

# Information and Instructional Technology: Bringing Adjunct Faculty into the IT Fold

[Monograph]

[Posted on Internet at <<http://media.centerdigitaled.com/cuny-casey/Ryesky-CUNY.doc>>]

By Kenneth H. Ryesky, Esq.  
Adjunct Assistant Professor  
Queens College CUNY

Presented at the Second Annual CUNY IT Conference, "Instructional/Information Technology in CUNY: Issues, Innovations, Integration," John Jay College CUNY, Friday 14 November 2003.

## **ABSTRACT:**

Adjunct faculty members teach a significant percentage of courses at CUNY. Adjunct employment circumstances and workplace conditions often differ from those of full-time faculty, thus posing many challenges and impediments to facilitating IT in Adjunct-taught courses. This presentation highlights various issues in bringing technological currency to Adjunct-instructed courses, using "case method" discussion of several illustrative scenarios derived from actual CUNY Adjunct situations.

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY: BRINGING ADJUNCT FACULTY INTO THE IT FOLD AT CUNY

by Kenneth H. Ryesky, Esq.\*

[Monograph <sup>1</sup>]

"Mere powder, guns and bullets, we scarce can get at all;  
Their price was spent in merriment and revel at Whitehall,  
While we in tattered doublets from ship to ship must row,  
Beseeching friends for odds and ends -- And this the Dutchmen know!" <sup>2</sup>

**I. INTRODUCTION:**

The employment of Adjunct faculty <sup>3</sup> has been a definitive and growing trend in

---

\* B.B.A., Temple University; M.B.A., La Salle University; J.D., Temple University; M.L.S., Queens College CUNY; Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Accounting & Information Systems, Queens College CUNY; Member of the Bar, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; Attorney at Law, East Northport, NY. E-mail contact: khresq@sprintmail.com.

The viewpoints expressed herein reflect the personal perspective of the author, and do not necessarily represent the official position of any institution, department, group or other entity with respect to which the author is or has been associated, enrolled, employed, affiliated or retained.

<sup>1</sup> This text monograph is a supplemental background document to the author's delivery of oral comments at the Second Annual CUNY IT Conference, Instructional/Information Technology in CUNY: Issues, Innovations, Integration," John Jay College CUNY, Friday 14 November 2003. Unless otherwise indicated, all photographs and illustrations are by the author.

Copyright © 2003, Kenneth H. Ryesky, Esq. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any form is prohibited without express written permission of author.

<sup>2</sup> Rudyard Kipling, The Dutch in the Medway, from Songs Written for C. R. L. Fletcher's "A History of England" (1911), in RUDYARD KIPLING, COMPLETE VERSE, p. 727 (Definitive Edition, Doubleday, 1940).

<sup>3</sup> Teaching faculty who are employed on a basis other than the full-time tenure track are referred to by titles such as "Part-time faculty," "Adjunct faculty," "Contingent faculty," "Special lecturers" or the like. See, e.g., *Full-time Students, Part-time Faculty*, Remarks by President Jane Buck, 87th Annual Meeting, American Association of University Professors (9 June 2001), available on the Internet at <<http://www.aaup.org/statements/archives/Speeches/2001/01ambuck.htm>> (accessed 15 October 2003); AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, HIGHER EDUC. PROGRAM AND POLICY COUNCIL TASK FORCE ON PART-TIME FACULTY, STATEMENT ON PART-TIME FACULTY EMPLOYMENT 2-3 (1996), available on the Internet at **[footnote continued ..... ]**

American academia.<sup>4</sup> The trend has certainly affected CUNY, where, in 1998, the percentage of undergraduate courses taught by adjunct faculty was 48% at the senior colleges and 49% at the community colleges.<sup>5</sup>

The Adjunct faculty employment conditions and circumstances are quite diverse from college to college, department to department, and individual to individual, and quite often differ markedly from those of full-time faculty. Access to campus computer systems, instructional technology and information technology (IT)<sup>6</sup> is a key area in which there is great disparity.<sup>7</sup>

---

<[http://www.aft.org/higher\\_ed/downloadable/Part\\_Time.pdf](http://www.aft.org/higher_ed/downloadable/Part_Time.pdf)> (accessed 15 October 2003). This Monograph will use the terms "Adjunct" or "Adjunct faculty" to refer to such individuals.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Valerie Martin Conley, *Part-time Instructional Faculty and Staff: Who They Are, What They Do, and What They Think* (National Center for Education Statistics, March 2002, Report No. NCES 2002-163), available on the Internet at <<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002163.pdf>> (accessed 1 October 2003).

<sup>5</sup> *CUNY Master Plan 2000, Part II*, available on the Internet at <<http://portalsearch.cuny.edu/cms/id/cuny/documents/informationpage/000834.htm>> (accessed 15 October 2003).

<sup>6</sup> Consistent with the tenor of the instant Conference, "IT" is used simultaneously and interchangeably in this Monograph as an acronym for "Instructional Technology" and/or "Information Technology" unless the sense otherwise demands the use of one to the exclusion of the other.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g. National Center for Education Statistics, *Teaching With Technology: Use of Telecommunications Technology by Postsecondary Instructional Faculty and Staff in Fall 1998* (Report No. NCES 2002-161, July 2002), available on the Internet at <<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002161.pdf>> (accessed 7 November 2003); Ernst Benjamin, *How Over-Reliance on Contingent Appointments Diminishes Faculty Involvement in Student Learning*, 5 *Peer Review*, vol. 1, p. 4 (Fall 2002), available on the Internet at <<http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-fa02/pr-fa02feature1.cfm>> (accessed 15 October 2003) ("Contingent faculty are fortunate to share an office space or computer access and are unlikely to be eligible for professional development grants, research support, or even participation in collegial meetings either to benefit from peer evaluation or to share information about student learning and adapt curricula to student needs."); Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty, Conference Statement (Washington, D.C., 26 – 28 September 26-28), available on the Internet at <<http://www.oah.org/reports/ptfaculty.html>> (accessed 4 November 2003) and at <<http://www.ams.org/membership/faculty-article.html>> (accessed 4 November 2003).

