

DISSERTATION

ADJUNCT FACULTY EXPERIENCES IN A COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAM: A SINGLE-SITE CASE STUDY

Submitted by

Christopher Alan Wells

School of Education

In partial fulfilment of the requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Spring 2015

Doctoral Committee:

Advisor: William Timpson

Timothy Davies

Karen Kaminski

Sue Doe

Copyright by Christopher Alan Wells 2015

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

ADJUNCT FACULTY EXPERIENCES IN A COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: A SINGLE-SITE CASE STUDY

Adjunct faculty have come to represent an increasingly larger portion of the overall faculty population in American community colleges and according to recent studies now account for approximately 70% of the instructors in these institutions. Definitions of adjunct faculty vary considerably, but they are generally part-time instructors whose course load is less than the full-time faculty requirement. There has been limited attention paid in the literature to the training and development needs of this faculty group. In addition, we know even less about the needs of the individual types or categories of adjunct or part-time faculty and their experiences in training and development programs. This study examines the experiences of a sub-set of adjunct faculty who are practicing professionals outside of higher education and who teach on a part-time basis. I have labeled this group practitioner adjunct faculty.

For this study, I chose to complete a single-site case study of a part-time faculty training and development program at community college in the southeastern United States. My primary data source came from interviews with 10 practitioner adjunct faculty who had completed either the 2010 or 2011 version of the college's centerpiece course in their efforts to support and develop their part-time faculty, the Summer Certification Program. In addition to interview data, I also collected data from internal college documents and the college web site, interviews with academic and professional development leaders, and my own direct observations of training and support programs for the college's part-time faculty.

The data from this study have provided an overview of the practitioner adjunct faculty study participants' perspectives on their experiences with the college's training and support efforts. The results show that while these faculty are not fully aware of and are largely not taking advantage of many of the training and support programs offered by the college, the Summer Certification Program was seen as a valuable resource by most of the study participants and does appear to have had an impact on their classroom practice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my most sincere appreciation to the members of my dissertation committee. First of all, my journey through the dissertation process would have been impossible without the constant guidance and support of my methodologist, Dr. Timothy Davies. Dr. Davies played an instrumental role in guiding me through the research process, keeping me on track, and helping me work through challenges as they emerged. I would also like to thank my advisor, Dr. William Timpson, for assistance throughout my long dissertation journey. Dr. Timpson was always available when I needed his advice, and he provided timely suggestions on my work that greatly enhanced the quality of this study. Finally, I am thankful for the support offered by Drs. Sue Doe and Karen Kaminski. Their recommendations helped to enhance the breadth and depth of my work.

Throughout my studies at Colorado State University I have been blessed to have the support of my loving family. I would like to thank my wife, Doty Wells, for her tireless support and encouragement as well as for the many sacrifices that she has made over the years. She has been my rock throughout this entire process, and I absolutely could not have done it without her. I would also like to thank my two children, Kendall Mullins and Nicholas Wells, for their support and understanding. Their love and encouraging words have been vital to my successful completion of this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	5
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	6
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.....	7
RESEARCHER’S PERSPECTIVE.....	10
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE.....	13
ADJUNCT FACULTY.....	19
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE.....	22
MODEL PROGRAMS.....	25
PROBLEMS AND TENSIONS WITHIN THIS FIELD OF INQUIRY.....	26
ADJUNCT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.....	30
CONCLUSION.....	35
CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY.....	36
BACKGROUND.....	37
WHY CASE STUDY?.....	38
CASE STUDY DEFINED.....	39
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	41
DATA COLLECTION.....	42
DOCUMENT REVIEW.....	43
INTERVIEWS.....	44
DIRECT OBSERVATIONS.....	46
DATA ANALYSIS.....	47
VALIDATION.....	50
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL OF STUDY AND.....	51
PROTECTION OF SUBJECTS	
CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS.....	53
EXPERIENCES WITH TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT.....	53
TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PRIOR TO MCC.....	57
TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AT MCC.....	66
IMPACT OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT.....	67
TRAINING ACCESS ISSUES.....	72
TRAINING AWARENESS ISSUES.....	75
VARYING LEVELS OF TRAINING PARTICIPATION.....	79
PART-TIME FACULTY ORIENTATION.....	81

DEVELOPMENT AS INSTRUCTORS.....	86
MOTIVATION TO TEACH.....	87
VARYING PATHS TO MCC.....	92
TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT MCC.....	97
SECONDARY PLACE OF EDUCATION.....	104
IMPACT OF THE SUMMER CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.....	107
SUMMER CERTIFICATION PROGRAM GOALS.....	108
POSITIVE EXPERIENCES WITH SCP.....	111
MOTIVATIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SCP.....	112
OPPORTUNITIES AT MCC.....	113
REMUNERATION.....	114
CREDENTIALING.....	114
INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT.....	115
CONNECTIONS WITH MCC COMMUNITY.....	116
NATURE OF THE SCP EXPERIENCE.....	117
BENEFICIAL COMPONENTS.....	118
SOCIAL BENEFITS.....	122
IMPACT ON INSTRUCTOR PRACTICE.....	128
SCP SHORTCOMINGS.....	133
SCP CHANGE IDEAS.....	143
GROWTH.....	147
CONCLUSION.....	151
CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSION.....	153
SUMMARY.....	154
FINDINGS RELATED TO THE LITERATURE.....	159
IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE.....	164
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY.....	170
CONCLUSION.....	174
REFERENCES.....	175
APPENDICES.....	182

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A uniquely American creation, community colleges represent an important component in the higher education system in the United States, especially considering that they account for nearly 45% of the overall undergraduate student population (cited in Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). With over a century of history, these institutions have grown significantly in size and importance and have seen their mission expand from an original focus on providing the first two years of coursework for transfer into a bachelor's degree program to a more comprehensive approach with multiple foci such as the transfer, vocational, community service, and developmental functions, and they serve an increasingly diverse student population engendered by their open door admissions policies (Bragg, 2001). While this evolution has greatly expanded the reach of community colleges and has allowed them to play a much more significant role in the communities that they serve, these changes have placed increased pressure on the faculty as they cope with the challenges this expanded population brings. Murray (2002a) notes, "For at least the last third of the twentieth century, community colleges have been struggling with the changing demographics that have brought them an increasingly nontraditional student body, one that demands different approaches to teaching and learning than most faculty are prepared for in graduate training" (p. 89). Community college faculty so often find themselves frustrated by this growing student diversity as it challenges and in many ways renders traditional approaches to teaching and learning ineffective (Levin, 2007). This challenge has been particularly acute in regards to the growing number of adjunct, or part-time, faculty who are teaching an ever expanding number of sections across all disciplines.

Definitions of adjunct faculty vary considerably; however, in a community college setting they are generally part-time instructors who teach fewer courses than the full-time faculty requirement and are paid less than full-time faculty for the courses that they teach (Wallin, 2004). Others, however, define adjunct faculty in much more narrow terms. Beckford-Yanes (2005) and Langenberg (1998) make a distinction between adjunct faculty, who they suggest have a career outside of academia and are generally hired to supplement the work of the full-time faculty, and part-time faculty, who they argue do not work full-time outside of higher education and are generally hired to meet spikes in student demand for courses.

There have been several studies in the literature related to adjunct and part-time faculty beginning in the late 1970s with the work of Howard Tuckman and his associates (Gappa & Leslie, 1993); however, he was one of the few scholars working on adjunct faculty issues until Gappa and Leslie's seminal publication, *The Invisible Faculty*, was published in 1993. This was followed two years later by another one of the more significant works in the field, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron's (1995) *Strangers in Their Own Land*, which provided an overview of the state of part-time faculty in American community colleges and offered suggestions for further integrating part-time faculty into the fabric of their institutions and for developing them as instructors. Gappa and Leslie (1993) outlined the make-up of part-time faculty, their motivations for teaching part-time, and the reasons why colleges and universities have come to rely so heavily on contingent faculty. The authors argue that a bifurcated faculty system has emerged in the United States in which the "have-nots" – temporary, adjunct faculty – sustain the "haves" – tenured, full-time faculty – by teaching heavy course loads at lower costs thus preserving the tenure system and protecting the jobs of the full-time faculty. Throughout the 1990s and the first decade of the twenty-first century, the following areas have been addressed

moderately well in the literature: the make-up of the adjunct and part-time faculty population and their motivations to teach in this capacity (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Christensen, 2008; Levin, 2007; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995), the treatment of adjunct and part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Langenberg, 1998; Mann & Hochenadel, 2003; Wilson, 2008; Cohen & Brawer, 2008), quality of instruction issues (Christensen, 2008; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Langenberg, 1998; Louziotis, 2001)), and the benefits that part-time and adjunct faculty bring to their colleges (Green, 2007; Louziotis, 2001; McLaughlin, 2005; Smith, 2007; Wallin, 2004). Additionally, most of the literature related to adjunct and part-time faculty has focused on their role within community colleges (Meixner, Kruck, and Madden, 2010).

With budget constraints combined with a growing demand for higher education, community college faculty must manage heavy teaching loads with limited clerical and instructional support (Wallin, 2002; Wallin & Smith, 2005). Wallin and Smith (2005) note “...the changing demands of employers and emerging technologies place additional stress on faculty” (p. 88). Given the environment within which community college faculty operate and the unique challenges faced by the part-time members of this faculty, there is significant agreement on the need for these institutions to create or expand development programs for their adjunct faculty, especially considering the important role they play in helping community colleges fulfill their missions (Wallin, 2004; Lyons & Kysilka, 2000; Eddy, 2005, Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Unfortunately, these programs are underfunded and understaffed in most community colleges. When faced with budgetary constraints and enrollment-based funding mechanisms, non-credit activities like faculty development are generally the first to be dropped (Wallin & Smith, 2005).

While faculty development in community colleges has received some coverage in the literature, there has been limited attention paid to adjunct faculty development programs other

than the calls by some scholars for the need for such programs (Christensen, 2008; Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; and Louziotis, 2001; Marits, 1996; Wallin, 2004). Only a handful of studies, however, have been conducted on community colleges which have actually implemented development programs specifically designed to support their adjunct and part-time faculty (Burnstad, 2002; Bosley, 2004; Lyons & Kysilka, 2000). These studies do point to the potential impact that such programs can have on adjunct faculty and the institutions that they serve.

In addition, several studies have addressed adjunct faculty needs in general, and while these needs can vary among individual faculty members and by institutions, some common themes have emerged. One in particular, the need to more fully integrate adjunct faculty into their colleges' institutional and cultural framework, has received significant attention from scholars (Johnson & Stevens, 2008; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Wallin, 2004; and Christensen, 2008). Gappa and Leslie (1993) note that despite their working conditions and the limited pay and benefits that they receive from their work, part-time faculty who feel more integrated into a shared faculty experience feel better about their work and role within their college. Therefore, Wallin (2004) suggests that community college administrators should be aware of the different reasons adjunct faculty teach as well as their varied needs, and argues that they should develop programs that more fully integrate adjunct faculty into the cultural fabric of the college.

While these studies address the needs of adjunct faculty in general, we know little about the specific needs of the individual types of part-time or adjunct faculty. Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) and later Gappa and Leslie (1993) provide a useful framework for this very diverse group in outlining several categories of part-time faculty. These include individuals who are retired

from their primary career and are teaching later in life, those who are practicing professionals in their field of interest and teach part-time for the love of teaching and to give back to others, those whose goal are to secure a full-time teaching position, as well as those who teach part-time for personal reasons or for whom teaching is only one of several professional interests and activities.

Scholars have noted, though, that despite the popular belief that the majority of part-time faculty fit into the aspiring full-time faculty category and are generally a dissatisfied lot eking out a living by putting together teaching assignments at multiple institutions, this actually represents only a small percentage of part-time faculty (Eagan, 2007; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). The majority of part-time faculty actually fall into the second category noted above and work full-time in a profession outside of education (Eagan, 2007; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). While there is no consistent definition for this sub-group of part-time faculty, I have labeled them practitioner adjunct faculty. This distinguishes them from the broader definition of adjunct faculty offered by some (Wallin, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993) and avoids the confusion of terms that results from the more narrow definition of adjunct faculty developed by others (Beckford-Yanes, 2005; Langenberg, 1998) From the literature we know little about this group, and we don't have a complete picture of their needs and what they are looking for in terms of professional development activities.

Statement of the problem

While the adjunct faculty development programs currently running in American community colleges demonstrate clear promise, there are unfortunately far too few of them and too few studies of those comprehensive programs that do exist. Green (2007), Marits (1996), Wallin (2004) and others have noted important considerations in building adjunct faculty development programs and the elements that should be included; however, despite the significant agreement

on the need for community colleges to invest in the development of their adjunct faculty, too few adjunct faculty programs have been examined to know with confidence which factors or components are most successful in meeting their needs. In addition, we don't have a complete picture or understanding of how practitioner adjunct faculty experience these programs and the particular activities that they find most impactful. Additionally, other than Beckford-Yanes' (2005) study, few scholars have focused specifically on the roles and contributions of practitioners in community colleges, and very few have dealt with the developmental needs of this group.

The purpose of this case study is to examine and describe an adjunct faculty training program at a community college in the southeastern United States in order to understand how the structure and specific learning modules associated with the program aid in the development of adjunct faculty, improve teaching performance, and increase overall satisfaction levels of adjunct faculty. I will address these issues through in-depth interviews with faculty participants and program administrators and through a review of program documents and tools. (i.e. training course shell, teaching videos). My primary goals are to develop an understanding of what adjunct faculty need from a development program, what their impressions are of the program that they just completed, and what they would improve for future programs.

Research questions

The primary research question that I wish to address with this study is: How does the adjunct training program impact practitioner, adjunct faculty teaching strategy and practice as well as overall satisfaction in their roles? I also plan to address the following questions:

1. What are the perceptions of the adjunct faculty participants regarding the utility of these programs?

2. Have faculty materially altered their teaching practices as a direct result of the training?
3. How are program goals tied to the mission of the institution and to what extent is this mission reinforced with adjunct faculty?

Significance of the study

As community colleges continue to hire greater numbers of adjunct, contingent faculty to teach ever expanding sections to increasingly diverse student populations with more complex needs and learning styles, it is critical that community college leaders develop programs to support these faculty whose initial commitment to the institution is tenuous at best. Cohen and Brawer (2008) note that the trend towards an increasingly full-time faculty base at community colleges, a trend which saw full-time faculty account for nearly two-thirds of all community college instructors by the late 1960s, reversed over the next few decades, and by 2003, 63% of all community college faculty were employed on a part-time basis. This trend shows no sign of abating; Jaeger and Eagan (2009) note that by the Fall 2005, the number of part-time faculty in two-year colleges had grown to 65.6% of all faculty appointments.

For the institutions that they serve, part-time faculty offer a significant cost savings. Cohen and Brawer (2008) point to two studies on community college faculty pay rates — one a 2006 California study and the other a 2005 Illinois study— which indicated that adjunct faculty were on average earning 3 times less than their full-time counterparts on a per course basis; these studies clearly demonstrate the cost savings that part-time faculty afford their institutions. In addition to cost savings, the increased use of adjunct faculty allow community colleges a greater degree of flexibility in staffing classes. McLaughlin (2005) notes that college leaders can increase sections during heavier fall enrollments and reduce them for lighter spring enrollments,

and sections can be added at the last minute if administrators need an additional section or dropped if a section doesn't meet enrollment minimums. Adjunct faculty also bring to their classrooms a number of benefits that more directly impact student learning. Their "real-world experiences" add substance and relevance to their lectures and connections to both industry and the community afford internships and in some cases employment opportunities for their students (Green, 2007). Additionally, given that adjunct faculty come from a number of professional backgrounds, they bring a degree of diversity and experience to their institutions that could not be achieved through full-time faculty (Green, 2007; Wallin, 2004); Wallin (2004) notes:

They allow colleges to maintain close ties with business and industry by employing their representatives to teach in appropriate subject areas. Practicing professionals who come to the classroom as adjunct faculty bring a currency and 'real-world' perspective that many full-time faculty, long removed from business and industry, if they ever were involved, may lack. This community connection is vital to the mission of the community college (p. 377).

While their overall numbers within community colleges continue to increase as they play an ever important role in helping community colleges fulfill their missions, the level of support afforded them by college administrators has unfortunately not kept pace with the need as adjunct faculty arrive on campus with little or no preparation for the role that they are about to undertake. Gibson-Harman, Rodriguez, and Haworth (2002) note that, "...few graduate programs, let alone community college faculty development initiatives, have seriously addressed the professional development needs of this next generation of faculty....and only a handful of institutions offered coursework or other experiences that prepared master's or doctoral students to teach in community colleges" (p. 79). Faculty often receive little pre-service instructional training and generally find themselves ill prepared to handle the demands of students whose own preparation

for academic work is lacking and who bring with them into the classroom a number of life and work distractions.

As Wallin (2004) notes, it is in the administration's best interest to support their adjunct faculty population who represent one of the more important resources a community college has and who are so essential in the operational and instructional work of the institution. A comprehensive faculty development program which clearly meets both the needs of adjunct faculty as well as those of the institutions they serve is not only in the institution's best interest but will also help the institution better serve its students. Therefore, I believe that it is important that researchers examine existing faculty development programs to better understand how they function and what they do to improve adjunct faculty performance in the classroom, and build commitment and loyalty amongst this very diverse population.

I believe that my study will add to the literature on adjunct faculty development by offering an in-depth analysis of one of the few comprehensive adjunct faculty training and development programs in the southeastern United States. Given that the majority of research to date on part-time and adjunct faculty has been quantitative in nature (Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010), my study will add a needed dimension to the field, told through a qualitative lens, which will illuminate the experience of practitioner adjunct faculty during and shortly after completing the training program and developmental activities at the community college site. By relying on interview, observation, and document data, I hope to obtain a level of detail describing individual faculty experiences that would not be obtainable through a quantitative, survey-based study. Additionally, this study will add another layer of understanding to the limited case literature on adjunct faculty development programs. By focusing on a single case site, I hope to be able to explore in greater depth the particular factors that make the program

successful as well as identify components or missing factors that could make the program even more effective. Through interviews with faculty participants, I hope to gain a better feel for what they are getting out of the program, what features they find useful, what has been less helpful, and how they plan to use what they have learned to improve their performance in the classroom or to improve their status in the profession.

Researcher's perspective

I have worked for the past 15 years for a proprietary institution of higher learning in the southeastern United States that offers associate's level, bachelor's level, and master's level degree programs and have not been employed in any capacity by the institution under study here. In my most recent position as an administrator for one of our satellite campuses, I worked with some 25 to 40 adjunct and part-time faculty members in any given term. While I did not directly supervise them, I did manage the overall operations of a satellite campus where they taught, and I frequently conducted in-class faculty observations of both graduate and undergraduate adjunct faculty for our academic administrators. I was also the first line of mediation in student-faculty disputes and the first administrator to review student grade disputes. Given my former position, some faculty may still have concerns that I would bring an administrator's bias to any evaluation of their developmental needs, or they may have concerns that I might not truly understand the many challenges that they face. I have, though, in addition to my administrative duties taught, on an adjunct basis, a freshman-level seminar course for the past six years. This experience has afforded me the opportunity to better understand the role of the adjunct instructor, and I believe that it allows me to empathize with their struggles.

In my new role as manager of our Academic Success Center I no longer have direct oversight of any adjunct faculty; however, I do have overall responsibility for academic support

for our metro region, so I still work with our faculty, both full-time and adjunct on a regular basis. Also, as part of the management team within our local College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, I am still in a position to conduct occasional in-class and online observations of our faculty, and I regularly attend and am involved in the planning of departmental faculty meetings and workshops – which bring together adjunct and full-time faculty – for both the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Business.

In my nearly nine years as an administrator and manager, I have developed relationships with a number of our adjunct faculty, and I have come to admire the wealth of experience and knowledge that they bring to the classroom. Also, although the majority of our faculty are content with their roles and perform well in the classroom, I have been particularly troubled by the few who were not successful in their role and by our inability to help them through current intervention strategies. I have also been touched by a couple of faculty members who were teaching part-time primarily because they were not able to secure full-time teaching positions. I shared their frustrations over applying for position after position but hearing no response. I have been moved to search for ways to help them grow professionally.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Lyons and Kysilka (2000), while adjuncts generally possess a solid foundation in their disciplines, they typically are not prepared to handle the needs of students unready for the demands of college-level coursework and who bring with them a multitude of personal challenges. The literature related to adjunct faculty has primarily focused on two key areas: 1) motivating factors and satisfaction levels of adjunct faculty; and 2) the effect that they have on educational quality (Smith, 2007). Smith (2007) notes, however, that this contrasts with a more positive trend in the literature which describe adjunct faculty as passionate about and committed to teaching and which focuses on the benefits that these faculty bring to their institutions.

Wagoner, Metcalfe, and Olaore (2005) also identify similar foci in the literature but frame them somewhat differently – “working conditions (related to the exploitation of part-timers), and integration into institutional culture (related to academic quality of colleges and programs)” (p. 26).

Given the environment within which community college faculty operate and the unique challenges faced by the contingent members of this faculty, there is significant agreement on the need for these institutions to create or expand development programs for their adjunct faculty, especially considering the important role they play in helping community colleges fulfill their missions (Wallin, 2004; Lyons & Kysilka, 2000; Eddy, 2005, Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Much of the literature for both full-time as well as adjunct faculty focuses on instructional issues and the need to improve faculty performance in the classroom. Little attention is given, however, to the overall development of adjunct faculty. I will focus my review first on literature related to the

community college and its growing reliance on a part-time instructional workforce. Then, I will take a look at the adjunct faculty themselves examining their background, motivations for teaching part-time, and needs. Next, I will examine the evolution of faculty development in general and then on the growth of faculty development in the community college. I will also discuss tensions within the literature on adjunct faculty and the quality of instruction that they provide. Finally, I will review literature related to faculty development programs geared specifically towards adjunct faculty.

The community college

Cohen and Brawer (2008) define community colleges “*as any institution regionally accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate in science as its highest degree*” (p. 5). Community colleges are often referred to as two-year institutions or colleges and serve a variety of interests within their communities. Cohen and Brawer (2008) do note that their definition leaves out many vocational institutions and adult educational centers as well as most for-profit, non-regionally accredited schools. As these institutions have grown over the last few decades, there has been a shift from a reliance primarily on full-time faculty to, in many cases, a majority part-time faculty base. In many ways, this trend is reflective of the unique status of the American community college. As community colleges have adapted to meet the needs of increasingly diverse community interests while balancing calls from state legislators for greater efficiency and to do more with less, the increased use of contingent faculty has become a necessity.

This trend has its origins in many factors; however, growing budgetary pressures faced by community college administrators appear to have had the most influence on their increased reliance on adjunct faculty. Gappa and Leslie (1993) place much of the blame on the nature of most states’ appropriation processes. They note that the length of time that it takes institutional

budget requests to proceed through the state system and back to the institution as an appropriation means that colleges generally do not receive funds until just before the beginning of the fall term and, therefore, must apply the budget as the term begins. Since these appropriations generally come up short of what the institution had planned the previous year, “they have learned to preserve flexibility in the budget at this time of year. Much of that ‘wiggle room’ is in the form of vacant faculty lines and other reserved funds that go to departments for hiring part-time and temporary faculty” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 94). Cohen and Brawer (2003) also offer a rather harsh criticism of community college leaders’ reliance on a cheap adjunct labor pool noting that “part-time instructors are to the community colleges as migrant workers are to the farms” (p. 86). This trend has led to a virtual bifurcation of college faculty; Gappa and Leslie (1993) offer a criticism of this emerging system noting that those whom they label the “have-nots” – temporary, adjunct faculty— sustain the “haves” – tenured, full-time faculty – by teaching heavy course loads at lower costs thus preserving the tenure system and protecting the jobs of the full-time faculty.

Other concerns about community colleges’ use of adjunct faculty come primarily from earlier works suggesting that many have come to see this as less of an issue. In a study from the early 1980s, Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) argue that many have felt that part-time faculty do not enrich an institution’s academics because they are often hired with limited regard to their academic credentials and because they are viewed with poor consideration by others in the academic community. Also, they point out that adjunct faculty may not be able to meet student needs as well as others noting, “A faculty member who is hired solely to teach class cannot show the same interest in students as one who is constantly on the premises” (p. 7). Gappa and Leslie (1993) point to studies in the 1970s and 1980s that made critical assumptions about the effect of

part-time faculty on academic quality; adjunct faculty were not able to make a “primary commitment” to the institution, and this commitment was necessary in order to allow for successful learning. They also cite a report from the Education Commission of the States (1986) which states, “[Use of part-time faculty] can...inhibit faculty collegiality, instructional continuity, and curricular coherence” (p. 5). More recently, Cohen and Brawer (2008) note abundant studies which indicate that students learn as much in courses taught by part-time faculty as they do in those taught by full-time faculty. Still, they point out that, part-time faculty are chosen less carefully than full-time instructors since the college is not making a lasting commitment to them, and they do not wish to invest too heavily in their hiring and selection.

The use of part-time faculty, however, does provide colleges with certain benefits other than the cost savings noted above. They offer community college leaders the flexibility of increasing sections during heavier fall enrollments and reducing them for lighter spring enrollments, and they can be added at the last minute if administrators need an additional section or dropped if a section doesn’t meet enrollment minimums (McLaughlin, 2005). Louziotis (2001) argues that the flexibility adjunct faculty provide to the college allow the institution to “...deploy its resources more efficiently, or re-deploy them more rapidly to meet changes in the marketplace” (p. 49). Levin (2007) concurs and adds that because they allow for greater efficiency and adaptability, part-time faculty are absolutely essential to the mission of the community college.

In addition, Smith (2007) notes that adjunct faculty love to teach and are committed to it; “With this passion for teaching, they bring a real-world perspective grounded in their professional experience in business and industry” (pp. 56-57). Green (2007) suggests that students benefit from and appreciate the real-world experience that these practitioner faculty

bring to their classrooms and that the use of adjunct faculty helps to build connections with the local community and can often lead to internships and jobs for students. “The connection to the world of work cannot be stressed enough. Adjuncts have a special ability to bring life to ideas with interesting and often contemporary examples” (Green, 2007, p. 30). Consistent with this position, Louziotis (2001) suggests that colleges are increasingly turning to adjunct faculty as they are in a better position to teach students about new and current business practice than full-time faculty who may not have experience in the business world. Also, as Cohen and Brawer (2008) point out, colleges often turn to adjunct faculty to teach specialty courses for which there is not a large enough demand to warrant a full course load.

Clearly given the role that faculty play in terms of teaching, mentoring, institutional service, and student advising, they represent one of the most important resources any institution of higher learning has. This holds especially true for community colleges with their almost total focus on teaching and community service. Human capital considerations should be at the top of administrators’ lists of concern. Considering that the majority of faculty at community colleges are adjunct, Wallin (2004) notes, “Clearly, it is in the best interest of community colleges to cultivate and support the large number of adjuncts, who are so essential to the operation of the institution and the teaching of students” (p. 373). She asserts that community colleges should make efforts to meet their instructional support requirements, understand their motivating factors, compensate them appropriately, and provide opportunities for professional development. Unfortunately, the majority of institutions provide only limited support to their adjunct faculty, and most treat them much more poorly than their full-time instructors. Gappa and Leslie (1993) ask, “How can institutions expect people of talent to contribute to quality educational programs when those same people are victims of medieval employment conditions” (p. xi)? Mann and

Hochenedel (2003) frame their discussion on the treatment of adjunct faculty in the United States and Canada in terms of class warfare and state that, “The hierarchy in academic life can be compared to a caste system in which the well-paid administration and tenured professors profit from the blood, sweat, and tears of sessional/adjunct teachers and graduate students, who are doing much of the real work...” (p. 114).

In many institutions, adjunct faculty endure these “medieval employment conditions” because they have very little power to change or ameliorate their situation. Citing Grieve and Worden (2000), Wallin (2004) notes that community colleges create conditions such as short-term contracts which carry poor wages and no job security, and adjuncts are generally seen by administrators and full-time faculty as separate from the rest of the college; adjunct faculty thus find themselves vulnerable to exploitation. Gappa and Leslie (1993) point out that this sense of powerlessness pervades the adjunct faculty community, and many feel anxious about the vague nature of their position. One of the more persistent of these conditions that adjunct faculty must endure are the consistently poor wages paid for the classes that they teach. In general, adjunct faculty are paid considerably less than full-time faculty (Tuckman & Tuckman, 1981; Wallin, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Cohen and Brawer (2008) cite California pay rates from 2006 in which community college instructors received around \$3,000 per semester-based, three credit hour course versus full-time faculty who were earning the equivalent of \$9,000 per course and Illinois pay rates from 2005 in which part-time faculty were earning roughly one third the rate of full-time faculty on a per course basis. While Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) assert that part-time faculty should earn a different salary given that they do not have the same committee, advising, and other academic responsibilities borne by full-time faculty, they point out that those part-time instructors who do take on additional duties are often not compensated for them.

Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) also note that part-time faculty salaries generally do not keep pace with full-time salary increases which can often lead to frustration and turnover. Along with poor pay, adjunct faculty also generally receive few if any benefits; although, Wallin (2004) notes that this is changing in some states where there is growing unionization. Still, adjunct faculty do not enjoy the same benefits as their full-time counterparts. Institutions often justify this situation by claiming that contingent faculty do not need benefits since they are generally employed full-time somewhere else; however, Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) note that this is only true for about 30 percent of adjunct faculty. Ultimately, they claim that, "...many institutions are unconcerned about the fringes they offer part-timers, mainly because the latter are a divided and largely invisible group" (p. 6).

Additionally, adjunct faculty are often saddled with heavy teaching loads as administrators continue to rely on them to teach increasing numbers of sections. Gappa and Leslie (1993) note that a majority of the institutions that they surveyed had adjunct faculty who were teaching the equivalent of a full-time course load or more thus raising serious legal and ethical issues. Others often teach heavy course loads but at multiple institutions; Gappa and Leslie (1993) label these individuals "freeway fliers". These multiple assignments can often be very rigorous with faculty sometimes teaching at one campus in the morning, another in the afternoon, and a third in the evening. This can "...contribute to the marginal nature of their affiliation with each of their institutions and to the little that is known about them by their departments" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 59).

Another area of concern involves the limited academic freedoms that adjunct faculty enjoy relative to their full-time counterparts. Without the protection of tenure, adjunct faculty in the community college are vulnerable should their actions or words run counter to the

administration. In many cases, as Wilson (2008) notes, instructors have been terminated for saying or doing something that offended students or someone in the administration. Colleges have the right to fire or not renew their contracts without having to give them a reason, and Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) note that the terms of employment for most adjunct faculty are not very well defined. Their status with the institution, which provides flexibility for the college, engenders insecurity on the part of the adjunct. This creates a very disconcerting situation given the majority of community college course sections being taught by adjunct faculty and has the potential to silence creativity and dialogue. Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) place this issue as one of the key concerns that institutions must address regarding their part-time faculty in asking, “What kind of protection can part-timers be offered for academic freedom or to insure that a contract will not be cancelled because of political rather than academic considerations” (p. 6).

Adjunct faculty

Despite the many challenges that adjunct faculty face, they continue to arrive on American community college campuses in increasing numbers and generally teach for several years. Citing Leslie and Gappa (2002), Wallin (2004) notes that while adjunct faculty are generally not as experienced as their full-time counterparts, they have on average about 5 to 6 years of teaching experience or around half of the average experience for full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty for the most part are competent and committed professionals and more than half have earned a master’s degree or higher (Wallin, 2004). They offer significant contributions to their institutions in terms of cost savings, real-world experience, and overall student learning. Still, as noted earlier their pay and benefits fall well short of their full-time colleagues. This leads one to question -- why, despite the conditions, do so many choose to continue to teach as adjuncts?

In analyzing part-time faculty motivations, Gappa and Leslie (1993) identified both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators and found that intrinsic motivators have a particularly significant influence on faculty behavior with financial motivators playing a largely secondary role. They note that those motivated intrinsically generally have other employment and are motivated by the satisfaction of teaching. Some of the faculty that Gappa and Leslie (1993) interviewed in their study indicated "...that they feel obligated to return debts they owe to institutions, to society, or even to parents" (p. 37). This sense of giving back carries even more weight for adjunct faculty who come from disadvantaged or underrepresented backgrounds. Gappa and Leslie (1993) indicate that these faculty are motivated by a desire to help those who endure many of the same challenges that they have already overcome and that, "They feel they have a special ability to capture the imagination of young people from their particular ethnic or cultural background" (p. 38). Despite the important role that intrinsic motivators play, a large number of adjunct faculty are motivated by extrinsic rewards as well. Unfortunately, those faculty motivated by status, financial rewards, and the possibility of securing a full-time faculty appointment so often find their needs unfulfilled (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

In the late 1970s, Howard Tuckman was one of the first researchers to examine the diverse employment characteristics of part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) classified part-time faculty according to seven different categories:

- Full-Mooners—persons who, in addition to their part-time job, held a full-time job of 35 or more hours per week for 18 or more weeks—27.6 percent of the sample.
- Students—persons employed in departments other than the one in which they are registered to receive a degree and who are called part-timers by the institutions that hire them—21.2 percent.
- Hopeful Full-Timers—persons whose primary reason for becoming part-time is that they could not find a full-time position—16.6 percent.
- Part-Mooners—persons holding two or more part-time jobs of less than 35 hours per week for more than one week—13.6 percent.

- Homeworkers—persons whose primary reason for becoming part-time is to take care of a relative or child at home—6.4 percent.
- Semi-Retired—persons whose primary reason for becoming part-time is that they are semi-retired—2.8 percent.
- Part-Unknowners—persons whose reasons for becoming part-time do not fall into any of the above categories—11.8 percent (p. 4).

While still providing a relevant classification system for part-time faculty, Gappa and Leslie (1993) found their categories too restrictive to account for the changing nature of the adjunct faculty themselves. They have relabeled Tuckman's *semi-retired* category as *career enders*; this group includes people who have retired and those in transition from one career to pre-retired state. Gappa and Leslie (1993) also note that this group now represents a much larger percentage of adjuncts than Tuckman's classification. They changed Tuckman's full-mooner category to *specialist, expert, or professional*. Adjuncts falling into this category work full-time in another field and teach more for a love of teaching rather than the money. The *hopeful full-timers* have been relabeled *aspiring academics*; Gappa and Leslie (1993) point out that, "...the focus of their career aspiration is not necessarily to teach full-time but to be fully participating, recognized, and rewarded members of the faculty with a status at least similar to that currently associated with the tenure-track or tenured faculty" (p. 48). The authors make a distinction between actual part-time instructors and those who combine part-time assignments at multiple institutions for a full-time course load or more. Their final category, *freelancers*, combines Tuckman's *part-unknowners, part-mooners, and homeworkers*. For this group, their "...current career is the sum of all the part-time jobs or roles they have, only one of which is part-time teaching in higher education" (p. 49).

