “Not really. My courses have been stable, but there have not been ongoing conversations about my preferences or longer term objectives”. Other members mentioned that they are only being consulted in regards to “time slots” or “receiving a list of available courses” or “whether [the member] accepts the offer or not.” Keeping in mind the responses to the previous question, it is fair to argue that term adjuncts are not being involved in any decision-making process in their unit for curriculum and course assignment regardless of their job stability.
Teaching

When asked about which type of courses they are assigned, term adjuncts responded as follows:

- 35 Term Adjuncts teach first year classes
- 48 Term Adjuncts teach classes with more than 100 students
- 69 Term Adjuncts teach a required undergraduate course
- 62 Term Adjuncts teach a graduate course

When compared to how many members who teach first year classes, classes with more than 100 students, required undergraduate courses and graduate courses to their Rights of Re-appointment, the results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>&gt;100</th>
<th>Required UG</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No RoR</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRoR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRoR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to these questions also demonstrated an unexpected tendency in individual units that can be considered discriminatory or inequitable. For instance, one member mentioned that their unit does not allow adjuncts to teach graduate courses. Another member mentioned that their course is capped at 90 every year which would prevent them from the additional pay for teaching more than 100 students. A number of members said their whole course load is either required courses or graduate courses preventing them from teaching in their own fields. On that note, in responding to the question whether term adjunct members would prefer variety in their course assignments, they highlighted how having variety leads to multiple complications for term adjuncts. For instance, some members mentioned that teaching the same courses is the only way to SRoR -then GRoR and Continuing Adjunct status-:

“I don’t mind variety and am qualified to teach several courses, but teaching a variety of courses has prevented me from earning SRoR on any one particular course.”

Others mentioned the additional workload of designing new courses every year. For instance, one member who indicated their courses change every year said:

“It depends on the variety - I would like variety but also would like to teach some of the courses again so I do not have to develop new courses each year.”
This concern of additional workload is also significant in relation to the time commitment to develop a new course. When asked about how many hours members usually spend on course development / creation before they teach a course for the first time, the responses were extremely troubling as they range from a minimum of 30 hours up to “hundreds of hours.” While some members mentioned COVID19 emergent remote teaching added extra time commitment to their preparation and adjustment of their syllabi, the majority described the time allocation of course development as “countless,” “impossible to count,” “weeks,” or “months.”. Several members indicated that they stopped counting since course development is very rarely compensated. Even those who provided an estimate highlighted this lack of compensation. For instance, one member said: “1 month full time equivalent, non-compensated, for a new course”. Another mentioned, “LOTS!! - the amount of hours divided by the pay for each course would probably mean that I earn less then the minimum wage.”. Another member mentioned, “Too many - my official workload is part-time. Often the need for course development makes it more like full-time hours.” This is especially significant concerning the question of stability. It is already established that many members do not have a stable roster of courses meaning their courses change from year to year. On top of that, many members - as mentioned above - indicated that they do not get informed about teaching “until 3-4 weeks before the term starts,” which results in what can be called “crunching.” This is also the case even if course development is compensated for online courses. For instance, one member who is mostly teaching online graduate courses said:

“The courses are pre-developed but always require significant updating (identifying broken links). Also, quite often I am given access with less than a week or two before the course begins. For new courses, I need to learn the course quickly. Also, changes to the courses are often made without informing instructors”

A similar trend is obvious when asked about how much time members spend on the deliverance of courses each week. Although individual responses varied from each course to each term, overall averages sit between 5-8 hours for a lecture that was delivered before and between 12-20 hours for a new lecture. Similar to the previous question; however, many members indicated that they stopped counting: “I gave up keeping track. A ridiculous amount, cut back by competing demands.” Similar to developing a new course, the time commitment to course deliverance was also affected heavily by COVID 19 teaching measures: “It is more recently because COVID is forcing a dual model of making lots of content available online as well as teaching in person.”

Service

"Crunch mode", also referred to as "crunch time," is the term used by those in the software development industry to describe working extra hours for extended periods of time in order to finish a project or meet a deadline. It is associated with management expecting employees to work 50, 60, 70, and sometimes even 80 hours a week for months on end.” [https://cs.stanford.edu/people/eroberts/cs181/projects/crunchmode/index.html](https://cs.stanford.edu/people/eroberts/cs181/projects/crunchmode/index.html)
When asked whether the members have ever supervised or sat on a supervisory committee for a 4th yr Honours thesis, Master’s MRP or thesis, or PhD thesis or a comprehensive exam, the majority of term adjuncts said they haven’t. For those who do have service experience, four points are important to highlight: 1) Majority of members who have ever served on committees did so once or twice. Those who have more experience than that are extremely rare showing even for those who responded positively to the question, it is not consistent. 2) Some members mentioned that they do serve on committees in other universities (such as external reader) but not at Queen’s, showing it is not the members’ incompetency of service work but the university’s to include term adjuncts in service work. 3) Of those who have service experience, 7 members have GRoR, 7 members have SRoR, and 16 members have no RoR, signaling yet again those who provide service work are also the most precarious. And finally, of the small minority of adjuncts who do have consistent service work (they served more than 10 occasions), 1 holds GRoR, 3 hold SRoR, and 2 have no RoR. 4) Multiple members who don’t have service experience consistently indicated that they are not permitted to serve on committees in their units even if students requested them as a committee member. They were prevented from service work as they were considered “ineligible” due to being “not a full faculty member” or “a recognized professor.” One member stated:

“I have not been denied and have not been offered - but I am a term adjunct so we are pretty much at the bottom of the barrel.”

One member mentioned that they are permitted but “not in an official capacity,” which indicates some members might be providing service work not only without compensation but without recognition as well. Answering another question regarding opportunities of supervision in their unit, one member mentioned:

“Yes, but a tenure or tenure-track prof is required to be on the committee. This is degrading.”

Similarly, another member mentioned the opportunities for service work are not discussed in their unit:

“only learned of this through personal connection, wish it was clearer in terms of how to apply to supervise other programs/students and sit on committees.”

When asked whether the members have ever served in major administrative positions, 8 responded positively: 2 with GRoR, 4 with SRoR, and 2 with no RoR.

When asked whether their service work was compensated, less than half (11 out of 30) members said that they were compensated. None of these members are members who have relatively consistent service work (they served on committees on more than 10 occasions). In other words, those who consistently serve on committees do so without compensation. Almost all members who were compensated added that the pay was not adequate. One member said:
“Yes. The pay was like minimum wage considering the amount of the time spent when I calculated.”

Another member mentioned the inadequacy of the pay made them stay clear of service work:

“Yes and no not nearly enough compensation, I won’t do it again”.

Multiple members indicated how compensation for service work which is standardized in the Collective Agreement Appendix Q is not really standard in their units. One member mentioned that although the compensation is inadequate, their unit still considers it as a reason why they don’t assign service work to term adjuncts:

“Yes - based on the CA. It was hardly enough and my department does not assign new supervision to me as they do not have the budget.”