The need to manage the human factor has long been recognized as a critical issue in technologically-intensive operations, good and evil,<sup>8</sup> especially where new technologies and new applications are in a state of development or flux.<sup>9</sup>

A significant percentage of CUNY instruction is in fact being done by Adjuncts. Moreover, currency in the information technologies is well recognized, implicitly and explicitly, for student and faculty alike, as a priority throughout CUNY.<sup>10</sup> Regardless of

---

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., George F. Viehmeyer, Jr., *Systems Engineering Methodology*, presented June 1967, Temple University School of Business Administration, *reprinted in A FORUM ON SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT 20* (Ingrid H. Rima, ed., Temple Univ. 1969); (ALAN F. WESTIN, ET AL, *THE CHANGING WORKPLACE*, chapt. 3, "Organizational Approaches to People-Technology Planning," pp. 3-1 to 3-19 (Knowledge Industry Publ'ns, White Plains, NY, 1985). Cf. SIMON WIESENTHAL, *THE MURDERERS AMONG US* 316 – 317 (Bantam/McGraw Hill, 1968):

"Once Himmler was present when experiments using exhaust gases from submarine engines for extermination had proved highly unsatisfactory. Himmler had been furious, and there had been draconian punishment. Machines broke down, but the people handling them never did. How could it be that the people operating the gas chambers and ovens were more reliable than the machines? Had they been trained mechanically *and* psychologically to stand the terrific strain? The question bothered me for years. ... All facts pointed toward the conclusion that special cadres of technically skilled and emotionally hardened executioners were trained somewhere. Castle Hartheim and other euthanasia centers were the answer [emphasis in original]."

*Id.*

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g. JAMES D. THOMPSON, *ORGANIZATIONS IN ACTION* 51 – 65 and 132 – 143 (McGraw-Hill 1965).

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., CUNY MASTER PLAN 2000, part II. Vision for the Future: Expanding the Use of Technology in Teaching and Learning, available on the Internet at <[http://www1.cuny.edu/events/press/mplan\\_IIfa.html](http://www1.cuny.edu/events/press/mplan_IIfa.html)> (accessed 23 October 2003); QUEENS COLLEGE, PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT FOR THE MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION, §§ 3.7.1 at 49 – 51 and 4.9.3 at 109 (1 June 2002); *available on the Internet at* <[http://vanguard.qc.edu/provost/Full\\_Report\\_09.pdf](http://vanguard.qc.edu/provost/Full_Report_09.pdf)>(accessed 1 October 2003); JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT FOR THE MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION, chapt. 8 at 80 – 89, *available on the Internet at* <<http://www.jjay.cuny.edu/generalInfo/middleState/pdf/prnew.pdf>> (accessed 6 October 2003); *see also* Minutes of the Meeting of the CUNY Board of Trustees, (28 May 2002), *passim* (approval of several significant expenditures towards the Network Infrastructure Initiative), *available on the Internet at* <<http://www1.cuny.edu/abtcuny/trustees/thismonth/MIN502.htm>> (accessed 15 October 2003).

one's views regarding Adjunct faculty, it therefore is quite vital to facilitate the use of IT among CUNY Adjuncts.<sup>11</sup>

This instant Monograph and its underlying presentation will explore various issues that need to be addressed in facilitating IT currency and use among Adjunct faculty. Several illustrative cases will be presented, the relevant issues exemplified by the cases will be explored, and, where relevant, possible remedies to the problems will be discussed.

## II. ILLUSTRATIVE CASES:

The illustrative cases which follow are scenarios derived from actual Adjunct situations and experiences at CUNY, and/or reported events, documents, or other material relating to Adjunct faculty. Each case will be presented, and then used as a basis for identification and discussion of the issues exemplified by the case. The cases will begin with a simple Adjunct office lacking IT amenities, and then progress to further scenarios involving Adjunct faculty, in order to demonstrate and discuss relevant issues which must be addressed in order to avail IT to the Adjunct-instructed course.

It is understood well nigh universally that funding is always a salient matter in bringing about any technological change. Any real life efforts to address Adjunct faculty participation in any technological revolution at CUNY or elsewhere will certainly need to be mindful of the costs of the initiative and how they are to be underwritten. The superficial attention given to the financial factors in the discussion to follow is in no way intended to diminish or invalidate the great importance of the purse. The objective of this Monograph, and of the author's accompanying Presentation at the Conference, is to spotlight the need to bring Adjuncts into the technological fold, and the issues inherent in doing so. At such time and to such extent as the Adjunct faculty members are embraced by any IT currency initiative at CUNY, the fiscal factors will, no doubt, be accorded their due regard by all concerned.

---

<sup>11</sup> See CUNY TASK FORCE FOR EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY, REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY-WIDE TASK FORCE FOR EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY, "Faculty Workload and Support," Recommendation 3, at 6 (May 2001), available on the Internet at <<http://www.core.cuny.edu/TFETrpt8.PDF>> (accessed 3 November 2003).

## A. CASE 1: THE CONVERTED CLOSET OFFICE:



*Due to lack of space, two Adjunct faculty members have been assigned office space in a building across the parking lot from the Department offices, in an out-of-the-way 8' x 10' room formerly used to store old books. The room has barely enough space for two desks, chairs, and some filing cabinets. There is no computer equipment, and indeed, neither the data jacks nor the telephone jacks are operative.*

**The Problem:** Unlike most of their full-time colleagues, the Adjuncts in this office have no desktop computers upon which basic hardware and software is available for preparing lectures, exams and assignments (*e.g.*, word processing, spreadsheet, printing capabilities, et cetera). As matters currently stand, Adjuncts such as the ones in this Case have the mutually exclusive choice of being in their office or using the campus IT; they cannot do both.

Another problem is that, all IT issues notwithstanding, the two Adjuncts are physically removed from the Department office, and therefore are attenuated from the social interactions which serve as an informal but often effective communication and information system.

### Discussion:

#### A. *Install a computer terminal in the room:*

The prospect of installing a computer terminal in the room has various issues. In addition to the omnipresent budgetary matters, there are security issues. With multiple individuals having access to a computer terminal, the security of the files may be at issue, though a spirit of interdepartmental collegiality and congeniality, if present, would tend to minimize this factor. Password access to the files and programs can tailor the computer facilities to the needs of the respective computer users and provide a degree of security. Of greater concern is the security of the room, physically set apart from the main Departmental offices and therefore not subject to the informal monitoring services provided by the other Departmental faculty, and the supporting secretaries and clerks.