More recent scholarship has refined our understanding of the make-up of the part-time faculty population in the community college. In a longitudinal study of multiple administrations of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), Eagan (2007) found that the data

support Leslie and Gappa's (2002) challenge of the popular belief that the majority of part-time faculty are frustrated academics juggling multiple teaching assignments while seeking full-time appointments. Citing Cohen and Brawer (2003) and Leslie and Gappa (2002), Eagan (2007) notes, "...the majority of part-time faculty tend to come from full-time jobs in other professional fields and pursue part-time academic opportunities because of an interest and satisfaction in teaching" (pp. 5-6). Leslie and Gappa (2002) found that only 15% to 17% of part-time faculty were currently teaching at another postsecondary institution, and in a later study, Eagan (2007) found that this number had dropped to 11%. Additionally, while part-time faculty average 7 years of employment at their current institutions compared to 12.2 years for their full-time counterparts, their length of service still suggests a greater degree of employment stability than popularly assumed (Eagan, 2007). Finally, these recent studies suggest that part-time faculty are generally satisfied with their positions (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Eagan, 2007), and while Eagan (2007) did find that part-time faculty were most dissatisfied with their college's benefits package, this dissatisfaction has fallen from 70% in 1988 to 49.4% in 2004.

Faculty development in the community college

Before the 1970s, faculty development efforts in the community college were limited for the most part to providing financial support for conference attendance, innovation in teaching grants, and sabbaticals (Murray, 2002a). By the early 1970s, though, faculty development efforts began to take shape as the academic market retreated amid the economic downturn and limited faculty mobility (Eddy, 2005). Throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s many community colleges began to offer more thorough, formal programs that addressed three key developmental areas: 1) professional – which focused on teaching effectiveness; 2) personal – which focused on career and life concerns; and 3) organizational – which focused on curriculum and program building.

(Murray, 2002a). Most community colleges, as Murray (2002a) notes, tended to emphasize professional development activities over the other two areas. In terms of the specific activities offered to faculty Murray (2000), in an earlier study focusing on two-year colleges in Texas, found that most colleges offered their faculty money to attend conferences; however, funding was generally very limited. Most of the colleges he surveyed held workshops by outside teaching consultants and by their own faculty. Around 65 to 70 percent of colleges offered sabbaticals and release time, but only 30 percent provided grants to improve teaching, peer mentoring, and tuition reimbursement for college classes.

While important for all faculty, development programs play an even more critical role in community colleges given many of the unique challenges that they face. Faculty must contend with demands from many different sources including their students, administrators, and local community and business interests. More importantly, faculty must effectively work with the large number of non-traditional students with varying learning needs and styles. Citing Amey (1999), Murray (2002b) details how community colleges serve a larger number of women than men, how they enroll more African-American and first generation beginning students than do four-year institutions, and how they enroll a higher number of older and part-time students; given the nature of the student body, the author notes, conventional methods of teaching might not work for all.

Unfortunately, the pre-service training that most faculty received in graduate school did not prepare them for the challenges presented by the open admissions policies of community colleges (Murray, 2002b). Because of the nature of graduate degree programs completed by most community college faculty, new instructors face a unique set of challenges in adapting to the teaching priorities of community colleges. Most did not begin their studies with an academic

career in mind and only took a position because it became available or after having a positive academic experience (Fugate & Amey, 2000). Their studies for the most part have prepared them to complete research, but not necessarily to teach (Murray, 2000). Once new faculty begin their teaching careers, though, they tend to lose disciplinary connections as they generally have no requirement to complete scholarly work in their fields (Cohen & Brawer, 2008), thus further complicating their instructional role. Murray (2000) asserts that in order to be an effective teacher, the faculty member must have both a strong knowledge of their discipline as well as understanding of pedagogy.

Veteran faculty, on the other hand, face a different set of developmental needs. Fugate and Amey (2000) found that as faculty move into their second year of instruction, roles secondary to teaching began to increase in importance, and they felt that they had the time to work on their teaching skills. After this second year, Fugate and Amey (2000) note, faculty roles remained relatively unchanged. While their roles may not change, they still face a number of concerns as they move through their careers. Many find themselves dealing with burnout, boredom, exhaustion, and apathy as teach larger classes with poorly prepared students and teach the same material over and over again (Wallin & Smith, 2005). All community college faculty, though, face heavy teaching loads with limited clerical and instructional support (Wallin, 2002; Wallin & Smith, 2005), and Wallin and Smith (2005) note "...the changing demands of employers and emerging technologies place additional stress on faculty" (p. 88). Given the situation, there is agreement in the literature on the need for effective faculty development programs. "...faculty-development programs can provide an antidote to stagnation and burnout by providing faculty with innovative and challenging ways to keep their teaching fresh" (cited in Wallin & Smith, 2005, p. 88). In addition, Ambrosino and Peel (2011) suggest that effective

faculty development programs can have a positive influence on instructional practice and ultimately on student learning. Unfortunately, these programs are underfunded and understaffed in most community colleges. When faced with budgetary constraints and enrollment-based funding mechanisms, non-credit activities like faculty development are generally the first to be dropped (Wallin & Smith, 2005).

Model programs

Despite the lack of success in many community colleges, there are a few examples of effective faculty development programs from which administrators can learn. St. Louis Community College's leadership instituted a new faculty orientation program in order to help transition the large number of new, incoming faculty as the college's original core of faculty enter retirement (Welch, 2002). Designed as a year-long course, the program format consists of a week-long orientation prior to the fall semester, weekly programs during the fall semester, and a skills workshop during the spring or summer terms (Welch, 2002). Welch (2002) examines the new faculty orientation program along four lines –1) program goals; 2) structure; 3) costs; and 4) evaluation—with a particular emphasis on program goals and efforts to match them with institutional priorities and values. The goals include: 1) modeling a learner-centered environment; 2) enabling new faculty to become knowledgeable of the college; 3) encouraging collegiality among faculty in different departments and campuses; and 4) creating expectations of continued growth. According to Welch (2002) the program has resulted in promoting greater interaction and integration among faculty in different departments and areas of the college, in increased interdisciplinary offerings, and in new faculty assuming leadership roles.

Nellis, Hosman, King, & Armstead (2002) detail the Time-Revealed Scenarios tool, a web-based, interactive software program, used by Valencia Community College in Florida. The

program is learner-centered, emphasizes active-learning, and is designed primarily for new faculty. Faculty members follow a “scenario” involving a fictional new professor, Steven Cauley. The authors “tried to capture some of the new faculty experience: the sense of dislocation and isolation, the conflicting advice from senior colleagues, the often-overwhelming demands of the job, the needs of the students, and the pressures of balancing family life and work.” (pp. 27-28) Participant faculty are able to discuss the professor’s development and relate to their own experiences. When asked to detail the changes that they would make on their syllabi for the next term, almost all said that they would rewrite their syllabus because of what they had learned through the program.

Problems and tensions within this field of inquiry

Tensions within the literature on adjunct faculty have generally centered around two key areas: (1) the distinction between and use of the terms “adjunct” and “part-time” to describe non-tenure track instructors who teach less than a full-time course load; and (2) disagreements over the quality of instruction provided by adjunct faculty instructors compared to that of their full-time counterparts as well as the impact that this has on student success. These tensions have helped to shape the course of the debate over the role of the adjunct instructor within the community college and in the success of its students.

Carolyn Beckford-Yanes (2005) notes that the terminology used in the literature to describe part-time and adjunct faculty has often been very contentious and in many ways reprehensible. While some of the tamer terms such as “associate faculty, temporary faculty, temporary part-time faculty, community faculty, reserve faculty, supplemental faculty, and percentage instructors” (cited in Beckford-Yanes, 2005, p. 17) still carry a stigma and in many ways serve to marginalize part-time and adjunct faculty, others such as “Missing in Action or

MIAs...anchorless street-corner men,' 'necessary evils'...pretend professors,' 'great academic unwashed'...." (cited in Beckford-Yanes, 2005, p. 17) are downright appalling and serve as an indication of the very low regard in which many authors hold these faculty or, in many cases, their perception of the position held by part-time faculty in most colleges and universities in the United States. A large number of authors, though, use the primary terms describing this group of faculty – part-time and adjunct – interchangeably (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jacoby, 2005; Fagan-Wilen et. al, 2006; Wallin, 2004; Christensen, 2008; and Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010), and they make no distinction between the roles that adjuncts and part-time faculty play within the colleges they serve. In clarifying the factors that delineate this group of faculty, Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010) note that, "Part-time faculty, also known as adjuncts or contingents, include those instructors who are paid per course taught and are seldom offered benefits such as health insurance or access to retirement plans, even if they teach as many or more courses than a full-time faculty member" (p. 141). Definitions of adjunct and part-time faculty vary; however, they are generally part-time instructors who teach fewer courses than the full-time faculty requirement and are paid less than full-time faculty for the courses that they teach (Wallin, 2004).

Others, however, define adjunct faculty in narrower terms, and clearly differentiate between adjunct and part-time faculty. Beckford-Yanes (2005) defines an adjunct instructor as, "A part-time community college faculty member with a full-time professional career outside of academia" (p. 12), and she labels part-time faculty as, "A part-time, community college faculty teaching several courses, often at one or more colleges. These individuals may not have professional role outside of academia" (p. 13). Given this definition, adjunct faculty could potentially be considered a subset of the larger part-time faculty group. Langenberg (1998)

offers perhaps one of the clearest distinctions between part-time and adjunct faculty with his definition of the two terms. He lists part-time faculty and adjunct faculty as subsets of a larger group that he labels “subfaculty” – faculty with a lesser status than the “regular” or tenured and tenure track faculty within their institutions. For Langenberg (1998) part-time faculty are hired by institutions to help meet spikes in student demand for courses and are rarely afforded the same level of compensation and status as their full-time counterparts; they in some cases take part-time work because they cannot secure full-time faculty positions or have other commitments which make it difficult to work a full-time schedule. His definition of adjunct faculty, consistent with Beckford-Yanes (2005), is much more narrowly defined than that for part-time faculty; according to Langenberg (1998), an adjunct faculty member has a full-time position outside of the institution for which they teach and are generally hired to supplement the coursework the college is able to offer with its regular, full-time faculty.

Another area of tension within the literature focuses on the quality of instruction provided by part-time faculty when compared to their full-time counterparts as well as part-timers’ commitment to the institutions that they serve. Mostly quantitative in nature, these studies look at the relationship between instructor type and student performance in the classroom as well as retention. Landrum (2009) (cited in Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010) found no significant difference between part-time and full-time faculty in terms of grading, instructional abilities, or student evaluations. Additionally, Ronco and Cahill (2004) (cited in Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010) found that instructor type had little impact on student retention and that retention and student performance had much more to do with the student’s background and experiences in education. Langenberg (1998) makes an argument that there is little to suggest that there are serious problems with part-time faculty instruction or contributions to their institution; he notes

that part-time faculty numbers have been increasing but asks, "...where is the evidence that this has been demonstrably bad for students" (p. 43)?

On the other side of the argument are those authors who suggest that students' exposure to part-time faculty does negatively impact their success in the classroom as well as the likelihood that they will remain in school (Christensen, 2008; Kezar & Maxey, 2014; Louziotis, 2001; and Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). While recognizing that studies on the effectiveness of adjunct faculty in the classroom have been mixed, Louziotis (2001) suggests that at the very least the quality of instruction delivered by part-time faculty varies to a greater degree than that of full-time faculty. Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010) cite a study by Eagan and Jaeger (2008) that indicate community college student transfer rates to 4-year institutions decreased as the number of classes taught by part-timers increased. Related to transfer concerns, Jaeger and Eagan (2009) found in a study of the California community college system that every 10 percent increase in student exposure to part-time faculty negatively impacted associate degree completion by 1 percent. Related more specifically to academic quality, Christensen (2008) cites a study by Brewster (2000) which raises concerns over part-time faculty commitments to their full-time work or other teaching assignments and how these commitments lead part-time faculty to rely on short-cuts (multiple-choice tests, fewer essay exams) in teaching their students. Additionally, Brewster (2000) notes, "If adjuncts wish to be rehired, they may be tempted to award high grades or make the course less demanding to achieve better evaluations from their students" (cited in Christensen, 2008, p. 34). Kezar and Maxey (2014) note that the working conditions of contingent faculty in general negatively impact students as last minute hiring prevents them from adequately preparing for class and the lack of access to professional development limit their use of innovative instructional techniques. Despite their concerns over the impact that part-time

faculty can have on student success, most of these authors (Christensen, 2008; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; and Louziotis, 2001) suggest that colleges could improve this situation through efforts to engage part-time faculty and integrate them into the institution as well as offer more training and development activities.

Adjunct faculty development programs

Development programs for adjunct community college faculty can play a very large role in supporting this important institutional resource and have the potential to more fully integrate part-time faculty into the complex framework of their colleges. Unfortunately, due to tight budgets, administration apathy, and a general lack of concern, much of this potential goes unrealized. Wallin (2004) states, “It is clear that many adjunct faculty are committed both to their discipline and to their college. It is sometimes less clear that colleges are committed to adjunct faculty. Opportunities for professional development are limited for adjunct faculty, particularly in times of tight budgets” (p. 383). If made a priority and structured properly, adjunct faculty development programs offer significant benefits to both part-time instructors and the community colleges for which they work. Marits (1996) lists three primary benefits that adjunct faculty derive from well-structured faculty development programs: 1) by participating they set a positive example for their students of the importance of life-long learning; 2) they have the opportunity to discover new areas and educational technology while developing their skill set; and 3) they receive intrinsic rewards for their work. For the college, however, the benefits are even more noteworthy; they include:

- An efficient system for distributing developmental resources
- An organized plan for assessing faculty growth and development
- A “blueprint” for individual adjunct faculty development
- Better integration of adjunct faculty into the institution and conformance of their work to institutional philosophy and goals
- A selling point for attracting new adjunct faculty (Marits, 1996, p. 224).

Wallin (2004) notes that by building strong adjunct faculty development programs, community colleges invest in the future potential of individual faculty members and demonstrate their importance in helping the community college fulfill its mission. Perhaps more importantly, though, these programs ultimately benefit the student whom the college serves.

Professional development includes many activities designed to improve an instructor's teaching methods, disciplinary knowledge base, understanding of technology, personal growth, and overall professional growth. Marits (1996) lists a number of development activities that would benefit adjunct instructors including peer visits, coaching instructor manuals, evaluation and recognition systems, instructional technology training, orientation programs, professional development forums, workshops, career development, shared media, participation in full-time faculty activities, an accessible communications network and presentation forums. In his definition Marits (1996) limits professional development, however, to only those "...formal or informal activities that ultimately help faculty to improve instructional quality" (p. 221). He does note, though, that other authors define professional development in much broader term to include personal health and development and career guidance. This perspective is consistent with Murray's (2002a) three development foci – professional, personal, and organizational – noted earlier.

Any faculty development efforts undertaken by community college administrators should address the specific and unique needs of their adjunct faculty population while recognizing that these needs can vary from institution to institution and among individual faculty members. Some common themes related to adjunct faculty needs have emerged in the literature, and chief amongst these is the need to more fully integrate part-time faculty into the institutions that they serve (Johnson & Stevens, 2008; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Wallin, 2004; and

Christensen, 2008). In their study of a single, private institution in the Midwest, Johnson and Stevens' (2008) most significant finding was adjunct faculty really want to feel connected to their instructional department and to the institution itself. They go on to note, "It was discovered that the adjuncts felt limited and isolated in regard to their own professional development" (p. 27). This sense of isolation appears as a common theme throughout the literature. Part-time faculty are often only on campus during class time and have limited interaction with colleagues and administration. Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010) expand the discussion on part-time faculty needs by identifying three primary themes which they label – "*receiving outreach, navigating challenges, and developing skills*" (p. 144). "Receiving outreach" centered on communication issues between the institution and the adjunct faculty and also included an interest in receiving mentoring from full-time faculty members. "Navigating challenges" focused on adjuncts' need for assistance in helping them engage their students and facilitate learning, their need to manage work-life concerns, and their need to develop connections with their colleagues. "Developing skills" centered on their need to improve teaching skills including improving the use of technology in the classroom, developing and sharing teaching strategies, and developing course plans.

Given their feelings of isolation and their perceived desire to develop more and deeper connections to their colleges, any successful adjunct faculty development program should have as one of its primary outcomes an effort to more fully integrate these faculty members into the institutions they serve (Green, 2007). These efforts can potentially significantly improve adjuncts' satisfaction with their roles and their commitment to their colleges. Administrators should understand that adjunct faculty teach for a number of different reasons and need to be cognizant of the ways to integrate them into the college's culture (Wallin, 2007). Gappa and

Leslie (1993) note that, “Even where there is universal dissatisfaction with pay, benefits, and other tangible support, part-timers who feel as if they are part of a collaborative faculty seem to have more positive feelings about their work and about their involvement with the institution” (p. 186). Community colleges should begin integrating adjunct faculty into their institutions early in the hiring process. Wallin (2004) suggests that each new hire should be given a contract which specifies pay, length of employment, and minimum enrollment requirements for the courses assigned to them, and they should be given a handbook that should include all relevant policies, procedures, and forms that they may need. Both Wallin (2004) and Green (2007) agree that community colleges should make a stronger effort to orient their new faculty. These orientation sessions should cover the mission and values of the institution, student growth, and the institution’s relationship with the local community (Green, 2007). Green (2007) stresses that any development program for adjunct faculty should begin with a clear focus on institutional mission and goals, and administrators should ensure that adjunct faculty “...understand the goals and realize that they are instruments in bringing the goals to fruition” (p. 35). Wallin (2004) also suggests that a mentoring program with full-time faculty serving as mentors to new, adjunct faculty can serve as a positive tool in providing institutional support. She suggests that faculty mentors should be carefully selected role models with a commitment to teaching and to their institution and that they should be properly compensated for this role.

Green (2007) lists several areas that he finds critical for any successful adjunct faculty development program. They include: helping part-time faculty understand the importance of establishing early in their classes a “foundation for student success” (p. 36) through the messages that they convey to students; providing faculty with expectations regarding contact with students; teaching faculty cooperative learning strategies; helping faculty with student outcomes

assessment and feedback; bringing “relevance” into their classroom; helping adjunct faculty examine their instructional pace and understand the importance of appropriate pace in teaching success; helping them better engage their students; monitoring and visiting the classroom to check for appropriate levels of enthusiasm; training faculty to use technology to enhance teaching; and finally, visiting classrooms on multiple occasions to get a more thorough understanding of classroom interaction.

While there has been some attention paid to adjunct faculty needs and calls by some scholars for programs addressing these needs (Christensen, 2008; Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; and Louziotis, 2001; Marits, 1996; Wallin, 2004), only a handful of studies have been conducted on community colleges which have actually implemented development programs specifically designed to support their adjunct and part-time faculty. Burnstad (2002) profiled the part-time faculty development program at Johnson County Community College (JCCC) in Kansas. The author notes, “The focus of JCCC’s efforts has been to integrate full-and part-time faculty into a teaching whole (293 full-time and 646 part-time) to serve students in our learning college” (p. 17). Central to the college’s part-time faculty development efforts is an individual development plan (IDP) that all instructors are required to complete in order to participate in development programs. With the IDP, the instructor identifies developmental needs and strengths and builds a one to two year and a three to five year plan. Also, upon recommendation of their assistant dean, part-time faculty members are invited to participate in the college’s Adjunct Certification Training (ACT) program and are awarded a certificate and pay increase upon completion (Burnstad, 2002). Another study by Lyons and Kysilka (2000) profiles the implementation of a five-part, comprehensive development plan for the college’s adjunct faculty. The program includes an orientation for new adjuncts held just

prior to their first class, an “Instructor Effectiveness Training” course required for each new adjunct instructor, a mentoring program that pairs new adjunct faculty with a full-time faculty mentor, monthly “Brown Bag Luncheons” which bring together full and part-time faculty and include a short developmental activity, and a materials resource center. Lyons and Kysilka (2000) indicate that the programs have been well received by both adjunct faculty participants and the college administrators.

Conclusion

Given the growing importance that adjunct faculty play in American community colleges, it is imperative that administrators, full-time faculty, and interested community members look for ways to more fully integrate this very valuable resource into the fabric of the institution. While the debate may continue over whether or not the growing number of class sections taught by adjunct faculty represents a positive or negative for the college and for student learning, it is clear that with tightening budgets and administrators’ needs for scheduling flexibility, community colleges likely will not reduce their adjunct faculty ranks anytime soon. Developing comprehensive, adjunct faculty development programs can help to improve overall instructional effectiveness, improve student learning, and more fully integrate adjunct faculty into the community college community.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

I have chosen to complete a case-study analysis of the adjunct faculty development program at an urban community college in the southeastern United States. The study will be limited to one single site and will not attempt to compare part-time or adjunct faculty development programs used by other community colleges. Recognizing that the issue of adjunct faculty development in community colleges has received limited attention in the literature despite the growing importance and increased use of contingent faculty not only in the community colleges but throughout all levels of higher education, I felt that it was important to take a complete and comprehensive examination of one of the few programs that have dedicated training and development programs for their adjunct faculty in order to fully understand the factors that made it so successful from the perspective of the faculty themselves. I believe that the lessons learned from this study will serve to inform future adjunct faculty training and development practice in other community colleges throughout the country. I begin with a discussion of why I chose to use the case study methodology to exam this issue, and I provide an overview of the case study site; next I discuss the conceptual framework that will guide my data collection and analysis. Then I offer a detailed description of the components of the case providing an overview of the data sources that I will include in my analysis. I will follow this with my data analysis process; and finally I detail the data validation strategy that I intend to employ. I have changed the name of the institution, its administrators, and participating faculty in order to maintain their confidentiality.

Background

Metro Community College (MCC) is a comprehensive community college with six full-service campuses located throughout a single county in the southeastern United States. Consistent with the college's mission of meeting the needs of students, local communities, and their business partners, MCC offers associate degree programs, diploma and certificate programs, and additional community and business services through their Corporate and Continuing Education division (Metro Community College, 2010). According to MCC website (2010), the college was founded in 1963 following the merger of two existing institutions, and it has since grown to become the largest community college in its state with more than 100 degree and certificate programs and serving more than 70,000 people in the region (Metro Community College, 2010).

MCC offers one of the few comprehensive training and development programs specifically designed for adjunct faculty in the southeastern United States. The college's outreach efforts to this faculty group consist of an orientation prior to each semester, a Saturday workshop series, a part-time faculty website, classroom observations, a faculty self-assessment, and a certification program for part-time faculty (Johnson & Smith, 2009). These programs serve the college's large contingent of part-time and adjunct faculty members who, based on data from the most recent evaluated period (2008-2009) account for 78.7% of the total number of faculty on campus (Johnson & Smith, 2009). Institutional administrators have been tracking data on the program's effectiveness since the inception of the part-time faculty certification program during the summer of 2008 and have seen improvements both in terms of student performance well as in part-time faculty satisfaction and retention (Johnson & Smith, 2009). What they have lacked, though, has been a deeper, richer understanding of how their program has impacted part-

time faculty and their sentiments towards participating in development activities. This study will help to provide that deeper understanding through gathering and analyzing qualitative data.

Why case study?

I choose case study because it offers the ideal research methodology that will allow me to develop a complete and thorough understanding of a single adjunct faculty development program. Examining any individual component such as training methods, institutional needs, or faculty needs or reviewing training programs from a more global perspective would limit my understanding of any one program and the elements of that program that make it so successful. Robert Yin (2003) cites one of the strengths of case study methodology in noting, "...the case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events..." (p. 2). In order to truly understand how MCC's part-time faculty development program is able to produce such a positive impact on faculty and students, it was vital that I understand not only the parts of the case but how each relates to the whole. Merriam (2009) adds to this understanding of the nature of case study in noting three of its distinctive characteristics: (1) its particularism or focus on unique situations or occurrences; (2) its descriptive nature or allowance for thorough, "thick" descriptions of study subjects; and (3) its heuristic nature or ability to "illuminate the reader's understanding of the phenomenon under study" (p. 44). Stake's (1995) idea of "naturalistic generalization" builds on this final point by detailing how individual readers incorporating the assertions and descriptions provided by the researcher into their own existing knowledge of the phenomenon. "Naturalistic generalizations are conclusions arrived at through personal engagement in life's affairs or by vicarious experience so well constructed that the person feels as if it happened to themselves" (Stake,

1995, p. 85). He asserts that the researcher's accounts must, therefore be detailed enough to allow for these "vicarious" experiences.

Case study defined

Definitions of case study vary significantly among researchers with some labeling it as a methodology, an inquiry strategy, or a "comprehensive research strategy" while others, particularly Stake (2005), present it more as a choice of topic rather than a methodology in its own right (Creswell, 2007). Creswell (2007) offers perhaps the most comprehensive definition of case study, "Case study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system (a *case*) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving *multiple sources of information* (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case *description* and case-based themes" (p. 73).

One constant among most researchers on the topic, though, focuses on the bounded nature of the case itself (Merriam, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003; & Stake, 1995). For Merriam (2009) clearly defined boundaries represents the most important consideration in defining case study research, and this characteristic is what separates case study from other forms of qualitative research. Yin (2003) clearly outlines the intensive research process required for a comprehensive case analysis. For Yin (2003) the case must be considered within its context, and proper analysis requires the use of multiple sources of data whose results should be triangulated. Stake (1995) argues that the researcher should carefully select data sources to include in the study and that "the researcher should have a connoisseur's appetite for the best persons, places, and occasions" (p. 56); he also suggests that the researcher should rely on

multiple sources of data including document review, direct observation, and interviews for a complete picture of the case.

Another key concern in defining case study centers on when it is appropriate to use this methodology over other forms of inquiry. For Yin (2003), the type of question that the researcher wishes to address largely drives this consideration; of the five types of questions that he lists—“who,” “what,” “where,” “how,” and “why”—the latter two are more suited to case study inquiry “...because such questions deal with operational links needing to be traced over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence” (p. 6). Also, a researcher may choose to use a case study approach when he or she has limited control over events or when “variables are so embedded in the situation as to be impossible to identify ahead of time...” (Merriam, 2009, p. 45-46).

Finally, the nature of the case can be further defined by the intent or purpose of the analysis (Creswell, 2007). Stake (1995) outlines three types of case study inquiry: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. He asserts that a researcher would be using an intrinsic approach if he or she had a genuine interest in the case itself and not necessarily how it might inform us about a larger issue or other cases. The heart of this approach, Creswell (2007) notes is similar to a narrative research; however, case study data collection methods and analysis are maintained. On the other hand, a researcher’s approach would be instrumental if the intent is to understand other cases or a general issue. (Stake, 1995). Stake (1995) argues that the selection of an instrumental case should be based on the extent to which it can “maximize what we can learn...” (p. 4); however, the researcher must also take into account ease of access to the site and subjects as well as time constraints in making a site selection. Finally, a collective study is used when multiple instrumental cases are considered in a coordinated fashion (Stake, 1995). Given

the nature of my study, I believe that it would be best described as an instrumental case study as my intent is to understand the dynamics of a successful adjunct faculty development program and how lessons learned from this case might help inform other colleges' efforts.

Conceptual framework

My approach to this study, data collection, and analysis will be guided by the principles of social constructivism. Creswell (2009) notes that from this perspective, "Individuals develop subjective meanings of their experiences—meanings directed toward certain objects or things. These meanings are varied and multiple, leading the researcher to look for the complexity of views rather than narrowing meanings into a few categories or ideas" (p. 8). In contrast to positivist and postpositivist approaches, with social constructivism the researcher does not begin with a theory that he or she would then apply to a situation or study subject; instead, theory or understanding emerges inductively as the researcher interprets others' meanings and understanding of their world while recognizing that the cultural and social lens through which the researcher interprets this meaning affects his or her interpretation (Creswell, 2009). The ontological assumption made with the constructivist worldview is that reality is constructed or co-constructed between individuals (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), and with social constructivism more specifically, meaning is "formed through interaction with others (hence social constructivism) and through historical and cultural norms that operate in individuals' lives" (Creswell, 2009, p. 8). Also, the epistemological assumption associated with constructivism suggests that reality is transactional and subjective (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), so I will need to become closely involved with the participants in my study and minimize any distance between them and myself in order to develop a deeper and more complete understanding of the case. Creswell (2007) supports this perspective noting that the epistemological assumptions of

qualitative research in general require “researchers try to get as close as possible to the participants being studied. In practice qualitative researchers conduct their studies in the ‘field,’ where the participants live and work....” (p. 18).

Therefore, I enter the study with an open minded approach with the intention of co-discovering with the faculty and administrators with whom I will be working what factors make the program at the case site so effective and understanding from their stories how they have experienced the program. Additional theory may likely emerge through negotiated meanings between myself and study participants. I also have laid out a thorough explanation of my own perspective so that anyone reviewing this study will have a clear understanding of how my own position and experiences could influence my interpretation of the data that will come from this study.

Data collection

With my data collection plan, I want to ensure that I include as many potential data sources as feasible in order to develop a more complete picture of all facets of MCC’s adjunct faculty development program. Stake (1995) warns that selecting “...data sources can be left too much to chance. The people who happen to be there when we happen to be there are not likely to be the best sources of data” (p. 56). Developing a solid data collection plan represents one of the most important steps in the case study research process and if done haphazardly, the research might miss out on key data which could potentially lead him or her to incomplete or inaccurate conclusions. Ultimately, as Stake (1995) notes, the data collection plan should flow from the main research questions of the study. Merriam (2009) takes this a step further in arguing that the data collection plan should be guided by “...the researcher’s theoretical orientation, by the problem and purpose of the study, and by the sample selected...” (p. 86). For my study, I have

chosen to begin with a review of documents related to MCCs adjunct faculty development program. I will follow this with interviews of multiple faculty participants, program administrators, and select academic deans. Finally, I will conduct direct observations of pre-term adjunct faculty orientation sessions and the summer certification program.

Document review

During the initial stages of data collection, I will review all relevant documents and electronic materials related to adjunct faculty development and training at MCC. This will include a thorough examination of the college's website with particular attention paid to the part-time faculty tab which includes descriptions of the new part-time faculty orientations offered prior to the beginning of each semester, the part-time faculty certification programs and requirements for inclusion, and the monthly Saturday workshop series. I intend to review the new faculty handbook and related orientation materials including the new faculty "goodie bag," welcome message from the president, meeting agendas and schedules, as well as all program evaluation forms. I will review the classroom observation forms and materials used by administrators to review the performance of part-time faculty in the classroom paying particular attention to the differences in performance of faculty pre-certification and post-certification. I will also examine individual faculty syllabi pre and post-completion of the certification program along with assignments lists from select instructors. In addition, I will review the college's evaluations of the four certification programs held to date – 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; these include pre and post-program faculty self-assessments, follow-up faculty assessment given six months after completion of the program, student surveys, and the college's own reports of student success and retention rates pre and post-program.

Interviews

In addition to my direct observations of program activities, I plan to interview up to 20 different adjunct faculty members who have completed the certification program as well as 3 to 5 adjunct faculty who did not complete the program. Faculty interviews included in this case study will be limited to practitioner adjunct faculty who participated in the summer part-time faculty certification program during the most recent two offerings. The study will not include interviews with faculty who completed one of the first two sessions of the program and the large number of part-time and adjunct faculty who benefit from the many other development opportunities that the college offers but were not selected by their department heads to participate in the summer program.

I will conduct two separate phone interviews with each faculty member after securing written permission to include their comments in my study. The faculty will be drawn from two separate participant groups. The first 10 will come from the cohort after they complete the summer 2011 session and will speak to their early experiences using the material and techniques that they had just learned in the classroom. I will draw the other 10 faculty members from the cohort that completed the summer 2010 certification program; this group should be able to provide insight on how they had altered their teaching practices based on lessons learned from the program. Finally, I will interview 3 to 5 adjunct faculty who did not complete the certification program; these instructors should be able to speak to some of the challenges associated with the program and their reasons for not completing. The interviews should last between one and two hours, and I plan to tape record them; all participants will complete a written agreement to the taping and subsequent transcription of our conversations. I will set-up each interview using a semi-structured format consisting of a base series of questions that I will

ask of each participant; although, these questions should evolve as the interviews progress based on my ongoing analysis. From their responses, I intend to ask follow-up questions that will lead in different directions based on their individual experiences and interests. I will transcribe the interviews right after completion so that my analysis of each interview will inform my questioning strategy for subsequent interviews. I will also conduct two interviews apiece with one of the primary program administrators as well as a full-time faculty member who completed the part-time faculty certification program previously and now, in her current role, serves as a point person in organizing program efforts. I intend to structure these interviews along the same lines as the faculty-participant interviews and will use them to gain insight into the administration's perspective and priorities for adjunct faculty development. In addition, I will plan to interview up to 3 department heads to gain their input on the criteria used to select adjunct participants as well as their feedback on the effectiveness of the program. Finally, during the course of my interviews with the program administrators, I will ask for their input on any other administrators who are either involved in the operations of the program or who have been particularly supportive of the efforts of program administrators. Based on their input, I will interview up to 3 additional administrators, including the president of the college if appropriate, to gain their insight on MCC's adjunct faculty program.

Once the interviews are complete, I will ask those adjunct faculty who had agreed on their consent form to participate in a post-interview focus group and who had affirmed their willingness to participate in this focus group, to come together for a 1 ½ to 2 hour session to discuss their thoughts on my analysis of the program, any changes or amendments that they would like to make to my findings, and to share any additional experiences or insight related to their participation in the program since the time of their interviews.

Direct observations

In order to gain a more intimate understanding of the functioning of the program and faculty members' engagement with its related activities, I intend to spend a significant amount of time on campus directly observing faculty training and development activities. I will begin with an observation of the part-time faculty orientation prior to the Spring 2012 session. Participants will be made aware of my presence by program administrators prior to the session; however, I do not intend to interact with them during the session and will position myself near the front of the classroom to the side in order to see the reactions and expressions of participants while at the same time being able to clearly see the presenter and the material being presented. I will plan to videotape the presentation and will take exhaustive notes on participants' levels of engagement, their expressions and interest, and the interactive nature of the orientation program. Afterwards, I plan to speak with several participants and presenters to get their feedback on the session. Also, over the course of the summer, I will attend the three onsite sessions of the part-time faculty certification program. The first Saturday session consists of an overview of the Blackboard e-learning system, instructional methods used at MCC, and an overview of core competencies. The second session is held on a weekday evening and involves participant group meetings in which the part-time faculty members work on their Student Engagement Technique (SET) in preparation for their capstone presentations during the final session. The final Saturday session and provided an opportunity for the groups to present their capstone projects. Since the presentations run concurrently in separate rooms, I will only be able to observe one of the sessions.

Data analysis

In analyzing the data collected from these interviews, observations, and document review sessions, I will follow an emergent data analysis plan that will begin shortly after my initial faculty interviews. For Merriam (2009) the imperative to begin analysis concurrently with data collection represents one of the most important considerations for the researcher. Stake (1995) notes that, “There is no particular moment when data analysis begins. Analysis is a matter of giving meaning to first impressions as well as final compilations” (p. 71). I will strive to immediately begin searching for meaning in program documents, observation of sessions, and discussions with participants to build themes that will emerge over the course of data collection. Merriam (2009) advises the qualitative researcher to begin analysis by building categories, or themes, which develop from the initial review of the first transcript, field note, or document. After reviewing the transcript, the researcher then groups the codes into broader themes through the process of *axial* or *analytical* coding. Merriam (2009) advises that the researcher repeat this process for each transcript with prior reviews informing subsequent ones; the researcher merges data from the various sources into a “master list” representing a “classification system reflecting the recurring regularities or patterns in your study” (p. 180). Stake (1995) equates this search for patterns to the search for meaning labeling it “correspondence.” He notes that, “Often, the patterns will be known in advance, drawn from the research questions, serving as a template for the analysis. Sometimes, the patterns will emerge unexpectedly from the analysis” (p. 78).