Other members echoed this when asked whether they have been prevented from service work:

“Yes, because appendix Q makes it mandatory for the department to compensate.”

“Budget constraints which have eliminated conferences, learning opportunities for students and staff”

“My home department does not allocate supervision or graduate level teaching to the adjuncts at the department. I do not think they have the budget to pay for any other service work either.”

On a similar note, one member mentioned that it was communicated to them as it is either unpaid or no service work:

“Have not been denied. But also told they would be unpaid.”

In another case, one member mentioned:

“I have received no compensation - it was considered part of my service. The "pay" was woefully inadequate for the time spent.”

This case shows that 2.5% of adjunct salary that is considered part of teaching-related administrative work can be extended as a way not to compensate our members.

Another member mentioned their pay practically disappeared in the bureaucracy:

“No - confusion over where the pay went and how it was delivered, no one followed up.”
As a follow up, the survey asked the members whether they were aware of the Appendix Q. Astonishingly, out of 158 term adjuncts who responded to the question, only 14 stated positively, with one of them saying “vaguely.” The survey also asked how to improve the Appendix Q, however with these numbers, the responses were low. Regardless, our members included some insightful comments: For instance members highlighted the inadequacy of compensation for specific tasks:

“I wish there was a proper acknowledgement of adjunct faculty members' hard work and time. As a primary supervisor, for supervision and reading MA theses I was paid 600 dollars for each MA Essay. This amount should be minimum $ 2000 for MA Essays.”

“Compensation for directed reading course is quite low - perhaps should be laddered by number of students??”

“clearly outline compensation for positions noted as major admin position”

“A process where the onus is not on the adjunct to continually go back to a tenure track faculty or administrator asking to be paid for work done.”

“Needs to be rewritten on the basis of how it is actively avoided by HODs”

“this year i have completed over 30 references with no compensation”

“Yes require Adjuncts, both Term and Continuing, to be present on all committees and paid for their work.”

“I think the directed readings pay is very low. Based on the numbers in Appendix Q, the compensation for this would be about 12.5 hours of work. From syllabus development, through weekly or bi-weekly meetings, to grading, these courses take much more time than that. Of course, we want to support our graduate students' interests and so we say yes but this compensation certainly does not match the labour. The pay for supervision of an MA project or essay is also very low compared to an MA thesis. Though this would undoubtedly be less work, it would be significantly more than supervising an undergraduate thesis as you will be guiding the student through graduate school, developing proposals, attending conferences, etc etc.”

Two members brought up the issues around communication with unit administration:
“It is a significant effort to chase down departments to ensure that appropriate payment is processed in a timely manner. This adds hours of communication and confusion to many department admin.”

“It only applies if you first have a term adjunct contract and the HOD asks. This is never how supervision occurs, in my experience.”

Another member highlighted the fact that the articles (including Appendix Q) is not necessarily clear or clearly communicated to the members:

“I am aware of Appendix Q. I think supplementary documents (on the website maybe an FAQ section) to explain the articles could be helpful. The wording can be tricky. As in years of service versus years of experience.”

One member brought up the issue of benefits – which will be further discussed below:

“would like to see medical and dental benefits for adjuncts ; participation in the regular medical plan”

Other members who have been unaware of the Appendix Q also included some suggestions for QUFA:

“Not aware of Appendix Q. I feel though that there should be Adjunct representation, proportional to the faculty compliment, on each and every committee and that this should be PAID work. There are few opportunities for involvement and to be a part of the school for Term Adjuncts specifically.”

“I have just been advised by QUFA that appendices to the CA (expenses for travelling adjuncts) are not binding on the University. If that’s true (which astonishes me) what would be the point?”

“no, I am not aware. We need an orientation for someone to explain all these Appendices...”

When asked whether they would feel comfortable requesting compensation for their service work (in accordance with Appendix Q), predominantly members said no, signalling the precarity of their work:

“I would if I knew it would not jeopardise my precarious employment status.”

“I would try not to ask for extra compensation.”
“I would not feel comfortable asking, but I think it should be paid”

“I would not be comfortable raising this for fear of not being offered work in the future.”

“might need a training to see its implications and how it can affect me”

Research

When asked whether the members are published researchers, a good majority (2/3) indicated that they are. When asked whether they have been able to maintain an active research record while employed as an adjunct at Queen’s, only a small portion responded positively. In majority of the cases, members highlighted the lack of time to maintain their research portfolio. When asked specifically whether their workload has affected their research, an overwhelming majority of term adjuncts said yes:

“I am published with a strong record. Since becoming an adjunct, I haven’t been able to keep up with my productivity.”

“[Published], but my production has diminished as preparing new courses constantly saps my time.”

“[Published]. So far, I have been able to do a minimal amount of research.”

“It is extremely difficult to do research off the side of your desk (I have a full time staff job in addition to my Adjunct role). Most of the research I am involved with now relates to the committees or theses I supervise. I would really like time afforded to me for more research.”

“I have four articles published. I have interest in my book from a well-respected publisher but I have yet to have time to edit my dissertation into the book I proposed. I find that I have been successful on many grants and yet I have barely any time to actually write my research findings or even edit existing work.”

One member highlighted the accumulated load by COVID19:

“My teaching load and time constraints brought on by the pandemic have severely limited by time for research”

Another member stated the fact that external funding requirements are a major barrier for maintaining their research:
“[Published] Queen’s actively limits my access to external funding, which requires a 3-year appointment to be eligible.”

On a similar vein, another member alarmingly stated that their research is prevented in their individual unit:

“My faculty makes this pretty hard, intentionally”

Multiple members mentioned how their research is unpaid as term adjuncts:

“[Published] although it is difficult to obtain funding and my research work goes mostly unpaid.”

“Being an adjunct essentially turns your research into a hobby (because it is not compensated)”

“Paid commitments trump unpaid commitments.”

One member highlighted not only the lack of pay but also the lack of respect for adjunct research:

“Yes, I am published. queens does not provide much support or respect. I have a very hard time doing it as it is unpaid work”

One member mentioned how they prioritized teaching over research for their promotion to Continuing Adjunct:

“it would not be possible to qualify for promotion if I spent time for my research. As a result, my dissertation is waiting to be revised and published.”

Other members mentioned how the precarity of adjunct work affect research directly:

“I have let my research slide because I don't get paid for it. My adjunct work is not enough to support my family (I am a single parent) so I take on other paid work and this puts research at the bottom of the priority list.”

“If I didn’t have to apply to teach twice per year, I could use the time and peace of mind from stable employment to devote to research and publishing.”