For computer terminals in a remote room such as the one described in this Case, maintenance and support may become relevant concerns. Even when the computers are in a functional mode, there should be some sort of defined responsibility for maintenance tasks such as virus scanning, updating software, deleting extraneous and obsolete files from the hard drives, et cetera.

Once the physical hardware is in place, there would need to be some sort of regimen or protocol for the enforcement of cyberhygienic practices so that the system not be infected by viruses as a result of activities such as swapping of floppy disks. And the potential for problems along these lines increases exponentially as the numbers of Adjuncts using the office increase from the two Adjuncts in this illustration.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g. REPORT TO THE [JOHN JAY] COLLEGE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON PHASE II SPACE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEPT. OF SCIENCES (Spring 2000), available on the Internet at <<http://web.jjay.cuny.edu/~phase2/asmentrep/cpreport.html>>(accessed 15 October 2002) "Over 50 adjunct faculty share the 3 adjunct offices available to the [Sciences] Department [footnote continued ..... ]

And if there be peripheral devices such as printers and scanners, their maintenance must likewise be attended to, if only to replenish paper and ink.

*B. Adjuncts use portable "laptop" or "notebook" type computers:*

The first question that needs to be determined early on is whether the Adjuncts are to be given the portable computers by CUNY, or whether they are to supply their own. Back in the days of chalk and slate blackboards, CUNY provided the Adjuncts (and other faculty) with the relevant information media teaching tools, namely, chalk and erasers (the blackboards generally being securely installed in the classrooms). The thousand-fold cost differential between a notebook computer and a box of chalk<sup>13</sup> would impose obvious budgetary barriers upon any plan to similarly provide the Adjunct faculty members with individual computers. Even if such budgetary obstacles could be surmounted, there surely would be the matters of accountability for the laptop computers on the part of the Adjunct who has been issued one.

If, on the other hand, the Adjuncts were required to provide their own laptop computers, there would be, in addition to the inevitable and justifiable demands from the Adjuncts for some sort of reimbursement, issues of technical compatibility between the laptop computers and the CUNY system. If, as in the illustrated Case, there is no available connection to the campus computer network, then issuing laptops to Adjuncts would have limited results; Adjuncts would be able to work with documents with word processing or spreadsheet software, but would have no ability to access real time information or central databases often essential to maintaining currency the courses and subjects taught. Moreover, if there be no available computer network connection via the wires or otherwise, but ordinary telephone system jacks are operative, then the Adjunct might be tempted or compelled to use the campus telephone system to dial up to his or her personal Internet Service Provider, a practice with obvious diseconomies for Adjunct and CUNY alike.

---

making the offering of office hours unpredictable. Most adjunct faculty have no discernable work areas."

<sup>13</sup> At the time this Monograph was written, one nationally well known supplier, Staples, listed the price of a box of chalk at \$.69 (Item No. 662775), and a Hewlett-Packard Pavilion ZE4500 with AMD™ Athlon™ XP 2400+ Processor at \$1,193.00 (Item No. 502117). Author's search of the website at <<http://www.staples.com>> (accessed 22 October 2003).



Additionally, theft of computers, laptops or otherwise, is a persistent problem on college campuses.<sup>14</sup> Adjuncts frequently use their assigned rooms as places to temporarily store their personal belongings. Accordingly, physical security remains an issue if laptops are used to avail IT resources to Adjuncts, regardless of whether the laptops are CUNY-owned or Adjunct-owned.

*C. Allowing Adjuncts to use computers in other locations on campus:*

[N.B. The issues involved in accommodating the Adjuncts in student computer labs are further discussed in Case 3 below. ]

In addition to the other security concerns previously mentioned, there is the potential for conflict between the Adjuncts' computer activity and the host computer users' normal routines where Adjuncts are given computer privileges in other campus offices. As an example, there is potential for unacceptable disruption in the Department office if the computer intended for use by the Department secretary were to be fair game for access by the Department's Adjunct faculty. Where the host computer is intended for use by a different Department or office altogether, the disruption potential is increased, as is the potential for interdepartmental territorial conflict.

The illustrated Case demonstrates another complicating factor at CUNY. The effective labor contract has an Adjunct Professional Hour provision<sup>15</sup> which has been interpreted by some to be a specified time period for which affected Adjunct faculty members are being paid an hour's salary, and during which time they are to be in their offices. If the Adjuncts in the illustrated case are at a student computer laboratory or at a computer elsewhere on campus, then they are not in their office, and thus, the time spent with computer access might technically be viewed by some as not applicable towards the Professional Hour.<sup>16</sup> There accordingly arises the issue of the manner of interpretation, application and enforcement of this Professional Hour provision by the union, Department and CUNY

---

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Ric Kahn, *The Thieves of Academe: Colleges Wage War on Campus Theft*, BOSTON GLOBE, 21 January 2001, City Weekly, p. 1.

<sup>15</sup> MEMORANDUM OF ECONOMIC AGREEMENT FOR A SUCCESSOR AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AND THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF CONGRESS/CUNY, ¶ 4(h) (1 August 2000 – 31 October 2002). Pending negotiation of a new contract to cover periods after 31 October 2002, the provisions of the Memorandum remain in force.

<sup>16</sup> See Minutes, PSC-CUNY Part-time Instructional Staff Affairs Committee meeting, 6 December 2002 (minutes by Diane Menna, copy on file with author) (PSC-CUNY President Barbara Bowen took position that "the PSC position that the primary use of Professional/Office hour is for office hour.").

Administration. Adjunct remuneration policies and issues are thus quite relevant to bringing IT to Adjunct-taught courses.<sup>17</sup>

*D. Physical attenuation of the Adjuncts from the Department Office:*

Though not per se an IT issue, the dynamics of the informal information transmitted through social interaction play a vital part in any organization.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, informal communication plays a significant role in shaping the cohesion of any work group.<sup>19</sup> Any degree of exclusion of individuals from the informal communication pipelines will in some way affect group cohesiveness. Group performance is impacted in no small way by social dynamics, and the social interactions cannot be ignored in successfully implementing any strategic objective, including the implementation of IT.

