

Institutions Sanctioned for Infringement of Governance Standards

REPORTS OF an Association investigation at the institutions listed below have revealed serious infringements of generally accepted standards of college and university governance endorsed by this Association, as set forth in the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* and derivative governance documents. Institutions are placed on or removed from this sanction list by vote of the Association's annual meeting.

The publication of these sanctions is for the purpose of informing Association members, the

profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic governance exist at the institutions in question.

The sanctioned institutions and the date of sanctioning are listed, along with the citation of the report that formed the basis for the sanction. Beginning in 2011, reports were published online on the AAUP website in the indicated month and year, with printed publication following in the annual *Bulletin of the AAUP*.

Lindenwood University (Missouri) (<i>Academe</i> , May–June 1994, 60–69)	1994
Elmira College (New York) (<i>Academe</i> , September–October 1993, 42–52)	1995
Miami-Dade College (<i>Academe</i> , May–June 2000, 73–88)	2000
Antioch University (<i>Academe</i> , November–December 2009, 41–63)	2010
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (New York) (January 2011)	2011
Idaho State University (May 2011)	2011

Draft Report on Governance and Contingent Positions

THE PROPORTION of faculty appointments that are “contingent”—lacking the benefits and protections of tenure and a planned long-term relationship with an institution—has increased dramatically over the past few decades. By 2009—the latest year for which national data are available—75 percent of US faculty appointments were off the tenure track, and 60 percent were part time.

A report just out from the AAUP examines the issue and makes recommendations for the inclusion of faculty holding contingent appointments in campus governance structures.

Draft recommendations include the following:

- Faculty members who hold contingent appointments should have governance responsibilities and opportunities similar to those of their tenure-line colleagues.
- Institutional policies should define as “faculty” and include in governance bodies individuals whose appointments consist primarily of professional teaching or research activities.
- Eligibility for voting and holding office should be the same for all faculty.
- All members of the faculty should be eligible to vote in all elections for college and university governance bodies on the basis of one person, one vote.
- Faculty in contingent appointments should have the opportunity to contribute to the evaluation of contingent faculty.
- All faculty members should, in the conduct of governance activities, be explicitly protected by institutional policies from retaliation.
- Faculty holding contingent appointments should be compensated in a way that takes into consideration the full range of their appointment responsibilities.

Produced by a joint subcommittee of two AAUP standing committees, the report is published online for comment (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/cgreport>) and may be revised in response to comments received. Comments should be addressed to Gwendolyn Bradley (gbradley@aaup.org) by September 10.