With Stake (1995) and Merriam’s (2009) approach to data analysis informing my own analysis, I will use a modified version of Tesch’s (1990) approach (cited in Roberts, 2004) to guide my coding strategy. I will begin by reading through all program documents and transcripts from initial interviews that have been collected early on in the process to develop an

understanding of the whole noting some general thoughts and observations as I progress. Next, I will dig deeper into one of the more interesting interview transcripts to develop an understanding of the most significant experiences for this professor and will make note of them in my notebook and researcher's journal; I will repeat this process for two additional interview transcripts. I will then make a list of all topics as they emerge from my review of the transcripts; these will become my initial codes. I will go back to the data and, using the comment feature under the Review option in Microsoft Word, I will place these codes next to their corresponding text in the transcript documents. As I move through the transcripts new codes should began to emerge, so I will include them as well. As an additional step, I will copy the segments of text that I had earlier highlighted, placing them in a separate document under their corresponding code, and labeling the lines of text according to the participant and interview. I will then schedule and complete my remaining faculty interviews. I will have already completed the coding for the first few interviews before reviewing remaining documents and completing remaining observations and interviews, so I will have already established set of codes that I will be able to apply to the rest of the transcripts. Merriam (2009) notes that this process represents in many ways a "...subtle shift to a slightly deductive mode of thought..." and that, "By the time you reach saturation—the point at which you realize no new information, insights, or understandings are forthcoming—you will most likely be thinking in a more deductive rather than inductive mode" (p. 183). After placing the codes into the subsequent transcripts, again using the Review feature in Microsoft Word, I will pull the highlighted text out and place it in my separate coding document and label according to participant interview, document, or session observation. At this point, following Tesch (1990), I will reduce the number of descriptive categories that I had identified into related topics. Departing from Tesch's (1990) procedure, however, I do not

intend to alphabetize my final codes as I feel that this would disrupt the connections that will likely emerge as I develop my overall analysis.

In order to develop a richer, more complete picture of the type of information gained from each source, I will create a data matrix listing data sources (interviews, document reviews, and observations) along the top line of the matrix and information provided by each along the left-side column (e.g. program goals, instructional improvements, motivation to teach). In citing his own case study of a university's response to a campus gunman (Asmussen & Creswell, 1995), Creswell (2007) notes that they were able "...to convey through this matrix the depth and multiple forms of data collection, thus inferring the complexity of our case" (p. 132). With this as a starting point, I will then build a conceptually clustered matrix in order to demonstrate the core themes developed from my data analysis and their relationship to each other. Miles and Huberman (1994) argue that these data displays represent one of the key elements of the data analysis process in noting that, "At first they provide preliminary conclusions about what is happening in the case—and how—and suggest leads toward new data. Later, as fuller, more complete descriptions are in hand, these displays can supply the basic material for *explanations*—plausible reasons for why things are happening as they are" (p. 90). The conceptually clustered matrix is an ideal display when the researcher needs to group several research questions into a more manageable and more easily understood format (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Along the top row of the matrix I will list concepts related to my research questions (e.g. perceptions of program utility, program effectiveness, faculty motives) and along the vertical column I will list adjunct faculty in one row and program administrators in the other. This matrix display should allow me to better understand the relationship between research

questions and will provide a basis from which to compare and contrast administrators' and faculty input relative to each of the questions.

Validation

In order to make certain that the study meets standards of credibility and that it is perceived by others to be an accurate representation of the adjunct faculty development program at MCC, I will take steps to ensure validity and reliability. Merriam (2009) argues that the criteria for establishing validity and reliability are very different for qualitative and quantitative research noting that, "If, as in the case of qualitative research, understanding is the primary rationale for the investigation, the criteria for trusting the study are going to be different than if discovery of a law or testing a hypothesis is the study's objective" (p. 210). For Merriam (2009), internal validity centers on how well the study's results mirror reality. In qualitative research this is no easy task as reality is largely subjective, complex, and constantly evolving; it is not a "single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured as in quantitative research" (p. 213). Stake (1995) argues, though, that it is absolutely essential that qualitative researchers use discipline and follow established procedures in order to ensure the accuracy of their studies; he labels these procedures as triangulation. The researcher assumes a moral responsibility to accurately tell the actors' stories and to paint a clear picture of events to the reader. Stake (1995) notes that, "It is true that we deal with many complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists—yet we have ethical obligations to minimize misrepresentation and misunderstanding" (p. 108-109).

Triangulation represents the first of 6 strategies for establishing internal validity in qualitative studies identified by Merriam (2009). Relying on multiple forms of data is one of the more common forms of triangulation and the type that I will use in my study. I will compare and

cross-check data gained from interviews with faculty and administrators, multiple observations of orientations and certification program sessions, and review of program documents. Her second strategy, member checking, involves gathering feedback from some of the participants in the study on the researcher's findings. I will employ this technique for some of my more impactful faculty interviews and for my key administrator interviews to ensure that I accurately capture their true sentiments. In addition, the focus group that I plan to conduct following the completion of faculty interviews will serve as a form of member checking. Merriam's (2009) third strategy, *adequate engagement in data collection*, is useful "...when you are trying to get as close as possible to participants' understanding of a phenomenon" (p. 219) as possible. Her fourth strategy involves looking for data that will lead to other, alternative explanations; lack of such data would then lead to increased confidence in the author's initial explanation (cited in Merriam, 2009). *Reflexivity* represents the fifth strategy and involves the need for researchers to "...explain their biases dispositions, and assumptions regarding the research to be undertaken" (Merriam, 2009, p. 219). For this study, I clearly laid out my own perspective and biases in the *researcher's perspective* section of chapter one. Finally, Merriam (2009) notes that with the sixth strategy, *peer review*, "...there's a sense in which all graduate students have this process built into their thesis or dissertation committee, since each member of the committee reads and comments on the findings" (p. 220). Given that this research will be undertaken in fulfillment of my dissertation requirements, my study will have been reviewed on an ongoing and continuous basis by my committee members.

Institutional Review Board approval of study and protection of subjects

Following the successful defense of my study proposal, I immediately sought approval to proceed with the collection of data from both the institutional research office at Metro

Community College as well as the Institutional Review Board at Colorado State University. A letter of cooperation (sent via e-mail notification) was issued by MCC on October 10, 2011 and the study was approved by the Colorado State IRB on November 9, 2011. The study has subsequently been approved for continuing review in October 2012, October 2013, and October 2014. In order to protect the anonymity of those involved in the study, pseudonyms were assigned to the college under study, all satellite campus locations, all college personnel either interviewed directly or mentioned by study participants, all program facilitators, and all part-time faculty interviewed. Study participants were assured of this anonymity in the consent documents that they completed prior to participating in the study, and I made sure to reiterate both before and at times during the interviews that their identities would be protected.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Experiences with training and development

Metro Community College has one of the most extensive training and development programs of any community college in the country. They have a dedicated Professional Development department with a full time staff of 21 who, working with various faculty trainers and other college support services, serve the training and development needs of the full-time and part-time staff and faculty for all 6 MCC campuses (Metro Community College, 2014). With a student population of over 70,000 in various corporate and continuing education, workforce and college preparatory, vocational, and academic programs, the staff and faculty who support these programs come from a wide variety of backgrounds with an equally wide variety of training and development needs. The professional development department, therefore, has structured its program offerings with this diversity of need in mind and makes most of them available to all staff and faculty, including adjunct faculty. They also schedule sessions during regular business hours as well as evenings, weekends, and online to accommodate varying schedules. In addressing the nature of training topics and session times offered to all faculty, including adjuncts, Director of Faculty Training and Development Lisa Page noted:

I believe that they cover the gamut because with so many folks...we have, Beth King and I sent out an e-mail to 1730 part-time faculty, and we have everybody from fire protection technology to cytotechnology, mathematics, associate degrees in nursing, culinary arts, and other, I guess you'd call them general education or four-year track type stuff in the humanities. So people are coming from all different places, the adjuncts, so some people may be, an adjunct may have a regular full-time job at a university where they teach, and they just pick-up adjunct work here. So, whatever they want they have access to....well we have a part-time boot camp, but we have training that's specific to part-time faculty that occurs a few times a year....we try to offer a variety of times and days so that it is accessible to part-time faculty.

The practitioner faculty who completed interviews for this study came to Metro Community College from a variety of backgrounds as well with an equally varying degree of preparation for teaching at the college level. Some had significant prior teaching experience while for others their initial class at MCC represented their first experience as an instructor in a college classroom. Most had participated in few, if any, formal instructional training or development programs prior to coming to MCC; however, all of my interviewees brought with them some degree of workplace experience, educational study at the undergraduate or graduate level, or other experiences that helped to prepare them in some way to teach at the college level.

Table 4.1 provides an overview of participant characteristics.

Table 4.1

Study participant characteristics

Name	SCP session	Years adjunct teaching	Subject (s)	Professional area
Susan Andrews	2010	6	Information technology (IT)	Logistics manager, library Retail management
Jessica Bledson	2010	4	Graphic design	Graphic design
Jim Caldwell	2011	10	CCE computer training and other PD courses for faculty and staff	Engineering firm director
Betty Mills	2010	3	ESL	English proficiency test examiner Administrative support ESL middle school teacher ESL instructor intensive language programs
Beth Page	2011	8	Human resources	Human resources manger
Jeff Roberts	2011	20	Law	Corporate law and private legal practice
Gary Sanders	2010	10	Public speaking Introduction to communications	Professional writer Agribusiness manager

John Smith	2011	18	Medical terminology Phlebotomy	Medical technologist Corporate trainer Hospital management
Kelly Smith	2011	3	Physical therapy	Physical therapist
Andrea Williams	2010	8	Communications	Communications manager

All ten study participants have professional interests outside of higher education and in many cases work in the field in which they teach. Susan Andrews has worked for the past 10 to 12 years as a logistics manager for a large metropolitan library system. Prior to that, she had built a 20 year career in retail, mostly in retail bookstores. After returning to school to complete an information technology (IT) degree, she realized that she did not want to work full time in the IT field and decided to apply as a part-time instructor with MCC. She has been teaching part-time for MCC for 6 years and for another, proprietary online college for roughly the same period.

Jessica Bledson has built her career in the graphics design field and teaches the same subject part-time for MCC. She has been teaching at MCC for four years and for one of those years, she also taught as an adjunct for a nearby university. Additionally, while an instructor at MCC, she earned her English as a Second Language (ESL) certificate and now teaches ESL courses for MCC.

Jim Caldwell works full-time as a director for a local engineering firm and has been teaching courses in MCC's Continuing and Corporate Education division for the past 10 years. He was initially brought on to teach computer training courses to adjuncts; however, his teaching responsibilities have expanded since he completed MCC's Summer Certification Program, and he has since been asked to teach additional professional development courses for faculty and staff.

Betty Mills currently works as an English proficiency test examiner as well as an in an administrative support position for a local cable conglomerate in addition to her part-time teaching responsibilities for MCC. She had recently transitioned from a full-time position with a local middle school teaching ESL and had spent the past 10 years or so teaching with various intensive ESL programs. She has also taught ESL courses for MCC for the past three years.

Beth Page has worked professionally in corporate human resources (HR) positions for 25 years and has taught on an adjunct basis for the past 8 years. The bulk of her college teaching experience has been with a proprietary college; however, she has been teaching part-time courses with MCC for the past two years. For MCC, she teaches HR courses with the business and accounting department.

Jeff Roberts has practiced law in various capacities from private practice to corporate law for more than 20 years. For the majority of that time, he has also taught legal courses on a part-time basis for a few different four and 2-year colleges including one stint teaching courses for one of the college's prison outreach program. He has taught courses in MCC's paralegal program for the past two years.

Gary Sanders is a professional writer with one published work of fiction and another that he is currently writing. Prior to launching his most recent career as an author, he served as a high-level manager with a large corporation in the agribusiness field, and after taking an early retirement, he started his own marketing firm. For MCC, he has been teaching public speaking and introduction to communications on a part-time basis for the past 10 years.

John Smith has worked as a medical technologist for the bulk of his career with a large hospital system in the area. He served in various capacities with the hospital including a long stint as the director of the hospital's school of medical technology and then as a trainer with the

hospital's corporate training division after the medical technology program was moved out of the hospital. In addition, he has taught medical terminology and phlebotomy courses for MCC for the past 18 years.

Kelly Smith has spent the bulk of her career working as a practicing physical therapist, and for the past three years she has taught physical therapy courses for MCC on a part-time basis. She also teaches an adult neurological rehabilitation course for MCC. Unlike most of the study participants, Smith's non-teaching work schedule is flexible enough to allow her to teach day classes for the college.

Finally, Andrea Williams has spent the majority of her career in the communications field and currently works as a communications manager for an industrial manufacturer. Her initial college teaching experience came as a graduate assistant while working on her master's degree. Following the completion of her degree, she has been teaching on a part-time basis with a few different community colleges including MCC for the past 8 years. All of her teaching experience has been in the communications field.

I will begin my analysis of their experiences with training and development by first examining the training, educational, and work experience that they brought with them prior to their first teaching assignment at Metro Community College. I will next examine the opportunities for training and development that these adjunct faculty have had since arriving at MCC as well as their level of participation in these activities. Finally, I will take a look at the impact that MCC's training programs, not including the summer certification program, have had on their overall development.

Training and experience prior to MCC

Perhaps some of the more valuable preparations that all of the interviewees had prior to coming to MCC were the experiences gained through their various professional endeavors. Each faculty member cited work experiences that helped in the preparation to teach at MCC, and for most these experiences helped them to relate to the needs and concerns of the students they were serving. A few of the instructors spoke to the role that their diverse life and work experiences played in preparing them to meet these needs. In discussing the wide variety of jobs that she had over the years, Andrews noted how this experience helped to put her in a better positions to assist her students in their job search:

...it gives me a very broad perspective because I teach intro computers, and one of the things we focus in on is resumes. And so I can tell students I've filled out plenty of resumes, I've read plenty of resumes, I do a lot of hiring, and this is what you need to do. So we spend part of the class on that which is really good, because at a community college everybody's looking for a job.

Bledson too felt that her diverse professional background could serve her students' career needs but in more of an advisory capacity:

I got a lot of experience...in a lot of different environments which eventually makes for being a better teacher...being able to be empathetic in a variety to where the students might want to go instead of just influencing them to go the direction I went because that might have been my comfort zone. Instead I could bring them a very broad background.

While preparation for the world of work was certainly an important strength that many adjuncts possess, one instructor, Caldwell, noted how his diverse work and life experiences helped to prepare him for his instructional role:

...my niche is teaching effective presentation design, and that's actually what I teach the faculty back at MC. So, I'm teaching faculty how to better communicate their lectures through use or lack of use of visual aids. But I don't know if any of that really came directly as a result of the formal education. It's a lot of just life experiences I've managed to accrue in my short life and a lot of reading, a lot of trial and error, a lot of working in my day job on literally thousands of presentations.

Caldwell went on to describe how these experiences have helped him hone the communications skills which have been so vital in his development as an instructor:

I work with people across every country that we're in...working in person with people, I'm working with them just in online. There are some people I've only ever e-mailed with, and there are some people that I've met numerous times and worked with remotely. So just in us being an effective communicator as a business professional, that alone has been a big piece of learning how to communicate yourself well through different media whether it be written or verbal or both or data conferencing or whatever. And in the different ways that you communicate whether one person or a group setting, and how you deal with people on the executive level versus people that are your peers, and all that organizational behavior type study that happens on the job, I think has given me a very strong primer in how to reach and mentally reach my students, regardless of their backgrounds. And I'm just interested in a lot of different things. But I feel like I have some sort of light anecdote or something that I can relate to just about anybody, because I'll ask everybody to give their introduction, not just their professional stuff, but I'll ask them what's your favorite 80s T.V. show, or what's your favorite ice cream flavor. It's things like that that they would never know about each other, and then I can use that throughout the course to keep them engaged. So yeah, I think just in general having to do with the types of people I deal with, whether they be engineers or other corporate relation style people or the CEOs are actually all about (unintelligible) immense amount of experience.

The adjuncts were for the most part well into their careers before their first teaching assignment at MCC and thus brought with them a wealth of experience and knowledge earned outside of the classroom.

The diversity of professional backgrounds that these instructors brought with them to their adjunct roles certainly came through as a perceived strength, and many felt that their professional experiences helped ease the transition into the classroom. Management stood out as one of the more common professional backgrounds with four of the study participants, Andrews, Williams, Caldwell, and John Smith, all having served in management roles with their primary or "day job" as some called it. Bledson noted how her experience as a manager helped her to break down concepts for her students:

...one aspect of my training was that I've been a manager in my career. And so it's very...I think really good managers, and I don't think I count myself as a really good manager, but I'm an aspiring good manager. It's, not only that you're organized, but you can actually break information down, and that's the hardest part of teaching in my thinking. The core of my previous training is that I was a manager, and I had to actually break projects down for the people that I was working with and who were working for me and to be able to explain the project and then interact with that person when they brought me progress.

For Andrews, her retail management experience helped her deal with the diverse needs of her students:

The only training that I ever had really came from my retail background, because when I worked for Walden Books, I was selected as one of two people that would actually go into the store, terminate the staff, rehire, retrain, and start from the bottom up opening new stores. So I had the hands-on training ability on how to deal with people, multiple personalities, different backgrounds, difficulties, and I just applied that to the students.

This ability to work with diverse students and creatively address both their challenges and different learning styles and needs comes through with other instructors' backgrounds as well.

In addition to her managerial experience, Bledson saw her work as a camp counselor as part of her preparation to teach:

...along the way I've had various smaller kind of arenas of training like I was a camp counselor, so I was teaching the kids how to rock climb for a summer...or how to build a fire. There are lots of smaller opportunities that exist as a person is growing up to pass what they know along to other people, and so mine has not been formal. My training has been, I would say, more informal and more experiential.

For Mills, her experience as an ESL instructor prior to coming to MCC helped her lose some of her inhibitions so that she could work more fluidly in the classroom, show emotion, and take risks:

...it's a personality thing...you have to be able to keep peoples' attention, and...in ESL especially you have to be willing to look stupid (laughing). And in certain situations when you're dealing with, for example when you're dealing with (unintelligible) people...people who are proficiently low in English, and you're trying to, you're not doing any translating, and all you have might be a

couple of pictures, and you have to show all the emotions, and you have to show all the silliness with your own body...try to get them to understand what's going on.

Roberts noted his legal experience and not necessarily his legal training as having had the most significant impact on his readiness to teach:

...I am an attorney and my training, particularly my trial training, has significantly helped. I have tried dozens of jury trials, dozens of bench trials; so, I know how to stand in front of someone and engage them. So that goes a long way toward helping me engage students.... So it is not necessarily the legal education so much as the legal experience and the training on how to be a litigator.

Finally, Kelly Smith noted how her professional experiences in physical therapy helped her prepare to teach labs in her program at MCC; "...there is a lot of that that is practiced and just in the nature of my job. I am probably...half of it is probably teaching because we are constantly not in the classroom so much, but teaching patients, teachings families and things like that." For all of these instructors, their varied professional experiences served as a type of on-the-job training that provided them informal lessons which would ultimately serve them well in their college classrooms.

Perhaps some of the instructors' more directly relatable experiences came through their work as trainers, instructors, or developers in training programs. Sanders had an opportunity while in the Army to spend some time as an ROTC trainer, while Page and John Smith discussed the impact that their experiences as corporate trainers had on their preparations to teach at the collegiate level. Page noted how her training experience helped her to refine her interactive teaching style:

...if anything it was probably corporate training, doing presentations. I've always done the type of facilitator, if you will, not from a presentation perspective but interaction. So I think that has really helped me with teaching because I still...and that's why I like to teach. I don't like to stand up there and "whamp, whamp, whamp!" I like the interaction.

With no formal instructional training, these experiences as trainers helped to prepare them for developing and leading courses at MCC:

I guess I've always had a propensity for training. So from a Corporate America perspective, the most that you can expect to hear out of me regarding training is that I used to set-up the curriculum for what our training needs were at any given time. So as far as myself having professional training, no....I've always been kind of the person that wants to learn and I always ask why. Why do we do it this way? So that actually has helped me....but in answer to your question, I've actually had no formal training (Page, B. 1, lines 90-100).

For John Smith, he noted how his experience as a corporate trainer had the most significant impact on his development as an educator:

...so in addition to leadership training I did orientation, I taught computer class, I taught some process improvement, a number of things, but my primary emphasis was conflict management, transition to leadership. I was DVI certified as a trainer. So I had a lot of background, and I guess theoretically I grew the most in education during those 10 years.

And in further discussing his time in corporate training, he reiterated, "...like I say, my most interesting time and growth period was when I was in corporate education and training because I got to do a lot of things, be creative in how I want to teach things and so forth and so on."

While most of the study participants felt that their work experiences had to a large extent helped to prepare them for the college classroom, their participation in formal, education-related training and development programs was much more varied. Several of the participants – Andrews, Caldwell, Roberts, and Page – had no instructional training prior to coming to MCC. Caldwell saw his lack of educational training as a missed opportunity in his professional development; "I guess in a way I'm saying I feel as if I would have been more impacted by the formal education. With an economics degree, I did double major in economics and business administration, but that doesn't really have a lot of bearing on education specifically." For Andrews, her lack of formal training left her unprepared to deal with some of the challenges that

she faced with her first teaching assignment; "...I had a very diverse student population, the IT equipment was not very good, and I had never been instructed on how to teach."

A couple of the participants did speak to their experiences with in-service training in past positions prior to coming to MCC. John Smith had to take teaching certification courses as part of his medical program's accreditation requirements:

...as I began to take the role of program director in the school of medical technology, we were an accredited program through NAACLS, so to maintain those positions you had to periodically go through workshops that they were holding to get certified to teach certain things and maintain your credentials to have a school that was certified. So I did not go through any academic institution to get it but only through these workshops and things.

He did not, however, note whether these courses had much if any impact on his development as an instructor. Mills as well indicated that she had completed in-service training and development courses while teaching at ESL centers; however, she noted that her prior training had very little impact on her teaching ability; "...so it was sort of weird because really there's been very little training that I ever got, that I feel that I can sit there and say to you now this had a big effect on my teaching style."

While participation in formal, pre-service training programs by the study participants was minimal, several did take individual courses that helped prepare them for their first teaching assignment and some completed full, education-related degree programs. Caldwell noted at least some connection between the coursework that he completed in international business and communications and the presentation design courses that he teaches to faculty at MCC; "I did have to take international business and a few things like that that gave me insight into the way that people communicate....I took communication courses at part of the...marketing strategies. I took public speaking. Of course, that tied into one of the classes that I teach...." Sanders as well mentioned that a communication course that he completed in graduate school was the only

education related training course that he took; “I had one course in organizational communication consulting and other than that nothing on teaching methods.”

Four of the study participants, though, either had formal education training over the course over their university studies or had education training as graduate students. Mills noted that she completed a teacher education degree after an arm injury prevented her from completing a program in education for hearing impaired children. Two other participants, John Smith and Kelly Smith, completed master’s degrees in education. John Smith’s degree was in leadership with a focus on adult education; however, he did not speak to any impact that his formal education played in preparing him to teach. Kelly Smith’s master’s program, on the other hand, was specifically geared towards teaching at the collegiate level:

I have a master’s degree, and it was a degree that was only offered for a few years. It is a Master of Arts in College Teaching. It was actually kind of a joint degree between the School of Physical Therapy and the School of Education in Chapel Hill, and a lot of it was clinical education. There was some on work/curriculum stuff, but the emphasis of the Master’s program was on clinical teaching (intelligible) and things like that as far as being able to teach those types of courses.

As with John Smith, though, her formal education training appears to have had little impact on her preparations to teach at MCC. She noted:

I would have to say that at the time it may have prepared me, but that was probably 25 years ago. So that is a long stretch of time to speak between getting that and actually getting into the classroom and teaching. So, maybe a little bit in so far as the theory was there, but not a whole lot that I could probably say I was directly applying just because of the sheer amount of time that has passed.

Finally, Williams spoke to the opportunity that she had in graduate school as a teaching assistant (TA). She did note that she completed one course that she referred to as “your basic education 101 class” that had only a minimal impact on her development as an instructor; however, her

most significant instructional development work came through her experience in her TA program:

...the professor that I taught for, she did a really good job with all of us first year TAs. We met weekly, and for...2 hours or something we can just talk. There was no real set schedule what we were talking about, but it was just a place for us to come together every week....that's in my first year...most all of her TAs were first year TAs. It was a good group of like 8 of us that met together once a week, and she was there...kind of hashed out problems we had, questions we had, and we talked about next week's lesson because we were all on the same schedule and talked about ideas for what we could do for the week's lesson, and we had to grade it, then we looked at, we shared...it was a writing class and so we would bring examples from the previous week. "This is how I graded it. How would you have graded it?" It was just to make sure we were all grading on the same level. And that was just a really good, not only good for that particular moment for what I was doing, but also just learning in general about...there was sometimes...there's not a right or wrong answer. Sometimes there is a little bit of gray out there, or sometimes, yes, it is black or white. And so how do you figure out the difference between the two and all sorts of stuff like that. And then also learning to lean on your peers as you tutor was as valuable lesson as there was to learn; it's OK to ask for help.

Williams felt strongly that this experience as a TA put her in a much better position to teach at MCC than many of her adjunct colleagues who lacked a similar level of preparation:

I think it was great; I think it very much prepared me. Because I tell you what, I walk around, and I just teach at night obviously, and so I was running into the other adjuncts, and I see teachers sitting down reading out of the textbook and stuff, and I hear stories from my students, "Well my friend took this class and she said it was terrible, blah, blah, blah." And it's just because of the teacher they had. So I think I, I definitely got a little extra, a little help.

All of the participants, therefore, came to MCC with varying but significant levels of preparation to teach and so, while for some MCC represented their first opportunity to teach a class, none walked into their first class assignment as a complete novice. Most brought a certain level of confidence into the classroom; although, that did not necessarily mean that they did not face uncertainty or challenges coming in. Also, because they came to MCC with important but

different levels and types of preparation, their training and development needs from MCC also varied.

Training opportunities at MCC

After arriving at MCC, study participants' experiences with training and development have been quite different with each of them, of course, having at least participated in the summer certification program (SCP). Outside of the SCP, however, participants' participation in other MCC directed or sponsored support programs has been relatively minimal. Two of the adjunct faculty participants, though, did share very positive impressions of the overall level of support that MCC provided to part-time faculty in general. Williams noted that the support she received from MCC was much more involved than what she had experienced at a previous institution and put her in a better position to help her students:

So it was just kind of nice to know so that when a student asks you something you had at least a general idea of where the students with disabilities office was and just little things like that that before I didn't really know at the other school.

The other participant, Page, spoke very highly of the training opportunities that MCC offered to part-time faculty; "One of the things that I really like about MCC is the fact that they have ongoing classes. Just because you go to orientation doesn't mean that it's over. So it keeps going on." As with Williams, Page favorably compared her experiences with MCC training with that of her previous institution:

Well, it is encouraging because... started teaching at MCC shortly after I arrived here and it was a rude awakening just because of the demographics of the student population, but I've grown to really enjoy it. But having said that, having come from Western International University I think that MCC should be definitely commended on the job that they do with their faculty and the opportunities that they offer their faculty to enhance their teaching practices and methodologies as

well as the student engagement process or the opportunities that they have for students just across the board. It's amazing to me, just amazing.

Page noted as well how the variety of offerings that MCC made available to faculty meant that she could find a program that would meet whatever need she had at the time, and she appreciated the professional development department's efforts to offer them at times convenient to adjunct faculty:

It is quite impressive...for me even as an adjunct faculty it's the simplest of things; if I want to go out and take anything from student engagement...let's just say I want to take an Excel class and learn a formula; it's available. I'm always impressed with the level of learning opportunities that MCC has to offer, and like I said, I participated in a program for Bloom's taxonomy, and I participated in another program as well. So they just have so much to offer and too, when you're an adjunct faculty I think...one of the challenges is we work, I work Corporate America, I teach adjunct faculty, and then finding the time to take advantage of some of these other programs. Now MCC is kind enough to have Saturday morning programs so I will check those out occasionally.

Therefore, despite the relatively minimal participation in training programs beyond the SCP that professional development offered to part-time faculty, there was at least some awareness of these programs and the value that they brought to the part-time faculty population.

Impact of supervisor support

For the majority of adjunct faculty participants, though, the level of support that they received from their individual departments had much more of an impact on their experiences with training and development than any other factor. That departmental support, however, was a mixed bag with some department heads making an effort to include their adjunct faculty in meetings, training, and other support programs, while many others received little support from their departmental leadership. Two participants, Caldwell and Roberts mentioned meetings or training sessions that their departments held for their part-time faculty, but the impact even of

these efforts was limited. Caldwell spoke highly of his department's meeting but indicated that it was the first meeting that they had had in the 10 or more years that he had taught for MCC:

...we've recently had a new director on our side, the computer training side of CCE, and they have not, they're folks that are my colleagues that have been teaching with computer training for like 10 or 12 years, and we have the first CCE computer training department meeting that they had had in 10 years. So, it's not necessarily training per se, but it is a department meeting that we're talking about. Here's how we want to do things in this group, do we have (unintelligible). But there's a very collaborative environment where we did talk about how to do things, but it was, it was clearly more than just a department meeting; it was a chance for us to all get together and talk about the direction of the department moving forward.

For Roberts, his department brought their adjunct faculty together annually for a meeting and training session; however, he noted that topical coverage was limited to procedural, student, and faculty support issues and did not address faculty instructional improvement:

Every year part time instructors in the paralegal program are asked to come to an orientation. So the word is used but it's really more of an administrative meeting. This is how you do your attendance, because it's online attendance...this is how you get your parking permit? So it is kind of administrative and has nothing to do with how to teach class. And that was it!

Another participant, Bledson, while not specifically addressing the impact of the meetings, did indicate that her supervisor conducted much more regular department meetings; "...he calls regular meetings a couple of times a semester; he'll pull all the instructors together and just talk about the direction of the department."

The importance of a supportive supervisor to their adjunct faculty experience thus emerges as one key sub-theme that did come through in my discussions with study participants, and several did speak highly of the impact that their supervisors had had on their transition to teaching. Bledson, Caldwell, Sanders, and Williams all noted receiving helpful advice, training, and instructional support from their respective supervisors. In discussing the support that she received from her supervisor, Bledson noted:

...it's ongoing so that we have a time to touch and he's always available. I find his file is so accessible, and I find that if I'm having a problem, I can either talk with him by phone or I can just go into his office and chat with him. And he'll either role play with me or sometimes we have a student in a meeting. So it'll be my supervisor and I and a student if the student's having a problem of some sort.

Andrews also noted the open door policy that her supervisor offered; "I got really lucky; Ben Jones was at Metro for 45 years, so he was a great resource for me. I could walk into his office, tell him what I was doing, what was going on, and he would give me great solutions."

A couple of the study participants spoke to the positive impact of the observation and evaluation process that they went through during their early teaching period at MCC. Williams indicated that she was observed at least once a year or once every other semester by her department head and that the feedback that she received was both specific and constructive in nature:

It's constructive I'd say, because even if they say her visuals were good, even if that was a straight-up positive comment, they'll still say, or at least I got why it was positive. There was, the visual it's good because they helped keep students interested, or whatever the case may be. It was not just good, good, good, good, good. It was the why behind the good.

Sanders also noted that he received an observation from his department head at least once a year and that the feedback did help to inform his classroom practice. His initial classroom review conducted by his supervisor after his first semester teaching had a particularly powerful impact on his early development as an instructor:

...it was after the first semester I think, with the division head Scott Bauer. And of course they had the student feedback thing, and he was extraordinarily helpful. And he would just come on over, and we talked about the issues I was having trying to evolve into this college environment, and he was quite helpful.

A couple of the participants also spoke to their supervisors' supportive attitude towards their training and development and the impact that it had on them as well as their interest and ultimately success in MCC's training programs. Caldwell noted the support that he received

from his supervisor while going through the summer certification program; "...my faculty supervisor, Bill Smith, was another just tremendous asset and walked me through the process."

Also, in addressing the factors that led her to participate in the SCP, Bledson mentioned:

...I'd say above and beyond that it's my supervisor. I just felt like he could see that I'd stick around. I had, I think I'd been teaching a couple of years by then. He knew that I would benefit directly from training because I hadn't been formally trained. And, I think that also since my supervisor he, he sensed that it was a chance for community of some sort in a way that, like you were saying earlier, that adjuncts typically don't. We don't feel that community because we kind of come and go in the night so to speak, and we're not bound by...we don't have the benefits and we don't have the ties to the college that the full time staff do, and that was just something he could offer me that would speak to that connection.

Bledson in general spoke very highly of her supervisor and his position in support of faculty innovation and growth.

While several participants did speak highly of the support received from their supervisors, others, including some who lauded their supervisors for their support in some instances, were critical of the level of assistance they received, especially early on in their time as instructors, from departmental leadership. In discussing her first teaching assignment at MCC, Andrews admitted to how unprepared she felt; however, she lamented, "I was just told you have the knowledge, give it to the students. Here's your tools and the guy literally walked away." This sense of "being on your own" due to supervisors' lack of involvement was shared by Mills. She noted that she barely had any communication with her supervisor and didn't even meet her for two years:

I didn't meet my actual supervisor for two years, and I was hired over the phone; I was seen based on a recommendation. I turned in my what the meflicky, your student evaluation of your course, because they were good, because I showed up for work, and I did all the paperwork that needed to be done, she just kept offering me classes. It was two years before I ever saw my supervisor I hate to say. We e-mailed (laughing)... and we talked on the phone one time, but I never saw her. In two years...and that was the only time I ever saw her and that was a year ago.

And so basically, because I was hired on such short notice, there was not an orientation available before I actually had to start. So and then basically the person who I took the class over from gave me the notebook from her orientation and I ran with it.

In many ways the lack of support received by the adjuncts participating in this study was most evident in the limited amount of materials support that they received. Sanders, Andrews, and Roberts all noted that a sample syllabus was the only course material that they received prior to their first teaching assignment. For Roberts, though, this didn't seem to present too large of an issue, and he even expressed an appreciation for its value as a course guide:

No, there is no handbook, but I was given a sample syllabus. I get one every semester if I am teaching a new course; for example, I will get copy of a sample syllabus that somebody used in the past. Of course, I edit it extensively....it gives me a nice start, but candidly I would prefer to give out my own syllabus and select my own textbook....but those things don't happen. But there is certainly nothing wrong with not reinventing the wheel, and it is always helpful to get a copy of a syllabus that someone else has used successfully. Certainly as a template or a guide that is all I use it for.

Andrews mentioned that she was only given the syllabus for her course at the very last minute, but since she was expected to follow a standard plan for the course and did not have to develop her own content, this did not seem to be much of a concern for her either:

I got a syllabus pretty much the day I walked into the class. The classrooms at Metro are set-up for me because most CIS110 instructors don't have time to do the set-up, and it's pretty much the same every term...things update, things change, but the syllabus is already there. I just have to import it, and I make final changes based on dates, breaks, and things like that. And it's a very generic syllabus.