“Teaching courses I have never taught before every term leaves me with too high of a workload and mental load to work on research”

When asked whether the members apply to internal fundings for research, some members stated that they are not aware of the internal funding opportunities or whether they are
eligible for them. Many members, on the other hand, indicated that they do apply, with some also adding how helpful it has been for them. However, again the majority said they do not for similar reasons. One member mentioned:

“Because my work is precarious and for many years I did not know if I would have been hired for the next term”

Another echoed this:

“No, during the deadline I didn’t have contract”

Time, or lack thereof, was brought up again as a barrier for applying to internal grants for term adjuncts:

“No. I don’t have capacity to do both teaching and research - preparing to teach courses I have never taught before each term takes too much time/energy and I don’t have time to think of research”

“No. I don’t have time or administrative support for research. Regrettably.”

“No. It feels too overwhelming and that it would take too much time for which I would not be paid. “

When asked what kind of additional support from the university would enable members to publish, they listed:

- More funding
- Dedicated research time
- Ability to hire research assistants
- Smaller course load for same salary
- Funded time proportional to teaching time
- Course Buy-Outs or Sabbatical for research
- Adjunct contracts to include paid research time
- Support for grant writing
- Job stability/job security
- Professional development trainings similar to tenure track faculty has
- Access to Queen’s Internal Grants
- Expanding the adjunct specific grants
- Respect and recognition of achievements

To extend on the last item, here are what members stated:
“Paid leave/sabbatical would help a lot. I would also suggest that the current culture does not in any way support research agendas of term adjunct faculty. It simply isn’t talked about or encouraged much less incentivized.”

“My primary suggestion would be for recognition of adjuncts who do research and bring research funding to Queen’s. This could take the form of course releases or teaching assistant help for adjuncts who are bringing in research grants and money. Higher pay could help enable less teaching. Ensuring I don't teach in the Summer. Less committee work.”

“access to research assistants could be helpful / or even just recognition that I do research …”

“Funding and respect”

“When term adjuncts have no contract, we lose access to resources. Maintaining access to resources such as email, the library, the ability to attend workshops and be part of the Queen’s community - those would be very helpful.”

When asked whether members utilize external fundings for research, only 38 out of 158 stated that they do. Of those 38, some considered their external or secondary professions (such as consulting or clinical work) as their external funding for the research that they conduct while employed at Queen’s University. Other members who hold external research grants such as SHHRC indicated they are co-applicants, which again correlates to the fact that term adjuncts are ineligible for external funding due to their limited contracts at Queen’s.

Benefits and Pensions
One of the survey questions included the following statement and asked members to provide input: Medical benefits and pension are extremely important issues for many Term and Continuing Adjuncts at Queen’s. The Adjunct Advocacy Committee is presently gathering data and research to better understand which adjuncts have benefits through Queen’s and how the providers determine eligibility. Once we have more information, we may follow up this survey with another brief one that specifically asks you about benefits and pensions.

The following are the comments from term adjuncts:

“this seems like a very basic request - I was shocked when I started teaching and learned that pension and benefits were not available. We should have the option of taking the 4% lieu instead of benefits if we are covered by a partner’s or external plan but pension for tenured faculty but not for adjunct faculty is absolutely shocking.”
“What is the recommended threshold to pay into the pension? How many courses should you teach per year for this to be worthwhile? It's also unknown if I should be contributing to a pension when my workload is unstable from one term to the next. The benefits aren't as big of a concern because my husband also works at Queen's and I/my children are fortunate to have benefits through him.”

“I learned that I qualify to receive health benefits through a random conversation. I could not receive it when I put in the request as my contracts were submitted late. First of all, we need more information. Second, the staff needs to be informed about this. Otherwise, I have to struggle every step of the way. I do not have the energy for extra struggles when I am teaching 5 or 6 courses a year.”

“This is a basic obligation for any organization employing highly educated professionals without whom the day-to-day functioning of said organization would be impossible.”

“The current terms of the Collective Agreement require adjuncts to work for years and pass many tests before qualifying for benefits that would be considered standard in other industries.”

“It is egregious that instructors teaching the same course will either have full benefits, including pension, or none at all, depending on their status.”

“I am lucky in that I have benefits through my partner's employment. The Queen's benefits overall are extremely limited as compared to most people I know working in universities. Therapy needs to be much higher and massage is very important as well. We know that mental health issues are very common in academics and the specifics of our desk work cause a lot of body pain, especially after last year.”

If I have access to benefits and pensions, no one has made me aware of it.

I am on a personal coverage plan, to have the universities would be a great improvement for my health and efficacy. Due to be self enrolled, much of my income from queens goes toward it. My income in turn must be diversified for survivability, which requires a split focus while teaching. I can be very honest, to be able to be 100% available full time for a term,
would improve learning and mental health of our term adjuncts. Particularly after this pandemic where many savings for our faculty may have been lost.

I have a family to support so any pension/benefits are paramount to my family's well being.

The current system actually penalizes adjuncts for years of service in some cases. I began working at Queen's on a two-year contract with benefits. When my contract was renewed to a one-year contract, I lost all benefits.

Having access to good benefits for the entire year would be life changing for me and my family! I am fortunate to have benefits some of the year through other part-time teaching I do. However, if we need things to be done when we don't have benefits we often delay or push things off which I know is not good. But I feel that I don't have a choice.

Health and Safety
When asked whether the members find the agreement between QUFA and the University regarding COVID-19 LoUs, the majority said yes with a few disagreements. However, members were still concerned about their workplace safety, especially in terms of going back to campus. One member stated:

“I am concerned that the university and provincial government are bypassing necessary health measures (e.g. arbitrarily lifting the distancing requirement on university grounds when it is still required elsewhere) for their own profit and thus endangering students and staff. However, since I was assigned to work remotely for other reasons, it doesn't directly affect me.”

Another echoed similar concerns:

“I applaud the efforts. However, I am not 100% confident about teaching large classes since students do not wear masks properly and I don't like to waste time and energy being the mask police.”

In fact, one member stated that they refused the work “due to fear of exploitation”. It is not clear from their responses for the following procedures regarding their work refusal such as whether they received support from QUFA or not. On a similar note, one member expressed their frustration in regards to communication from QUFA with the following statement:
“Communication from QUFA as to the options available for Adjuncts regarding contracts, pay, bonuses, benefits, etc. The amount of emails regarding Pension and retirement that were sent out during COVID (remote teaching last year), while Adjuncts were struggling to make ends meet was insulting and unproductive to the most precarious members of this union.”

In other and possibly more alarming cases, however, it is clear that term adjuncts have been discriminated against in their units as their preference for teaching remotely was denied. One member mentioned:

“In 2020, I taught exclusively on-line. About as safe an environment as possible. In 2021 I was only offered full return to in-class teaching.”

Another member said they were actively prevented from teaching remotely based on their adjunct status:

“I would have preferred the option of teaching online, my unit made it clear that adjuncts and teaching fellows would not be approved for remote teaching.”