**B. CASE 2: THE LIBRARY LAPTOP LOAN PROGRAM:**

*The Reserve Desk of the campus library has laptop computers available for sign-out by students.<sup>20</sup> The computers are available to students only; faculty members, Adjunct or otherwise, may not participate in the program. The rationale for excluding faculty is "[s]ince laptops were purchased with the technology fees paid for by students ONLY (not staff, not Adjuncts,) and since we could only afford a minimal number of laptops, it was decided that for the time being only students should benefit from this new purchase paid by them."<sup>21</sup>*

---

<sup>17</sup> This Monograph does not deal with the issue of the issue of adequacy of Adjunct remuneration (though the author, in other contexts, would unabashedly advocate higher salaries for Adjuncts). The salience of this issue necessarily grows in proportion to the out-of-classroom time required of an Adjunct to prepare IT for the course taught.

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g., KEITH DAVIS, HUMAN BEHAVIOR AT WORK 261 – 270 (4th ed., McGraw-Hill 1972).

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., DAVID R HAMPTON, ET AL., ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND THE PRACTICE OF MANAGEMENT 195 – 197 (3d ed., Scott Foresman & Co. 1978).

<sup>20</sup> See Queens College Libraries <<http://qcpages.qc.edu/Library>> (click "Laptop Loan Program"), accessed 22 October 2003.

<sup>21</sup> E-mail communication to author from Izabella Taler, Rosenthal Library, Queens College CUNY (9 December 2002) (on file with author).

**The Problem:** Just who shall be responsible for ensuring that Adjuncts are availed IT resources? Is it appropriate – or fair – that a program or office within a university, whose specific mission is to facilitate student needs, be compelled to expend its resources toward matters unrelated to its mission such as facilitating Adjunct faculty members?

**Discussion:**

Resources intended for student benefit should be availed to students, and resources intended for faculty benefit should be availed to faculty. Administrators of such programs must ensure that their programs operate as intended. If, for example, doing good for an Adjunct would inure to the detriment of the students intended to be helped by a venture such as the Library Laptop Loan program in this Case, then the administrator of the program, duty-bound to ensure that the program serves its intended constituency, is appropriately compelled to deny access to Adjuncts.

There are several possible approaches to assigning responsibility to ensure that Adjunct faculty members can access IT resources. The "point person" might be centralized in the IT bureaucracy, or might be decentralized in the individual Departments. While local circumstances may well dictate that the specific schemes for facilitating Adjunct IT access vary from college to college, it is important that a specific policy in fact exist at each college, and that such policy identify with specificity just where and in whom some defined responsibility is reposed.

Where such policy does not exist, there runs the risk that enterprising Adjuncts might look to sources on campus that are neither geared to nor appropriate for connecting the Adjunct with the campus IT. The Adjunct is thus placed into a bind: He or she can proactively seek out IT empowerment by beseeching friends for resources<sup>22</sup> and thus benefit the students but in doing so cause the disruption of orderly campus organizational functioning; or else he/she can avoid the conflict inherent in bucking the system, but in doing so, not have access to IT resources, to the detriment of the students. The system is ill served by such a condition. There needs to be policy and procedure to avail IT resources to Adjuncts.

---

<sup>22</sup> See Epigraph, note 2 *supra* and accompanying text.

### C. CASE 3: THE STUDENT COMPUTER LAB:

*The author, upon inquiring as to his use of a student computer lab on campus, was informed by the student assistant on duty that the lab was for students, and that he was to use the computer terminals in his own Department (there were none in the Department available to Adjuncts). A few days later, upon further inquiry to a higher-up administrator, the author was given an account to enable his access to any student computer lab on campus.*

**The Problem:** The operative campus policy on Adjunct access to IT did not formally exist or, if it existed, was not adequately communicated to all relevant personnel.

**Discussion:** It is axiomatic that promulgated organizational policies must be communicated to all concerned personnel within the organization. Policies regarding Adjunct access to IT resources need to be communicated to the IT purveyors down to and including the student assistants in the campus computer laboratories, and to the Adjuncts themselves, which effectively means that Department Chairs and Department Secretaries must also become cognizant of such policies.

If, in the instant Case, no formal policy indeed existed for Adjunct access to student computer labs, then the bringing of the matter to the attention of the cognizant administrator was a signal that such policy ought be promulgated, instead of having to deal with each Adjunct on an ad hoc basis. Where no policy has been promulgated, a situation can easily arise where all functional departments disclaim responsibility for connecting Adjuncts with IT resources, to the long-term big-picture detriment of college and student alike.<sup>23</sup>

This Case now presents a convenient juncture for excursus, to briefly discuss availing IT to Adjunct faculty through the use of campus computer laboratories. There are several acceptable approaches to doing so, any or all of which may be appropriate to a given CUNY campus. These include (1) a computer lab reserved for faculty only; (2) particular terminals in a student computer lab reserved for faculty (or for faculty and graduate students); (3) priority terminals which students may use, but must yield to faculty members when so requested; and even, as typified by the instant case, (4) issuing faculty computer accounts which enable the Adjunct to use any campus computer lab on same basis as the students.

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf., e.g. *In re Lillibridge*, N.Y.L.J., 28 October 1994, p. 29, at p. 30 (N.Y. Ct. Cl. 1994) ("County Line Road is aptly named for it divided Monroe and Orleans Counties, each of which had separate DOT [Department of Transportation] units responsible for maintenance. In the words of a DOT employee assigned to Orleans County, the responsibility for removing the foliage was 'not mine,' while, according to employees assigned to Monroe County West that responsibility 'was within the jurisdiction of Orleans County.'").

What is *not* acceptable is a situation where, taking into consideration the totality of circumstances, Adjunct access to computer facilities is *inferior* to that of the students. Such indeed was the situation that temporarily existed in the instant Case when the Adjunct, having no computer facilities in his office, was denied access to the student computer lab.