Sanders noted that his participation in the SCP represented the first time that he had received any training, assistance, or materials support other than the syllabus since he began teaching with MCC; "They gave me a sample syllabus, and of course told me if I needed any help to certainly ask, which I did on several occasions, but that was about it. I mean we had no formal classroom training." For Mills, she experienced even greater challenges with a lack of materials and

technical support. When asked if she had received a handbook, syllabus, or anything else from her department, she lamented:

Oh no... I don't even have, I still to this day don't even have a sit-down station as we call it at MCC. There is no... well, they call it a sit-down station, and it's something different departments will give you. You will have a room with a computer in it and part-time faculty are able to use it. And it's not exactly an office place to go. I've never gotten one of those or even been told where one is. I can just use the computer in my classroom. I print off my stuff at my own house if I need a printer, and then I make certain copies at the campus. But no, and it's funny because if you were to look me up on the directory, I have a phone number apparently. I don't know how anyone could ever call me. So I don't know when I would get access to that phone and that extension, but it's sort of always been funny to me that there's not actually a sit-down place.

Participants' experience with training and support at the department level varied considerably with some having regular interactions with their departmental leaders and other faculty, while others rarely if ever even met with their supervisors. Another example of the support or lack of support received comes through in the limited materials and instructional support that some received from their departments. One of the keys to their experience, though, certainly does appear to be the level of engagement shown by their supervisors and other departmental leaders.

Training access issues

Another concern that emerged from my discussions with the adjunct faculty participants centered on their lack of access to the various training and development opportunities offered by MCC due to timing issues, time constraints, or time conflicts with other obligations. For a couple, though, they had simply not made training a priority. Sanders admitted, "...you always have time to do the things you really want to do. So I'm just, suffice it to say, that I have not taken the time. That's as fair as I can be with you." For Andrews, in addressing the reason why she hadn't participated in a new faculty orientation, she noted that since they were being offered

while she was scheduled to be in class, she made her students a priority over attending orientation:

...what happened was I got hired at the Spear campus and basically just went in and taught. And then the next time I went to Ravinia at that same time it was a Saturday morning class, and they said oh we're having this orientation Saturday morning. And I said, weighing my options, the students were more important than my orientation; you're going to have to find another time to do it. So, they never did find a real good time.

Andrews, Bledson, Sanders, and Kelly Smith all cited time constraints or additional commitments as factors limiting their participation in MCC training programs and development opportunities. Sanders expressed an interest in becoming more involved with the college and participating in more development activities, but felt that he shouldn't do so until he had more time to commit to them:

Quite frankly I have been, they have asked...up until the last year and a half I have been so busy with my other business that I've had to say no. OK, but they've certainly asked. I've been asked to be on the senate, and I just...well...it's kind of like belonging to the Kiwanis Club. You go belong to the Kiwanis Club and you can't do anything with them. You haven't made new friends; you've made new enemies, OK. If you can't put in the time, you don't do it.

Bledson also noted that her lack of participation in training activities was not due to a lack of interest but stemmed more from time considerations:

...that's not due to lack of interest. I haven't had the extra time to put into it. But I'm aware that they're out there....I haven't had the extra time. And I guess if I look at something and I think ahh I wish I could go to that sometimes, the time's not convenient. So it's a mix.

For Kelly Smith, the convenience of MCC's training programs was not a concern, but time commitments were; "I'm not sure it is so much of a convenience time. I think it is just a time (laughing) as far as the extra time because of my work in the clinic as well as I really probably do not have enough extra time to do additional things." Finally, Andrews noted that she does

involve herself with the college when she can but that her time commitments prevent her from participating in more development opportunities:

...it just depends on time factors and limitations ...am I aware of different things? I know they're always doing different things; there are tons of e-mails that I get all the time. I primarily try to stick with the campus that I'm working with and try to support them because my time is very limited. So I've volunteered; I've helped out at the tables introducing new students, helping them find their classrooms, things of that nature, but not designing a class.

For some study participants, the timing of the training opportunities themselves, and in particular the orientation programs, was problematic. Andrews and Williams both noted an awareness of the part-time faculty orientation sessions, but the sessions conflicted with other commitments. For Andrews, the sessions coincided with the times that her class was scheduled, and Williams noted that the sessions conflicted with her work schedule. "There was no formal orientation that I attended; although, they did offer one. I just couldn't attend because it was during the working hour days, during the daytime." Williams further lamented that she was unable to access other training programs because they were scheduled during the work day:

...they do host...I get e-mails inviting me to all sorts of training sessions, informational sessions. They all tend to be during the working day, and so I can never get to them. So there are opportunities. I'm just not able to take advantage of most of them.

For Caldwell, his concerns regarding the timing of the orientation centered not on conflicts with other commitments, he was able to attend an orientation session, but on the timing of the orientation relative to his first scheduled teaching assignment:

...there was a part-time faculty orientation, and I'm sure there's a follow-up question about how useful that was...it was not very useful at all. Yeah I'm not, and that's not a comment on the training itself, because I think the training itself would probably be fine for some people, particularly if you're on the curriculum side you can get that training and use it immediately. My last class wasn't for like 4 months; that's a long time. Yeah I got brought on board, maybe even 2 months, whatever the case was, it wasn't something I could use immediately. I think for

people on the corporate, continuing ed side this just was not very helpful at all. I mean I've lost almost all that information.

I will dive deeper into the study participants' perceived utility of the part-time faculty orientation sessions later in this section, but the timing of training sessions did emerge as an issue for some of the study participants. This included the timing of the sessions as well which often conflicted with other work and teaching commitments that the practitioners had as well as an overall perceived lack of additional time that many felt they had to dedicate to training and development opportunities and new, part-time faculty orientation.

Training awareness issues

In addition to participant concerns over the timing of part-time faculty training programs, there seemed to be a lack of awareness of the available training resources, both online and onsite, for some of them. These faculty had access to a huge catalog of online resources which included a handbook, instructional guides, sample syllabi, and other instructional support programs including all modules of the *Getting Results* program. Getting Results is a program developed by the League for Innovation in the Community College designed to assist community college faculty with improving classroom practice (Getting Results, 2006). Professional development leaders modified the *Getting Results* program for use in the summer certification program. Also, through MCC's Learner Web faculty portal, part-time faculty had access to hundreds of short, web-based training course (Metro Community College, 2014). Additionally, professional development offered programs that were specifically geared towards adjunct faculty (most notably the summer certification program) and made full-time faculty training programs available to them as well. Associate Dean of Professional Development, Barbara Knight asserted that in recognizing adjuncts as a valuable resource to MCC, college leaders wanted to

insure that they had access to a wide range of training options to meet their needs and ultimately better serve the mission of the college:

...so in the part-time faculty when we look at the numbers that we hire and where we hire and you have a huge mix as you heard when they introduced themselves, but in the AAS degrees where they're hiring part-time faculty out of business and industry related positions...machining, the air conditioning/heating guy, the automotive area, all of those, those are folks who have significant knowledge and skills, practical to the workplace and very little understanding and in some cases interest in what are the, how do I teach this, what are the educational underpinnings of this? And so the college I think recognized that we rely heavily on part-time faculty. We have this whole focus on student success and targeted workplace, and so these faculty really bring a knowledge and skill set that can benefit us and the students, but we haven't given, we need to give them the tools to make them more effective in the classroom. And I think that the willingness of the administration to say this is a valuable resource and we need to provide training, or we need to provide them with faculty development opportunities has been one of the underpinnings of that. We, not just this program in which they're getting paid to participate in this program, but in any of the professional development things that we do for faculty, part-time faculty are invited and are welcome to come and encouraged to come if they have the time, energy, interest, whatever. So we've never divided that or closed that door.

Awareness, though, did vary greatly from participant to participant depending on how actively engaged their department leadership was in forwarding notice of these training opportunities to them and how closely they paid attention to communications from their leadership and professional development.

Despite the large number of training resources included in the college's part-time faculty website, a few of the study participants did not know that it even existed. When asked about their awareness of online training materials and programs, Bledson noted, "No but again, it's quite possible (laughing) they could send e-mails out, and I have not noticed them," and Roberts added, "I am not even aware of it now....I did not know there was a part-time faculty website....Do you know where it is?" During our discussion, Roberts was online reviewing the part-time website and expressed surprise at the resources that were available there; "I had no

idea. I had no idea....there is a handbook....it is not funny. I had no idea that this existed! So I will save this to my favorites.” Three other adjuncts, Andrews, Sanders and Williams, did indicate an awareness of MCC online faculty resources, but they appeared to have only a limited appreciation of what was available to them. Andrews quipped, “Yeah, there were some online resources available, and I don’t remember if I took advantage of any of them or not. Because now everything is just like a blur.” While for Williams, she appeared to express a lack of interest in using the online resources. When pressed about any encouragement that she had received to use the part-time faculty website, she stated, “Uh, no I guess they think probably because I was grandfathered in (laughing). You know what I mean? (laughing)....So, I haven’t even looked at it!” Given the clear value that the part-time faculty website can offer to MCC’s adjuncts, there appears to be a real opportunity to improve adjunct awareness of the site.

Adjunct faculty awareness of the professional development department’s training programs also varied a great deal among part-timers. Mills and Roberts both noted a limited awareness of available part-time training offerings which they appeared to attribute to a lack of communication from their supervisors. In discussing the training notices from his supervisor, Roberts mentioned:

...I get the emails if you want to do this... for example she just sent another email about a couple of weeks ago if you are interested in enrolling in the summer program for 2012....but I do not know if there are other things that I am not aware of...I do not get a lot of correspondence from her.

For Roberts, the dearth of communication from departmental leadership represented a significant concern:

I mean candidly there is nothing and again how best to exemplify that concern then by admitting to you that I had no idea there was even a part-time faculty website. I mean that is unacceptable; that’s silly. Who knows, maybe someone mentioned it to me the very first day I started, but honestly I do not ever recall seeing it. Again, I would have added it to my favorites if I had been aware of it.

Mills also noted a limited awareness of the college's training opportunities; however, for her this increased significantly following a change in her department's leadership. When asked if she had been aware of other training opportunities provided by MCC, she responded:

Not originally, no, not originally. I think we changed, they changed some leadership in our department, and then the newer person ended up sending out the e-mails that professional development would send out to full-time staff, and that person made sure the part-time staff got it. So eventually I did....MCC, I don't feel that they always send out the Communicator, which is what they call their electronic newsletter. So once they started sending that out electronically there tends to be opportunities listed in that. But not the first 6 months I would say.

A few of the participants, Bledson, Page, Andrews, and Kelly Smith, did indicate that they had been made aware of available training opportunities. Smith noted the effort that the college makes to ensure that adjuncts are made aware of the various programs available to them; "I know just as far as the email system there. They really seem to reach out in a lot of areas as far as the newsletter they send out plus other things that will come across from different programs indicating an invitation to this or that." Andrews concurred noting, "...am I aware of different things? I know they're always doing different things; there are tons of e-mails that I get all the time." Bledson also spoke very highly of MCC's effort to communicate opportunities for part-timers; "...we have a lot of different trainings that we can go to, and those are pretty readily available and published in a very accessible manner" (Bledson 1, lines 183-184). Her sense of the strength of MCC's communication effort to part-time faculty came through when asked about her awareness of a part-time faculty orientation program. She asserted:

I probably have been notified but to tell you the truth I would not put against the college to have...I think that they probably...publicized it, and I just didn't pick up on it and didn't take advantage of it. So I'm sure it's out there, but I haven't taken advantage of it.

She essentially felt that she was responsible for her own lack of awareness regarding the part-time faculty orientation. Finally, Page expressed how impressed she was with the number of training offerings and the college's attempts to offer them at times convenient for part-timers:

...so they just have so much to offer and too when you're an adjunct faculty I think one of the, I don't even know what the right verbiage is, one of the challenges is that we work. I work Corporate America, I teach adjunct faculty, and then finding the time to take advantage of some of these other programs....Now MCC is kind enough to have Saturday morning programs so I will check those out occasionally.

There do at least appear to be some inconsistencies with the communication of training and development opportunities to part time faculty as some have little to no recollection of training opportunity and support materials while others received regular communications, particularly in the form of e-mails. Again, the relative level of engagement by departmental leadership appears to be a key factor here.

Varying levels of training participation

Given the varying levels of awareness that part-time faculty had regarding training programs at MCC, it is understandable and even expected that we would see varying levels of participation in these programs as well. A few faculty noted that they were occasional to even frequent participants in the college's training programs, while others had experience only minimal if any of the training programs at MCC outside of the summer certification program. Of the adjuncts that I interviewed, Andrews and Page were the most prolific participants in MCC's faculty training programs. Andrews even expressed surprise as she thought back on the number of classes that she had completed; "I guess I did take quite a few of them. Emotional Intelligence at Work, Developing Effective Teams....these are all through Metro, and these all are...2009. I actually took quite a few after looking through here...that's pretty good." For Andrews, she really appreciated the convenience of webinars and other online training courses:

I love webinars. I watch a lot of webinars....since I'm very familiar with webinars and very comfortable with them whether they're live or not. Because we've had a few where they've been facilitated by Skype or another technology so we can actually interact with the presenters. But usually the information is great. I like it because it's at the time I can take it and some of them are saved, so I can go into the portals later and use them. I don't have to leave my full-time job to attend them, the material is up-to-date, and I can always e-mail whoever the presenter is and get answers to my questions later.

Page also noted that she had participated in multiple training programs; however, she primarily attended training that was open to all faculty, part-time and full-time:

...they do have some specific classes that are for adjunct only, but I don't know that I've attended any of those because most of the classes that I've attended, or extracurricular activities as I call them, are open to any faculty member regardless of whether they're adjunct or full-time of course.

She was motivated by a desire to grow as an instructor and felt that she would gain from any training session that she attended:

...I am the kind of person that always goes to any kind of program and knows I'll get something out of it, and even if I spend, even if I go to a one day event, I'll walk away with something. I, too often I hear people go, "Oh I went to this and it was a waste of time." Well then you weren't paying attention, because I've never ever been to a program where I didn't walk away with just even one thing. But that's about attitude...."

She did specifically mention one particularly impactful training session that she completed after the orientation on Bloom's taxonomy and how she updated her syllabus based on what she learned in the course; "...since then I have participated in Bloom's taxonomy, so the way that I originally learned how to do a syllabus has transitioned to Bloom's taxonomy" Page did go on to note, though, that her participation in training programs had waned recently and that she hadn't attended any sessions for a few months. Page and Andrews were the only two study participants, however, who discussed any regular participation in MCC's training programs.

The majority of adjunct faculty in the study participated in either very limited or no additional training programs beyond the orientation, for some, and of course the summer

certification program. Bledson, John Smith, and Kelly Smith all indicated that they had not participated in any additional training offerings. One participant, Mills, did share that she had taken one training webinar, but she only had a vague recollection of what was covered:

I feel like I did something online the first year. I cannot remember what it was (laughing); I sound so stupid. But MCC offers various different types of...you can learn to use this computer program or that computer program, and some things are not true webinars, but webinars that you just do on your own. I think I did one of those, but I didn't do any of that other stuff.

Most of the participants did not elaborate on their reasons for not participating in additional training programs beyond the time commitment and awareness issues discussed earlier; however, their relative lack of participation given the extensive catalog of offerings from professional development does appear to point to some disconnect between efforts by college leaders to include part-time faculty in the college's training and development programs and actual practitioner adjunct participation in training.

Part-time faculty orientation

One of the cornerstones of MCC's adjunct faculty support efforts is the new part-time faculty orientation. Professional development generally offers several orientation sessions during the day, evening, and weekends at the beginning of a semester in order to accommodate varying schedule needs and participant time conflicts. The sessions typically last about 2 to 3 hours and are mostly procedural in nature. The professional development department brings together representatives of various support functions throughout the college including security, human resources, IT and others in order to provide new, part-time faculty with an overview of college support services. Participants learn how to set-up their classes, how to use the two course management systems used by MCC – Moodle and Blackboard, and how to use LearnerWeb – the online training website for faculty. They also cover parking and security, HR procedures, part-

time faculty work stations, course and grading expectations, as well as additional information that part-time faculty need going into their first teaching assignment with MCC. Lisa Page did note, though, that the orientation time frame was not sufficient to cover the material required and that her preference would be to develop a more engaging program:

...it's a lot...I feel like it's overwhelming, I really do....I think due to limited time and there's so much to get across. And we, I really want to model student engagement rather than...I want to model what we want them doing, but there's so much information to get across, that it's been kind of the power point. And we're kind of getting away from that....

Very little time during the orientation session is spent covering teaching techniques and pedagogy. Knight mentioned:

It's significantly procedural and much less about how to teach. We talk about it in a very cursory way and set the seeds that this is a learning college...you're going to see things like the core 4, do some of that kind of stuff, program outcomes; it's about getting students to those program outcomes and course outcomes.

While MCC's goal is to have all new part-time faculty complete an orientation session, actual participation rates fall well short of that. While Professional Development leaders indicated that about half of new part-timers were attending an orientation session prior to their first teaching assignment, participation rates for the practitioner adjunct faculty that I interviewed were much lower. Caldwell, Page, and Kelly Smith all indicated that they had completed the new part-time faculty orientation; however, Andrews, Mills, Bledson, Roberts, Sanders, Williams, and John Smith had not. Even for those that did attend, some indicated that the orientation session and the related orientation materials, including the part-time faculty handbook, had had only a limited effect on their preparations to teach. In discussing the part-time faculty handbook, Bledson noted the only benefit that she recognized from the orientation materials was information regarding the employee credit union; "I just didn't really use it. The

one thing that really stood out that I did take advantage of is the credit union....I have an account there. And that's helpful." While Williams did not attend a formal orientation session, she did indicate that she received some orientation materials and a DVD prior to teaching, and she noted that the materials did have a limited impact on her teaching performance; however, she could not remember if a faculty handbook was included:

I don't remember if I did or not (laughing). If I did obviously it wasn't that memorable. I want to say I probably did. I feel like when I got here, I got a lot of stuff. And so I would assume there was a faculty handbook in there, but obviously it wasn't that memorable. I do not remember it.

The orientation materials did, though, provide her with useful information that she was subsequently able to use in her classroom to the students' benefit:

...it was little, simple things about...we expect students to check their e-mails, just stuff about school and their expectations of us, their expectations of the students, and different things like that. So it was just kind of nice to know that when a student asks you something, you had at least a general idea of where the students with disabilities office was...just little things like that that before I didn't really know at the other school.

For Caldwell, the only real benefit that stood out to him was a set of dry erase markers that he received during the session:

Honestly the only thing I remember distinctly about that meeting is that I got some free dry erase markers. I mean it's not like I'm harsh, but I use those still. Of course they're great; they're great dry erase markers. But yeah they really pulled out all the stops; they didn't get the cheapy ones" (Caldwell 1, lines 329-331).

A few of the participants did note some more significant benefits gained from the orientation experience which did have an impact on their preparedness for teaching. Page noted that while the orientation did not provide her with the kind of training and support that she felt that she needed in order to manage the significant age diversity in her classroom, she did find the session informative and helpful in preparing her to teach:

...my orientation just was acclimation to...here's MCC, here's kind of what we do, here are the expectations regarding our students such as...I remember we covered topics such as attendance and syllabus and how to write a syllabus....

And she went on to say:

...it was very informative and it got me prepared. I don't know that it necessarily prepared me though for the types...I'm used to working with and was used to working with adults who 99% of them really...they were going back to school, they were entrenched in Corporate America and they needed their degree. So the difference with MCC students is the age variable, if you will, is really diverse. So you have students that are...see I've had students in my class that aren't even 18 yet because the way their birthdays fall...but soon to be 18 within in a couple of months. So I'm like, "OK why are you in my class?" But sometimes it worked out well and other times it doesn't work out so well. But there's quite an age variation. So orientation didn't really prepare me for that. But it prepared me for what were the expectations, here's kind of how you go through your semester as an adjunct faculty.

Kelly Smith also noted the benefits of the procedural information covered in the orientation; "I think it was just knowing more as to what the resources there were on campus as far as available to faculty...things like where there were part-time faculty work rooms, the equipment available, the library those types of practical things you might need." Smith also indicated that the part-time faculty website and online training materials had been covered in orientation and that she had found that to be helpful and was able to use the material to improve her classroom instruction:

I did primarily before as I was not at all familiar with some of the online components that the students use like Moodle and Blackboard. I was not at all familiar with them, so I did use several of those tutorials to learn my way around there....I thought that they were real helpful.

For those that did attend one of the part-time faculty orientation sessions, most were able to gain at least some benefit either from the sessions themselves or the associated orientation material. The participants were able to use the information covered in the classroom for the benefit of their students.

Only one of the study participants who attended the part-time faculty orientation cited any concerns over topic coverage or the way in which the session was administered. For Caldwell, his primary concern about the orientation centered on a perceived disconnect with the needs of the Corporate and Continuing Education faculty of which he was a member:

I don't know if there was a disconnect because I think they were pretty, if I recall correctly, they were pretty quick to say this is pertinent to you curriculum folks, this is pertinent to you CCE folks or this is not relevant to you, close your ears for a moment, how you want to phrase it. But I just remember...clearly at any community college your curriculum faculty are going to vastly outnumber your CCE faculty. So I get that it's going to be geared more towards the curriculum than anything because you're covering what's important to most people first. And I do think we had a break-out session, who knows maybe like a ½ hour or something for just CCE faculty, and I think there were only like 3 or 4 of us in there.

He went on to add:

...I don't have to be a visual learner myself, and I'm also....I'm fine with reading things and figuring out, but I don't know, again with the MC specific terminology and I think they were making a few more assumptions about the knowledge we brought to the table coming in. And maybe I could be unique in this, but I feel like people on the CCE side, anyway, many of us don't have any prior teaching background...we have to do a teaching demo to get hired, but other than that and then it's on us to make sure that we're continuing to improve our skills.

Because of the timing issues, as mentioned earlier, he completed the orientation several months prior to his first teaching assignment, and because of the disconnect with the needs and interests of the CCE faculty, Caldwell did not feel that the orientation was terribly useful.

It is clear that Metro Community College offers a significant array of training and development programs for their part-time or adjunct faculty and that the college feels strongly enough about the value that these faculty bring to the college as well as their students to invest considerable resources in terms of manpower, time, and money to ensure that these part-time members of the faculty community are in a stronger position to grow personally and professional

as well as better meet the needs of a large and diverse student population. What is less clear, however, is the extent to which the college's adjunct are aware of and take advantage of the training opportunities provided. At least with the participants in my study, it varies considerably. Also, it was difficult to gauge the long-term impact of the sessions on those who did attend. For those who did participate in training, other than the summer certification program, they generally spoke highly of the training they had received, but they did not really indicate any impact on their growth as instructors.

Development as instructors

Just as the study participants' experiences with training have varied extensively, so have the paths that have led them to teach. Given that the focus of my study is on the experiences of practitioner faculty, the majority of those considered here did not choose academia as their profession; they are lawyers, managers, directors, and ESL instructors among others. For most, teaching holds a secondary place in their professional lives. All, however, were drawn to teach by a desire for something more. For some, that motivation comes from a desire to help others, while others simply find joy in the art of teaching itself. Their levels of teaching experience prior to coming to MCC also varied extensively with some having taught for several years while others taught their very first college class at metro. All as well have endured some of the same challenges that adjuncts face across the country and at all levels of higher education: these challenges were addressed in the review of literature and will be further expounded upon in chapter 5. They have dealt with a sense of isolation, they have felt unappreciated, and some have described feeling unprepared to deal with the nature of community college students. They have all remained, though, active and engaged members of the adjunct faculty community despite the common challenges they face.

I will begin my analysis of the study participants' experiences as instructors by first examining the motivations that led them to teach in the first place and explore the secondary nature of teaching in most of their professional lives. I will then examine their experiences in teaching prior to joining MCC as well as the varying paths that led them to Metro. Finally, I will discuss their experiences since joining MCC paying particular attention to some of the challenges that they have faced as adjunct instructors.

Motivation to teach

The adjunct faculty in this study were motivated by a variety of factors that were largely intrinsic in nature. While a couple did cite teaching as a means to remain current in their fields, none mentioned financial compensation as a primary driver. For most, the primary motivators came from either a desire to help students or from their love for teaching. Bledson hinted at how the minimal financial compensation could actually act as a disincentive to teach but that her desire to help students outweighed the financial drawbacks:

...a lot is expected for very little compensation and so the people that are doing it are...well I can only speak to my own self; I'm doing it because I love it. I love the students. That's what it really boils down to...it's just about them and the inspiration they give me.

Andrews also touched on the inspiration that she received in watching her students achieve success:

...to this day my students e-mail me or call me and say, hey "You showed me how to do this so that I can do it at my job; you showed me how to write a resume and I got my first gig over here at the central whatever" And so they just sustained me in keeping my interest.

She went on to speak about the satisfaction that she gained from sharing information that was useful to her students:

My students really know that my classes are energetic; they're hands-on, we talk, I learn about their families, and they hear about my vacations and while we're

doing that, we're learning about Word, Access, Excel, PowerPoint, and I'm showing them how to use it in their lives, something that's relevant to them. So that's what really hooked me.

Caldwell also talked about the motivation that he had to teach something that was useful to his students; for him it was about teaching students how to more efficiently use technology:

So, that's kind of my motivation is just that I get a big kick out of watching peoples' eyes light up and have that ah hah moment . They're like, "Oh my goodness, I can do this!" And then the cogs start turning and they realize, "Oh darn," or something different that they'll actually say in class, "I have been doing this the wrong way or not at all for years..." and they think of all the time that they could have saved....I guess outside of the education context I am, I think, an efficiency expert. That's probably what it comes down to because I teach all kinds of tips and tricks; that's a lot of what I do to help people get to whatever it is....a lot of this is in the context of software, so I want the software to be a tool not an obstacle. And I help them get over the hump of this being an obstacle and helping them.

Finally, for Sanders his inspiration came from being able to reach his students and achieve that moment of clarity when they finally understand what he has been trying to teach them. When asked what drives him to teach he responded:

... the students I'm able to touch. I mean touch from a figurative standpoint, OK (laughing)...but the students I'm able to see that they start seeing the light, and that's certainly not all of them, but the ones that do that keep me going from the one semester to the next.

For most of the study participants, the opportunity that teaching provided to connect with and assist their students served at least as a partial motivator; this clearly came through in all of the interviews. Mills spoke about the interesting people that she was able to meet through teaching English as a second language (ESL):

I've met some really amazing people. I've literally taught everyone from...Afghan refugees all the way to lower princes from Saudi Arabia. Recently, like last year, there was an election in Burkina Faso or it might have been Guiana and the guy who was running for President, I gave him private lessons a few years ago. It's weird like every once in a while you hear somebody and go, "Oohh, I taught that person." There is a guy that who made the Arab Barbie doll. I have never seen it, but I have heard him on NPR. It's like awe, I

gave him a private lesson or two. I mean it's so vast. Like because at MCC I teach in two departments. I teach in the pre-program and I teach in academics/foreign languages. I see the people who have never finished high school in their own country then I see people who might have masters. I do not think I have met anyone with a PhD in their country who would actually come to me for language help. It's a variety...you meet a whole bunch of different people. You learn a whole bunch about different cultures and religions and it's a very interesting conversation....

Page also touched on the energy that she drew from her students, their shared stories, and being able to provide information useful in their lives:

I have to tell you quite frankly I've never had a day where...I would rather go home than go deal with these students....it does rejuvenate me and I get really hyped up. When I do get home finally after a long day, I have a hard time going to sleep even. So I do enjoy it and I enjoy the students, I enjoy hearing what's going, and I like hearing what's going on in their world and what's going on in the companies that they work in. And at MCC it's a little bit different from you because not all of them are actively employed in Corporate America. They may be in transition, but they still have their story, and they still have their experiences, and regardless if they use the information that I translate to them in the professional world, the interesting thing about teaching human resources is that they can use it in their own personal lives.

Study participants seemed to gain as much if not more from their experiences in the classrooms as their students. Bledson perhaps summed up their sentiments best in expressing, "...the students actually end up inspiring me in a way they probably can't possibly imagine. I can tell them they inspire me and they might roll their eyes, but really they do."

Beyond their desire to help students, a few of the study participants shared how a sheer love for teaching motivated them to pursue teaching opportunities. Roberts described how a chance opportunity to teach led him to discover something that he really enjoyed:

The first course I taught was a probate law course and I decided that this was something that I thoroughly enjoyed doing. I have never taught full-time, but I have always enjoyed kind of doing it on a part-time basis. So, that was my first experience because it was a lot of fun and I thought it was something that was worthwhile.

For Caldwell, his love for teaching went much deeper, and he noted how he would seek out every opportunity that he could to teach others:

Oh, I would teach all day if I could find a way to get paid (laughing). Hey I mean seriously, I love teaching. So any chance I get to teach, whether it's an informal setting or formal setting or just random. See I can't tell you how many phone calls I've spent work, and on my mobile, that is, "Hi, you don't know me, but somebody said that you could help me with Excel," or whatever. So they're somewhat of a nuisance if I'm really busy, but generally speaking I get great pleasure out of those calls because I get to solve somebody's problems easily and then hopefully teach them something along the way. So, yeah absolutely every chance I get to teach....

Caldwell goes on to express how his passion for teaching really comes through in the classroom and in how he interacts with his students, and it is this passion which allows him to better connect with his students and help them better connect with the material that he's teaching:

It's like I said I'm, with my actual personality, I'm not the life of the party. I'm actually a very subdued guy, but when I'm in front of a class I light up because my passion comes out and that probably does come across in this interview. I just love teaching. I love just being able to share that. And part of that is entertaining them because the more emotion that someone can have, the increased likelihood they're going to remember it. So if you introduce them, if you get them energetic, you can even make someone cry and they're going to remember it, but I don't want to make anyone cry. So if I can get them to laugh and smile...put more physical and physiological energy into committing it to memory then I can.

In sharing her love for teaching, Page also noted deriving a sense of energy from being in the classroom and suggested that it offered a counter-balance to the drudgery of corporate life:

...quite frankly the reason that I decided to teach was Corporate America can kind of suck the life out of you. And well I don't know where you are....I love Corporate America, don't get me wrong, but it can suck the life out of you. So I really get energized, and when I'm having a week in Corporate America I can go and teach and it's like rejuvenating for me.

She goes on to say:

I have to tell you quite frankly I've never had a day where...I would rather go home than go deal with these students. I guess I've just never thought of it from

that perspective because it does rejuvenate me and I get really hyped up. When I do get home, finally, after a long day I have a hard time going to sleep even.

This passion for teaching and for being in the classroom clearly was a motivator for many of the study participants, and for most it was a feeling that they simply were unable to replicate in their full-time work experiences.

Finally, some participants offered individual motivations that were both personal and professional in nature and ranged from enjoying the challenge offered by teaching to a desire to remain current in a professional field. Bledson described how much she enjoyed the challenge of teaching and how it kept her focused in a way that her corporate position could not:

I enjoy the students, and I say students as a collective because there are always going to be students that are really challenging in a destructive way. There are other students in a constructive way, and then there are many students who are there quietly doing their best and participating where needed. I find the collective, though, of just being challenged every day is really exciting and something...there's no parallel experience offered within corporate America or even the non-profit sector as far as what you might call a 9 to 5 job. And I find that teaching just makes me sharper as a person. It's calling on me to stay up to date with all the software, all the designers out there, and the work that's being done....

For Caldwell, he had a particular connection to his subject matter and appreciated being able to teach his students something that they could actually use in their own work:

...particularly the CCE side, I like that I'm teaching people who can learn and take their skill back today or tomorrow...,it's a day long class, and use it immediately. I prefer that as opposed to your theoretical proclamation that this is going to be great in a couple years when you get a job.

Finally, Roberts and Bledson noted how being in the classroom fit with their personalities and brought them satisfaction. Roberts quipped, "I've got kind of a strong personality. So, I kind of like being able to stand in front of a group of people." For Bledson, the classroom experience was more about connecting with her students:

...there's almost no substitute for just being in a classroom with students because you really get... you can see right away if they understand just by the way they're looking back at you. And you can see right away how they're applying the learning. And then you can see right away with other students and inspiring each other. So I think overall it's just a real positive experience being in the classroom (Bledson 1, lines 148-153).

Study participants' motivations to teach emerged as largely intrinsic in nature and came from their love for teaching, a desire to help their students succeed, and the satisfaction they received in being able to help their students and share with them information that they could use in their lives. Some were motivated to teach by other personal or professional factors, but above all teaching provided them with a sense of joy and tapped into their passions in a way that no other professional endeavor could.

Varying paths to MCC

Study participants came to teach at MCC after following a wide variety of paths and brought with them varying degrees of experience and preparedness to teach. Many came to teach through largely happenstance factors after an opportunity presented itself only to discover a true love for teaching in general and for the community college in particular. Others turned to teaching as a means to earn some extra money while some parlayed volunteer work into paid teaching assignments. Still others made connections in their professional lives which led to opportunities to teach. In addition, some came to MCC with extensive teaching experience while for others MCC represented their very first time in the classroom. These varying paths led to a participant group with a wide variety of training and support needs.

Several of the participants had extensive teaching experience prior to arriving at MCC. Mills, Page, Roberts, Williams, and Bledson all had taught for several years at other institutions. Roberts noted how an initial positive experience with teaching led to continued opportunities to teach on a part-time basis:

I started teaching in the Paralegal Certificate Program at Rex State College in the Fall of 1992. The first course I taught was a probate law course and I decided that this was something that I thoroughly enjoyed doing. I have never taught full-time, but I have always enjoyed kind of doing it on a part-time basis. So, that was my first experience because it was a lot of fun and I thought it was something that was worthwhile. I approached the Head of the Paralegal Certificate Program at Rex State College. I said that I would like to continue to do this; so there began a relationship with that college that spanned through 2004. So pretty much every semester I was teaching some kind of a business law course in the Paralegal Certificate Program and I did teach probably a dozen different types of courses ranging from Estate Planning to Family Law to the Introduction to Legal Writing to Critical Thinking. So I taught a number of courses.

Williams had her first teaching experience as a teaching assistant while a graduate student at the University of Florida. Soon after graduation she began teaching at another community college and taught part-time for 8 years. Beth Page had also been teaching on a part-time basis for some 8 years and noted the positive nature of her experience with MCC when compared to her prior institution:

I formerly taught prior to coming to the city (name omitted), I taught with Global University, which is under Education, Inc. So this is a little bit different for me, but I have to tell you I'm very impressed with MCC....I'm impressed with the opportunities that they afford not only their faculty members but also the students.

As with Page, study participants in general compared their teaching experience at MCC favorably with their prior experiences; however, these experiences do seem to have helped them grow as instructors. This sentiment was reflected in Bledson's comments when she noted, "So I was at Chester University for about a year and that actually made, and I taught as adjunct there, and just made me stronger as an instructor during that time even though I was still part-time."