When asked what other improvements there can be in regards to health and safety, many members highlighted air exchange and air quality and signaled the lack of transparency and clear communication. A number of members mentioned either remote teaching or social distancing/larger classrooms with less students. Some also mentioned better office space as they share one office with multiple adjuncts. One member mentioned:

“I wish I was provided PPE, provided orientation to my teaching spaces, and received clear direction to provide to students around missing lectures/labs”

Regarding communication, one member mentioned that they have not been communicated by the university at all:

“More communications with people who are remote from Queen’s, the only information I receive is from the QUFA. The university itself doesn’t seem to communicate at all with term adjuncts”

Many other members expressed that the late and inadequate communication from the university in the early Fall 2021 added extra and unnecessary stress to term adjuncts:
“Not especially, in particular with regard to the Fall start up. The timing of decisions was abhorrent and lead to a very stressful and unnecessarily so situation.”

This was also critical for term adjuncts who teach larger classes:

“The communication was left much too late, especially in preparing for a fall semester back in the classroom. When adjuncts are often teaching the large undergraduate classrooms, we deserved to know information like air quality, how vaccine mandates would be implemented, and how covid tests would be administered well before starting classes”

When asked what other measures can be taken to protect job security of adjuncts during pandemic and what other non-pandemic related issues regarding health and safety they are facing, members listed several alternatives from longer term contracts to increasing job stability, from relaxing research conditions and requirement to teaching-track positions, and from paid sick leave to further protection of adjuncts with disability. They also included more communication from QUFA specific to adjunct issues and the measures the Union is taking regarding protecting adjunct jobs. Similar to previous responses, one member mentioned their lack of option for teaching remotely:

“1. The freedom of the professor to switch into remote teaching as soon as we learn that a student is sick with covid. 2. A clear information on how much we are going to be paid if we get sick with covid, I have no idea about this.”

Another member suggested a more robust approach for cancelled classes stating:

“This seems impossible because units are blocking advancement by cancelling courses when adjuncts get close to SRoR but claiming operational limitations, etc. no one is watching them cancel successful courses.”

Finally, like many other questions, this question also received many responses from members simply asking for respect and recognition:

“Recognition of the tremendous amount of effort required to still deliver high quality courses in a remote environment.”
Continuing Adjuncts

The qualitative analysis reported here was done on the first Seventy-seven (77) Continuing Adjuncts who took the survey. Forty-six (46) of them have been Continuing Adjuncts for five years or more, and thirty-one (31) four years or less. For fifty-five (55) of them, it took five years to more than ten years before their Term Adjunct appointments could be converted to Continuing.

In this qualitative analysis of the survey’s written answers, the needs, opinions and information provided by Continuing Adjuncts will be outlined to help QUFA understand the reality of its members about a variety of issues. The analysis will show that working conditions of Continuing Adjuncts are not treated the same way between the different units and faculties at Queen’s. It will also highlight some lack of information and topics that would need to be better explained in various units. These written answers also show the different way Continuing Adjuncts are sometimes regarded in comparison to tenured full-time faculty members. The outcome of this qualitative analysis is to provide information that will lead to recommendations to the bargaining team about areas of improvement in the Collective Agreement to create more opportunities for adjuncts to participate in their university career and to receive fair and equitable treatment.

Continuing Adjunct appointment

There are many different types of workload arrangements for continuing adjuncts at Queen’s. Some of them are happy with a part-time (% FTE) permanent position with teaching only. Others have teaching and service compensated in % FTE. Many are doing free service work and would like to be compensated for it. Some Continuing Adjuncts do research and are interested to go through the promotion process and become tenured full-time professor. Others don’t have time, or are not interested, to do research. The flexibility of this type of appointment is a strength for the university and for Adjuncts. However, the different treatment throughout the university for FTE calculation and for compensation (or not) of service work should be addressed in the collective agreement to achieve equity between all Continuing Adjuncts.

Ideal appointment

When asked to describe their ideal employment relationship or appointment, some answered that they were happy with their current arrangements, others answered that they would like better recognition of the work they do, some underlined they would like a %FTE for their service work, others that they want to reach a tenured full-time appointment.

“Either 100% of my pay or tenure, which is effectively the same thing. I already perform a full-time position, teaching, service, research, but am only paid for a portion of it.”
“One that treats me like I’m a full employee of the university, that doesn’t set me at a lower level than people I work alongside. One that opens admin opportunities to me”

“full-time (100% FTE) teaching and service only”

“I would like to see service being a better explained option when converting to Continuing. My ideal would be a teaching position with anything from 50-80% of FTE for teaching and 20% for service.”

“My ideal employment would be a Teaching Professor with Service requirements.”

“Permanent 1.0 FTE with teaching and service”

“Continuing adjunct, part-time permanent, with automatic recalculation of FTE when teaching in overload for 3 years in a row (remove the exception for applied teachers)”

“Permanent (continuing or tenured) employment, where I am paid for teaching, research, and service.”

“Regular full time tenured associate professor.”

**Teaching**

When asked if they are involved in discussions or consulted about their teaching assignments, Continuing Adjuncts answers were divided between yes, yes to a degree, and no. Some mentioned a priority given to tenured faculty for course selection.

“Yes, but full-time faculty are given priority over continuing adjuncts wrt(for) course selection”

“Not really around which courses - I’m boxed in that way. Administration worries about keeping TT faculty happy; really don't care if CA faculty are happy. It's a caste society here.”

When asked how many hours they spend on course creation for course taught for the first time, the answers varied greatly, but the majority mentioned weeks and months of preparation. For course preparation for each course taught, week by week during a semester, answers varied as well, but everyone agrees with many hours, hard to quantify, all-consuming.”

Continuing Adjuncts are often teaching over their fixed load. The way this work is compensated is not clear to everyone. These calculations should be transparent and part of a letter detailing teaching overload. For some, this overload is paid at the % FTE rate; for other, at the basic
stipend for Term Adjuncts from the collective agreement, or from Appendix L basic stipend for term adjuncts.

The survey asked CA what could be improved in the process of applying to tenure-track appointments. Some answered to have a prior internal search or that Adjuncts be given priority over external candidates. Others preferred the Continuing Adjunct appointment as it provides job security or would like to keep that job security if offered the tenure track appointment.

Supervision
Many Continuing Adjuncts have reported doing supervision work in a variety of disciplines. When asked if they have been compensated for this work, many answered “no”, for some it is part of their FTE, some say “yes, based on the CA, but the pay is very low”.

“Yes- based on the CA. It was hardly enough and my department does not assign new supervision to me as they do not have the budget.”

“Yes. The pay was low.”

“I am currently on my first comprehensive exam committee and expect to be paid a paltry sum for the work. The low compensation is little more than a token and is wildly out or proportion with the work involved with the task.”

“I was compensated. The pay was $600 which is not a lot. (capstone project, master degree)”

“Yes. The pay was like minimum wage considering the amount of the time spent when I calculated.”

When asked if they are aware of terms for work/service and compensation in Appendix Q, and what changes/improvements to this Appendix they wish to see implemented, most respondents answered no, not aware. Those who answered yes would like the compensation amounts to be increased and well communicated to all departments.