There is much to be said for using campus computer labs as a means to avail IT to Adjuncts.<sup>24</sup> Problems can crop up on the opposite extreme, however. If, for example, the Adjunct is using an ordinary computer in the computer lab, and is seated next to a student, then privacy issues may be implicated if the Adjunct is working on grades or other personal student data, or is composing an exam paper for the class. And, depending upon factors such as the IT resource needs of others, the bounds of reasonableness may be tested in situations where the Adjunct spends all of his or her "office hours" in a computer lab, even to the point using the lab as a venue for meeting with students. Sensible and appropriate rules and protocols, whether formally specified or otherwise, must be followed in such regard.

---

<sup>24</sup> The technologies that enable mobile computer labs present further possibilities for delivering IT access to faculty members, Adjunct or otherwise. See Joanne Davies, Mike Carbonaro, Gerry Kendal and Larry Beauchamp, *Implementing a Mobile Lab in a Faculty of Education*, T.H.E. JOURNAL, October 2003, p. 29.

## D. CASE 4: WEEKEND COLLEGE:



*The Sunday morning class is scheduled from 8:30 AM to 12:15 PM. The campus Library does not open until 12:00 Noon. The one campus computer lab open on Sundays does not open until 10:00 AM. The one campus computer lab with projection screen facilities is closed on Sundays. Data projectors and other audio-visual equipment are not available for faculty sign-out before 10:00 AM.*

**The Problem:** IT is not made available to students or instructors at times when weekend or evening classes are held.

**Discussion:** Evening and weekend classes are more likely than not to be taught by Adjunct faculty; therefore, any issue involving evening or weekend classes implicitly concerns Adjuncts. The limited availability of IT for evening and weekend classes is thus a matter that affects Adjuncts at least as adversely as it affects students.

Here, Adjuncts such as those from Case 1 whose designated office space lacks computer access cannot do something so simple as check out something on the Internet when prepping for their classes; their access to the student computer labs is meaningless if the labs are not open during and before the time of their classes.

Some colleges have support services specifically for faculty who teach weekend and evening classes.<sup>25</sup> Such support services need to include Internet and IT access for faculty at meaningful times for class preparation and instruction.<sup>26</sup> Where no such support services are present, even an enterprising Adjunct such as the one in Case 3 above would have difficulty beseeching a cognizant administrator if the administrator's regular office hours did not coincide with the hours the Adjunct is normally present on campus.

If the classrooms are wired with network connections for computers, then availing laptop computers and data projectors to Adjunct faculty who teach evening and weekend classes might be one element in the resolution of this problem. But, as mentioned earlier, such is not without its own issues. In this case, if the audio-visual (AV) personnel are not available to deliver the equipment to the classroom and the instructor therefore must personally obtain it, then there is, at the very least, a class disruption while the instructor goes to the AV office (which might be at a campus location remote from the classroom).

Nor are Adjuncts the only ones adversely affected by the unavailability of IT resources during scheduled class times. Many academic disciplines and professions have become very dependent upon particular databases and/or technologies for accessing and searching such databases.<sup>27</sup> Students whose classrooms lack IT connections to such databases at the time of the class session are no less disadvantaged than their instructor, particularly where a real time interactive database accession is appropriate or desired for the lesson.

It has long been taken for granted that a classroom will have an operative blackboard, and that the instructor will either find be issued chalk, find chalk in the classroom or will

---

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g., Queens College CUNY, Queens Weekend College, <<http://qcpages.qc.edu/weekend>> (accessed 15 October 2003); see also Pima Community College, Adjunct Faculty Service Center (AFSC) <<http://ecc.pima.edu/~afaculty>> (accessed 5 November 2003) (Though the Pima AFSC is for Adjunct faculty in general, its hours of operation, together with its after-hours access availability, would serve a constituency that includes many if not most evening and weekend instructors.).

<sup>26</sup> The Weekend College program at Queens College CUNY is attempting to achieve such an ideal. Author's telephone conversation with Karen Kennedy, Ph.D., Director, Queens Weekend College (5 October 2003).

<sup>27</sup> The field of Law, for example, has become dependent upon on-line databases such as LEXIS-NEXIS, which is available CUNY-wide. See CUNY OFFICE OF LIBRARY SERVICES, E-JOURNALS & REFERENCE DATABASES, <<http://libraries.cuny.edu/resource.htm>> (accessed 5 November 2003). Indeed, accessibility of the judicial opinions databases has a major impact upon the court systems and the law profession itself, see Kenneth H. Ryesky, *From Pens to Pixels: Text-Media Issues in Promulgating Archiving and Using Judicial Opinions*, 4 J. APP. PRAC. & PROCESS 353, 366 – 397 (2002).

otherwise have chalk available. If the familiar slate and chalk technologies are to be supplanted with the new IT, then such IT must likewise be expeditiously available to the Adjunct (with due regard for the relevant budgetary, operativity and security factors).

#### E. CASE 5: THE GRANT:

*"Several years ago, I won a very large 3-year federal grant from The Fund for Improvement in Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) for development of an online forum for ESL teachers. The feds knew I was an adjunct and had no problem with it. In fact, they gave me the largest CUNY FIPSE grant at Hunter during those years. But CUNY has a rule that adjuncts can't be directors of grants, so I was required to find a full-timer who would put their name to it (to help get tenure) as director. I did all the work, but the "director's" name was on it. At the end of the first year, my full-timer left the university. ... I had to find another full-timer. This time, the Dean appointed someone without my input, someone who had absolutely NO knowledge of the field, someone who had never even been in the classroom. At the end of the year, that person decided she didn't want to sign my time cards anymore, and quit. So another person was appointed....and so on. I wrote the grant proposal, ran the project, did all the paperwork, hired employees, but nowhere at CUNY is there any record of this. I am sure that this is repeated often, but we don't know about it because adjuncts are not allowed to put their names on grants at CUNY." <sup>28</sup>*

**The Problem:** The operative CUNY regulations <sup>29</sup> impose restrictions upon Adjuncts handling funded research projects. <sup>30</sup> Such restrictions, in addition to having a

---

<sup>28</sup> Posting by Anthea Tillyer on PTCUNY Yahoo discussion group (29 September 2003).