The different paths that led study participants to teach in general and to MCC in particular are as unique as their experiences with teaching but generally fall along four lines – (1) personal connections, (2) related experiences, (3) opportunity or school need, and (4) happenstance. Bledson, for example, traces her interest in her chosen career field and in

community college education back to a connection that she made with a former community college instructor:

I had transferred to the community college not really sure exactly what I wanted to do, but I had formed such a strong bond with my community college teacher that I decided to become a graphic design teacher, I mean graphic designer, as a result of the inspiration I received and the encouragement I received from her . Then I became a very big proponent of the community college system....

She would later make a connection with her eventual supervisor at MCC which led to her current teaching opportunity:

...about 4 years ago I formed a strong bond with my supervisor at MCC. I met him at an event; I served on a local board, AIGA, which is a national or international graphic design association, and so my boss was an attendee of those events, and I kind of developed a strong bond with him and saw in him a kindred spirit as far as my supervisor, just like my mentor who was my graphic design teacher back in Denver. He really enjoys innovation and trying to bring his students kind of the cutting edge of what's going on in the industry....So that's really how I came to the...I had a great experience as a student in community college, and then I formed a good relationship with my now boss.

For Roberts, his prior experiences with teaching led him to seek out part-time community college opportunities when he transferred to MCC's geographical area:

A couple years after I got down here I realized that one of the things that I thoroughly enjoyed when I was working in New Hampshire was teaching. I approached some of the local colleges. The first one that I received a response from was called Southern Delta Community College. It's no relation to Metro Community College. It's just another community college here in the area and they told me they needed someone to teach in their Prison Outreach Program.... So yeah, I taught a couple of legal courses at Brown Creek State Penitentiary here...which was fascinating, just fascinating. Then I of course began teaching on campus as well at SDCC and then 2007 or 2008, I approached the Head of the Paralegal Program at Metro Community College; her name is Tracy Blair. I told her that I would like to teach in her Paralegal Program., and so I began teaching at Metro Community College in their Paralegal Program.

For Caldwell, his interest in teaching stemmed from an experience that he had in volunteering with a local school system:

...in the city there's an amazing program that unfortunately lost its funding called Tech Next. And Tech Next was a partnership between the Chamber, school system, the public school system, and the IT (city name omitted) part of the city chamber. And it was to have professionals in the field, in technology fields in particular, which arguably that is what I do, to go in and teach, again volunteer after school technology program. So I went around to 6 separate high schools in the MCS program to teach the specific software skills and just business skills in general. The track varied from 6 weeks or 8 weeks...and I would just go around from school to school and ended up being one of the curriculum developers for that, and again on a volunteer basis. But that, all that, piqued my interest and led me to, about 2008 when I first expressed my interest to Metro to teach software skills.

While he was initially unsuccessful in securing a teaching position with MCC because the college was not hiring in Corporate and Continuing Education (CCE) at the time, he was later brought on board when a need for additional part-time faculty emerged:

I just figured, ah, I'm not qualified, I've never taught at that level. It's all been volunteer to that point, and then 8 months later, 9 months later they did a whole slew of interviews to bring people into the computer training side of CCE, and I basically got hired on the spot....

Mills also came to MCC because an opportunity emerged; although, in her case it was due to an unexpected need on the part of the college:

I was hired at MCC because the instructor that was originally hired to teach T.O.E.F.L. prep got another job the week before I was to start. And she left the state, and I was the only person that anybody could find that had ever taught T.O.E.F.L. prep.

Unfortunately, this scenario is not unusual as part-time faculty are often brought in to fill a last minute need and are not afforded the benefit of orientation or additional training prior to their first teaching assignment.

For some study participants, their path to community college teaching was a result of a combination of interest built from prior experience, opportunity, and in some cases sheer happenstance. Andrews noted how she, in many ways, fell into teaching as she was trying to

figure out what she wanted to do professionally and ultimately discovered that it was something that she really enjoyed:

I have a degree in psychology, and working with juvenile delinquents didn't really pan out for me. So, I worked in retail for 20 years, went back to school to get a computer degree, thought I would work in the IT field, realized that I didn't really want to do it, applied to be an instructor, got accepted, and got my first teaching gig, and I really enjoyed it....So I've been doing that in my evenings and on weekends.

Williams shared how she had not even thought about teaching professionally when she began her graduate studies; however, a need for financial aid led to an opportunity to work as a teaching assistant that ultimately spurred an interest in teaching at the community college level:

... I had never thought of even being a TA, and just on my application I checked the box for proof and eligibility for all financial aid available and guess printed their financial aid they considered it being a TA. So I got the call, "Would you consider being a TA?" And they don't usually have master's students, but I think they were getting desperate. And I said sure. My mom teaches 6th grade, and so I figured I could learn from her and do it as a graduate student. So I did...I really enjoyed it and found that it was something that I liked even though I had never considered becoming a teacher. I wasn't even in that program, never took any education classes at that point. So it was in grad school and then found that I really enjoyed it and liked it. So, instead of going back to ground zero and getting a teaching degree, I figured I'd finish up my master's program and just work through the community college that way.

For Sanders, his concern about the younger generation's lack of communication skills led him to pursue a teaching opportunity at MCC when it presented itself:

Well I was just...kind of got the idea that the young people that normally, at the age that would be in, at MC would be in school, just weren't very good communicators. And my graduate degree is in that and so I said well, why I don't try to help out a bit. And that quite frankly is how it happened. And MC had a part-time opening and so I went and talked to them about it and started teaching.

For all of the study participants, whether they fell into teaching by chance, actively sought out teaching opportunities at the community college level, or simply came to teach at the community college through an evolutionary engagement with teaching, they came to love teaching in

general, developed an attachment to the community college and MCC in particular, and were committed to improving as teaching professionals.

Teaching experience at MCC

While study participants came to MCC with a wide variety of experiences and varying levels of preparation and though generally positive when compared with prior teaching experiences, study participants nonetheless dealt with many of the same challenges and issues that adjunct faculty across the country experience. As noted earlier, this was addressed in the review of literature and will be further expounded upon in chapter 5. They struggled with a sense of isolation from each other and the greater college community. They felt underappreciated and undervalued for their contributions. Some also felt unprepared or challenged to reach the very diverse student population at MCC. For most of these part-time faculty, teaching played an important but secondary role in their overall career and professional lives, so their professional priorities were in their primary career areas and their needs were going to be different from those who taught part-time out of necessity or because they were unable to secure full-time faculty positions. Finally, while sharing many of the same challenges and priorities, their areas of instruction varied considerably, and thus their training and development needs varied as well.

Given that the adjunct participants in this study were teaching primarily evening and weekend classes at a time when most of the college's offices were closed, a few noted the sense of isolation or separateness that they felt on campus. In discussing her experience teaching an evening class Mills shared, "...the hours that I teach, I normally teach after 6, so most of the departments kind of close at 5 or 5:30, like the actual department offices. So I don't see many people at all....I'm like alone with a rabbit out there." She went on to discuss how her primary

work schedule prevented her from sharing in the activities and events on campus that full-time and other day faculty and staff were able to experience:

...any socialization things that my specific department does, they always do during the day. So basically it's only for the full-time people or the people who teach, even the part-time people, who teach during normal college hours. So, no I never get to the Christmas party or anything like that because my schedule won't allow it.... the only people I actually know from my department, I only know because I work with them in another venue. Either they're also IS examiners or we taught at another English program. I don't actually know them from working at...MC.

Williams also notes how all of the college offices were closed by the time that she arrived to teach; however, she did not necessarily feel the same sense of isolation:

...it's not that we're not wanted or appreciated or anything, it's that all the office doors are closed in the building and no one's there. It's just us and the secretary but yeah there are a lot of us. So even in my office there are about 5 of us in there at any given time, but then you walk to another building and there are still other part-time people in different departments around.

The issue then becomes more about separateness than isolation necessarily with many adjuncts who teach at night or on the weekend being cut off from the people and activities that bring the larger campus community together. Andrews noted how this separation from the rest of the college can present challenges for adjuncts:

...adjunct instructors primarily teach at night and on the weekends. We don't know what goes on in the college day to day. We don't meet the registrar's office people. We don't meet any of the tutors, so often we're at a disadvantage.

Perhaps she summed it up best in noting the vital yet different position that adjuncts occupied within the college community; "... we're a vibrant part of the community college even though we may not be seen during the day. We're sort of like the roaches at night. We come out, we party, and then we go back home!"

Another issue that presented a concern for a couple of the study participants was a feeling that there was a lack of appreciation for their work and the contributions that they made or could

potentially make to the college. Bledson noted that despite the value that many adjuncts bring to the classroom because of their proximity to industry, many are experiencing fatigue and burnout with very little in the way of rewards for their contributions:

I don't remember what the...it wasn't kind of a joke but a bit of an ironic comment that adjunct people, faculty are always exhausted and burned out (laughing). I think there's something to that....so people can really look at that and say, "Geez, is this what we want for education?" And, I don't know because on the positive side you got people in our department that care tremendously whether they're part-time or full-time and sometimes if they're part-time it means they're working out in the industry, and they're able to give the students a different kind of experience than, not better or worse, just different than and maybe even closer to the working world than the full-timers. So there's something for everybody, but there is something to that exhaustion...I've felt it myself. So, that'd probably be the only other thing I'd have to offer is just that a lot is expected for very little compensation.

Another study participant, Andrews, spoke about the limited role that she felt was expected of her as an adjunct in terms of what she could teach and the contributions that she was able to make to the college:

...the understanding is I am part-time, and really for Metro the only class they want me to teach is the CIS110. They really look for that master's degree; they need somebody to fill that slot, and it has to be somebody of a high caliber who wants to work nights and weekends, because, they have full-time staff who are going to take the morning slots...boom, boom, boom (laughing)! They don't want to hang out in the evenings, and I can't say that I blame them.

She also hints here at a bias towards full-time faculty; although, she does not appear to be overly offended by it. She was quick to note, however, that opportunities were available to part-time faculty who wanted to take on a more active and involved role with the college but that these additional responsibilities were not necessarily encouraged by college or departmental leaders:

As much as you as an adjunct are interested in doing it...for me they don't actively seek my knowledge or my information or my input. But I think it goes twofold. If I was really aggressive and wanted to be a part of the community college in a greater capacity, they would welcome me.

It does appear, then, that while there may be opportunities for adjuncts to become more involved with the college, from the perspective of some of the study participants, involvement beyond teaching the course they are assigned to teach is not consistently encouraged by departmental leadership. Also, at least one practitioner indicated that part-time faculty burnout is a concern for many and that lack of compensation may be an issue with further involvement in college activities.

Andrews and Bledson also discussed some of the challenges or resistance that they have experienced in trying to develop interdepartmental or interdivisional collaborative teaching projects or in simply teaching a class in another area of the college. Andrews spoke about a conversation that she had with someone in continuing education who needed her to teach a resume writing course, but bureaucratic obstacles made it difficult for her to teach a course on the continuing education side of the college:

...they'd have to borrow me for the continuing ed. side and that would require them to go to Chris Wilson, and there was talk about that because there is a woman who teaches how to write resumes, and she needed an instructor. And I talked to her about it, and she's like I'd have to borrow you and that might be a lot of red tape, and I said well if push comes to shove, I'd be happy to do it, but it's between you and Chris.

For Bledson, her concern centered on a perceived lack of support by college administrators for her interest in collaborative teaching projects. She discussed a project that she had completed with an instructor in the culinary arts program that seems to have had a real benefit for the students involved but was met with some uneasiness from administration:

The other thing I've done this semester, which I've been very pleased with the results, is I've actually connected with an instructor on a different campus and she's in a different department than me, and she's full-time, and she is allowing her students to work directly with my students. So those students are bakery and pastry art students so obviously they're in a very different world...and my students are actually doing design work for them. And so they operate as a student operated...the whole thing's very renegade and hasn't sat well with the

administration as far as they've been kind of like, oh, what's going on here, but those students have formed a collective café that they operate. So they sell bakery goods, and my students are creating graphics for that café. It's really great; it's all students and students, and we as instructors have to facilitate the whole thing, so it's much more work on our part than just a regular, controlled environment project that's fictional or aspirational....This is helping other students. My work, my students' work is to help the other students, and those students are actually providing feedback to my students about work. So in that way I think Kimberly, the other instructor, and myself, we have been able to create a learning environment for these students by just allowing them to interact with each other. It's not controlled and it's not contrived or scripted. I think they're getting a lot out of it.

Bledson did go on to note that she understands, at least to an extent, the administrative resistance to these types of collaborative projects, but she did indicate that her supervisor, on the other hand, was very supportive:

I don't know whether it's just allow it or not...I know that the administration, they're not always sure about some of these things because they're new ideas, and they...I understand their side because they don't know how to administer it college-wide. And if they can't administer it college-wide, what is their role? I understand their side of it, but I have never felt a restriction from anybody and especially not my supervisor; he loves this kind of stuff. So much so that he's really proud of... he thinks it speaks well to our department....

As was mentioned with regards to the varying levels of training and support that the adjunct faculty study participants received following their hire at MCC, their freedom to explore collaborative projects and to take on more roles and responsibilities within their departments and beyond appears to be significantly influenced by their department chair or supervisor's level of commitment and support for them.

Two other study participants, Sanders and Beth Page, noted from their experience in the classroom feeling unprepared to deal with and effectively reach the diverse student population at Metro. For Page, she noted that she has been able to turn her challenges with working with MCC's diverse student population into a real positive:

Well, it is encouraging because one of the things...I've only been here in the state (name omitted) for a couple of years and I started teaching at MCC shortly after I arrived here, and it was a rude awakening just because of the demographics of the student population, but I've grown to really enjoy it.

While she has grown to appreciate the diversity in her classroom, she still struggles with the varying levels of motivation that her students bring with them:

I still find it to be a challenge because there are some students who, and my goal always is to engage all students, but if we go back to values and they're intrinsic, I can motivate people for a short period of time. Motivation also has to come from them. So, I see sparks of motivation in some students here and there but to keep that fire ignited, it's overwhelming.

She goes on to note how she has tried to use some of the engagement techniques that she has learned, but they are only able to go so far:

I do read a lot so I incorporate a lot of those alternative methodologies into my class structure, but at some point in the semester you just know who's on board and who's not onboard. And it's not that I don't call on those students that aren't onboard; I will engage them until the day they take their final. But it is far more challenging.

For Sanders following his arrival at MCC, he found himself challenged to reach students who were much younger than those with whom he had worked in his prior training experience:

Well, initially I felt pretty well prepared until I got there. And the vast majority of my instructional experience was teaching workshops and seminars with older adults...late 30s, 40s, 50. And to reorient myself to teaching 18, 19, 20, and 21 year olds, that was a challenge. And it took me a while to grasp it too.

As with Page's experience, he too found that his students lacked motivation and was challenged to find ways to reach them:

Well they weren't...by and large they weren't as motivated....they didn't see the importance and relevance of that skill set as a person that was in industry would because their livelihood didn't depend on it. That's probably the best way that I could put it....if I can draw a parallel, it's kind of like I didn't go to graduate school until I was 34 years old. I graduated from undergraduate school when I was 21. I think I did a heck of a lot better in graduate school at 34 after I had 12, 14 years of experience under my belt then I would have done had I gone to graduate school when I was 22. And that's, I just think that being in the

workforce, having those, going through the maturation process of having a job and seeing how the world works and doesn't work helps you. And to have a class of students that for the most part did not have that was a challenge.

Despite some of the challenges described here, the teaching experience by and large for the majority of study participants has been a positive one, and a couple of them spoke about their expanding roles and responsibilities within the college. Some of them have seen the number of course they teach grow as they have proven themselves to be reliable instructors. Andrews shared how her teaching responsibilities increased as her reputation at MCC grew; "...I went from one class to two classes a term to three, and now I have four. But I teach 3 nights and a Saturday morning, and I also teach at the Main campus now... it's gotten to be word of mouth." For Caldwell, his experience as a corporate and continuing education instructor has led to a number of opportunities both within CCE as well as the college as a whole:

I joined in the summer; I actually was brought on in June or so at the time, and since then it's been predominantly CCE. And I'm sure that we'll get into this in a minute, but as a result of my being in the certification program, I got exposure to other folks within the school and out of that I've actually done some professional development courses internal for faculty and staff. I just had my second one of those just two weeks ago, and so now I've been asked to be a keynote speaker at one of their events that professional development is a part of it, a big southeast regional conference that they host. So that's kind of my history with CCE in a nutshell.

Of course, with many participants their full-time work and other commitments kept them from teaching more than one or two courses per semester; however, in general their comfort level with the material and skill as instructors improved with experience. Andrews shared how much more confident she feels in her teaching ability since the experience with her first class; "So, I was learning as the students were learning. Now, it's pretty much a smooth process."

Overall, the teaching experience for most of the study participants has been a positive one in terms of the overall level of support that they have received from their departments and from

MCC as a whole. Certainly when compared to experiences at prior institutions, some participants lauded MCC for the support that they provided part-time faculty. Despite the level of support that MCC offers through departmental activities and through the professional development department's efforts, the practitioners that I interviewed were still struggling with some of the same challenges that adjuncts across higher education experience – some felt undervalued and underpaid for the work that they did, some experienced a sense of isolation or separateness from the rest of MCC, and some struggled to reach MCC's diverse student population. The nature of their instructional experience, though, does appear to be heavily influenced by the level of support and engagement received from their departmental leadership.

Secondary place of education

For the majority of study participants, teaching, and more specifically part-time teaching at the community college, played a secondary role in their overall career plan. Roberts noted, "I have never taught full-time, but I have always enjoyed kind of doing it on a part-time basis," and Williams added that after she took on her first teaching assignment with a community college she "...just kind of always kept it as a part-time gig." Their work lives outside of the community college represented the focus of their professional experience and the nature of their work was as varied as the paths that led them to Metro. Some were managers, business professionals, while others were lawyers, ESL instructors, physical therapists and writers. Most had at least some connection between the subject they taught and their profession. All, though, shared a love for teaching and viewed teaching at the college level to be an important part of their professional lives.

Teaching for most then, beyond simply being secondary in nature, played a complimentary role to their primary career interest. Page indicated that teaching was such an

important undertaking for her that any corporate employer would have to accept her commitment to adjunct teaching in order for the position to be a good fit:

...Corporate America is my first love, if you will. I'll always be a part of Corporate America. As an example when I first interviewed with MCC, I indicated to them that I would always be part of Corporate America and they kind of looked at me cross eyed and said, "What will Corporate America think of you teaching as an adjunct faculty?" And I said, "Well if they want me then they will support that. If they're not that interested in me then they won't support it...so well I'm a mismatch (laughing)."

Sanders, who was a professional writer and had a prior career in management, taught public speaking and communications. Andrea Williams also taught communications and was a full-time communications manager professionally. Kelly Smith, who worked as a physical therapist outside of education, taught physical therapy courses. Jeff Roberts, who was a practicing attorney, taught law classes at MCC. John Smith was a medical technologist for much of his career and taught courses in medical terminology and phlebotomy. Jessica Bledson was a graphic designer professionally and taught graphic design courses for MCC. For each of these instructors, there was a direct link between their profession and the areas in which they taught. Not only did this serve them well professionally, but it also allowed them to bring their own real-world experience to the classroom.

Most of the reasons shared by study participants for choosing to teach part-time, to limit their part-time teaching, or to eschew other opportunities to become more involved with the college, centered on financial concerns or other work commitments. Caldwell somewhat jokingly suggested, "Oh I, I would teach all day if I could find a way to get paid (laughing). Hey I just mean seriously, I love teaching...so any chance I get to teach, whether it's an informal setting or formal setting." Financial considerations, though, outweighed a love for teaching.

Work and travel commitments, on the other hand, were much more of a factor in limiting Caldwell's availability to teach:

...my challenge is I have a full time and then some day job, so I'm limited to a one or two day commitment, not semester long. And I travel fairly significantly with my job, my day job, so sometimes, usually around March, I'm gone for almost 3 weeks straight so I can't in good conscience take on a curriculum course that's going to be semester based. So with that in mind, I have spoken with several people on the curriculum side, and I've been approached about developing or giving guest lectures, and that's going to kind of probably be as far as I can go on the curriculum side.

Bledson offered perhaps some of the more striking commentary on the reasons why she did not teach more in explaining that, despite her love for teaching, she had to pull back from a heavy teaching load and take on more outside work simply in order to support herself:

I was teaching, actually I was teaching one more class than would have been required for a full-time instructor, and I was not making anything close to a living wage. And I made a conscious decision I couldn't do it, I could not, I couldn't work full-time as an adjunct or part-timer, and so I pulled way back and now I supplement my income with a much higher, much more lucrative freelance project work. And it's not because I don't love teaching, I do, but I couldn't support myself. And that's a problem I think really.

Williams added that she might even be interested in teaching full-time later in her career, but financial considerations prevented her from pursuing further teaching at the present time. When asked if she would be interested in teaching full-time, she responded, "I think maybe somewhere maybe down the future, maybe after I have kids and it's a good schedule...a good schedule might be able to work well. But right now, to be honest...I would take a severe pay cut."

These practitioner faculty represent a unique group both within the larger adjunct or part-time faculty population at Metro and within the larger college community as a whole. They bring a skill set and real-world, practical experience to their classrooms that is difficult to replicate through traditional, full-time faculty instruction, and thus they occupy an important place among the college's faculty and represent a significant asset to the college and one that

certainly should be trained and developed so that they may reach their full potential as instructors. An opportunity exists for college leaders to take note some of the challenges and struggles that these faculty face on a regular basis and take steps to ensure that they feel valued and included in the greater college community. Given their wide variety of interests, priorities, and outside commitments, efforts to more fully integrate practitioner faculty will have to be creative and need to include options that are offered at times and locations that take into account their daytime work schedule.

Impact of the Summer Certification Program

The Summer Certification Program (SCP) at Metro Community College serves as the centerpiece of the Professional Development department's efforts to support the college's part-time and adjunct faculty. While the program has undergone significant changes since it was first instituted in the Summer of 2008 by then director of professional development, Pam Johnson, and continues to evolve under the current director, it has remained true to its original purpose to support the learning college mission of MCC by helping the college's better adjunct faculty further develop as instructors so that they may in turn help their students grow and develop the four core competencies that are at the center of the college's mission – critical thinking, communication, personal growth and responsibility, and information technology and quantitative literacy; all MCC graduates, regardless of program, are expected to master these competencies over the course of their studies (Metro Community College, 2014). Knight noted that each spring, professional development sends a communication to departmental leaders asking them to nominate part-time faculty for the SCP who are some of their department's stronger instructors who they want to grow and develop. For these adjunct faculty, particularly the practitioner faculty at the center of my study whose opportunities to connect with colleagues,

students, and services at MCC are limited by full-time commitments and other obligations, the SCP serves as an important lifeline to the college and helps to integrate them into the larger MCC community.

Here my intention is to examine the impact that the Summer Certification Program has had on those program completers whom I had the opportunity to interview. I will begin by examining the nature of the SCP paying particular attention to the mission and goals of the program and the participants' overall sense of their experience. Next I will examine participants' motivation for attending the program and delve deeper into their experiences while completing the program and the immediate and long-term impact of their experience. Finally, I will take a look at some of the participants' perceived program shortcomings and their ideas for improvement.

Summer Certification Program goals

One sub-theme that clearly came through in my interviews with the practitioner faculty participants was that the purpose, goals, structure and delivery of the SCP were in line with the overall goals and mission of the college. Andrews noted in discussing the goals of the summer program that they were working to create:

...a consistent, collaborative, communicative partnership of adjunct faculty that would support our MCC graduates in a manner consistent with the MCC values and mission statement. ...It was pretty much reinforced because we were learning about the diversity of the community that we were supporting. We were learning about our students and ways to enrich their learning experience. And that was reinforced because, not only were we reading about it online and discussing it, we were simulating our classroom environment in the capstone at the end.

Metro's approach to teaching and learning has as its foundation the concept of the Learning College; instruction and the classroom experience thus is focused on the student, the learner (Metro Community College, 2014). Bledson recalls specifically that while it wasn't dictated to

the participants, the college's goal of creating "a learning experience for the student" connected with her and her own background, was emphasized by her supervisor as a key shift in teaching strategy for MCC, and was also brought through as an objective in the SCP.

From this foundation, the college has developed four core competencies (Core 4) that all students are expected to develop through their coursework – critical thinking, communication, personal growth, and responsibility (Metro Community College, 2014). Sanders, Mills, Kelly Smith, Roberts, and Beth Page, even some time after completing the summer program, had at least some recollection of an emphasis on the Core 4 throughout the SCP, and some were able to discuss specifics of each competency. Roberts recalled that:

...it was a recognition that we need to prepare the students to be aware of what these core competencies are and to get them, at the very least, to where they are able to function in society successfully. This is the only way you can do it if they are fully adept in those four competencies, and I think that they really did recognize that. In fact, I can recall Kathy actually going over the core competencies of the school.

Other participants clearly recognized the connection between their departments' efforts to craft their own objectives to be in line with the Core 4 and the SCP's focus on those competencies throughout the program. Mills noted that:

...there's been, they were really making a push for all the departments to rewrite the objectives of the department. And there might be a different term that they use, but all the goals and objectives of each individual department had to be rewritten to reflect those things on the bookmark (laughing). And so, yeah, that was definitely there.

Program facilitators also appear to have set the expectation that faculty build the core competencies into their course delivery. Sanders mentioned that, "...as a matter of fact, one of the requirements was how they were inculcated in your program...in the course you were teaching."

While some faculty had a difficult time remembering the specific goals of the program, most of the participants did remember facilitators clearly laying out the goals and expectations of the program. Mills recalled that, “I think the goals were pretty clear and how we were going to get to those goals I think was relatively clear. I remember at first the culminating project was not clear, but that became clearer as things went on.” For one participant, Sanders, the main focus of the program was to develop better part-time faculty; “I think the overall goal, and I don’t know if it was stated precisely this way, but I think the overall goal was just to make a more effective cadre of part-time instructors.” Facilitators also appear to have clearly laid out their expectations of the participants and the tasks and actions that they would need to complete in order to receive credit for the course. Sanders went on to note:

You had to complete those modules by a specified period of time. The online modules had to be completed by a specified period of time. There was no grading onsite that I can remember, but you had to have those modules completed by a specified date in order to get credit.

Although, several participants did mention that facilitators gave additional time to those who were unable to complete the online course modules by the deadline.

At the core of the Summer Certification Program was the emphasis on greater student engagement in the classroom through the use of student engagement techniques. These techniques were featured in all program material, held a prominent role in the online discussion modules, and were the basis of the teaching demonstration at the end of the program. Most of the study participants cited student engagement and active learning as the key goal or focus of the SCP. Williams noted that:

...they wanted us to learn what these engagement techniques were to get our students more engaged in the classroom. That was, I think, maybe the point of my session was that the engaged student.... You might call it the headline; so they wanted us to learn how to get our students more involved in the classroom.

Beyond engaging students, though, at least one participant recognized that the SCP had an indirect but intended purpose to impact the student experience in the classroom through more engaged faculty. Andrews noted:

I think a lot of them have had bad experiences with instructors whether they're full-time, part-time, it doesn't matter. It's that they've had that one instructor who was totally disengaged, was generally there, just didn't have the interest anymore for whatever reason, and because of that the student is sort of bitter about every instructor they come across. They're thinking it's going to be more of the same. And I think that's what this course is really aimed at, is that part-time faculty are not disinterested, they're not disengaged. We're actively there for them....

Related to this notion of an improved classroom experience is the impact that more engaged part-time faculty might be able to have on student retention. Mills noted that, "...the entire goal of the program was student engagement and how to get the students more engaged which I think, whether it was explicitly stated or just mentioned in passing, of course fed into retention rates and that sort of stuff." For the faculty participants, there seem to be clear links between intended goals of the Summer Certification Program and MCC's desire to improve student outcomes.

Positive experiences with SCP

In general the faculty participants viewed their summer certification program experience in a positive light, enjoyed their time in the program, and felt that it contributed to their professional development. Mills noted of her experience that, "...overall it was positive and I would do it again. I would definitely do it again if it were offered to me, or I could turn back time in hindsight I would still make the same decision I think." While most of the participants cited certain aspects of the program with which they were not happy or areas which they felt could be improved (those will be address later in this section), none had an overall negative experience.

Kelly Smith described the positive attitude that she perceived from her fellow participants:

No, I really did not sense any negativity at all. I thought most people were very open. And even if it might be something totally foreign to what we're dealing

with on a daily basis, I think everybody seemed to have the attitude that they were there to be able to learn some new things. I did not sense any negativity at all at least in the folks I dealt with.

A couple of the participants also spoke to the professional nature of the program and the way in which it was delivered. Gary Sanders noted "...it's the instructors in the program were...they really took it seriously; they were excellent." Williams added:

...the way they presented it where it wasn't high pressure; you didn't get so stressed out about it, but you knew it was serious, that it wasn't just, "Well we're going to do this, so show up and do what you can." It was kind of like, "We're taking this seriously, and we're going to be critiquing you." So that, I thought that was a nice balance between don't stress out about this and don't lose any hair, but...this is important, and we're serious about this.

It appears clear that both the participant and facilitators groups worked to create a supportive and collaborative environment and study participants came away with an overall positive impression of their experience and a sense that the program was worth their time.

Motivations to participate in the SCP

Faculty motivations for participating in the SCP varied but were largely extrinsic in nature and were centered on the potential financial gain from participation and expansion of professional opportunities that might result. Few, though, had well defined, if any, expectations going into the program. Two participants, Jim Caldwell and Kelly Smith noted having a limited initial understanding of the nature of the program, and both instructors along with Betty Mills and John Smith indicated that they had no expectations going into the summer program. Kelly Smith explains:

I went in without too many expectations because I don't think it was really explained in detail. It was more of an opportunity to improve student engagement in the classroom and active learning. So that's pretty much all I knew. I guess going in with no expectations really...I can't say that my expectations were exceeded, because I did not really have a whole lot. But I was very, very pleasantly surprised by how in-depth it was and by how many practical, hands-on things that I came home with.

The only instructor who mentioned specific expectations was Andrews who expressed that she was largely seeking validation for the approach that she was already taking in the classroom.

I wanted to make sure was that I wasn't missing the boat totally because I'm sort of a self-taught instructor, and even though I had great supervisors, I wanted to make sure that I was doing everything that I was supposed to be doing. I didn't want somebody coming back to me later saying, "Well didn't you know you should be doing icebreakers with your students, that you should be playing games with your students, or you should be doing X, Y, and Z with your students?" And I didn't want to be the person saying, "Well, I had no idea, nobody told me." And that's why I wanted to go, and I got exactly what I expected. I was reassured that what I was doing was correct.

While expressions of clear expectations of the summer certification program came through only minimally in the participant interviews, their motivations for participating came down along much more clearly defined lines – (1) improved teaching and other opportunities at MMC, (2) financial motivations, (3) professional development, (4) instructional improvement, and (5) improved connections with MCC community.

Opportunities at MCC

Two of the faculty participants, Caldwell and Sanders, were motivated, at least in part, to accept the invitation to participate in the Summer Certification Program because they felt that it could potentially lead to additional professional opportunities at MCC or out of a sense that participation was expected. Caldwell mentioned that, "...I'm still just trying, in general as an aside, I'm still trying to build my reputation at the school. I want to be a resource for them, and I figure anything I can do the better." Sanders' motivation was not as clear cut but did at least imply some expectation that he attend; "...and so they said you were selected and I was kind of like I was back in the Army. 'I'm selected...OK I'll go!' And so I went. I thought it was just excellent." When pressed, though, he did note that he was really looking forward to the training and wanted to participate because he had not taken advantage of any prior MCC training

programs. He did, though, later express a concern that participation in the SCP might serve as a de facto requirement for future teaching opportunities:

But MCC is running a part-time certification program I get invited to attend. And I enjoy teaching at MCC, so I'm figuring if I'm going to keep on teaching at MCC, I got to be certified, because one of these days they're going to come up and say, "OK well we're going to concentrate on certified part-time." OK so I was covering my bets on that."

Remuneration

One of the factors that did clearly come through as a motivator for participants was the stipend that each received for successfully completing the program; although, it did only appear to be a primary incentive for one participant. Mills stated that:

Honestly, part of it was the stipend at the end of the summer because...that summer I didn't have a summer course to teach....If there hadn't been a stipend, I don't actually know if I would have done it. I'm not always motivated by money, but I definitely, I distinctly remember that being like, "Oh wow, I actually get paid if I complete this training!" And so I did it.

The stipend was the first thing that Bledson mentioned when asked about her motivations for participating; although, she did indicate that her supervisor's belief that she would benefit from the training was her primary motivation for accepting the SCP invitation. For others, including Williams and Caldwell, the stipend did at least serve as an important side benefit. Caldwell noted, "...then I found out they were paying me which of course that did help. I would have done it if they hadn't paid me, but I definitely appreciated the stipend particularly with a six month pregnant wife at the time." Financial incentives, even if not the primary motivator for most, were thus seen as a clear benefit for some of the participants.

Credentialing

Another important motivating factor for faculty participants was the value that a couple of them placed in a credential that they would receive or believed that they would receive upon

completion of the program. Caldwell placed a high value on professional certifications and credentials and saw the Summer Certification Program as a piece in building his resume. He noted:

I initially was saying cool I'm getting certified. That was my immediate response. And then after that I realized, oh goodness, I'm actually going to get something out of it. And I make that point kind of in gest, but I do have all kinds of alphabet soup behind my name. I can list on a professional level many of those certifications I have solely for the sake of having certifications....I have all types of licenses and certifications. Some of them I get just because I feel obligated to because I have the other 18, I might as well get the 19th. And I kind of looked at it like that. Like cool, this will look good on a resume and may get me some exposure to other groups in the school.

Mills too felt that she would be earning a credential that could potentially benefit her for future opportunities. She noted:

I thought the title of it, part-time faculty certification, I honestly thought that there was going to be more of a, legitimacy is not the word I'm really wanting, but oftentimes when you hear that someone's been certified, like I am a certified public school teacher, that really means something to be a certified public school teacher. So when I saw the title and it said faculty certification, I was really thinking that it would be some sort of credential that would carryover more to say another community college or something like that. So it just kind of goes back to why did I did it to begin with. So I didn't really know what I was getting into, but then when I went to the orientation for that program and it was going to be more about students, I completely went brain dead for a second... ways to get students more motivated to learn and that sort of thing.

Both instructors, though, noted that once they understood the true nature of the program and were progressing through the activities and assignments, that they were getting much more out of it than a credential and better understood the real benefits of the program.

Instructional improvement

Four of the participants cited a desire to become better instructors and improve classroom presentation skills as motivation for accepting the SCP invitation. Roberts mentioned that:

...I just want to be able to become the best adjunct professor I possibly can. The only way to do that is to constantly search for ways to improve. So whenever I

come across a course like the part-time certification program, it excites me because it gives me something to try out.

Page noted her desire to continuously learn and improve as a teacher as her motivation:

...there's always room for improvement. I'm not by any means perfect. I don't expect that I'll ever be perfect, so I'll always be in a mode to learn new ways. And no as our student population changes and their expectations change, I think there's always an opportunity to learn. So that's why I attended.

Additionally, Kelly Smith listed her desire to improve her lecture skills and John Smith mentioned his wish to learn best practices from his colleagues as motivators for attending.