“Yes. I would like those terms to be enforced across departments rather than left up to individual depts. or dept. heads.”

“yes, I am aware; perhaps increase the compensation amounts?”

“Clearly laid out vacation allowance for those with admin duties as well teaching duties.”

“Yes. I understand that it is inconsistent accross departments with some paying significantly more”
“Yes, I am aware of these terms. Compensation is clearly stipulated, but is very conservative.”

“Compensation is fair, all I would say is that the language about how it applies to CAs could be tightened up to reflect that a lot of us do committee work but aren’t compensated through service in the FTE.”

When asked if they would be interested to supervise thesis, some answered maybe, but noted that they have busy schedules and that they would have to be compensated.

“I’d like to serve on committees, not necessarily supervise”

“Maybe. if I can get my head above water.”

“Maybe... never had the opportunity”

“Maybe, if I was compensated for it”

Research
Access to tenured full-time position through the promotion process
Continuing Adjuncts who go through the promotion process with the goal to reach the tenured full-time position responded that it is unrealistic and practically impossible to achieve:

“In our unit, promotion requirements are the same for continuing adjuncts as TT. In my case, my promotion from Assistant to Associate required me to do considerable research that I was not paid for (two edited books, book chapters, journal articles etc. In order to go to full and become TT the unwritten rule in our unit is that you need a minimum of 2 single authored books to apply which is impossible to do while teaching 5 courses (1 more than a TT), full graduate supervisions, full service, plus in my case, the expectation of extra service to bring my FTE to 87.5%. No doubt that I will retire as an Associate. Why can my application to full not be based upon only my performance on the work I expected to do rather than on an unrealistic assumption that beyond the 87.5% FTE I can somehow also be as research productive as a 40/40/60 TT member? Seems unrealistic and frankly impossible to me.”

“It seems horribly unfair to go through the same review process of promotion to associate but to have no tenure or renumeration for research as a result.”

“It would be nice if there was some recognition that many adjuncts do the very same, sometimes more than tenure-track faculty in order to set
ourselves up for tenure after achieving associate professor, but we do so for many years at half the salary as other faculty.”

“Acknowledgement that adjuncts often have had no compensation for research and should be evaluated more holistically”

“A privileging of teaching over research. The need to take on overload teaching or contracts at other institutions to supplement adjunct salaries impedes research. There are only so many hours in a day!”

“Yes- include research as part of the baseline salary for all Adjuncts...it is ridiculous that they are expected to do the same amount of research as their tenure track and tenured colleagues for free before they can be considered for promotion and conversion to a tenured position”

**Title of Assistant Professor**

“I don't have an interest in tenure-track because I don't do research - however, after winning multiple teaching awards in my dept. I feel I should be able to at least reach the Assistant Professor level (but the CA stipulates you must demonstrate research, which should go when I'm not employed to do research)”

“Although there's been a lot of points made to allow Adjuncts to become tenure-track - to me that's not my desire. I just want to be respected by my students and colleagues by being granted the title of Assistant Professor when I became a continuing adjunct. To me the stream I am in is 'non-tenure, but continuing', but what I do is being a Professor. Just give me the Assistant Professor title upon reaching continuing status...”

**Research activities**

When asked if they are a published researcher and if they have been able to maintain an active research record while employed as an Adjunct at Queen’s, 41% of adjuncts answered “yes” and 51% answered “no” (7% other). Many Continuing Adjuncts stated that their research activities are hard to maintain because of their heavy teaching load. Many also mention the lack of recognition.

“Yes, I have published but it would not have been easy to maintain.”

“I am published, but it is difficult to maintain active while I teach so much”
“Yes, Many publications, although fewer as I get closer to retirement age and less incentive since it seems impossible that I will be promoted to full given the expectations of our promotion process.”

“I am published, yes, but the all-consuming work involved with teaching has curtailed further research.”

“Yes and yes. It is very difficult with my teaching load, but I don’t think I can be an effective teacher unless I am also writing.”

“I have published, possibly enough to get tenure, but it was never recognized so I cut back considerably. I play around with research now but mostly for my own purposes with little interest in publishing.”

**Research recognition and support**

Continuing Adjuncts who do research or are interested to build research projects need more support, more time and recognition. They provided some ideas of support the university could provide, such as protected research time, right to sabbatical, merit points for research, and income for research work.

“Recognition of research in Head’s evaluations”

“There seems to be some kind of mystery around merit points criteria for adjuncts. No matter how well I teach and even how much I publish, I can’t get more than 10 merit points, because whatever I publish is not part of my contractual obligation!”

“Yes, but it is hard, knowing it gains me no formal recognition or any additional reward as a Continuing Adjunct apart from the Adjunct Creative Award fund”

“Access to income support for research and writing projects.”

“permit adjunct faculty members to negotiate a research pay if they have a research profile. Their research effectiveness can also be assessed.”

“Actually having advice and support from one’s department.”

“Personal encouragements and mentorship from tenured faculty and dept. heads”

“Removing the built-in bias against adjuncts in RTP committees....”

“yes- protected research time would be valuable”
“less teaching load; recognition of research in Head's evaluations”

“I am curious if the CTL has any specific workshops or courses which are targeted at new faculty and getting PhD theses published. A course in revising PhD work for monograph publication would be great.”

“Unless my salary were to increase substantially, thereby affording me opportunity to set aside at least some of the overload teaching I do to pay the bills, there isn't much support the university could provide.”

“More advertising about where to turn.”

“Make the application for research money easier.”

“Same sabbatical that tenured people get. I am currently trying to use article 37.4.4 and 37.4.5 to do an "adjunct sabbatical" but it would be nice to have the same options as my tenure/tenure track colleagues, given that I am as active a researcher as most of them”

“If I wasn't in an administrative position (UG Chair) and not teaching large 1st and 2nd yr courses, I feel I would actually have some time to get my research going. (we need more faculty in our dept)”

Service
Many Continuing Adjuncts are doing service work, but some are not compensated. Compensation is treated differently throughout the university. Service work from Continuing Adjuncts is varied and include sitting on various departmental committees such as appointment, area chair, undergraduate studies chair, headship search, reader for admission awards, referee, outreach and recruitment, senate, faculty board, and QUFA, among others.