<sup>29</sup> These rules apparently are promulgated by the Research Foundation of the City University of New York. See PSC-CUNY RESEARCH AWARDS: GUIDELINES: ELIGIBILITY, *posted on the Internet at* <<http://www.rfcuny.org/PSCCUNY/Guidelines/PSCEligibility.html>> (accessed 22 October 2003) ("Since the Program was specifically designed for those permanent faculty where research is a condition of their employment, applications from Visiting Professors, Substitutes, or Adjuncts cannot be accepted."); *see also* 2003 CUNY COLLABORATIVE INCENTIVE RESEARCH GRANTS PROGRAM, *posted on the Internet at* <<http://www.rfcuny.org/r&dweb/collab.html>> **[footnote continued ..... ]**



repressive effect upon the egos of Adjuncts who secure grants, can actually serve to impede the quality of the research through misadministration of the grant.

**Discussion:** It is, of course, necessary to have rules and regulations with respect to funded research. It is also necessary that responsible and accountable people exercise meaningful control over the expenditure of the grant funds, particularly where such funding is from an instrumentality of the Federal Government.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, there is no logical reason why, under the appropriate circumstances, an Adjunct cannot direct a grant.

If indeed it is CUNY's intent and objective to develop and expand IT resources and applications, then Adjuncts clearly have much to offer towards such an end. It was recognized comparatively early in the Computer Age that "[i]nnovation must become a way of life... Creativity must be encouraged and rewarded in an environment where risk is accepted as a calculated policy of corporate action."<sup>32</sup>

The role of Adjunct faculty in academia has shifted dramatically over the past few decades. Adjuncts now have a major presence, and play a major role, at CUNY and other educational institutions. In light of such changes, the rules that restrict Adjuncts from directing grants need to be revisited and reconsidered, so that responsible and qualified individuals who happen to be Adjuncts can, without impairing the research efforts of full-timers, optimize their contributions to, and use of, campus IT, to the betterment of all concerned.

---

(accessed 22 October 2003) ("Only full time faculty at the campuses of CUNY are eligible to apply.").

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Benjamin*, note 7 *supra*.

<sup>31</sup> Misusing Federal funds carries potentially serious consequences. See False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729 et seq.

<sup>32</sup> William Karp, *Management in the Computer Age*, Data Management, December 1970, reprinted in *MIS: MANAGEMENT DIMENSIONS* 246, 248 - 249 (Raymond J. Coleman and M. J. Riley, eds., Holden-Day, Inc., 1973).

## F. CASE 6: THE LOADING DOCK:



*14 October 2003: A big pile of discarded computers, monitors, printers and other equipment cluttered the loading dock of the Queens College "I" Building.*

**The Problem:** Adjuncts perceive that though CUNY regards computers as cheap discardable junk, CUNY regards Adjuncts as not worthy of having computers in their offices.

**Discussion:** At the very least, a problem of perception has been created. It is, of course, necessary to discard obsolete and nonfunctional computer hardware from time to time. But the sight of computers which might otherwise be put to good use in offices lying in a junk heap on the rear dock, without further explanation, sends a powerful and negative message to the Adjuncts (and such messages are surely amplified by the sight, a few days later, of discarded packing crates from the new high end equipment that replaced the discarded hardware). Adjuncts whose offices lack even the most basic computer facilities can easily interpret the sight of computers, keyboards and monitors cast onto the rubbish pile as a proclamation that CUNY does not care about Adjuncts' IT needs. It is very unrealistic for CUNY to expect to motivate Adjuncts to use IT when CUNY is concurrently telling the same Adjuncts that their IT needs are irrelevant.

Adjuncts need to know that they are included in CUNY's grand scheme for IT in the classroom. Credible plans to connect the Adjuncts to campus IT need to be clearly communicated to the Adjunct faculty members. Even where budgetary or technical factors preclude the immediate installation of necessary computer hardware in Adjunct offices, the promulgation of, dissemination of and substantial adherence to reasonable timetables for implementation, together with reasonable interim measures for availing IT to Adjunct faculty members, can go a long way towards preserving the Administration's credibility and cultivating the Adjuncts' goodwill.

## G. CASE 7: THE DISCUSSION GROUP POSTING:

*"The current trend of adjuncts and part-timers trying to take over the faculty union is scary. We have a group of individuals who for one reason or another could not make it. Nobody has a childhood dream of becoming an adjunct faculty. You become one because you were unsuccessful in the competition and you have no other choice. Now, these individuals who could not make their way to the main lobby through the street entrance and were able only to get to the basement through the side door are trying to force themselves to the main elevator in order to get to higher floors. When we hire a new full time faculty, we open the competition to young individuals who proved themselves and are promising. We will never agree to treat years of adjunct teaching as a criterion for natural advancement to full time lines."*<sup>33</sup>

**The Problem:** Negative views of Adjunct faculty.

**Discussion:** As demonstrated by this posting, Adjunctcy itself is the basis for stigmatization in the eyes of some in academia.<sup>34</sup> Adjuncts are frequently viewed with

---

<sup>33</sup> "Anonymous233702," formerly posted on the Internet (17 June 2001) at <<http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/pscdues.htm>> (accessed by author various times, including 7 June 2002), now archived on the Internet at <<http://web.archive.org/web/20020618234535/http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/pscdues.htm>> (accessed 15 October 2003). The posting was on a web page formerly maintained by Professor Robert "KC" Johnson, History Department, Brooklyn College <<http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/>>. Prof. Johnson's experience in obtaining tenure stirred a controversy of national proportions, see, e.g. Karen W. Arenson, *CUNY Chief Gives Tenure To Professor In Brooklyn*, N.Y. TIMES, 25 February 2003, Sec. B, p. 6, col. 6; Scott Smallwood, *Tenure Madness*, CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 23 May 2003, p. A10, available on the Internet at <<http://chronicle.com/free/v49/i37/37a01001.htm>> (accessed 23 October 2003). Assertions to the effect that Prof. Johnson lacks collegiality were put forth during the course of his tenure controversy, *id.* Prof. Johnson's failure to even respond to the author's e-mail inquiry regarding the subject web page is not inconsistent with such assertions.

The issue of whether and to what extent the statement regarding the opening of the hiring competition to "young individuals" constitutes an admission that CUNY violates the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 et seq., is beyond the scope of this Monograph, and is left for discussion in the context of the appropriate conference, symposium or lawsuit.