Connections with MCC community

Finally, two other participants mentioned a desire to develop connections both with other part-time faculty as well as a deeper connection with the MCC community at large as a motivation for attending the summer program. Williams noted that she:

...was interested in meeting other part-time people and other non-communications part-time people. I wanted to meet...there was a need for me to meet the science part-time people and the history part-time people and just to kind of see how other departments were and what other people were going through.

Sanders also saw the value in developing connections with part-time faculty in other areas of the college:

...I just wanted to interact; part-time instructors don't interact with anybody so far as other faculty. You go teach, you get finished teaching, and then you get in your car and go home or back to your office. And I just wanted to interact with some of the other instructors.

While only Sanders and Williams cited an interest in developing deeper connections at MCC as motivation for participating in the summer program, most of the faculty would recognize this as a benefit after going through the SCP; this will be developed further later on in this section.

Participant motivations for accepting the SCP invitation therefore varied by instructor but they

were largely extrinsic in nature and contrasted, interestingly, with most study participants' intrinsic motivations for teaching.

Nature of the SCP experience

While many of the faculty had few, if any, expectations going into the summer program, most came away from the experience having gained some key benefits that would impact both their short-term and long-term experience as instructors at MCC. Additionally, there were more commonalities in how participants experienced the SCP than there were in the motivations that led them to undertake the program in the first place. Generally, professional development administrators would tweak the schedule, topic coverage, and program format of the SCP with each summer's offering based on their own observations and feedback from participants and facilitators; however, the basic structure of the overall program remained consistent. Participants and facilitators would all come together for a whole group session for a meet and greet, program overview, and instruction. This would be followed by a series of online modules which built on the student engagement techniques presented in the opening sessions and course texts. Finally, the program would culminate with the participants coming back onsite to complete a teaching demonstration in which the instructor would model one of the student engagement techniques learned over the course of the program. Changes in the program structure often stemmed from participants' expressed desire for more or less time onsite and online. Director of Professional Development, Barbara Knight pointed out that:

I think this tweaking this program and integrating the online elements with the face-to-face elements has improved it. And that was something that we started tweaking the year, I guess the year before with Kathy. But it's keeping it fresh, evolving it, and sort of making sure that Lisa and Kathy and all of those that are involved with it are really keeping it relevant for what the faculty needs to have. That's why...we really do use the feedback. Lisa went through, meticulously through the feedback and went in and adjusted the syllabus, adjusted the

activities, created linkages, did some things to make sure that we were addressing the issues that they had.

I will begin here by first examining the components of the program that participants found most helpful. Next, I will review the social benefits that participants gained from the program; these include developing connections with their peers and the greater MCC community as well as building a deeper sense of community. Finally, I will take a deeper dive into how the lessons learned from the summer program have impacted participants' approach to classroom instruction and their overall development as instructors.

Beneficial components

One of the more effective components of the summer program from the participants' perspective and the one with certainly the greatest perceived long-term impact was the main course text, *Student Engagement Techniques*, by Elizabeth Barkley. It was one of two texts used in the summer program, the other being *Getting Results*, but it was the one most often cited by participants as having an impact on them and their approach to teaching following completion of the SCP. Williams, John Smith, Kelly Smith, Page, Mills, Sanders, and Roberts all cited the *Student Engagement Techniques* text as a useful or helpful resource. Williams spoke to the quality of the text and its usefulness as a resource:

...we had a nice book with all these ideas for classroom engagement (laughing). It was awesome to get the book, and it was just like 85 different ways to engage your students. So it was just a great resource that we got, but then we used the book. And so we had to teach our fellow classmates. And so, it was neat to read that book, go through that book, and to read the kind of why behind the engaged student and how that...as to how to teach.

Some of the faculty who completed the 2011 SCP also spoke to the value of the author's presentation to the group during their first session together. In referring to Barkley's presentation, Kelly Smith noted:

She actually came to our opening session which involved her coming and presenting to us and having us go through some of the techniques in that book. It was a great introduction. She was just a very dynamic person to be able to do that....I just thought it was a really nice way to start it and I think especially her success with it and talking about the successes in other programs that have used it. What a difference it made in the students, and I think she just presented a very strong case for it.

Page too mentioned the impact that the author's presence had on her appreciation of the text and how she continues to use lessons from it in her courses:

She had some really lovely stories that she shared with us regarding student engagement and interpretation, and as I reflect back on it, I do recall that I thought that was pretty interesting. And I also have, of course, her book on student engagement techniques, and I've actually utilized some of these in my classroom.

This continued use by some of the SCP participants of the *Student Engagement Techniques* text represents perhaps one of the more significant impacts that it had on those completing the program. John Smith mentions:

...as far as the material that we got in the certification program, I realized that there's actually something in writing that justifies if you want to teach a class or teach a subject...if you are doing gaming, if you are doing lecture, if you are doing skits or whatever....I've got a resource now that I can go to and see what it works best for and how it works best in regards to my own classes.

Mills also noted that, "...some of the techniques that were in the book, I incorporate them from time to time and I think about it a lot." The *Student Engagement Techniques* text, therefore, appears to have represented both a short-term as well as longer term value for participants and one that has clearly impacted participants' classroom practice.

The teaching demonstration at the end of the summer program was also well received by most of the participants interviewed, and it was generally seen as one of the more impactful components as well. It represented the final deliverable for program participants and required that each faculty member complete a short teaching demonstration in which they modeled one of

the student engagement techniques covered in the texts. Mills described the value that she found in the demonstration exercise:

...the last time we met we were supposed to demonstrate one of these techniques, and I really enjoyed that because some, I guess that I'm more of a visual person and I learn by doing. Sometimes you can read something and go that doesn't really make any sense to me...like I don't get the idea of what this person is trying to convey. But then when you see how people would apply different things to their specific subject areas, sometimes it was very interesting, and to see that and also to see other peoples' teaching styles. I actually thought that was probably the most valuable part was actually that last part when we had to give a lesson in the field.

Jeff Roberts and John Smith also discussed the value that they found in the teaching demos with Smith noting, "...I think the opportunity to come together and do the demonstrating, demonstration teaching strategies, and seeing how different people use different things...that was very valuable." Smith goes on to note how he has used examples that others presented in the teaching demonstration in his own class.

Participants had a much more varied view on the value of the online component of the summer certification program; although, more did see the online modules as a strong supporting component to the SCP than those who found it to be lacking. Between the initial full group meeting and their final teaching demonstrations, participants were divided into smaller sub-groups, each led by one of the SCP facilitators, where they would complete a series of online modules related to student engagement. Andrews noted how the online component of the program helped to stitch-in what the facilitators were covering in the live sessions. Mills spoke to the program's online activities and the role they played in supporting participant engagement and communication; "...you got to know certain people's sort of online persona, and when you saw them again at the next face to face session, it just made it easier to communicate with them, to be

more open, and to do that sort of thing.” Kelly Smith expounded on this idea by noting how the commonalities shared by sub-group members helped facilitate idea sharing:

...the fact that we were in smaller groups and the way we were assigned to groups, we were assigned to groups that were faculty in similar programs to ours. Like this one group I was in has some other people that were in some other health care professions. So we had a lot more in common, a lot more similar types of classroom dynamics and labs that we were doing. Being able to bounce information and ideas off of each other and it just had that. I know part of it was formal types of things where we had to respond to certain sessions online, but being able to just communicate with some of those folks in our online forums, I got a lot of great ideas from other people. Hopefully there was an exchange there too.

In addition to offering a forum in which to share ideas and build connections with each other, one participant, Williams, spoke to the benefit of perspective that she gained from the online discussions. She was able for the first time see the Blackboard tool from the student’s perspective and noted:

...it was in that session where I learned for the first time that I can log in Blackboard and see what a student sees, because before I never knew that I could do that. So I learned that, which was good, and now I do go and see how a student sees what I’m posting and stuff. So that was a good lesson (laughing). It definitely helped me to think about just the order and ways that I might post announcements. Do I put oldest to first or newest first? I mean just little things like that.

These participants’ experiences, therefore, seem to support the idea that the online modules were integrated with the onsite portions of the SCP and helped to foster social connections between participants in the program.

While participant comments were mostly complementary of the online component of the program, Bledson and Caldwell, expressed concerns that the online modules lacked impact and limited the effectiveness of the program. In discussing her sub-group work, Bledson complained that the online focus limited participant interaction. She noted, “Well, because most of it was online, any kind of interaction that we had seemed fairly, I don’t mean to be critical, but it was

fairly superficial. I don't feel like we really got into it too much. We didn't go deep." For Caldwell as well the online discussions felt limited and fell short of his expectations; although, for him the issue centered more on a lack of participation by his fellow sub-group members:

We were not using the tools to their full advantage. There was no real-time or even remotely real-time discussion or something, though we tried. We would, there were a couple of us, it was very clear that there were a couple of us...maybe 3 of us that every time someone else posted something, we would try to get a conversation going. We would say, "Great I liked your point about this, have you thought about this?" We were trying to get a dialogue going. And now Bill, my particular faculty mentor in this, he absolutely responded to every single one. But it was kind of falling on deaf ears. So there's not, I don't know if it's a specific critique necessarily because you're only able to do that if the other students are able to engage, but I felt like it was ironic that we're talking about student engagement as a core but those of us as students were not being engaged in the conversation. So, I don't know...I was looking for getting the most out of this and to get the most out of it there was going to be more than just a dialogue with the instructor.

The main course text and the teaching demonstrations were seen by most of the participants as beneficial components of the SCP and both appear to have had a lasting impact on their classroom practice and at the very least are seen as a resource by most of the participants in this study. The structure of the summer program was generally seen as effective by participants; although, their impressions of the effectiveness of the online component are clearly mixed.

Social benefits

One benefit of the Summer Certification Program that was nearly universally recognized by study participants was the opportunity to make connections with their peers, especially those adjunct faculty members from outside their own departments. It also offered a counter to the sense of isolation that some of the adjuncts felt. Roberts shared that:

What it did primarily was reassure me that I was not alone, kind of like being a sole practitioner in private practice. You spend your life working by yourself so sometimes you think that you are the only one who is doing it. I have never been a sole proprietor, but I have been in situations, primarily here at X company, where I was the only attorney down here in Metro City. It was kind of like I was

alone, and teaching part time you feel that way. You have no connection with anybody else. I was greatly reassured when I was in that class and I was hearing other adjunct professors commiserating about the issues, and they were the similar issues that I was having.

The session structures did allow for participants to interact with their peers in ways that some had not had the opportunity to do before. Andrews noted, “I enjoyed meeting my fellow peers in a big session, but it’s not always feasible. It was nice that this was set-up in this manner that we met at the beginning and we met at the end....” Even for those faculty who, prior to participating in the summer program, had had the opportunity to interact on some level with other adjuncts in their own department, few had the chance to build connections with adjuncts from other areas of the college. Sanders described how, “...it was an effective program for me because up until that point in time, well I mean I taught there 8 years, I’d never had any contact except that narrow little contact in the department, so it was a lot of fun.” Kelly Smith also recognized the opportunity to make connections with faculty from other departments that the SCP helped to foster. She explained:

So being adjunct, I’m usually there in the evenings. So I don’t see some other people. I know the people within my realm that teach our classes, but I don’t necessarily know others, and that was one advantage of this certification program. When we were all pulled together for the initial meeting, we were in groups and they somewhat had to try to put certain topics together, like healthcare would be one major group and then others. But after that when we came back and signed up for the teaching demonstrations, you signed up based on what would work with your schedule, so consequently your group at that point was probably going to be a mixture of a lot of people and not necessarily just health related.

Page appreciated the opportunity to share experiences with such a diverse group:

MCC is rather unique in that they have a rather substantial adjunct faculty staff, but I’ve intermingled with all of them and from all different disciplines and all different...everything from medical...I sat in a team with someone who did surgical terminology. So it’s just fascinating to hear their experiences versus my experience. Even though it can be a very similar student population, it’s different disciplines.

Opportunities to build social connections went beyond the regular sessions and included scheduled and unscheduled times when participants could casually interact. Williams discusses the benefits that she felt program planners built into the SCP by providing lunch for attendees:

...the whole term I thought they were really taking care of us, and even through little things like providing lunch for us, that really helped add a little bit of socialness into the Saturdays. Because if we have to go lunch on our own, then everyone would have gone in their car by themselves and not....So, because I was eating lunch with strangers, I talked to people and I got to know other people. And so little things like that were not only just a free lunch, but it was....I met new people that I would never have met before even though we were in the same classroom together. We don't always talk to the guy way in the corner, but even the way they had that set-up, I thought was really good, and I don't know if they thought of that, if they did it on purpose, but I thought that was very smart and good to kind of keep us together the whole time and yet still be able to have a little bit of the social time where we weren't in class the whole time. So that was a good break-up.

The times that participants shared in and out of sessions often led to bonding opportunities between participants as they began to recognize common interests and experiences. In discussing a side conversation that he and his fellow sub-group members had about Robert Fluhum's *All I really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten*, Caldwell shared:

...that for me was one of those moments where I realized OK, ah hah, I, we, we're all on the same level playing field here. That book had an impact on my life and my teaching, and it had for them as well. So that was one of those commonalities that we had shared, then I realized cool well I have something to talk about to these much longer tenured educators.

Whether intended or not, the opportunity for participants to come together with their peers, interact, and develop an understanding of one another and the commonalities that they shared, proved very impactful for most involved. The SCP seemed to provide a real opportunity to develop a sense of community among the adjuncts there. Bledson noted that this was a benefit that her supervisor felt she would receive from participating:

I think that also since my supervisor sensed that it was a chance for community of some sort in a way that, like you were saying earlier, that adjuncts typically don't.

We don't feel that community because we kind of come and go in the night so to speak, and we're not bound by...we don't have the benefits and we don't have the ties to the college that the full time staff does, and that was just one...that was something he could offer me that would speak to that connection.

Mills confirmed this sentiment in stating that, "I think at the time I did definitely foster a sense of community because it would definitely bring people from different departments who would otherwise have probably never meet each other or seen each other...it brought us together."

Most of the participants viewed their social experience in the summer program in a very positive light with only a few sensing any social tension or favoritism on the part of other participants. Caldwell, Sanders, Bledson, and Mills all reported that they experienced no social tension or tendency for participants to form cliques or favor certain participants over others.

Only two faculty noted any tensions or problems among participants, and for one it represented only a minor barrier between veteran and new adjuncts; Andrews stated:

I didn't see any cliques as far as continuing ed. and different departments, but I did notice, of course, the older instructors who've been there 20 or 30 years as adjuncts that they all knew each other. They tended to gravitate towards each other. And then you'd have to force yourself in, and if you aren't an outgoing person, you sort of got stuck with those of us who were rebels that were new. I'm very outgoing, obviously, so it didn't bother me to go up to these people and go, "Oh, you've been here 28 years. I've been here 3 years. Hi, how you doing? (laughing) So, what are you teaching, and why are you doing that? And I don't understand." And they're just mortified like, "Who let her in?" (laughing)

For John Smith the issue was not so much tension but barriers in understanding between curriculum and continuing education faculty. He noted:

Personally, being in a Continuing Education division of the college versus a curriculum...it is different. So I don't know when I was with other part-time, adjunct faculty and maybe some of them were attorneys and they're teaching a part of law or somebody that is in dental hygiene. If they were teaching in the curriculum, I felt like they were seeing things differently than those of us that are teaching through continuing education.

In his eyes, the issues stemmed more from the administration's lack of action than from the participants themselves:

I think as far as the people in the room, all of us on the same level as adjunct faculty, that was not as much of an issue as I feel it is on the next level up. The people that were not in the room that would maybe have some control over addressing these, the directors, the deans, some of those...are they looking at anything of this nature to maybe see if there could be more coordination.

Participants also had the opportunity through the summer program to build greater connections with the college itself and varying support staff. A few of the study participants mentioned feeling a greater sense of connection with MCC after completing the summer program. Sanders noted, "Yeah I walked out of this feeling a lot closer connection with the school. Now, I thought if that was one of their goals they achieved it." Andrews also discussed how the chance to meet others from different areas of the college opened her up to the prospect of new opportunities within the college; "...for me, it was finding out that there were other opportunities and that I wasn't just limited. Even though the school only needs me to teach one class, I might be needed to help someone else." For Mills, her sense of connection to MCC following the summer program was particularly strong; "I think at the time it made me feel more of a sense of pride with MCC. You asked about relating to MCC as a whole, and I guess there was more of a sense of, not ownership, but investment in the college campus." So whether participants were able to build connections with other adjunct faculty from other departments or they were able to network with staff and leaders from other areas of the college, their sense of being part of a much larger college community seems to have, at least in part, been enhanced through their summer certification program experience.

In addition to fostering connections with their fellow adjuncts, the SCP allowed participants to share ideas and best practices. Several participants noted the supportive

environment that encouraged everyone to share ideas and support one another. Andrews pointed this out and noted its importance in instructor growth:

...it was such an open atmosphere, and as a whole I find the instructors are very engaging. They will, if they see you sitting there as a wallflower, try to pull you out and try to bring you into their group...the older ones maybe not so much (laughing). But they do make an effort, and they are all great at explaining whatever you have. So you didn't feel...I get students to this day, "Oh, I know it's a dumb question." It's never a dumb question. You have to answer the question otherwise you never learn. It's the same as an adjunct. We have to tell each other, it's OK, it's not a dumb question, and you can ask because you're new. And even if you've been here 30 years, it's OK. You're old, and you've forgotten! (laughing)

Andrews, Smith, Page, and Sanders all cited instances of sharing best practices and other instructional improvement ideas that they gained from their participation in the summer program.

Page noted sharing:

...different approaches to teaching by virtue of the material, so you do, you can take away a lot of things. A lot of the things that we've done in the past, that I really did enjoy, is they'll give a situation and then we, a lot of times from an independent perspective, will like to each go around the room and say how we'd handle that situation, and you learn from those opportunities as well.

For Page, even though she felt the feedback from her facilitators was helpful, the feedback that she received from her fellow adjuncts was more memorable and impactful. Andrews discussed the helpful nature of her fellow adjuncts and related a collaborative project that resulted from her interactions with another participant in the summer program:

I had met a woman who teaches an English class, and she said it was very frustrating to teach an English class when the students don't know how to use Microsoft Word. Well, anytime you want to we can swap. I'll come teach your class Word for a day, and you come teach my class how to punctuate because they suck! (laughing) Yeah, and I said it's a perfect swap game if you can find somebody, because I work with librarians, and I know how librarians operate. I wasn't going to get a librarian to come into my classroom, but I can get an English teacher to, and she loved having an IT person coming into hers.

As with the community building that participants enjoyed, much of the idea and best practice sharing occurred during those informal moments that they shared together. Sanders spoke of the improvements that he has made in his own instruction; "...a lot of the updating, and some of it's subtle...but a lot of that I got out of just sitting around and talking to these instructors...full-time as well as the part-timers going through the program." Participants, thus, found real value and benefit in the limited down time that they had, and this suggests that many were indeed using this time productively. This also suggests that program planners might find it worthwhile to build more unscripted time into the days when participants come together for the onsite sessions.

Impact on instructor practice

Perhaps the most significant indicator of the success of the summer certification program lies in participants' use, after completion, of the tools and lessons learned in the program. This would include both the immediate use of engagement techniques as well as the long-term impact on instructor practice and development. All ten of the practitioner adjunct faculty interviewed indicated at least some use of materials, techniques, or connections learned from the SCP in their classrooms after completing the program. One participant noted how effortlessly and rather unintentionally he began to incorporate the lessons learned in the SCP into his classroom practice; "I think I've had enough time for it to permeate that I am doing some things without realizing that what I'm actually pulling from is things I learned in the course, particularly reading the *Student Engagement Techniques*."

On a fairly basic level, the engagement techniques covered in the SCP helped to create an active environment where students had to remain alert. Mills and Williams both spoke to concerns about students' lack of attention in class, and Williams noted that this was a particular concern for her evening students. She stated:

I guess the whole point of getting an engaged student is to help them remember and stay alert in the class (laughing) and awake...6 o'clock at night they're tired. So it's actually been really helpful, and I have changed not a whole lot...in the beginning probably prior to the semester is the same, but after we get into the semester and the students get more, "Oh, got to go to class," and when they usually start dropping off, I'll start bringing in the engaging thing to keep them alert and coming back to class.

In addition to fatigue, Roberts also notes the how the hectic lives of his students require a more engaging approach to instruction on the part of the professor:

...teaching at night and a lot of times my students are full-time mothers or full-time employees who left home and grabbed a bite to eat, then feed the family, and have to rush out to college. These people have lives that are a little more hectic or in need of management and organization than your typical college student. It means I just cannot just get up there and lecture a class...you cannot do that. They're going to fall asleep; they're not going to want to be there.

The engagement techniques learned from the SCP then helped to serve as a counter to student fatigue and lack of focus and for Williams and Roberts helped to keep them involved in the class.

Echoing these comments, Mills also spoke to the added benefit of helping students remember course material:

...I thought that was interesting because I never taught anybody whether kids or adults...there's a point where your lesson just sucks, the weather's too hot or too humid, and people are just looking at you as if they are zombies. And nobody really wants to...it doesn't make for a fun class. So it's always good to have some things that you can kind of pull on for variety, and research has shown that if people have an emotion, they're going to remember more, and...hopefully that emotion is going to be happiness to help them solidify that knowledge and have it go over to their long term memory.

Roberts and Caldwell also spoke to the increased use of student engagement techniques in their classrooms following the completion of the SCP. Caldwell, who indicated that he generally brought an engaging style to the classroom, found the techniques from the course texts helpful. Roberts noted the importance of gaining the trust of his students and proactively involving them from the very beginning of class:

...every class I start in my first class and choose one of the engagement techniques from Ms. Barkley's book, and we spend a class doing that exercise. It is a team building or a trust or comfort exercise meant to get people to engage in the class so that....For example, last night I was in a class...we were there until a quarter to 9:00 p.m. because they just wanted to keep talking. Every single student to a person was interactive and participating.

For Mills, Williams, Caldwell, and Rogers overcoming the fatigue and distraction that students, especially the evening students that so many adjunct faculty teach, presents a significant challenge for which the engagement techniques learned through the summer certification program offers an important counter.

A few of the participants cited specific examples of engagement techniques covered during the SCP that they've implemented in their own classes. Sanders described a particularly impactful exercise that he has used to help his students overcome their fear of asking questions in class:

...I could never get students...I always had the feeling that students had questions but were afraid to ask. This one instructor (from the SCP) had this technique called the exit pass. And you couldn't leave - it was just on a 3 x 5 card - you couldn't leave class until you filled out an exit pass. If you had to ask one question about this class, what we've covered today in this class, what would it be? OK, so they all filled that out and some of them are duplicates and some of them you could hardly understand, but there are 4, 5, or 6 that made a lot of sense. And so the first of the next class you covered those. I thought that was excellent.

Page also shared an example of how she learned a technique to flip the traditional class exam into an engaging activity that helped to promote student learning:

...so I have a real issue with exams without resources, so one of the things that I learned in this summer session was that there was a way to give an exam, and I've utilized it in 2 different classes...not consistently but here and there, and the students absolutely love it where I give an exam and if a question is worth 2 points after they're completely done with the exam, I let them get together in groups, and they can go back through the exam, and if they have different answers, they can discuss why they have a different answer or perhaps what the correct answer is and why. And then they get, rather than lose 2 points, they can actually gain a point. So they like it because they get to talk about, and I've sat and listened to them talk: "Well I picked this answer because...this, this, and

this,” and then someone else, they’ll say well, “Yeah I understand why you did that, but I picked this answer because...remember in class they talked about this and someone brought up this...”, and they’re like, “Oh, oh that’s right...you’re right and I’m wrong...oh OK.” So it’s kind of fun to listen to them.

With this technique, Page is able to show how an instructor can take even one of the most recognizable elements of the traditional, lecture-based classroom, the exam, and turn it into an engaging, active exercise. In addition, she discussed another technique from the summer program that she has found helpful in encouraging small group discussions:

...there’s one concept that she’s used here that I used....It’s a practice if you will where I’ve taken all kinds of facts and there are about 100 facts, and then I have students get into groups and they put them where they belong so to speak in different groupings, and it’s an engagement process as well as a learning process, and I like using that.

Page indicated further that she intends to incorporate additional techniques from the SCP’s course texts into future classes. Caldwell noted how he had incorporated the engagement technique that he used for his SCP teaching demo into his subsequent class sections and that he had found it to be very effective:

...the teaching demo that I did, the deliverable that I had for that, I’ve actually used in three seminars since. And it was a deliverable I developed for the teaching demo that has actually been one of my most successful and useful handouts that I’ve ever done. So that’s a very number by number thing there. I developed the technique as a result of her S.E.T. number whatever, S.E.T., student engagement technique number 47 or whatever it was, and I used that technique to develop this handout that I’ve used in various seminars...I think three seminars I’ve used that. I’ve just changed the name at the top the same teaching demo...it’s just presentation effectively.

Finally, while not citing specific examples, Kelly Smith showed that even for classes that generally do not lend themselves to an engaging style, she was able to find value in the lessons learned from the summer program:

I actually must say most of the SETs and most of the things in the book are really hard to implement in the type of classes that I would teach or the type of...the physical therapy curriculum, but there were several in there that were just ideal

that I have been able to use a couple of times in both the lecture and in the labs that I am teaching. So there were some really hands on, practical things that I would probably not have even thought about doing. I have gotten really good feedback from the students when I have done them too.

Several of the participants also spoke to a stronger understanding of their roles and responsibilities as instructors and important tools and resources available to them developed through their participation in the summer program. Sanders discussed his new appreciation of the importance of a well-developed syllabus; "...for example I learned that I had to include just a heck of a lot more on my syllabus than had ever even crossed my mind. If it's something important, it had better be on that syllabus." Bledson and John Smith mentioned how they came away with a better understanding of the resources available to students. For Bledson, she appreciated being able to refer students to the services offered by the college. Smith noted how he has incorporated this resource discussion into his classroom practice:

I will say that throughout the sessions, particularly the last session, they did tell us other things that are available in the college services such as resources like the library, counseling and the various things that maybe as an adjunct you are not aware that it is out there for the students to use, or it's there for you as a faculty person. And I have valued that in that I have gone and used some things, doing some stuff that I can assign the students to the learning resource centers to look for some streaming videos and things like that I had not used before.

Beyond a better understanding of resources and responsibilities, some participants discussed improvements that they had made in their lesson planning following completion of the summer program. Mills noted, "I think sometimes it makes me think more like when I plan a lesson about what can I do in this situation to make this more interesting to make the students work together and actually use the language...." Roberts discussed how, following the SCP discussion on MCC's four core competencies that all students are expected to master over the course of their studies, he implemented those into his own class:

I think it was a recognition that we need to prepare the students to be aware of what these core competencies are and to get them at the very least where they are able to function in society successfully. This is the only way you can do it if they are fully adept in those four competencies, and I think that they really did recognize that. In fact, I can recall Kathy actually going over the core competencies of the school. I build those into my first class as I am going over my syllabus. I have the core competencies actually built in to my syllabus and we actually talk about them.

Also, another participant, John Smith, indicated a shift, even if somewhat slight, away from an exclusively lecture-based instructional approach to one that involves some team work:

I've tried to develop a few more team activities at the very beginning of class so the people can realize they don't have to study by themselves to accomplish a goal. If they can work with somebody else, sometimes they will help them learn something that is difficult than if they were trying to do it on their own.

Finally, Bledson spoke to an improved understanding of her role as an instructor:

I've understood the difference between giving advice and teaching. I don't know that I still have it totally clear in mind, but it's not up to me to give advice or to judge; it's up to me to teach and to teach the subject...and to really understand what is my responsibility and what isn't, and I think as I get clearer about those lines in the sand, I become a better teacher. And it also frees me up to not ponder every single thing that crosses my so called desk and try to figure out what I need to do about it, which takes a lot of time and then it ends up taking time away ultimately from the students because I'm taking time out to, what I might have previously seen as refereeing a situation, when it wasn't my place to do it in the first place.

These examples point to a significant shift in participants' approach to classroom instruction that can be attributed in large part to their lessons learned during the summer certification program. Participants gave the impression of being more confident in their roles as instructors, and they certainly demonstrated a willingness, and to an extent, an eagerness to experiment with more active, engaging approaches to instruction.

SCP shortcomings

While the participants' overall experience with the summer certification program comes through in very positive terms, most did share at least some concerns that they had about the program

following their experience. These concerns ranged from minor inconveniences to significant structural issues that limited the potential benefit derived from the program. Study participants offered generally constructive criticism of the program and suggestions on how various aspects of the SCP might be improved. I will take a deeper dive into these concerns which fall along four primary lines – (1) time constraints, (2) issues with feedback, (3) minimal interaction, and (4) limited follow-up – as well as other areas of individual participant concern. Finally, I will review the ideas that participants shared for changing and improving the program.

Participants had more concerns about the time constraints that they faced than any other issue with the program. These included limited time within the SCP to complete program activities as well as time constraints faced by participants from outside the program. Caldwell expressed his concerns about the limitations of the short program timeframe in sharing:

It was very condensed, the timeline. If we could have spread all that out maybe over another two weeks, maybe three weeks, I think that would have helped. At least all of my concerns with it are going to come back to that to some degree, because it was just so quick.

Caldwell went on to note that several participants expressed similar concerns. While the time constraints presented a problem for some, at least one participant, John Smith, found the SCP timeframe to be a strength of the program. He shared, “...one of the reasons that I did accept was knowing that it was going to be basically just that month of June with everything else that was going on. Had it been going to run the whole summer, I probably would have declined.”

Most of the complaints shared with me, though, centered on the limited time for delivering and evaluating the final participant presentations at the end of the SCP. Sanders joked that, “It was kind of rushed....they had 17 cats in a 5 cat gunny sack. So they had to kind of push on through!” Andrews noted that with her large sub-group, the time constraints did not allow enough time for everyone to present:

...in our group I think that there were 12 people, and I think we got through 9 people. We had to give up. We just couldn't get through everybody....a few rushed through the presentation, because not only did you present, but then you got the feedback and critique from other people. So you presented how to do a mathematic....Because we have math instructors too, they were doing mathematical equations, and they were trying to teach us like they would teach their students, and we were getting lost, and we were asking a lot of questions. Next thing you know they were over their 5 minute limit, so that meant the next presenter didn't get enough time to present. And to get that feedback that was really good, a lot of us were scribbling on index cards giving feedback to that person, and just throwing it at them!

Roberts also saw this as a concern noting, "...there was a huge weakness with it. Each of our presentations was limited to 10 minutes. The problem is that they had too many presentations to give and not enough time." He remarked that this tendency to go over time limits created tension among some in the group:

I can tell you that people were getting testy when the people who were giving their teaching demonstrations went over their time, because you are limited to the 10 minutes and if you are at the 15 minute mark, you've gone over significantly. At the same time you are frustrated by the fact there is no presentation that you can possibly give of any quality in 10 minutes.

For Kelly Smith, she found that the teaching demonstration time constraints limited her and other participants' ability to fully develop the topic they presented to the group:

I think it was a little more challenging and I realized that I did not have the time as we were so limited on the time for 5, 7, or maybe 10 minutes to try to teach this particular thing. I realized it was not quite time enough to really explain what or give enough background for them to know what this case study was....I think it was really limited a lot of people, and I think that was the one thing they didn't really hold everybody to that exact time. There were people who did run over which made the class run a little bit over. I think with the group it did not matter really a whole lot, but I think a lot of people found it difficult to teach something in that short amount of time.

While participants in general spoke very highly of the teaching demonstrations as a culminating project for the summer program, and many as noted earlier have used either their own demonstration or examples provided by other participants as models for activities in their own

classes, the concerns over time constraints do point to an area for potential improvement and an opportunity for turning the teaching demonstration into an even more powerful tool.

One of the participants, Caldwell, spoke to the time constraints that he and other faculty members faced from outside the SCP due to their heavy professional commitments. For Caldwell these challenges were particularly acute for the practitioner faculty participants, and he cited this as a likely reason for the limited participation by his fellow sub-group members in the online discussions:

...I'm not knocking the people that didn't comment, but I think what probably happened is, particularly because I was in a CCE sub-group predominately, we're all in the same boat. So we have, and I know adjuncts in general are the same way, but I think CCE in particular we are definitely all full-time at some other position, a lot of us in kind of middle management or senior management, so we have those hours that don't seem to stop. So we're all in that same boat and then we're trying to do this certification on top of it. I think they just simply didn't have time to comment and read everybody's comments. I think they were struggling to...get their own reading done and get their own thing posted, they weren't going to do the follow-up stuff in my mind which was OK....I think it was just a lack of time on their part.

He went to note how his own participation in the SCP waned as his work commitments increased:

...for about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the time while I was enrolled, I was able to put in 100%, and towards the later very tail end I just...the work got ridiculous and I had to drive all over the...it just didn't work out. And it was a very specific timeline that we had to do things.

Interestingly, though, while Caldwell felt that he and many of his fellow practitioner participants were limited by full-time work commitments, none of the other participants that I interviewed indicated this was a concern.

While almost half of the participants indicated that SCP time constraints were an issue, the majority had concerns related to the quality and depth of the feedback provided by both the

program facilitators as well as their fellow participants. For Bledson, the feedback that she received from others in her group lacked a beneficial, critical nature:

...as an instructor I've never had that experience before. I didn't get that formal meeting where you're role-playing, and you're teaching something then the fellow instructors will look on and make comments like, "Oh you weren't very clear about this or that," or, "you should have given more time on this," or "you gave too much time on that," or "you needed more visual aids, or more examples or fewer." "You talk too much; you didn't talk enough." I didn't really get that, and then when I finally did teach, it seemed like the instructors were so nurturing of each other that nobody offered any real constructive feedback. They were all really being nice is kind of where it went.

Mills was somewhat less critical, though, of the feedback received from her fellow participants and felt that the nature of their feedback was more evenly split between helpful and superficial comments; "I think it was sort of a 50/50 split with the feedback that I received being just the response, 'Oh interesting' and 'good job' and then someone actually sort of saying something that was more meaningful, insightful, and made you think about something." She also appreciated the opportunity to provide what she felt was helpful feedback due to her experience as an ESL instructor:

In terms of the feedback that I gave there are quite a few people who leave the ESL program and eventually make it to the community college level who would therefore be in regular classes...I think I was able to sometimes give insight into different cultures. You know, "Why did the Asian kid never speak or hide as the Filipino kid always does...?" And I could share some ideas with them and that sort of thing. And so sometimes I felt that I could give meaningful feedback.

There was more widespread agreement, though, about the quality and depth of feedback provided by the program facilitators. Bledson, Page, Sanders, and John Smith all expressed concerns over the nature of facilitators' feedback. For Bledson, the fact that she had difficulty remembering any specific feedback from her facilitator served as an indication of a perceived lack of value:

I don't remember feedback at all...I don't remember any; I may have gotten some, but none of it stuck, and I know constructive feedback always sticks. You remember it later, and I didn't. I guess I could probably safely say that I did not receive anything lasting that made an impression on me or that made an impact.