Many members are unsure of how they are compensated for this work. Some are not compensated, some receive course releases and stipend, some have a %FTE specifically for service, for others it is part of their FTE. Some have been refused service work for budgetary reasons or because committees were only opened to tenured faculty. There are a variety of answers:

“Mostly done without compensation”
“Course relief and stipend”
“i am paid for 20% service”
“It is treated as 15% of FTE. But again, we ballpark this. They accept my word on it.”
“as 10% of course load”
“no compensation for the service listed above, the only compensation is for online courses above my 100% FTE and for coordination of large courses”
“I get 2 course release”
“part of my FTE”
“Can’t specifically recall - believe it was stipend plus 3 course teaching release.”
“Unsure of exact formula! Has seemed reasonable to me.”
“Other than this year’s service on a PhD comprehensive exam committee, none of my service has been calculated as anything.”
“It’s not overload. I have 90 teaching 10 service”
“I did this as term adjunct and was given same level of compensation as I was receiving for a seminar course at the time”
“I receive one course release/yr and am paid $15k/yr in overload pay for serving as UGC”
“Compensation and Course Release”
“Not overload but expected”
“Grad Chair is considered a 3 unit course release. Some committee work included in grad chair hiring committee compensated at $500”
“5% extra FTE”
“It isn't; my contract includes a service component”
“Some overload was calculated along with admin duties”
“Not as overload - increase in FTE.”
“N/A. In the process of getting service added to my workload”
“Equivalent to one course”
“I'm told service cannot be calculated and therefore cannot be overload.”
“It is calculated based on our workload standard, which gives credit equivalents to each service work.”
“It was a stipend that was roughly (less than) equivalent to teaching a course. The preparation and work required made this unsustainable.”
“when I converted to Continuing Adjunct I was doing as much- if not more service than tenure track/tenured colleagues so I asked for 20%FTE to be included in my letter of appointment. That has not changed over the years. I did have one Dean ask me to do my service for free because no other Continuing Adjunct was being paid for their service at that time. I politely declined her request and then pointed out how much work Continuing Adjuncts did for free in the Faculty and that she should be ashamed of the fact that they weren't being compensated for it...eventually she did start paying them but they used a different system than our tenure /track-tenured colleagues.”
When asked about changes/improvements to Appendix Q they would wish to see
implemented, many answered “unsure” or “not aware”. Some answered that service work
should be part of Continuing Adjunct contracts; others proposed that rates should be
increased.

“service should be made part of a contract if an adjunct wants to
do service.”

“see above about strengthening language as it relates to CA.”

“increase the rates, especially for supervising theses!”

“That appendix seems only appropriate for Term Adjuncts and
not continuing”

“Again, having these terms implemented in all depts without having to
ask for the compensation would be helpful.”

“Compensation for service should be included in the contracts for Term
Adjuncts so that they can play an active role in their departments.”

Pandemic/Health and Safety
When asked if the agreement between QUFA and the University on a number of matters
related to teaching during the pandemic was adequate to protect their health and safety as an
Adjunct, they didn’t answer about the LOU, but rather about the university’s preparation for in-
person teaching. The most common problematics mentioned were class and room size,
additional work not recognized, lack of protective equipment, and lack of ventilation data.

“Class size and room size are not always compatible with safety
requirements. A percentage of the class has to meet in person while the
rest of the class participates via Zoom.”

“Not at all. The pivot to online teaching creating a great deal of
additional work which was not recognized. In fact, the Faculty ADDED
marking to the --------- workload when they directed TC to complete
EXTENSIVE learning logs. Profs were expected to keep track of tons of
paperwork, email and logs with absolutely NO CONSULTATION. It is
indicative of the very poor communication with Adjuncts in the Faculty of
------------. We are like the Cinderella’s of the Faculty -- expected to work
like druges, take on additional marking and prep and do it with a smile
and make it all look good. Lack of consultation is a huge problem. The
Teacher Candidates were scheduled to begin a 7 week practicum on
October 4. There was no communication form the Faculty and then -
over the weekend, a memo goes out directing students to complete all
sorts of "deep dive" work which will be marked by the ------- teachers. So now we are marking material that we have not developed and don't have any real expertise in. Last year was an emergency situation, so we tolerated it. We are now in the 21st month of the pandemic and this sort of heavy handed, last minute direction from the admin of the Faculty with no consultation is really not acceptable. Not at all."

“Moderately so. I’m not happy with the University tactics to stall and have students be forced to commit. I think it is unethical. But this didn't affect me personally.”

“Absolutely NOT -- PPE provided was laughable -- very poor and beneath regulation”

“Mostly, though it seems we are responsible for enforcing classroom mask and food rules, but are not practically empowered to do so.”

“Adequate but I did not get a hepa filter in my classroom space”

“Classes are running at full capacity this fall.”

“There are health and safety issues in our building that predate the pandemic...I have witnessed Adjuncts who are reluctant to express their concerns about this issues because of the precarious nature of their work”

When asked what other measures or policies they would like to see to protect their health and safety, a better verification of air ventilation throughout the school, the ability to choose online vs in class teaching, better communication, verification of protocols, better cleaning, better attention to mental health issues of faculty members, and social distancing in large (400-650 students) classrooms were mentioned.

When asked what other measures they would like to see in place to protect their job security during a pandemic, Continuing Adjuncts answered that they already have job security. Two mentioned that term adjuncts didn’t want to complain about health and safety issues in their building. Another one mentioned that teaching evaluations during the pandemic should be set aside.

“There are health and safety issues in our building that predate the pandemic...I have witnessed Adjuncts who are reluctant to express their concerns about this issues because of the precarious nature of their work”
“I would like to see teaching evaluations formally set aside. The environment we are operating in is fraught with challenges and does not represent anything meaningful in terms of teaching ability. (Not that USATS ever did.)”

Continuing Adjuncts provided the answers below about other, non-pandemic related areas of Health and Safety they would like QUFA to pursue for adjuncts:

“The housekeeping in the Faculty of --------- is a scandal. They have spend millions on paint and renovations and yet every pane of glass on the door is filthy, and there all sorts of old junk around. On the third floor, there are rotting, dessicated, Biology projects in the window sills that have been there for years. I don't think anyone from Admin ever walks through the building or leaves the "Executive Wing" of the Faculty."

“If you consider personal stress a health issue, well, being a term adjunct sucks. Being a continuing adjunct in my case has been very nice. Mental health is important.”

“follow up on recommendations of Joint Committee”

“as we do more teaching than research our exposure to the students is much more than others. This extra risk needs to be recognized and contract expectations reduced.”

“Increasing awareness about mental health issues experienced by precarious labour, especially BIPOC adjuncts, when we/they are doing work with BIPOC students and their experiences with whiteness on campus. More support in general for all adjuncts (all faculty) who are basically now frontline mental health workers for our students”

“Term Adjuncts are reluctant to express their concerns about health and safety because they don't want to lose their contract. QUFA has to do it for them...nobody else will”

**Benefits and Pension**
Not all Continuing Adjuncts are currently eligible to benefits and pension. It seems to be different throughout the university. Here are some comments from Continuing Adjuncts:

“I feel any instructor who is under contract for greater than 12 months should have the opportunity for benefits... that being said I know some instructors get 9-month contracts repeatedly, and therefore I would also say any instructor who has taught for over 18 months in a 3 year period should have the opportunity to have benefits.”
“The one thing I am most angry about at Queen's is the way my pension is calculated. The pension plan considers me to have worked only half the years I have worked, at the salary I was paid. But the salary is based on my 50% FTE and is thus already cut in half.”