<sup>34</sup> See, e.g., Robert E. Roemer and James E. Schnitz, *Academic Employment as Day Labor: The Dual Labor Market in Higher Education*, 53 J. HIGHER EDUC. 514, 527-528 (1982); GEORGE [footnote continued ..... ]

disdain and scorn by many individual full-time faculty and administrators, and indeed, this personal and institutional view of Adjuncts as *untermenschen* frequently facilitates, in a self-feeding cycle, the unprofessional treatment of Adjuncts by their employers, including the unavailability of such basic office supplies and services as the full-time faculty implicitly view as necessities for teaching.<sup>35</sup>

During the 2002 contract negotiations between the CUNY and the Professional Staff Congress, the CUNY Association of Scholars ("CUNYAS") issued a detestation of specific union proposals to allow "the time spent handling e-mail related to the course taught" as a valid activity to be performed in the compensable professional hour;<sup>36</sup> to "[provide] adjuncts with office space ... and with desk, chair, telephone, file cabinets, bookshelves and *computers* [emphasis supplied];"<sup>37</sup> and to provide for Adjuncts

---

ROCHE, *THE FALL OF THE IVORY TOWER* 214 (Regnery Publ. Co. 1994) ("Additional 'slave labor' is provided by thousands of part-time faculty with full Ph.D.s, who work for low salaries and benefits *and are treated with scant respect* [emphasis supplied]."); cf Ana Marie Cox and Courtney Leatherman, *Study Shows Colleges' Dependence on Their Part-Time Instructors*, CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1 December 2002, p. A-12 (Quoting William Pannacker, Asst. Professor, Hope College: "I don't think anyone is going to be able to claim anymore that the crisis is merely the whining of people who couldn't cut it in the profession.").

<sup>35</sup> See, e.g., Michael Murphy, *Adjuncts Should Not Just Be Visitors In The Academic Promised Land*, CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 29 March 2002, p. B-14: "But, at the same time, the rhetoric of crisis that characterizes so much of the part-timer discussion has also created a very dangerous and widespread misrepresentation: that the use of instructors necessarily produces *inferior* instruction, that students paying ever-rising tuition bills are "short-changed" when they work with "pretend" professors. It is all too easy these days to universalize the economic urgency of the much-proclaimed "*adjunct* problem" and thus, even quite inadvertently, to reinforce the prevailing bargain-basement mythology about part-time faculty members that both popular and academic newspapers disseminate widely."

*Id.*; George Van Arsdale, *De-Professionalizing a Part-Time Teaching Faculty: How Many, Feeling Small, Seeming Few, Getting Less, Dream of More*, 14 AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST, no. 4, p. 195 (November 1978).

<sup>36</sup> CUNY ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS, PARITY FOR ADJUNCTS? THE NEW THREAT TO ACADEMIC STANDARDS, at I(5)(B) (6 May 2002), available on the Internet at <<http://www.nas.org/affiliates/cunyas/parity.html>> (accessed 3 November 2003).

There is no evidence that time spent by any CUNY full-time faculty in handling course-related e-mail correspondence requires a pro rata docking of money from their paychecks, nor that such time must be compensated in order to fulfill the full-time faculty office hour requirements. Indeed, at least one Department of Education report notes that e-mail is a "logical" form of communication between instructional faculty and their students, *Report No. NCES 2002-161*, note 7 *supra*, at 17 and 31.

<sup>37</sup> *Id.* at I(5)(E).

**[footnote continued ..... ]**

"eligibility for participation in faculty development opportunities." <sup>38</sup> Inasmuch many IT technologies require some degree of training, specialized skills, and participation in discussions relating to reasons and techniques, <sup>39</sup> the latter objection should be no less disturbing than CUNYAS's objection to availing computer access to Adjuncts.

The bias against Adjunct faculty, then, corrupts the thought processes of many in academia, even to the point where Adjuncts are thought so unworthy as to not be deserving of access to IT resources, notwithstanding the inescapable rational conclusion that such availment would far serve the better interests of the University and the students.

Moreover, administrators and Department chairs who condone Adjunct-bashing (let alone participate in it) cannot then expect enthusiastic cooperation in *any* initiative or effort, IT or otherwise, from the Adjuncts in their charge.

Negative attitudes towards Adjunct faculty are a further impediment to facilitating IT in Adjunct-instructed courses. Effective leadership towards, and implementation of, the lofty IT objectives espoused by CUNY is materially undermined by a CUNY academic culture that espouses anti-Adjunct attitudes.

### III. CONCLUSION:

Like any other organization, CUNY is both a technical system and a social system; and the growing complexities of the technical and social aspects have impacted their interaction and integration with one another. Accordingly, implementing technology at CUNY or any other university of comparable complexity requires attention to social

---

<sup>38</sup> *Id* at at I(5)(F).

Charles Landesman, a member of the CUNYAS Executive Board, subsequently wrote a letter to the PSC monthly newsletter *Clarion* in which he stated "We do not object to improvements in the wages and working conditions of the part-time faculty ..." *Clarion*, February 2003. p. 2. Whether this apparent backpedaling represents a clarification, or a change in the CUNYAS official position, or anything else, remains to be seen.

<sup>39</sup> *See, e.g., Task Force Report*, note 11 *supra*, "Sustainability" recommendations, at 4 – 5. Indeed, the need for training, development of ideas and collaboration is the very reason and justification for the instant Conference.

issues; and the social factors are likewise affected by technological factors, IT or otherwise.<sup>40</sup>



The Battle of Trafalgar <sup>41</sup>

This concept has oft been demonstrated throughout history, including the case of the decisive and pivotal British victory over the allied French-Spanish naval forces at the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805. There, in developing and implementing the signal flag communications system that would facilitate his fleet's win over an enemy having more ships, men and guns, Admiral Nelson was quite mindful of the social interactions among

---

<sup>40</sup> See, e.g. John V. Murray and Frank A. Stickney, *The Human Factor in Matrix Management*, in *MATRIX MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS HANDBOOK* 231 – 254 (David I. Cleland, ed., Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1984).

<sup>41</sup> 'The Battle of Trafalgar' by J.M.W. Turner (circa 1822) © National Maritime Museum, London [NMM Catalog No. BHC0565], used here with the kind permission of the National Maritime Museum. Readers who visit London are invited to visit the Museum to view the original.



the users of the signal system.<sup>42</sup> What held true for the state-of-the-art IT in Nelson's day is surely no less applicable to IT at CUNY in our own day.