John Smith, while noting that participants received constant feedback on the assignments submitted over the course of the program, felt that the feedback lacked the kind of detail he was looking for. He also hinted that the feedback lacked the corrective qualities that some participants needed:

...we had the opportunity to see what some of the other people were doing in their responses to the same thing, and I have to say there were times I felt like some were maybe not on the right direction, and we could also see the feedback they were getting, and I'm not sure that they still were clear, that they were doing something maybe not the right way.

While some participants expressed concerns over feedback from both their fellow participants as well as program facilitators on the final teaching demonstrations, a couple of the participants, Page and Sanders, spoke to the limited impact of facilitator feedback on their sub-group discussions and submissions. For Page, while she spoke very highly of the facilitators, none of the feedback they provided stood out; she noted, "...a lot of information that they provided was very thought provoking if you will, but I don't recall any specific feedback." Sanders, on the other hand, was much more direct in his criticism of facilitator feedback in expressing concerns about the lack of depth in the feedback that he received:

... on balance I, if you had to have an area of improvement, would say a little more specific feedback on what you submitted online... Well, we just didn't get a lot of feedback...at least I didn't. Now maybe that's because they didn't like what I said in the first place, I don't know, but, and some of it was that I was on a kind of a make-up mode, I just think it could have been more depth; I know you said that but that's a good term.

Finally, Mills spoke to limiting effect on growth that the dearth of effective feedback had on participants, especially the veteran faculty in her group:

...even people who were instructors they still need....Anybody who's there to learn kind of expects guidance in certain things and some of the people who were in our cohort had been teaching for 30 years, and they kind of have one way of teaching and that was the way that they were taught. And sometimes, for some of those people the things that we do now with actually wanting student input, project based learning and all this sort of stuff, they're going to need more guidance with, and I think there was a lack of that in our group in particular, because the guy didn't give us any guidance, any feedback.

In addition to concerns over time constraints and feedback, a few of the participants shared their concerns over the limited interaction and lack of connection that they developed with their fellow participants. Both Mills and Caldwell noted a lack of interaction in the online modules; however, Mills' complaint centered more on the facilitator's limited involvement in the sub-group discussion, while Caldwell noted a lack of responsiveness on the part of his fellow participants. Mills stated:

...in my group the faculty member who was in charge of our group would not respond to our posts. And he only responded to the one guy who was in his department. And I wrote it down....we could hand write comments at the end, but we all noticed it. Like we would get together and talk and then we'd see each other face to face because sometimes the person who would actually pose a question, and it was obviously directed to that particular instructor, and he never would respond. He only responded to the guy who was in his department.

Caldwell, on the other hand, did not have a concern with his facilitator but lamented the unwillingness of the others in his sub-group to join in; "I had this explicit recommendation at the end of the course...there was not a lot of interaction among my other students or my colleagues. I mean we weren't using Blackboard the way it was intended, or Moodle, whichever one we were using." Also, despite the sense of community that many participants felt developed from their shared experiences, one participant, Bledson, felt that any connections made between faculty remained on a relatively superficial level, and she did not experience any sense of community development among SCP participants:

I did not get a sense of community. I think people were very polite with each other. We didn't have to invent or create anything as teams of people, and I think that's when you really bond. We were sort of politely in class, and there wasn't any...traction or constructive tension and therefore no bonding. I didn't ...there were probably some instructors that made new friends. I certainly experienced a lot of really friendly people. But I think on the other side of it, often adjuncts are a little stressed out and pressed for time, and so they often just don't have a lot of extra time to make new friends unless there were instructors that were from the same department who were present and those folks probably had a tighter bonding as a result.

Her point, though, about the SCP lacking the type of collaborative activities that could potentially promote greater bonding between participants points to a potential opportunity that program leaders have to increase the interactivity in the program and promote deeper connections among adjunct faculty. She does go on to note that she didn't have any expectations of building bonds with others in the program:

I would say that I wasn't really looking for a deep connection through the experience. So there was no expectation and then therefore there was no disappointment; therefore it wasn't negative. But did I receive any extra bonding or make new friends or bond with someone from a different department? No I didn't. So you're right, it stayed on the surface, but I didn't expect it to go deeper and it didn't.

This lack of expectation, therefore, certainly could have influenced her sense that participant interactions were largely superficial in nature.

Another potential concern that emerged from my discussions with SCP participants centered on a lack of follow-up or engagement on the part of participants and program leaders following completion of the program. Both Mills and Kelly Smith lamented that relationships developed during their time in the program didn't last long after they went their separate ways. Smith noted a stronger connection with colleagues and MCC immediately following the summer program that diminished over time:

I think probably right afterwards and especially the fact that several of the people in our online group all being...most of us being in the health profession. It is

interesting because I will see several of those people around the building a lot of us teach in. But don't think we've...I hadn't really maintained any contact with those people on a regular basis or on a professional basis or anything.

In referring to exchanges of information and best practices with other faculty that she met during the SCP, Mills noted, "...it didn't really last long and I don't know if that's because it's people who don't work still at MCC or not or just because our content areas are so different. Despite indications from program leaders of follow-up part-time faculty community events, trainings, and surveys and my own observation of one such community event, awareness of and participation in these activities by study participants seemed limited. Sanders, Andrews, Mills, and Kelly Smith all noted a lack of follow-up activities since completing the SCP. When asked about ongoing training or mentorship from the summer program, Andrews quipped, "No, at least not one that I'm involved in. It's not to say there isn't somebody out there doing something, but I'm sort of on my own." Kelly Smith recalled some discussion near the end of the SCP about having participants get together every month or so to share ideas but noted that her schedule would never have allowed her to attend; she was unsure, though, if others had followed through on this idea. Mills added, though, that even with the lack of follow-up activity, she still retained significant value from the program:

I think it is because it's been two years almost, and the thing there is I haven't had the opportunity with colleagues from MCC in any sort of training or development or even like I said before your kind of typical holiday party...people just sort of getting together and decompressing, that sort of stuff. I guess on some levels it is waning, but at the same time the knowledge that I got I still have, and I think to me that's more important than feeling a sense of community with other instructors who I don't even teach in the same department with.

While the impact of this lack of engagement and follow-up activities following the completion of the SCP is difficult to discern, it is clear that for several of the study participants this represented a missing component in MCC's adjunct faculty development efforts and points to potential

opportunities for additional SCP follow-up activities and better communication of the opportunities that are currently available.

Other concerns raised by a couple of the participants tended to be more individual in nature but generally came back to concerns about the applicability of program concepts and activities to their subject matter or program, a sense that they were already well versed in program concepts, and unmet expectations. Mills noted that because of the uniqueness of the ESL program for which she taught, much of the summer program work didn't apply to her:

I think with the engagement techniques, there was a lot of validity to that...with just that part of the training, I thought that was effective. But in terms of making what I do, because what I do is obviously an anomaly, because if you're teaching French or Spanish or German at MCC you're most likely teaching it to a native English speaker who is going to go and work in English at a local company, and so you don't have to get them to do the same things in French that they have to do in English. So it's more like elective course like music. But I don't know; I've never really thought about that. I was just so used to being an anomaly in terms of what...really at the department that I teach in and what I teach, I really just used to be like okay that doesn't apply.

For Bledson, she had accepted the invitation to participate in the summer program because she wanted to grow as an instructor through the trial and error process of trying new techniques; she noted, however, that these expectations were largely unmet:

OK, this didn't work or the whole thing didn't work or part of it didn't work. So that means that the next semester I'll try to take the part that worked and bring in something else. And then that new dynamic of coupling things together may not work for a variety of reasons. So it's just my strength and that's what has allowed my personal improvement. Was I hoping to get some shade of that in this course? Yes. Did I get it? No.

Both Mills and Bledson also indicated that they already used an engaging approach to teaching and that the engagement concepts covered in the text amounted to more of a review for them. Bledson noted, "...as a creative person, and I think told you I'm always trying to reinvent the wheel for better or worse, I already try a lot of things and so that section of the program seems

like review for me.” Mills, while indicating that much of the engagement text was redundant for ESL instructors, still found it to be a valuable resource:

...I kind of thought that it really was a lot of stuff that language teachers already do because we're not generally...ESL teachers are not kind of teaching the general population. And a lot of it works out...get your students more involved and that sort of thing. But I thought it was a really good resource. I still have the book. I've loaned the book to other colleagues for them to look through. From time to time I even go back to revisit it to look for some more ideas. So I actually thought that part was really good.

Study participant concerns centered primarily on issues related to time limitations.

Participants felt constrained by the limited time allowed to complete and evaluate the final teaching demonstrations, and some participants were limited by other, outside obligations. Several also had an issue with the quality and depth of feedback received from program facilitators as well as each other. Finally, a perceived lack of interaction and a lack of post-SCP follow-up activities represented an issue for some participants. Despite the concerns expressed by some of the SCP participants, on balance all found value in their participation and in general felt the program to be a worthwhile experience. In addition, most of the participants offered suggestions on how the program might be improved.

SCP change ideas

Study participants seemed to have a genuine interest in program improvement and offered several suggestions on how program leaders might shape the SCP to better serve their needs and those of their fellow adjunct faculty. Suggestions ranged from extending the timeframe for completing program requirements to building more creativity and constructive tension into program activities. Participants also offered suggestions for follow-up or follow through activities that could help to further integrate part-time faculty into the fabric of the college and ultimately continue their development.

As noted earlier, Bledson took a very creative approach to classroom instruction and felt innovation to be the hallmark of a successful instructor. Her suggestions centered on building more creativity into SCP program activities:

I know many of my fellow instructors in graphic design have that strength of always trying to create things...ways for the student to learn. We could have done more with that where we were actually called on to invent things; it wasn't just dictated to us. It's like the difference between being given a box of Legos with a picture of what you're supposed to make versus just a box of Legos with no picture....I would have liked it if they didn't just tell us what we should do, but they had us invent.....So, maybe for an accounting instructor where they really need that extra bit of, every bit of creativity they invite. I even feel like any instructor, by the very nature of being an instructor, you need to be creative. You need to be a little made to make up stuff that's applicable to your...try things, make games out of learning. By the very nature of being an instructor, you're creative. So I would go so far as to say more invention in that course would have been helpful.

For Bledson, instructor growth comes from these opportunities to be creative and to try new things. In addition, with several participants expressing concerns over program time constraints, both Roberts and Caldwell made suggestions to extend the time given to participants to complete the teaching demonstrations and program requirements. Roberts recommended:

... I do not think they have to restrict the number of participants. I think what they need to do is expand the course. You could expand it into a second month; you don't have to get this all done in a month and by doing that you can spend a half an hour on a presentation and really critique it.

By affording participants more time to complete the summer program, those involved certainly would have had the opportunity to more thoroughly explore course topics, deliver more effective presentations, and have more in-depth conversations over instructional techniques; however, this might have proven problematic for many part-time faculty whose busy schedules and outside commitments might make it difficult for them to participate in a longer program.

Other recommendations centered on possible follow-up or follow through activities that would have helped the participants gain more from their experience long term. Page indicated

that she would have benefited from a self-assessment to better understand what she wanted or needed to get out of the program. When asked how the program might have better met her needs, she stated:

If I had done a self-assessment prior to beginning the program then maybe I could better answer your question and I would know what those needs were, but I did not participate in a self-assessment, so if I had to change something...I think a self-assessment because we all have to be self-aware, but that's something you have to practice. So I would recommend the self-assessment...it would really be nice to do a self-assessment prior to the class, a self-assessment at the end of the class, and maybe 3 months down the road do another self-assessment because how many of us have gone to multiple session program and we're like that's really great, I'm going to use that and then it just kind of stays on the back burner; we never really incorporate it.

In addition to the post-program self-assessment, Page recommended that the college follow-up with the summer program completers to gauge how faculty were applying what they learned.

Williams went even further in suggesting that MCC offer a refresher certification to help keep adjunct faculty on track:

I really did enjoy the program and think it really wouldn't be a bad idea to have people who've done it but maybe 5 years from now get them back to do it again....So I think if they have the money, you can make it...you'd definitely get the people who haven't done it first, but....it's always a good refresher and since we're not education people, we don't have PhDs in Education, it's always good for us to be reminded.

This idea does seem to have some support from leaders within the professional development office who have discussed the need to assess the long-term impact of the summer program on participants and the possible need for a follow-up course down the road. Knight noted conversations that she had with leadership about the need for a long-term assessment:

...that's another piece that we haven't done, one of the things that I said told Pam J. that I'd like to do is a sort of a two-year post-survey and say you completed this last, two years ago in the summer, address some things about what have you changed, what have been the long-term gains for you and for your students as a result of going through that program, not just what were the immediate things that

you changed. And we haven't done that; we haven't done any kind of two-year post...

Finally, Roberts offered an idea for follow-up adjunct support that would go one step further into advocacy for part-time faculty issues. He suggested:

It would be kind of nice to see get some type of organization, if you could get some type of part-time faculty group just to raise concerns from adjunct professors. It's just an idea, but there are probably a thousand professors out there or more than that....The fact is that there is no voice for them other than going to the department heads. So you have got dozens, hundreds perhaps different departments that are all really inconsistent in how they support their adjunct professors. It is kind of nice to have some sort of e-group or some sort of organization that could be created to support adjunct professors.

The Summer Certification Program represents the key component in MCC's efforts to support and develop the college's part-time faculty. The primary goal of the SCP is to help the better part-time faculty from all of the college's departments and divisions grow and develop as instructors and ultimately better serve the needs of MCC's diverse student population. In addition, the goals and structure of the SCP are in line with the overall goals and mission of the college to be a learning college where instruction is focused on the student. The program itself emphasized student engagement in the classroom through the use of student engagement techniques.

Study participants generally spoke highly of their experiences in the SCP, and all gained some value from it. Their motivations for participating in the program were largely extrinsic in nature and included a desire to improve teaching, financial motivations, professional development motivations, instructional improvement, and a desire to make connections with the MCC community. Participants spoke to the value in the course texts, the teaching demonstrations, and the social connections made with peers and the MCC community. In addition, all noted the impact that the SCP had on their classroom practice following completion

of the program with an increased use of engagement techniques and a greater awareness of available resources for students.

Despite the largely positive experiences overall, study participants did identify some program shortcomings. Several felt that program leaders did not allow sufficient time to deliver and evaluate each other's final teaching demonstrations while others felt that the overall program length was too short or the additional time commitments that they faced limited their availability to fully engage with the SCP. Participants also expressed concerns over the lack of quality and depth of the feedback that they received from both their peers as well as program facilitators. Finally, some spoke to a lack of follow-up activities or engagement following the complete of the SCP. Some did demonstrate a sincere desire to improve the program by offering suggestions on potential enhancements. From additional time to complete program requirements, teaching demonstrations, and peer-to-peer and facilitator evaluations to additional self-assessments and follow-up activities, their suggestions represented opportunities to enrich an already valuable program for part-time faculty.

Growth

At the core of any faculty training and development program, whether it is geared towards full-time faculty, part-time faculty, or a combination of the two, should be a desire for the participants to grow on multiple levels, and the program should be designed to facilitate the growth of faculty and ultimately help the students who work with these faculty to grow in turn. I believe that growth as a motivation for the summer certification program as well as other training programs clearly comes through in discussions with program administrators and developers. For the participants in this study, growth comes through as a motivation for some and certainly an outcome for most. This growth for each of the participants comes in different forms. For some

it is simply a matter of learning some new techniques to help them be better instructors in the classroom. For others, growth means a better understanding of who they are as faculty and helping them tap into their creative potential. I will begin this section by examining the growth drivers which push some of the study participants. I will then take a deeper dive specifically into what motivates some participants to want to be better instructors. Finally, I will examine how the Professional Development department's training programs and the summer certification program in particular have impacted study participants' growth.

For the study participants, a number of factors pushed them to grow as instructors and professionals in their fields and for a few of them, a desire to improve skills and knowledge through education served as a primary motivator. Andrews noted how she's constantly looking for opportunities to improve her knowledge base as an instructor:

...I see something and I'm like, well why am I not getting that? And I know that I can do that. So, I'm a bit of an overachiever. I want to take as many classes as I can, I want to get as much knowledge as I can from whoever. And I don't care how I have to go about to get it. So I'm pestering Ben, I'm asking Don Bell, I'm tapping Kathy on the...you know someone's like, why are you taking class with management? And I'm like, because I can. I might need it.

In addition, Andrews saw education and training as a means to help other instructors as well and this served as a motivation for her to complete her doctoral studies in Education Technology:

...for me, it was finding out that there were other opportunities, that I wasn't just limited even though the school only needs me to teach one class, I might be needed to help someone else. And that's why I'm interested in educational technology as my PhD, because now I'm finding out, oh, yeah I teach Word and I teach Excel, but these other courses need those components to propel their students forward. And so I've met some really neat instructors who have really neat ideas but don't know how to do it.

For Page, MCC's training programs provided an opportunity for adjuncts to challenge themselves and push their boundaries as instructors:

I think MCC does an excellent job and I think that they, if faculty members take advantage of it and obtain it, there are a lot of opportunities out there. So it's just a matter of putting it into practice, and I think that sometimes...I can even say for myself you get used to doing things a certain way and faculty, even myself, need to stretch those boundaries a little bit and explore different things...

This idea of pushing oneself and challenging oneself as an instructor appears to be a common theme for some of the participants and a clear indicator of their desire to grow in their roles.

A couple of the study participants discussed factors in their personal background which pushed them to grow as part-time faculty. Both Caldwell and Bledson had creative backgrounds which helped to foster an innovative spirit that pushed them to explore new areas and seek self-improvement. Caldwell noted how his parents instilled an attitude in him that he was capable of doing so much more than he might have thought possible:

I did have an environment at home that very much fostered being innovative, being curious, being willing just to try something out. My dad had a giant workshop, wood-working shop on the land where we lived, so he's like well do what you want to. He would always say if we wanted to go buy something, "Well, let's build it." So I had that kind of sense of learning from them these things...yes you can learn how to do X, Y, Z even if you've never done it before. So...during my very formative years, in the very beginning there was a definite sense of environment of fostering creativity and innovation. So, out of that I think I latched-on to that idea that, just when people say they can't do stuff, well you probably can do more than you realize you can do.

These lessons impacted his professional life and pushed him to constantly seek to improve as an instructor and try new techniques in his teaching in order to create a better classroom environment. Bledson expressed a similar sentiment in noting how her creative drive led her to take risks and seek opportunities to improve as an instructor:

One of my strengths, though, is that I'm creative and innovative so I'm always trying new things. Every semester I try a new way of explaining and every semester I invariably fail (laughing). I'm trying to get it, trying something new, and I've got to make a lot of room for myself.

Mills also described her approach to improvement in her instructional role through a willingness to try new things in the classroom:

I'm a very self-taught person, and I do a lot of trial and error type things at times...try something in one class, it will go very well and in another class it might completely bomb. It just might depend. But I've always been told that I'm a very dynamic person in the classroom. I have a dramatic tendency, and so I can often keep a class entertained by my personality.

The willingness that some study participants showed to be creative and innovative in the classroom ultimately stemmed from a desire to improve and grow as instructors. For these practitioner faculty, growth in their instructional role was much more important than any other faculty function. This was the type of growth that some were able to find through the training programs offered by the professional development department and specifically through the Summer Certification Program. Andrews noted how the SCP provided her with ideas on how to make improvements in her classroom, and she appreciated learning from other instructors; "There were things I could add. It wasn't necessarily mandatory, but it made my classrooms a little more smooth....so it was nice to hear from other instructors, things that they did and found that worked for them." Roberts spoke to the benefit that he gained in understanding that the use of engagement techniques should vary depending on the nature of the student and subject taught:

I think that the key goal that they established was to be able to recognize the different opportunities that you have for engaging your students because there are not cookie cutter classes. Every student is different so when every class is different and every student is different, you cannot just use the tried and true engagement techniques because you are going to fail some of the students. That is why it is important to recognize that there are different techniques or different ways to engage the student. It is incumbent upon the instructors to understand that and to use those different methods of engaging the students depending on what the circumstances of the class are. If I have paralegals, then I may use different engagement techniques than people that are business majors. I may have different engagement techniques for people who are introductory students or students that have only been taking courses for a very short time versus those have been taking courses a couple of years. So I think what their goal was to make sure first of all you understand what engagement is and second to employ

different strategies for engaging the students depending on what the circumstances of your class are. That was the great advantage of this course because they really taught you that there are dozens of learning techniques or engagement techniques.

For Bledson, the summer program provided her with an opportunity to understand the human emotional side of teaching and to learn ways to help her students deal with the emotional challenges that they bring with them to the classroom:

...for me the most important workshops that I experienced in person were those that involved the human relationships of teaching...which is just that hands-on, day-to-day contact with the students and behavioral stuff, because, especially we part-time instructors are not trained as counselors...we're not able to dispense advice about emotional problems. And yet given our day and age there's a lot of anxiety out there....a certain fraction of the students are what you might even say at risk students. So, they come from varying...financial backgrounds, and if like me the student is totally responsible for their education and they're working, they have a job on top of everything else and perhaps they come from an emotionally tumultuous family lifestyle, there's a lot of stress. And that of course goes somewhere, and it ends up in the classroom. So the most valuable advice I've continued to have in these four years is how to mitigate emotional situations.

For all of the study participants, growth in their instructional roles was perhaps one of the more important outcomes of the summer certification program and their training and development experience at MCC. Some expressed a clear desire to improve teaching and classroom skills through education, to help their fellow instructors, and to tap into and develop their own creativity. Whatever their motivation to grow was clearly stated or implied, growth was an outcome at least on some level for all of the study participants. The SCP provided these practitioners with an opportunity to fulfill these desires for personal and professional improvement and ultimately grow as instructors.

Conclusion

The data from this study have provided an overview of the practitioner adjunct faculty study participants' perspectives on their experiences with training and support at Metro Community

College. They recognize the value that they bring to MCC and its students, and this value is in turn recognized by the college's academic leadership and its professional development department. Participants came to MCC from varying backgrounds and with varying degrees of teaching experience; however, for each of them teaching on a part-time basis at MCC represented an important but secondary professional interest; they all had primary career interests outside of higher education. Because of their diversity of background, they came to MCC with a diverse set of interests and needs in terms of training and development. They all shared, however, a love for teaching and were motivated to teach largely by intrinsic factors.

In examining their experiences with training and development while at MCC, the data do show that many study participants are not fully aware of or are largely not taking advantage of the training opportunities beyond the Summer Certification Program that are available to them. The SCP, though, certainly does appear to have had an impact on them as they do appear to have alternated to some extent their teaching practices following the program's completion. Most of the adjuncts involved in this study were able to find some value in their participation, none expressed any regrets about having participated, and all, at least on some level, appeared to grow from the experience.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The nature of teaching and learning, specifically who is doing the teaching and who is doing the learning, in American community colleges has evolved significantly over the past couple of decades. Kezar (2012) notes that the faculty population has shifted from a majority full-time, tenure track labor force to a majority non-tenure track group. Within this group, approximately 70% of these instructors, around 700,000 individuals, serve in part-time or adjunct roles, and they account for nearly half of all higher education faculty members in the United States (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). Within community colleges, the rise in part-time faculty numbers is even more striking with part-timers accounting for 70% of faculty positions (Rhoades, 2013). In addition, the nature of the students whom they serve has grown more complex. Rhoades (2013) notes that the student demographic in the United States has shifted so that, “The growing prospective college student population in this country is lower-income, first-generation, students of color, as well as immigrants, documented and undocumented; those students who have thus far been dramatically underserved by higher education” (p. 72).

Given the budget crunches faced in most states and the continued pressure on community college administrators to serve increasingly larger, more diverse groups of students, the trend towards a greater reliance on part-time faculty is unlikely to abate in the foreseeable future. That being said, community college administrators must find ways to better support and develop their adjuncts; however, models for doing so are scarce. My study helps to add to the limited body of literature on adjunct faculty development in the community college by examining the perceptions of practitioner adjunct faculty of the impact of a single, multiple campus community college’s efforts to train and develop their part-time faculty. Additionally, my study is the only one of

which I am aware that specifically focuses on the impact of a community college faculty development program on practitioner adjunct faculty.

I will begin this chapter by addressing the evolving nature of my study as I began to dig deeper into my data and explain my shift to a primary focus on participant faculty interviews, and I will summarize my major findings from the study along seven thematic lines which emerged over the course of data analysis. I will then frame my finding in existing and new literature on adjunct and part-time faculty development. Finally, I will look at potential implications from this study on current and future practitioner faculty.

Summary

From the beginning of my study, my goal was to understand how practitioner adjunct faculty perceived their experiences with Metro Community College's training and development support programs. I wanted to understand what they needed in terms of support and development from MCC, and to understand this I needed to know who they were as individuals, how and why they came to teach, and what experiences they had with teaching prior to and during their time with MCC. I wanted to know how the training they received from MCC helped them grow or not as instructors, and I wanted to know how their approach to instruction had changed after completing the professional development department's centerpiece program for adjunct faculty, the Summer Certification Program. Given these goals, the stories of my practitioner faculty study participants rose to a level of importance above all other forms of data that I collected. It was through their stories, both individually and collectively, that I came to understand their experiences with MCC's training and development programs.

The other forms of data that I collected included: (1) observation notes from the 2012 summer certification program, part-time faculty orientation, and part-time faculty community

event; (2) review of the MCC website, training documents, the Summer Certification Program training shell, and SCP participant evaluations; and (3) transcripts from interviews with administrative and academic staff associated with the SCP and the professional development department. These other sources played an important but secondary role in my overall analysis. They helped to provide the framework and the context through which I came to understand participant perceptions of their experiences in MCC's programs, and they were helpful in allowing me to triangulate some of the data that I gathered through the participant interviews. It was through these participant interviews, though, that I came to understand their overall experience with training and development at MCC. The table below offers a summary of data drawn from each source type.

Table 5.1

Data source matrix

Information type	Faculty interview	Administrative interview	Observation	Program document review	Website review
Instructor background	X				
Teaching experience	X				
Motivation to teach	X				
Motivation to participate in training	X				
Feedback effectiveness	X	X	X	X	
Nature of feedback	X	X	X	X	
SCP goals	X	X	X	X	
SCP session impact	X	X	X	X	X
SCP online impact	X	X	X		X
SCP design		X		X	
SCP historical development		X		X	
SCP follow-up activity participation/impact	X	X			
College goals/mission	X	X	X	X	X
College background	X	X	X	X	X

Institutional structure	X	X	X	X	X
Institutional resources available to part-time faculty	X	X		X	X
Number of part-time faculty teaching at MCC		X			X
Level/nature of institutional appreciation for part-time faculty	X	X	X		X
Nature of MCC students	X	X			
Training availability/awareness	X	X			X
Other training impact	X				
Training experiences prior to MCC	X				
Administrative support for training	X	X	X		X
Participant engagement in SCP sessions	X	X	X		
Role/impact of department supervisor	X	X			
Orientation participation/impact	X	X	X		
Place of teaching in professional lives	X				
Instructors' paths to MCC	X				
Nature of teaching experience at MCC	X	X			
SCP impact on practice	X				
SCP concerns	X				
SCP ideas for change	X	X			
SCP participant peer group dynamic	X		X		
Facilitator/SCP participant dynamic	X	X	X		
Online engagement	X	X			X

SCP program structure	X	X	X		
Orientation program structure	X	X	X		
Part-time faculty community event structure		X	X		

Note. Adapted from *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.), p. 342, by J. W. Creswell, 2007, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Over the course of my analysis of the practitioner faculty data several key themes began to emerge. First, it became evident that all of the participants did indeed alter, at least to some extent, their teaching practices as a result of their participation in the summer program. Mills and John Smith noted their continued use of the main course text, *Student Engagement Techniques*, as a resource for their classroom practice post-SCP, and Smith mentioned that he had incorporated some of the techniques demonstrated by his fellow participants during the final teaching demonstrations into his own class. All of them mentioned some aspect of their approach to teaching that they had changed or intended to change as a result of what they had learned in the SCP. Next, it became clear that study participants in general were not taking advantage of the large catalog of training options, both onsite and online, available to full and part-time faculty. Only two participants, Andrews and Page, noted extensive participation in the training programs offered by professional development, and fewer than half of them had even participated in the part-time faculty orientation.

Also, despite the extensive support that MCC offers its adjunct faculty, study participants are still dealing with some of the same challenges as other part-time faculty across the country. Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2013) discuss how adjuncts often feel unnoticed and undervalued at their community colleges.. Some of the participants noted only receiving minimal materials or other support from their supervisors prior to their first teaching assignments and one, Betty Mills,

mentioned that she did not even meet her supervisor for the first two years with MCC and that she did not have an office or computer station where she could work. Many participants felt isolated and separated from the larger college community, some felt unappreciated and undervalued for their real or potential contributions to the college, and some were challenged to teach MCC's diverse student population.

In addition, it became clear that some follow-up activity would be beneficial to those completing the SCP. A couple of the participants noted how connections developed during the SCP did not last long after the program, and several noted a lack of follow-up programs after the SCP. Faculty made recommendations for post-SCP activities including assessments to gauge how program completers were applying what they had learned, a refresher course a few years after completing the original SCP, and advocacy for part-time faculty concerns.

Other key concepts that emerged from my analysis of the data centered on the very diverse nature of the study participants. These faculty came to MCC with a diverse set of interests, experiences, and needs making one-size fits all support programs unhelpful. That was one of the challenges of the Summer Certification Program; it was designed to help the stronger part-time faculty become even better instructors, but it made no variation in content, scope, or approach based on the varying needs and interests of those involved. Also, participant motivations for teaching and pursuing development opportunities varied, but in general their motivations to teach were largely intrinsic in nature, and their motivations for participating in training and development programs were primarily extrinsic in nature. Participants noted drawing inspiration from their students and feeling joy when their students achieved success. They also spoke to a love for teaching which pushed them to teach; none mentioned financial motivations as a primary driver. On the other hand, participants were motivated to pursue

training and specifically the SCP by extrinsic factors including the financial gain or stipend that they were to receive upon successful completion of the program and professional development or instructional improvement considerations.

Finally, the importance of growth as faculty and professionals clearly came through in my discussions with participants. Some faculty, including Andrews, noted a continuing desire to improve their abilities as instructors through education and to challenge themselves as instructors. Others including Caldwell and Bledson were driven to grow by a creative spirit within. All participants, though, seemed to truly grow from their experiences with the summer program.

Findings related to the literature

This study helps to fill important gaps in the literature identified earlier in the study. As noted in the review of literature, scholarship on adjunct faculty issues has generally focused on two main areas: (1) motivating factors and satisfaction levels of adjunct faculty and (2) the effect that adjuncts have had on educational quality (Smith, 2007). In addition, the majority of the literature concerning adjunct faculty has centered on their role and place within community colleges (Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010) where, according to the American Federation of Teachers (2009), their numbers rose more than 100 percent between 2006 and 2009, and they came to represent around 68% of all community college faculty (cited in Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2013).

Recent scholarship has continued along these same lines focusing on adjunct faculty working conditions, satisfaction, and academic quality concerns. Goldstene (2012) and Rhoades (2013) have been very critical of adjunct faculty working conditions in institutions of higher learning in general. Rhoades (2013) calls into question the logic of “new realities” and “innovative answers” which he claims are harmful to students and ultimately to the health of the

country. The issue centers on practices related to contingent faculty of which a majority work part time. He notes:

Specifically, there are at least three patterns that undermine educational quality: 1) the “just-in-time” hiring of faculty a few weeks or days before classes start; 2) the “at-will” conditions of employment that disconnect contingent faculty from their peers and students in time and place; and 3) the growing promotion and use of depersonalized curricular delivery models that separate and alienate faculty and students from educational programs they utilize. Each of these patterns works against the interests not just of faculty, but also against the needs of students and the nation (Rhoades, 2013, p. 71-72).

Goldstene (2012) expounds on the working conditions of adjunct faculty noting pay as low as \$900 per course making some adjuncts eligible for food stamps, lack of access to benefits, no long-term job security, exclusion from institutional governance, and adjunct obscurity even within their own departments. In discussing the poor working conditions relative to their full-time faculty counterparts, Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2013) note that adjuncts often feel unnoticed and undervalued at their community colleges and that their work in the classroom frequently goes unassessed and unevaluated. The authors emphasize that it is important to note how assessment and development influence the impact that adjuncts “...have on student success as defined by retention and completion” (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2013, p. 219).

In addition, recent literature has continued to emphasize the institutional imperative to provide a greater degree of support to part-time faculty. Hoyt (2012) argues that colleges and universities should:

...provide adequate pay, requisite classroom facilities, faculty support, and training to attract the best part-timers possible and augment their skills to promote a quality educational experience....These efforts also promote job satisfaction, which is associated with greater loyalty and hopefully retention of well-trained and competent adjunct faculty so that these investments in human capital can benefit institutions over the longer term and as well as benefit students in the classroom (p. 140).

Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2013) concur with this assessment noting that the poor working conditions of part-time faculty in community colleges can be improved through policies and procedures that work to integrate adjuncts into the college community and by providing access to resources that "...could do much to harness the creative and productive talents of this part of the professoriate" (p. 228).

This support, though, should be in line with the differing needs of adjunct faculty and appropriate to each individual instructor's level of development. Also, as professionals, the adjunct faculty themselves are in the best position to determine what those needs are.

Brookfield's (2013) ideas on self-directed learning could perhaps offer some guidance here.

With self-directed learning, the locus of control lies with the adult learner who is in a position to determine what and when something should be learned and how to go about achieving learning goals. Brookfield (2013) notes, though, that the instructor still plays a critical role in fostering self-directed learning by directing learners to important resources in the learning process and in helping them build self-confidence to be self-directed. In addition, citing Perry's (1981, 1999) ideas on cognitive development, Timpson and Doe (2008) offer some insight into how, through "challenging instruction," students' cognitive development progresses from an early stage where they tend to view the world from a dualistic perspective and where the source of authority lies with the instructor and the assigned text through advanced stages where they are able to deal with the complex and ambiguous nature of things and have more confidence in themselves as the source of authority shifts internally.

Along these lines, Timpson and Doe's (2008) speak to the role that peer feedback and coaching can play in faculty development. According to the authors, "Feedback may be the single most important mechanism we can tap for nurturing our own professional development"

(Timpson & Doe, 2008, p. 321). They argue that peer feedback and coaching should be “unhooked” from instructor evaluations and should focus instead on the support and guidance that faculty can provide their fellow instructors. Noting Levinson’s (1978) work on the role that mentors play in helping new employees succeed and Erickson’s (1963) contention that veteran members of an organization have a natural tendency to want to support and develop the next generation, Timpson and Doe (2008) point to mentoring that occurs in universities to support the research process and suggest that, “We could obviously adapt these same mechanisms in support of teaching improvement through some form of peer coaching and feedback” (p. 328).

There were several instances where my findings concurred with the current literature on adjunct faculty and adjunct faculty training and development. First of all, several scholars have noted the need to more fully integrate adjunct faculty into the institutional and cultural framework of the institutions they serve (Johnson & Stevens, 2008; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Wallin, 2004; and Christensen, 2008). I believe that this imperative to integrate faculty into the college framework comes through as a goal of program administrators in terms of their efforts to build part-time faculty community and in their efforts to include part-time faculty in training and development programs and courses for full-time faculty and staff. Also, study participants spoke to connections that they were able to make with fellow adjuncts from other departments as well as connections that they were able to make with MCC itself as a result of their participation in the Summer Certification Program. Additionally, Johnson and Stevens (2008) noted that adjunct faculty really do want to feel connected to their college, and this came through as one of the motivating factors driving study participants to take part in the summer program.