“Happy with benefits.”

“The pension and medical benefits should begin in the first year, not after two years of one-year contracts. Also work at other universities should be able to be repurchased.”

“Would like to be able to participate in one”

“Benefits were a big deal when I was younger and had young kids (and had very limited benefits). Now not such a big deal. But for the sake of younger people, I consider this a huge deal.”

“I have access to benefits and the pension plan”

“I did not understand that my pension calculations would be based in FTE equivalent units. I regularly teach signify overload and feel that other 80% calculation is not reasonable.”

“Good benefit plan - Manulife.”

“I was unable to be a part of the pension and medical/dental plans until such time as became a continuing adjunct. I would have like to join as soon as I started as an adjunct.”

“benefits and pension should be offered to all adjuncts”

**FTE calculation**

When asked if their FTE was calculated correctly when they received their first Continuing Adjunct letter, there were a lot of “unsure”, “I don’t know”, “possibly not”, and one “I hope so”. Better communication and clearer explanation are needed after the conversion of contract to Continuing Adjunct.

“how would I know...it was new to me”

“Yes but they didn't tell me that adjuncts get more 'load' per course.”

“I don't know. I was told what my FTE would be”
“It was increased by .5 in order to have me do admin work”

“Originally, it was 37.5%, later bumped up with additional admin duties to 40%”

“yes, for many of the years, but in the past several years I've bounced between being less than full time to more than full time, depending on the department's needs.”

Other issues with FTE calculations? - Yes (please explain) – Text
Here is a list of issues underlined by Continuing Adjuncts. The main issues are the lack of explanation and transparency, mistakes, the impact on pension years of service, the FTE which doesn’t reflect all the work done, the responsibility of Adjuncts to ask for recalculation.

When asked if they were consulted on the FTE assigned, and if their manager had discussed possibility for changing their FTE, continuing adjuncts answered that yes, they had discussions with their manager, but it seems to have not been always easy. There seems to be a lot of case by case and different treatment of FTE throughout the university.

“We had to ask to be consulted as it was not correct.”

“not initially but I asked later on for additional pay for service work and this was granted. Initially it was denied.”

“Over time these conversations have occurred.”

“In relation to rate of pay for repeated overload. Was solved through agreement during last bargaining FTE went from .5 to .625 department voluntarily pays FTE rate for additional overload”

“Yes, but when the manager changed, previous discussions were no longer valid”

“No - but I had suggested it on occasion when we were short instructors - and then finally they listened...”

“I have been in overload during all 19 years that I have been teaching at Queens and the Overload never counted towards achieving an elevated FTE as Applied Teaching did not count.”

“the automatic recalculation of FTE when teaching in overload for 3 years in a row should apply to all continuing adjuncts (remove the exception for applied teachers)”
Appendix D Quantitative Analysis
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Questions for All Adjuncts

Table 1. Question: Are you a term or continuing adjunct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term adjunct</td>
<td>67.23%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing adjunct</td>
<td>32.77%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Question: What do you want to see QUFA bargain for in the next round of negotiations on the Collective Agreement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>definitely would like this</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>*Not sure</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>No, this isn't important</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track appointment is granted when you achieve the rank of Associate Professor?</td>
<td>46.89%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>37.32%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRoR removed as a prerequisite for permanent employment?</td>
<td>42.23%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalize years of service and years of experience (at Queen’s)?</td>
<td>54.59%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>39.61%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*unclear if ‘Not Sure’ reflects a lack of knowledge of what this would entail, or how it might actually benefit them, or a lack of certainty in terms of what they want.
Selected text responses (applicable to all adjuncts) – for ‘Other’

Converting to tenure-track upon achieving rank of Associate Professor would be amazing. My worry is that this would give the employer incentive to not allow Adjuncts to reach this status.**

I’d like to see some sort of conversion from Continuing Adjunct to tenure (not tenure-track), based on meeting certain teaching, service, and research standards/requirements.**

Equitable Compensation for Labour > Adjuncts often perform the same exact duties as TT faculty but receive a fraction of TT salaries. **

To be honest, the pay should be 50-100% more for adjuncts for the work involved; Better salary, 9k/course is not enough when you own a phd, etc**

Promotion provisions specific to adjuncts (beyond mutatis mutandis); Research should not be evaluated for those who do not have research as part of their contract**

Funding for research; Research time**

Seniority based hiring for term adjuncts

Adding benefits to the contract; Pension Eligibility Expanded**

Greater respect for Adjuncts; Recognition of service**

Teaching one section of a course shouldn’t count the same as teaching give sections of a course. The effort we put in is lost in this formula.

**issue mentioned by multiple adjuncts
Table 3. Question: Please rank each of the following from 1-7 in terms of how important they are to you
(percentages are given for rows, number of responses (n) given in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Extremely Important 7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Extremely Unimportant 1</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearer track for promotion (or conversion) to full time Tenured or tenure track?</td>
<td>38.73% (n=79)</td>
<td>18.63% (n=38)</td>
<td>14.22% (n=29)</td>
<td>10.78% (n=22)</td>
<td>5.88% (n=12)</td>
<td>4.41% (n=9)</td>
<td>7.35% (n=15)</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better compensation</td>
<td>43.20% (n=89)</td>
<td>18.93% (n=39)</td>
<td>18.45% (n=38)</td>
<td>13.11% (n=27)</td>
<td>3.40% (n=7)</td>
<td>2.43% (n=5)</td>
<td>Numbers too small to report</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full responsibility? (contracts include teaching, research, service)</td>
<td>27.09% (n=55)</td>
<td>14.78% (n=30)</td>
<td>11.82% (n=24)</td>
<td>18.23% (n=37)</td>
<td>10.84% (n=22)</td>
<td>8.37% (n=17)</td>
<td>8.87% (n=18)</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-focused appointments that are tenure track?</td>
<td>41.21% (n=82)</td>
<td>22.11% (n=44)</td>
<td>8.54% (n=17)</td>
<td>13.07% (n=26)</td>
<td>3.52% (n=7)</td>
<td>4.02% (n=8)</td>
<td>7.54% (n=15)</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer term appointments/contracts?</td>
<td>44.67% (n=88)</td>
<td>22.34% (n=44)</td>
<td>15.74% (n=31)</td>
<td>9.14% (n=18)</td>
<td>Numbers too small to report</td>
<td>4.06% (n=8)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to a pension?</td>
<td>56.10% (n=115)</td>
<td>18.05% (n=37)</td>
<td>7.80% (n=16)</td>
<td>10.24% (n=21)</td>
<td>Numbers too small to report</td>
<td>4.39% (n=9)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical and dental benefits</td>
<td>60.29% (n=123)</td>
<td>16.18% (n=33)</td>
<td>6.37% (n=13)</td>
<td>8.33% (n=17)</td>
<td>Numbers too small to report</td>
<td>4.90% (n=10)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for sabbaticals and/or self funded leave?</td>
<td>39.41% (n=80)</td>
<td>17.24% (n=35)</td>
<td>12.32% (n=25)</td>
<td>12.32% (n=25)</td>
<td>5.91% (n=12)</td>
<td>3.94% (n=8)</td>
<td>8.87% (n=18)</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain (n=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected text responses (applicable to all adjuncts) – for ‘Other’