It is clear, then, that technology alone cannot and will not successfully bring Adjunct faculty into the IT fold at CUNY. The social issues need to be addressed along

with the technological issues if IT is to become the norm in the CUNY classroom, Adjunct-taught or otherwise.<sup>43</sup>

Barriers and impediments to integrating Adjunct faculty into IT include, but are not limited to:

- Limited or lacking availability of relevant technological resources to the Adjunct.
- Exclusion and attenuation of the Adjunct from cohesive faculty groups.
- Inconvenience of technological training and assistance for the Adjunct.

<sup>42</sup> See JOHN KEEGAN, *THE PRICE OF ADMIRALTY* 48 – 52 (Viking-Penguin, 1989); DAVID H. ZOOK, JR. AND ROBIN HIGHAM, *A SHORT HISTORY OF WARFARE* 115 (Twayne Publishers, N.Y., 1966).

Signal flags had long been used in military battles, *see, e.g.*, SUN TZU, *THE ART OF WAR* 90-91 (Samuel B. Griffith, trans., Oxford U. Press, paperback edition, 1971) (Commentary on Sun Tzu by Chang Yü (12th - 13th cent.): "Therefore officers and men are ordered to advance or retreat by observing the flags and banners ..."). However, Nelson's hands down defeat of the French-Spanish naval forces at Trafalgar was facilitated by a newly perfected interactive "talking flag" signal communications system which allowed Admiral Nelson's ship crews to effectively communicate with one another, and to adjust their formations and battle plans, even after the battle had commenced. *Zook & Higham.*

Prior to Nelson's successful use of "real time" flag communications at Trafalgar, the British rules for naval battle engagement necessarily required fastidious adherence to predetermined ship line formations; and those rules had been so strictly enforced that Admiral John Byng was court-martialed and shot in 1757 for deviating from them, *id.* The widespread reluctance of British naval officers during the Revolutionary War to take certain risks against the less inhibited American patriots was attributable in no small part to the example that had been made of Byng two decades earlier, *see, e.g.* MARK M. BOATNER III, *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION* 153-54 (Stackpole Books, Mechanicsburg, PA, 1994).

<sup>43</sup> See *Task Force Report*, note 11 *supra*, "Community-Building" recommendations, at 3 – 4.



- Compatibility issues between the campus technology and the Adjunct's personal technology.
- Unrealistic Administration and Departmental expectations of and support for the Adjunct.
- Specialized information and IT needs of some courses taught by Adjuncts.
- Communications gaps between the Adjunct and the campus technology administrators.
- Remuneration policies for services rendered and expenses outlayed by the Adjunct.
- Professional and personal bias against the Adjunct in academic and administrative circles.

Adjunct faculty have been referred to as "higher education's replaceable parts,"<sup>44</sup> "the least secure, most underpaid, and most exploited academic workers"<sup>45</sup> and as "higher education's best-kept dirty little secret."<sup>46</sup> As discussed above, negative and demeaning attitudes towards Adjuncts abound in American academia, and certainly are to be found at CUNY.

But regardless of one's sentiments regarding Adjunct faculty, it is obvious that excluding IT from Adjunct-taught courses serves the legitimate interests of neither full-time faculty, CUNY administration, the CUNY system itself, nor the students. The imperative to involve "broad representation from the campus community" in the IT planning processes<sup>47</sup> must also encompass Adjunct faculty members.

---

<sup>44</sup> David L. Kirp, *How Much for That Professor?*, N.Y. TIMES, 27 October 2003, Sec. A, p. 21, col. 2.

<sup>45</sup> Henry Steck, *Corporatization of the University: Seeking Conceptual Clarity*, 585 ANNALS AM. ACAD. POL. & SOC. SCI. 66, 79 (2003).

<sup>46</sup> John C. Duncan, Jr., *The Indentured Servants of Academia: The Adjunct Faculty Dilemma and Their Limited Legal Remedies*, 74 IND. L.J. 513, 516 (1999).

<sup>47</sup> See *Task Force Report*, note 11 *supra*, "Setting and Achieving Goals," Recommendations 3 & 4, at 3.

Legislation such as the Civil Rights Act,<sup>48</sup> the Freedom of Information Act,<sup>49</sup> the Small Business Act,<sup>50</sup> and the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984<sup>51</sup> are all based upon the proposition that restricted access to vital rights and resources causes unfairness and inefficiency in society. Indeed, the very existence of CUNY is based upon such legislative sentiments favoring equal accessibility to educational resources.<sup>52</sup> Unfortunately, equality of access to IT resources is severely wanting for CUNY's Adjunct faculty, to the detriment and inefficiency of the CUNY system as a whole.

It is necessary to fine-tune and clarify IT policy and procedure at the various CUNY colleges, but this alone will not bring IT to Adjuncts' classrooms. CUNY's success in dealing with IT (and indeed, all other challenges of our changing educational world) requires system-wide cultural change in the perceptions of and attitudes towards Adjunct faculty members.<sup>53</sup> And, as with other systemic cultural changes in an organization, such is best facilitated by definitive words and actions from the upper layers of the organizational chart.<sup>54</sup>

#####

---

<sup>48</sup> P.L. No. 88-352.

<sup>49</sup> P.L. 89-554, 80 Stat. 383 et seq.

<sup>50</sup> P.L. No. 85-536, 72 Stat. 384 et seq.

<sup>51</sup> P.L. No. 98-369, div. B, title VII, subtitle D.

<sup>52</sup> N.Y. Educ. L. §6201.

<sup>53</sup> See Barbara A. Wyles, *Adjunct Faculty in the Community College: Realities and Challenges*, NEW DIRECTIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION 89 (Winter 1998).

<sup>54</sup> There are, of course, factors beyond the direct control or cognizance of CUNY's top administration, including, but not limited to, the tax disadvantages for Adjuncts who, finding college-provided office facilities inadequate, choose to do their work at home. Cf. *Matter of Sylvester L. Tuohy*, New York State Tax Tribunal, Docket DTA No. 818430 (13 February 2003), available on the Internet at <<http://www.nysdta.org/Decisions/818430.dec.htm>> (accessed 10 October 2003).