Regarding adjuncts' connection to teaching, Smith (2007) notes the relatively recent trend in the literature that describes adjuncts as passionate about and committed to teaching and speaks to the benefits which they bring to their institutions. This passion for teaching clearly comes through as a primary driver for the participants in this study as they describe their love for teaching, the inspiration that some draw from their students, and the satisfaction that some received from seeing their students succeed. Also, several participants spoke to their connection to industry and real-world benefits that they were able to bring to their classrooms. These results are also in line with Gappa and Leslie's (1993) contention that part-time faculty are largely motivated by intrinsic factors and that those who are motivated intrinsically typically are employed elsewhere and are motivated by the satisfaction they receive from teaching.

The study results were also in line with the literature in terms of adjunct faculty experience in teaching. Wallin (2004) noted that adjunct faculty on average have around 5 or 6 years of experience teaching in higher education and that more than half have an earned master's degree or higher, and Eagan (2007) found that part-time faculty averaged 7 years of teaching experience at their current institutions. The participants in my study actually had more experience than the average cited in the literature coming in between 2 and 20 years of college teaching experience, and they all had at least a master's degree or higher. Also, in focusing on some of the challenges that adjunct faculty face, Lyons and Kysilka (2000) noted that adjuncts are generally not prepared to handle the needs of students who themselves are not ready for the demands of college-level work and who have their own personal challenges.

As Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2013) point out, part-time faculty often too feel unnoticed and undervalued, and Rhoades (2013) adds that part-time faculty often hired right before their class is scheduled to begin leaving them little time to prepare. While most of the study

participants were not hired at the last minute to teach, one instructor, Mills, noted that she had been hired by MCC just before the beginning of the course because the originally scheduled instructor left the state. Some felt isolated from each other and the larger college community, and a couple, Sanders and Page, spoke to initially feeling unprepared to work with the diverse student population at MCC.

Additionally, as noted in the introduction, only a handful of studies have examined community colleges which have in place training and development programs for their part-time faculty (Bosley, 2004; Burnstad, 2002; Lyons & Kysilka, 2000); however to my knowledge, no studies prior to this have specifically focused on the needs of practitioner adjunct faculty and the impact on their instructional practice, growth, and development that a community college's training and development program has on them. My study helps to address this gap by first of all adding to the limited number of case studies on adjunct faculty training and development programs in the community college.

Also, this study touches on some of the challenges that participants faced in terms of inconsistent support from departmental leadership and timing issues which limited their ability or availability to access additional training and support offered by MCC beyond the Summer Certification Program. My study results also show that the summer program did have a positive impact on participants' approach to classroom instruction as all 10 indicated some use of the materials, concepts, or connections made from the SCP following completion of the program.

Implications for practice

As noted in chapter 1, I have worked as an administrator and manager for a private, proprietary institution of higher learning for the past 12 years and as an admissions advisor for the same institution for 3 years prior to that. During my time in these positions I have had the opportunity

to work with both full-time as well as part-time faculty in a number of capacities. In addition to my responsibilities as an administrator and manager, I have also taught a freshman-level seminar course in critical thinking and problem-solving for the past 9 years at campuses and satellite centers around the metropolitan area of a large city in the southeastern United States. In addition, I have recently begun teaching a section of the same course online. This new experience has allowed me the opportunity to experience teaching in one of the fastest growing areas of higher education instruction. Citing a report by the Sloan Consortium (2011), Hollman (2013) notes that online student enrollments as a percentage of total enrollment rose from 9.6% in 2002 to 31.3% 2010 and that students taking at least one online course rose from 1.6 million to over 6 million during the same time period. The potential for online adjuncts to feel disconnected from their campuses and students is in many ways much greater given the nature of online instruction and the instructor's physical disconnect with the students.

My experience as a practitioner adjunct has been somewhat different in many ways from the participants in my study largely due to the nature of my full-time work. While I teach primarily during the evenings and weekends like the majority of the practitioner adjuncts in my study, I have not experienced the same sense of isolation that some of them have felt or the disconnect from other faculty and campus support services. I regularly interact with both full-time and other part-time faculty due to a work schedule that includes both day and evening hours as well as staff from various student support services and our local academic and operational administration. In many ways I am in a much better position to connect the students that I teach to the support services that they need due to my position with the institution. Some of the faculty with whom I spoke noted not even having offices or a station on campus where they could make copies, meet with students, or complete other administrative tasks related to their teaching.

Some recent changes in our staffing models; however, have led our satellite campuses to close offices in the evenings and on Saturdays, so when I teach at one of these locations, I do get some sense of the isolation experienced by the study participants during their afterhours classes.

While my full-time position with my institution has provided me with a different perspective than those shared by my study participants, I nonetheless recognize several commonalities in our experiences. First of all, for the past 3 years I have experienced some of the same course scheduling uncertainties as the study participants. While this did not come through as an issue for many of them, at least one, Sanders, noted feeling pressure to participate in the Summer Certification Program over concerns that his future opportunities to teach with MCC might otherwise be limited. With fewer sections of the course that I teach being offered, I feel some of the same pressures to participate in faculty meetings to ensure that I remain in consideration to those making the instructor selections. That being said, I also face many of the same time constraints that limited many of my study participants from taking advantage of the additional training and development opportunities beyond the summer program. My full-time work responsibilities and doctoral studies limit the time that I could dedicate to additional development programs; however, since my full-time position is housed within our academic structure, I am able to attend some of our faculty meetings as part of my regular responsibilities. In addition to these common challenges, I am also motivated to teach by many of the same factors that have motivated my study participants. Teaching brings to me many of the same joys that the practitioner faculty in this study noted. I recall sharing stories with some of the interviewees about the energy that we derived from the classroom experience and how much we loved engaging with our students. I am motivated and inspired by my students as well, and I feel satisfaction when they succeed.

I believe that community college administrators, faculty training and development staff, and adjunct faculty themselves could all find value in my study results. For the administrators and development staff at Metro Community College, the results of this study offer them a much richer, in-depth picture of the lived experiences of the practitioner adjunct faculty in their training and development programs than they could get from in house surveys of faculty participants and their students. Prior survey efforts by program administrators were also more general in nature and did not specifically look at the impact of training on the school's practitioner faculty. As noted earlier, these faculty bring a wealth of practical, real-world experience to the classroom, and they represent an important resource to the college. They have a connection with industry and an awareness of current practice that other faculty are often unable to provide. By understanding the needs of this particular group of adjunct faculty, by understanding what aspects of training are effective and have the greatest impact, and by understanding where current training and development efforts fall short, program administrators can tailor training to better meet their needs and more efficiently and effectively employ college resources.

For other adjunct faculty, this study offers a glimpse into the experiences of some of their fellow part-time instructors and an opportunity to see within those experiences some commonalities, a recognition of the benefits and importance of training and development, and an understanding of the value of engagement in improving teaching and learning. I believe too that the study results suggest that it is in their interest to actively seek out opportunities to grow and develop. Given that many of the practitioner faculty came to MCC with little if any formal training in teaching methods and pedagogy, it would be to their benefit as well as most practitioner faculty in general to pursue training opportunities that might help to fill in some of

the gaps in their preparations to teach. Despite the time limitations noted by the study participants, I would suggest that practitioner faculty make training a priority and budget their time accordingly. This would serve not only their long term professional interests by helping them become more effective instructors and more marketable and relevant in their current positions with MCC but also position them for success in future teaching opportunities. Finally, practitioner adjunct faculty should seek out and take advantage of occasions to network and share ideas and best practices, and build a part-time faculty community. Study participants noted that some of their most impactful moments from the summer program were lunch, breaks between and after sessions, and other unscheduled times during which they were able hang out and share ideas with their colleagues.

Despite the clear personal and professional advantages that training and development programs offer adjunct instructors, motivating part-timers to pursue training opportunities will likely remain a challenge for training directors and college leaders. Given the many noted priorities that practitioner faculty must balance, finding time to participate in training programs beyond their compensated teaching assignments represents a difficult task for most. As mentioned by one of the study participants, though, part-time faculty will make time for that which is important to them. Training leaders are thus challenged to answer the adjunct faculty question, “Why is this import to me?” It is clearly in the institution’s interest to have a well training, committed part-time faculty workforce; however, where is the incentive for the part-timers themselves to pursue training? Many may certainly consider themselves to be experts in their fields and may not feel that they need additional help. Some may even question the trainer’s authority to tell them how to teach. This tension between the needs and interests of the

institution to promote part-time faculty training and those of the part-timers themselves will likely continue to complicate efforts to increase adjunct participation in training.

For program administrators and college leaders, I would recommend taking steps to ensure consistency of communication with and support for adjunct across all departments and divisions. This inconsistency clearly came through in my discussions with study participants as some reported receiving consistent communications from department chairs about opportunities for training and greater involvement with the college, having regular meetings or conversations with the department chair, periodic classroom observations and assessments, and attending departmental faculty meetings whereas other participants noted rarely if ever hearing from departmental leadership. The professional development department appears to do a very solid job in offering a wide variety of training opportunities at convenient times and through different learning modalities; however, based on the feedback that I received from study participants, there does not appear to be consistent awareness of these offerings among adjunct faculty. Also, I would recommend that professional development leaders explore options for developing more individualized training to better meet adjunct faculty needs. The needs of part-time faculty are as diverse as the faculty themselves and vary according to individual instructor's priorities and their part-time faculty category. Burnstad's (2002) Johnson County Community College (JCCC) part-time faculty development program example might perhaps serve as a model for efforts to individualize adjunct faculty training at MCC. Part-time faculty could complete an individual development plan (IDP) identifying developmental needs and build a one to five year plan. Also, pay increases similar to those that part-time faculty receive after completing JCCC's Adjunct Certification Training (Burnstad, 2002) might further incentivize MCC adjunct faculty to seek out and complete the Summer Certification Program. Regarding the SCP, professional

development should consider expanding the program's timeframe to allow participants more time to deliver and evaluate each other's teaching demonstrations. This came across as one of the chief complaints from study participants about the program. This should help to address some of the quality of feedback concerns that some faculty expressed. Finally, program leaders should consider a more proscribed and regularized follow-up program for SCP completers. Several study participants noted a lack of follow-up activities after completing the program and indicated that many of the connections and community benefit from the SCP was lost over time. Follow-up activities could range workshops and lunch and learn events for program completers to mentorships with veteran part-time and full-time faculty, online forums and discussion boards for part-time faculty, and possibly even a refresher certification program a few years after completing the original program to allow program completers an opportunity to revisit key concepts and learn new instructional techniques.

Recommendations for future study

I believe that my study helps to fill an important gap in the literature by describing the experiences of practitioner adjunct faculty in a community college training and development program. However, this study by no means represents an exhaustive examination of training and development needs and experiences of this particular sub-set of part-time faculty, and the opportunity certainly exists for refining and furthering study in this area. I will begin this section by considering the ways in which this study could potentially have been improved or alternate routes that I might have pursued in attempting to understand their experience. Then I will offer suggestions on possible next steps in adjunct faculty development research and in particular training and development for practitioner adjunct faculty.

Given my central interest in understanding the experiences of practitioner adjunct faculty in community college training and development programs and the impact that these programs had on their teaching practice as well as satisfaction in their roles as part-time instructors, an ethnographic inquiry is another approach that I might have considered in developing this understanding. Citing Harris (1968), Creswell (2007) notes, “Ethnography is a qualitative design in which the researcher describes and interprets the shared and learned patterns of values, behaviors, beliefs, and language of a culture-sharing group” (p. 68). An ethnographic approach would have allowed me to explore the relationships between practitioner adjunct faculty, their relationships with other part-time and full-time faculty, and their relationships with departmental and other college leaders. It would potentially have provided for a deeper exploration of practitioner faculty culture.

I do, though, believe that this study could have been enhanced by expanding the scope of participants to include participants from the 2009 and 2012 Summer Certification Programs. By interviewing and analyzing data from adjuncts from the 2012 program, I would have been able to gain a fresher perspective on the experience of practitioners who had just completed the summer program. They would likely have been in a position to provide a much more detailed accounting of the specific aspects of the program. One of the challenges that I encountered in interviewing SCP program completers from the 2011 and especially from the 2010 program was that they often struggled to remember certain details from their experiences; this would likely have not been as significant an issue for the 2012 completers. They would also have been able to discuss their intentions for using the concepts that they had just learned in their own teaching practice. By contrast, interviewing the 2009 SCP completers would have afforded an opportunity to examine the impact of the program on participants from a longer term perspective than I had

with this current study. This would have offered greater insight into how participants retain important concepts covered in the course and to what extent they are still incorporating what they learned from the summer program into their own classroom practice 3 years removed.

Following these thoughts on the ways in which my study could have been enhanced, I would recommend as a next step in further research in this area to examine MCC's training and development efforts from the perspective of the administrators and professional development staff who conceived and established and who continue to run and shape the Summer Certification Program, part-time faculty orientation program, part-time faculty community events, and other training programs designed for their part-time faculty. This would essentially provide the other side of the adjunct faculty development story at MCC and would allow the researcher to explore the development of training and support programs at the college and take a deeper dive into the intent, development, and intricacies of these programs. This approach would essentially flip the relative weight of the data that I collected for this study by placing an emphasis on data from administrator and professional development staff interviews with data from faculty interviews, observations, and document review playing a largely secondary and validating role.

Future researchers might also want to explore training and development needs and experiences of the other, non-practitioner categories of adjunct faculty members. Although researchers have noted that part-time faculty now constitute 70 percent of all faculty positions in American community colleges (Jolley, Cross & Bryant, 2014; Rhoades 2013), little effort is made to distinguish faculty members from each other, and they are often treated as homogeneous group. As noted in the review of literature, Gappa and Leslie (1993) and Tuckman and Tuckman (1981) before them identified several distinct categories of part-time faculty. The

practitioner faculty who represent the focus of my study correspond primarily to Gappa and Leslie's (1993) *specialist, expert, or professional* category, and this category does represent the majority of part-time faculty (Eagan, 2007; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). However, Gappa and Leslie's (1993) other categories of part-time faculty warrant attention as well. These include *aspiring academics* – those who are interested in serving as fully engaged members of the faculty with a status comparable to tenured faculty; *career enders* – retirees and those nearing retirement; and *freelancers* – those who are working in a number of different jobs or roles. Part-time faculty from these other categories are likely to have very different training and development needs and priorities from the practitioners that I examined in my study; therefore, future study centered on these other groups could potentially yield different results in terms of the experience with and impact of MCC's training and development efforts on these groups of instructors.

Finally, I believe that the impact of training and development on part-time faculty teaching online courses warrants attention. Citing a report from the Sloan Consortium (2011), Hollman (2013) notes that the number of students enrolled in at least one online course has increased from 1.6 million in 2002 to more than 6 million in 2010, and as a result colleges and universities have had to ramp up hiring of online instructors to keep up with the growing demand. Shattuck and Anderson (2013) add that the majority of these online faculty are adjuncts and that the different teaching roles for online and onsite instructors "...result in a need to provide instructor training that is focused on teaching in online contexts" (para. 1). Horvitz and Beach's (2011) study points to the potential benefit that targeted professional development for online instructors can have in improving online teaching practice. While the participants in my study all taught primarily or exclusively onsite, the primary course text used in the Summer

Certification Program, Barkley's (2010) *Student Engagement Techniques*, does address engagement in an online environment, and each of the student engagement techniques (SETS) discussed includes a section on its applicability in an online class. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the SCP and other MCC training programs for adjunct faculty teaching online warrants future research consideration.

Conclusion

Given the trends in higher education in general and in community colleges in particular to rely increasingly on part-time faculty to cover more and more course sessions to an ever growing and increasingly diverse student population, the need for adequate training, development, and support programs for these faculty has never been greater. Adjunct faculty and particularly practitioner faculty represent an important resource to students and the institutions they serve. Programs such as the one detailed here at Metro Community College go a long way towards meeting the needs of this group; however, more needs to be done. More community college leaders need to make training and development of their part-time faculty a priority, and those community colleges that do have programs in place for their part-time faculty need to ensure that they are reaching a larger percentage of them and that the programs are designed to meet their diverse needs and interests.

REFERENCES

- Ambrosino, R., & Peel, J. (2011). Faculty Development Programs: Assessing the Impact on Instructional Practices, and Student Learning and Motivation. *Journal Of Faculty Development, 25*(2), 33-38.
- Barkley, E. F. (2010). *Student Engagement Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Beckford-Yanes, C. (2005). *How adjunct faculty's professional work experience affects the community college learning environment* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3185548)
- Brookfield, S.D. (2013). *Powerful techniques for teaching adults*. San Francisco, CA. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bosley, M. (2004). *Professional development activities and job satisfaction among community college adjunct faculty* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3163590)
- Bragg, D.D. (2001). Community college access, mission, and outcomes. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76* (1), 93-116.
- Burnstad, H. (2000). The comprehensive faculty development program. In D.E. Greive & C.A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium* (pp. 71-100). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.
- Burnstad, H.M (2002). Part-time faculty development at Johnson County Community College. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 120*, 17-25.

Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012, June). *A portrait of part-time faculty members: A summary of findings on part-time faculty respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce survey of contingent faculty members and instructors*, Retrieved from the Coalition on the Academic Workforce website:

<http://www.academicworkforce.org/index.html>.

Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Christensen, C. (2008). The employment of part-time faculty at community colleges. *New Direction for Higher Education*, 143, 29-36. doi: 10.1002/hc.310

Eagan, K. (2007). A national picture of part-time community college faculty: Changing trends in demographics and employment characteristics. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 140, 5-14. Doi: 10.1002/cc.299

Eddy, P. (2005). Faculty development in community colleges: Surveying the present, preparing for the future. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 20 (3), 143-152.

Fagan-Wilen, R., Springer, D.W., Ambrosino, B., & White, B. (2006). The support of adjunct faculty: An academic imperative. *Social Work Education*, 25 (1), 39-51. doi: 10.1080/02615470500477870

- Fugate, A.L. & Amey, M.J. (2000). Career stages of community college faculty: A qualitative analysis of their career paths, roles, and development. *Community College Review*, 28 (1), 1-22.
- Gappa, J.M., & Leslie, D.W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Getting Results (2006). League for Innovation in the Community College homepage. Retrieved from: <http://www.league.org/gettingresults/web/>.
- Gibson-Harman, K. Rodriguez, S., & Grant Haworth, J. (2002). Community college faculty and professional staff: The human resource challenge. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 117, 77-90.
- Goldstene, C. (2012). The Politics of Contingent Academic Labor. *Thought & Action*, 287-15.
- Green, D.W. (2007) Adjunct faculty and the continuing quest for quality. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 140, 29-39. doi: 10.1002/cc.302
- Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 191 – 215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hollman, W. A. (2013). Professional Online Adjuncts and the Three Pillars of Entrepreneurialism, Arbitrage, and Scholarship. *Online Journal Of Distance Learning Administration*, 16(1).
- Horvitz, B. S., & Beach, A. L. (2011). Professional Development to Support Online Teaching. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 25(2), 24-32.
- Hoyt, J. E. (2012). Predicting the Satisfaction and Loyalty of Adjunct Faculty. *Journal Of Continuing Higher Education*, 60(3), 132-142.

- Jacoby, D. (2005). Part-time community college faculty and the desire for full-time tenure-track positions: Results of a single institution case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 137-152. doi: 10.1080/10668920490891629
- Jaeger, A.J. & Eagan, K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review*, 36 (3) 167-194. doi: 10.1177/0091552108327070
- Johnson, P. & Smith (2009). *An effective solution for helping part-time faculty become better teachers*. Unpublished PowerPoint presentation, Metro Community College, Anywhere, U.S.A. (pseudonym)
- Johnson, C. & Stevens, C. (2008). Creating links: An inclusive faculty development initiative. *Adult Learning*, 19 (1/2), 26-29.
- Jolley, M. R., Cross, E., & Bryant, M. (2014). A Critical Challenge: The Engagement and Assessment of Contingent, Part-Time Adjunct Faculty Professors in United States Community Colleges. *Community College Journal Of Research & Practice*, 38(2/3), 218-230. doi:10.1080/10668926.2014.851969
- Kezar, A. (2012). Spanning the Great Divide Between Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty. *Change*, 44(6), 6-13. doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.728949
- Kezar, A. & Maxey, D. (2014). Troubling ethical lapses: The treatment of contingent faculty. *Change*, 46(4), 34-37. doi: 10.1080/00091383.2014.925761
- Kezar, A. & Sam, C. (2013) Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(1), 56-87.
- Langenberg, D.N. (1998). The subfaculty. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 104, 39-44.

- Leslie, D.W. & Gappa, J.M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118, 59-67.
- Levin, J.S. (2007). Multiple judgments: Institutional context and part-time faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 140, 15-20. doi: 10.1002/cc.300
- Loziotis, Jr., D. (2001). The role of adjuncts: Bridging the dark side and the ivory tower. *Review of Business*, 3, 47-52.
- Lyons, R.E., & Kysilka, M.L (2000, May 29). A proven program for developing adjunct community college faculty. Paper presented at the 22nd annual international conference on teaching and leadership excellence national institute for staff and organizational development, Austin, TX.
- Mann, D. & Hochenadel, H.N. (2003). A manifesto of the twenty-first-century academic proletariat in North America. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 34 (1), 111-124.
- Marits, E.J. (1996). Professional development of adjunct faculty. In V. Bianco-Mathis & N. Chalofsky (Eds.), *The adjunct faculty handbook* (pp. 220-226). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McLaughlin, F. (2005). Adjunct faculty at the community college: Second-class professoriate? *Teaching English in the Two-year College*, 3, 185-193.
- Meixner, C., Kruck, S.E., & Madden, L.T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching*, 58, 141-147. doi: 10.1080/87567555.2010.484032
- Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

- Metro Community College (2014). *Metro Community College homepage*. Retrieved from <http://www.mcc.edu/> (Pseudonym).
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Murray, J.P. (2000). Faculty development in Texas two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24, 251-267.
- Murray, J.P. (2002a). The current state of faculty development in two-year colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118, 89-97.
- Murray, J.P. (2002b). Faculty Development in SACS-Accredited Community Colleges. *Community College Review*, 29 (4).
- Nellis, P., Hosman, D., King, J.M., and Armstead, C. (2002). Web-based faculty development using time-revealed scenarios. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 120, 27-34.
- Rhoades, G. (2013). Disruptive Innovations for Adjunct Faculty: Common Sense for Common Good. *Thought & Action*, 291-16.
- Roberts, C.M. (2004). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Roueche, J.E., Roueche, S.D., & Milliron, M.D. (1995). *Strangers in their own land*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Shattuck, J., & Anderson, T. (2013). Making a Match: Aligning Audience, Goals, and Content in Online Adjunct Training. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 16(3).
- Smith, V.C. (2007). A systems approach to strategic success with adjunct faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 140, 55-66.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York, NY: Falmer.
- Timpson, W.M & Doe, S. (2008) *Concepts and choices for teaching: Meeting the challenges in higher education*. Madison, WI. Atwood Publishing.
- Tuckman, H.P., & Tuckman, B.H. (1981). Who are the part-timers and what are colleges doing for them? *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 4, 4-7.
- Wagoner, R.L., Metcalfe, A.S., and Olaore, I. (2005). Fiscal reality and academic quality: Part-time faculty and the challenge to organizational culture at community colleges. *Community College Journal Of Research & Practice*, 29(1), 25-44.
doi:10.1080/10668920390276948
- Wallin, D.L. & Smith, C.L. (2005). Professional development needs of full-time faculty in technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 87-108.
- Wallin, D.L. (2002). Faculty professional development: Building a world of learners. *Community College Journal*, 76(5), 32-35.
- Wallin, D.L. (2004). Valuing professional colleagues: Adjunct faculty in community and technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28, 373-391.
doi: 10.1080/10668920490424087
- Welch, G.F. (2002). A new faculty orientation program: Building a core of new faculty to shape the future of the college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 120, 11-16.
- Wilson, R. (2008, October 3). Adjuncts fight back over academic freedom. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 1, 2008 from
<http://chronicle.com/weekly/v55/i06/06a00102.htm>.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

APPENDICES

Attachment A – Adjunct faculty study participation invitation

CSU letterhead

Date

Dear MCC (pseudonym) part-time faculty member:

My name is C. Alan Wells and I am a researcher from Colorado State University in the School of Education. We are conducting a research study on adjunct faculty training and development. The title of our project is, *Adjunct Faculty Experiences in a Comprehensive Development Program: A Single-site Case Study*. We are investigating the part-time and adjunct faculty training and development efforts and activities at Metro Community College (pseudonym). Given the vital role that adjunct faculty play within the community colleges that they serve and considering that they have come to represent an increasingly larger percentage of community college faculty across the United States, it is critical that community colleges develop programs to support these faculty. As a participant in MCC's part-time faculty certification program, you represent one of the shining lights among your peers and have clearly demonstrated your value to the college and a commitment to its students. My primary interest is in understanding how practitioner adjunct faculty (faculty who are practicing professionals whose full-time work lies outside of higher education) experience the training and development program and how it impacts their teaching strategy and satisfaction in their roles.

Your participation in and contributions to this study are vital to understanding the faculty experience in the college's certification program and to understanding the factors that have made it a success. Equally as important, your input will allow us to suggest potential improvements to MCC's certification program and areas for further research in adjunct and part-time faculty training and development. We would like you to participate in a series of two phone interviews in which we will discuss your experiences in the part-time faculty certification program, its impact on your teaching strategy and success in the classroom, areas for program improvement, and your overall impressions of the program. Participation will take approximately one to two hours per interview. Also, there is an optional focus group that will follow the completion of all faculty interviews that will take another one and a half to two hours. Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participation at any time without penalty.

If you would like to participate in this study, please review the attached consent form, initial each page, sign the final page, and return to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. If you have any questions, please contact me, C. Alan Wells, at 770-361-5419 or by e-mail at: cawells@rams.colostate.edu.

Sincerely,

William Timpson, Ph.D.
Professor

C. Alan Wells
Student researcher

**Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Colorado State University**

TITLE OF STUDY: Adjunct Faculty Experiences in a Comprehensive Development Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Timpson, Ph.D.

CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christopher Alan Wells

**CONTACT NAME, PHONE NUMBER, AND E-MAIL ADDRESS FOR
QUESTIONS/PROBLEMS**

C. Alan Wells, 770-361-5419 or cawells@rams.colostate.edu

WHY AM I BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being asked to participate in this study because the researchers feel that you are in a position to provide information that is valuable in understanding the nature, structure, impact, and utility of adjunct and part-time faculty training and development efforts at Metro Community College (pseudonym). Given the nature of this case study, the researchers need to hear directly from the part-time faculty participants about their experiences in the program, administrators who oversee the direction and development of the program, and other leaders within the college who have a stake in the success of the program in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of these training and development efforts.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

All observations, focus groups, and interviews will be conducted by the Co-PI, C. Alan Wells, with oversight from the PI William Timpson, Ph.D.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

Given the vital role that adjunct faculty play within the community colleges that they serve and considering that they have come to represent an increasingly larger percentage of community college faculty across the United States, it is critical that community colleges develop programs to support these faculty. With this study, I plan to conduct a case study examination of the adjunct faculty development program at MCC (pseudonym). The study will focus on a single case site and will include an evaluation of program-related documents, interviews with faculty participants, program administrators, and college leadership, and observations of orientation and training sessions. My primary interest is in understanding how practitioner adjunct faculty experience the training program and how it impacts their teaching strategy and satisfaction in their roles.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

This study will last approximately one year and will take place in MCC campus facilities. Interviews will be conducted both in person and over the telephone. Faculty participant interviews will be conducted primarily via telephone.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

You will be interviewed up to two times and each interview should last between 1 and 2 hours. Also, if you are a part-time faculty participant, you will be asked if you would be interested in participating in a faculty focus group that will follow the interview period. This will take an additional 1 1/2 to 2 hours.

During the interviews, you will be asked to share your thoughts about the part-time training and development program at MCC and either your experiences as a participant in the program or in observation or oversight of the program. For those participating in the focus group, you will be asked to discuss your thoughts on my analysis of the program, any changes or amendments that you would like to make to my findings, and to share any additional experiences or insight related to your participation in the program since the time of the interviews.

To ensure that your thoughts and observations are accurately recorded, the researcher will audio tape and transcribe all interviews and video tape the focus group session, part-time faculty orientation, and part-time faculty certification program sessions.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY I SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

Part-time faculty interviews included in this case study will be limited to practitioner adjunct faculty who participated in the summer part-time faculty certification program during the most recent two offerings. Practitioner adjunct faculty include practicing professionals whose full-time work lies outside higher education. The study will not include interviews with faculty who completed one of the first two sessions of the part-time faculty certification program (2008 and 2009) and the large number of part-time and adjunct faculty who benefit from the many other development opportunities that the college offers but were not selected by their department heads to participate in the summer program.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

There are no known risks to you in participating in this study. It is not possible to identify all potential risks in research procedures, but the researcher has taken reasonable safeguards to minimize any known and potential, but unknown, risks.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There are no direct benefits to you as participants; however, program administrators will gain insight into faculty experiences in the program. Lessons learned from the study may suggest improvements to future certification programs and adjunct faculty development activities.

DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT I GIVE? We will keep private all research records that identify you, to the extent allowed by law.

Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. You will not be identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. For example, your name will be kept separate from your research records and these two things will be stored in different places under lock and key.

You will be given a pseudonym which will be used on interview transcripts, session notes, and in the final write-up of the study in place of your real name. The file linking your name with your pseudonym, along with audio and video tapes of interviews and sessions will be kept in a secure location in the researcher's home. Following the completion of the study, audio and video tapes will be destroyed. Transcripts and the participant pseudonym file will be maintained by the principle investigator for three years after the study.

WHAT HAPPENS IF I AM INJURED BECAUSE OF THE RESEARCH?

The Colorado Governmental Immunity Act determines and may limit Colorado State University's legal responsibility if an injury happens because of this study. Claims against the University must be filed within 180 days of the injury.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions about the study, you can contact the investigator, C. Alan Wells at 770-361-5419. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact Janell Barker, Human Research Administrator at 970-491-1655. We will give you a copy of this consent form to take with you.

Additionally, MCC is eager to ensure that all research participants are treated in a fair and respectful manner. If you have any concerns or questions about your treatment as a subject in this project, contact:

Page **3 of 4** Participant's initials _____ Date _____

Dr. Bobbi Jones (pseudonym)
Planning and Research
P.O. Box 55555
Metro City, USA 55555
(555) 555-5555

This consent form was approved by the CSU Institutional Review Board for the protection of human subjects in research on November 9, 2011.

WHAT ELSE DO I NEED TO KNOW?

For faculty participants, please note below your willingness to participate in the faculty focus group following the completion of interviews by initialing one of the two choices. Participation is voluntary and there is no penalty for non-participation. Please note that we cannot ensure confidentiality of information discussed in this open forum.

☐ I am interested in participating in the adjunct faculty focus group.
☐ I do not wish to be included in the adjunct faculty focus group.

Your signature acknowledges that you have read the information stated and willingly sign this consent form. Your signature also acknowledges that you have received, on the date signed, a copy of this document containing 4 pages.

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Signature of Research Staff

**Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Colorado State University**

TITLE OF STUDY: Adjunct Faculty Experiences in a Comprehensive Development Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Timpson, Ph.D.

CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christopher Alan Wells

**CONTACT NAME, PHONE NUMBER, AND E-MAIL ADDRESS FOR
QUESTIONS/PROBLEMS**

C. Alan Wells, 770-361-5419 or cawells@rams.colostate.edu

WHY AM I BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being asked to participate in this study because of your involvement in the new part-time faculty orientation or part-time faculty certification program.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

All observations, focus groups, and interviews will be conducted by the Co-PI, C. Alan Wells, with oversight from the PI William Timpson, Ph.D.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

Given the vital role that adjunct faculty play within the community colleges that they serve and considering that they have come to represent an increasingly larger percentage of community college faculty across the United States, it is critical that community colleges develop programs to support these faculty. With this study, I plan to conduct a case study examination of the adjunct faculty development program at MCC (pseudonym). The study will focus on a single case site and will include an evaluation of program-related documents, interviews with faculty participants, program administrators, and college leadership, and observations of orientation and training sessions. My primary interest is in understanding how practitioner adjunct faculty experience the training program and how it impacts their teaching strategy and satisfaction in their roles.

**WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT
LAST?**

This study will last approximately one year and will take place in MCC campus facilities. Your participation, however, will be limited to the orientation or certification program sessions themselves.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

My primary interest is in observing the sessions themselves, the level of interaction and engagement of the participants, and the quality of project presented during the certification program. Your participation will be minimal. You are consenting to allow the orientation

Page 1 of 3 Participant's initials _____ Date _____

session or part-time faculty certification program session in which you are participating to be observed. In addition, you may be asked to provide feedback on the session and your experience.

To ensure sessions are accurately recorded, the researcher will video tape the part-time faculty orientation and part-time faculty certification program sessions.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

There are no known risks to you in participating in this study. It is not possible to identify all potential risks in research procedures, but the researcher has taken reasonable safeguards to minimize any known and potential, but unknown, risks.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There are no direct benefits to you as participants; however, program administrators will gain insight into faculty experiences in the program. Lessons learned from the study may suggest improvements to future certification programs and adjunct faculty development activities.

DO I HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT I GIVE? We will keep private all research records that identify you, to the extent allowed by law.

Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. You will not be identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. For example, your name will be kept separate from your research records and these two things will be stored in different places under lock and key.

If you provide feedback on your experience, you will be given a pseudonym which will be used on session notes and in the final write-up of the study in place of your real name. The file linking your name with your pseudonym, along with audio and video tapes of interviews and sessions will be kept in a secure location in the researcher's home. Following the completion of the study the video tapes will be destroyed. Transcripts and the participant pseudonym file will be maintained by the principle investigator for three years after the study.

WHAT HAPPENS IF I AM INJURED BECAUSE OF THE RESEARCH?

The Colorado Governmental Immunity Act determines and may limit Colorado State University's legal responsibility if an injury happens because of this study. Claims against the University must be filed within 180 days of the injury.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions about the study, you can contact the investigator, C. Alan Wells at 770-361-5419. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact Janell Barker, Human Research Administrator at 970-491-1655. We will give you a copy of this consent form to take with you.

Additionally, MCC is eager to ensure that all research participants are treated in a fair and respectful manner. If you have any concerns or questions about your treatment as a subject in this project, contact:

Dr. Bobbi Jones (pseudonym)
Planning and Research
P.O. Box 55555
Metro City, USA 55555
(555) 555-5555

This consent form was approved by the CSU Institutional Review Board for the protection of human subjects in research on November 9, 2011.

WHAT ELSE DO I NEED TO KNOW?

Please note below your willingness to allow the session (s) in which you are participating to be videotaped:

- ☐ I consent to the session (s) in which I am participating to be videotaped.
☐ I do not consent to the session (s) in which I am participating to be videotaped.

Your signature acknowledges that you have read the information stated and willingly sign this consent form. Your signature also acknowledges that you have received, on the date signed, a copy of this document containing 3 pages.

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Signature of Research Staff