CA terms that are not so easily manipulated to exclude adjuncts.
Ability to have a voice in program planning
Programs aimed at bolstering Adjunct research opportunities
Recognition of research in Head's evaluations [even though it is not in the contract]
Departments supervise TAs
Leave policy; Funded sabbaticals**

**issue mentioned by multiple adjuncts

Table 4. Question: In terms of work balance, do you want to do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more research?</td>
<td>40.31%</td>
<td>24.49%</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more teaching?</td>
<td>46.31%</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
<td>30.05%</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more service?</td>
<td>27.04%</td>
<td>41.33%</td>
<td>31.63%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less teaching?</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>21.62%</td>
<td>71.89%</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Question: How many course sections do you usually teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>38.39%</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>36.81%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer</td>
<td>24.80%</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Question: Would you prefer to teach the same course(s) year to year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74.29%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.52%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Question: Do you want more variety in the course(s) you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31.86%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.47%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Question: Have you ever supervised or sat on a supervisory committee for a 4th yr Honours thesis, Master’s MRP or thesis, or PhD thesis or a comprehensive exam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28.71%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.51%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Question: Is thesis supervision something you are interested in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.45%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.91%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Question: Do you have an active research program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41.29%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.24%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Question: Considering your research program, is it primarily:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For academic purposes (research, publication, etc)</td>
<td>51.98%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For course preparation</td>
<td>26.73%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For supervision</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain</td>
<td>16.34%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Question: What types of service work are you doing at Queen's, if any?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Doing this now</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Have done in the past</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Never done</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee work</td>
<td>37.62%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.76%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.61%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letters of reference</td>
<td>59.07%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attending departmental meetings</td>
<td>52.15%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>26.79%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to recruitment fairs</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69.32%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize conference</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.03%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69.66%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit on student awards boards</td>
<td>17.13%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.31%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58.56%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Question: Are you being compensated for service work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.76%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56.48%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain</td>
<td>21.76%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Question: Have you done any service work without compensation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.87%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.92%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please explain</td>
<td>14.21%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. Question: How important is it to you to have the option of enrolling in benefits or a pension plan? (percentages are given for rows, number of responses (n) given in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and dental benefits</td>
<td>9.85% (n=20)</td>
<td>6.90% (n=14)</td>
<td>9.36% (n=19)</td>
<td>13.79% (n=28)</td>
<td>60.10% (n=122)</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension plan</td>
<td>10.05% (n=19)</td>
<td>6.35% (n=12)</td>
<td>6.88% (n=13)</td>
<td>14.29% (n=27)</td>
<td>62.43% (n=118)</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Question: Were you provided any Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.63%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions for Term Adjuncts

Table 17. Question: How long have you been a term adjunct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 12 months</td>
<td>20.78%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 23 months</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two to four years</td>
<td>25.32%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five to six years</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to 9 years</td>
<td>16.88%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten or more years</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Question: Do you have Right of Reappointment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have Specific Right of Reappointment</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have General Right of Reappointment</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no right of reappointment, I am hired on a term by term basis.</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected text responses – for ‘Other’**

* I don't know** [mentioned by several adjuncts]*

*This is the 4th year I have taught the [same] course (full year), but have had to reapply each time.*

* I have no right of reappointment, though I am on a 3-year contract**

* I have it [SRoR] for one course but not the others**

**issue mentioned by multiple adjuncts**
Table 19. Question: If you could have a specific type of permanent employment at Queen’s would you prefer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be a tenure-track/tenured professor with teaching, research, and</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a permanent full-time (100% FTE) faculty member with only</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a permanent part-time faculty member with only teaching</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities (become a Continuing Adjunct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - please explain</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected text responses – for ‘Other’**

Any of the above

I would be satisfied with either TT position with full responsibilities OR permanent teaching position; first or second option**

Permanent part-time faculty member with some funding for research.

Permanent part-time faculty member with teaching and research responsibilities

Happy to continue as a term adjunct; No desire to be receive permanent teaching employment at Queen’s

To work as a professional whose compensation commensurates with his experience and qualification.

**issue mentioned by multiple adjuncts**
**Question asked only to those indicated that they have a type of right of reappointment:**

Table 20. Question: How long did it take from your initial appointment for you to receive Specific Right of Reappointment (SRoR)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than three years</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three to four years</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five to six years</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven to eight years</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine to ten years</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than ten years</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question asked only to those who answered that they have GRoR:**

Table 21. Question: How long did it take from your initial appointment for you to receive General Right of Reappointment (GRoR)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than three years</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three to four years</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five to six years</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven to eight years</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine to ten years</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than ten years</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions for Continuing Adjuncts

Table 22. Question: How long have you been a continuing adjunct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 12 months</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 23 months</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two to four years</td>
<td>19.12%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five to six years</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six to 9 years</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten or more years</td>
<td>36.76%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Question: How long were you a term adjunct (from your initial appointment) before you became a continuing adjunct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than three years</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three to four years</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five to six years</td>
<td>22.06%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven to eight years</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine to ten years</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than ten years</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24. Question: When you received your Continuing Appointment letter, was your FTE calculated correctly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Question: Did you have any other issues with FTE calculations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (please explain)</td>
<td>28.79%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71.21%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. Question: Were you consulted on the FTE assigned?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.88%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71.64%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Question: Did your manager discuss possibilities for changing FTE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.14%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Question: If you could have a specific type of permanent employment at Queen’s would you prefer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be a tenure-track/tenured professor with teaching, research, and</td>
<td>21.33%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a permanent full-time (100% FTE) faculty member with only</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a permanent part-time faculty member with only teaching</td>
<td>30.67%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities (Continuing Adjunct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - please explain</td>
<td>14.67%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected text responses – for ‘Other’

I would at the same time appreciate an opportunity or pathway to increased FTE over time

At this point, only teaching - when I started, TT all the way but now I’ve been out of the research game too long.

Also, I’d add service to the teaching responsibilities.

I would have preferred a tenure-track position when I just starting out. In the future, I am not sure, as after over 10 years of voluntary research activities, I think it is unsustainable to lead to long term research activities.

My appointment is teaching only but I have been asked to do administration such as PRTC but given no reduction in teaching load or credit for it in my annual reviews since it is not part of my contract

At the time I received the continuing adjunct, yes, permanent full time faculty member with only teaching responsibilities 100%FTE; Permanent full-time faculty member with some service responsibilities (no research)

**issue mentioned by multiple adjuncts**