

PERCEPTIONS OF EMPLOYMENT AND USE OF PART-TIME FACULTY AMONG
CHIEF INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICERS AT SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES
AND SCHOOLS-ACCREDITED PUBLIC ASSOCIATE'S COLLEGES

by

CHARLOTTE NIX SPEER

STEPHEN G. KATSINAS, COMMITTEE CHAIR

DAVID E. HARDY

NATHANIEL J. BRAY

RICK A. HOUSER

JON C. ACKER

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Education in the
Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy, and Technological Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2013

Copyright Charlotte Nix Speer 2013
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Based on Yackee's (2000) study of the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at community colleges accredited by North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), this study identified, described, and compared the perceptions of CIOs at institutions accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC). The CIOs' perceptions regarding difficulty accreditation criteria for part-time faculty, challenges in implementing commonly cited good practices for employing and using part-time faculty, and reasons for employing part-time faculty were included.

The population included CIOs from all SACS-COC-accredited associate's colleges. A questionnaire was adapted from Yackee's survey instrument for distribution using an online software program and was sent to all 256 chief instructional officers; 107 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 42%. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The one-way ANOVA and Tukey's HSD test for multiple comparisons were used to analyze significant differences ($p < .05$) among the data.

The findings were that (a) CIOs perceived meeting accreditation criteria as not difficult; (b) there were no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting SACS accreditation criteria among CIOs based on institutional location; (c) CIOs perceived implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as challenging across all types of associate's colleges; (d) Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines proved the most challenging for recruiting and hiring part-time

faculty; and, (e) CIOs agreed that commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty influenced the decision to employ part-time faculty.

The conclusions were that (a) no statistically significant differences existed in the perceptions regarding difficulty in meeting SACS accreditation criteria among CIOs at associate's colleges based on institutional size and location; (b) the practices that contribute to the effective employment and use of part-time faculty are typically the same practices that pose the greatest challenge to CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges; (c) STEM disciplines pose the greatest challenge for recruiting and hiring part-time faculty across associate's colleges, regardless of location or size; and, (d) regardless of institutional type, CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges agreed on the reasons for employing part-time faculty.

Keywords: community college, associate college, two-year college, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, part-time faculty, adjunct faculty, STEM disciplines, and accreditation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have supported me while reaching this goal. Their patience, help, kindness, and love have not gone unnoticed.

First of all, my late parents, Paul and Willie Mae Nix, taught me that God's grace is sufficient, and through good and bad times, He is my rock. My siblings share my parents' wisdom, generosity, and understanding, so even though my parents are no longer with us, their spirit for life remains. I am so fortunate to have been born into their family. For my daughter, Shera McKinney, and son, Garrett Speer, I am eternally grateful because their love has driven me to overcome some difficult obstacles and look toward the future.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee, Dr. David Hardy, Dr. Nathaniel Bray, Dr. Rick Houser, and Dr. Jon Acker, for their valuable time, expertise, and critical review of this work. In addition, thanks to Dr. Grace Yackee for a fine study to replicate and for her invaluable advice when beginning this study, to Dr. Kristie Rankin for her helpful feedback, to Dr. Kandis Steele who so generously gave of her time and advice in the process of updating the survey, and to Dr. John Schmitt, Associate Dean of The University of Alabama Graduate School, for providing me with opportunity to complete this work.

A special thanks goes to Dr. Stephen Katsinas, my dissertation chair and advisor, for words of encouragement and a plan when I was unsure of my next step. Just hearing or reading those simple words "CHARGE ON!" at the end of a phone call or email was incredibly uplifting. His enthusiasm for community colleges is contagious, and his dedication to ensure that his students who are "in the field" write about them signifies his talent.

Finally, much appreciation goes to President Anne McNutt, Dean Penne Mott, Michelle Anderson, Jeremy Bearden, Mike Hagood, Bill Watt, Judy Barnes, Sheila Sappington, and Dr. Wendy Wood at Bevill State Community College who helped along the way with kind words and deeds. Also, my dear friends, Marcia Adkins, Chandra Rice, Carla Gregg, Jim Yost, and Barbara Bozeman, have been anchors through every tempest of my life for the last ten years. I could not have succeeded without them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
Primary Research Questions.....	7
Secondary Research Questions.....	8
Delimitations.....	9
Assumptions and Limitations.....	9
Definitions.....	11
Summary.....	15
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	16
Introduction.....	16
Background.....	17
Part-time Faculty at Community Colleges: Demographics.....	17
Diversity of Community Colleges and Their Students.....	20

Community College Funding.....	25
The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation.....	28
History.....	28
Mission.....	32
Philosophy.....	32
SACS-COC and Accreditation Procedure.....	33
SACS-COC and Components of the Review Process.....	34
SACS-COC and Faculty Policy.....	35
Reasons for Employing Part-time Faculty.....	38
Advantages.....	38
Disadvantages.....	42
Recruiting, Developing, and Retaining and Involving Part-time Faculty.....	47
Recruiting and Employing Part-time Faculty.....	47
Developing Part-time Faculty.....	48
Retaining and Involving Part-time Faculty.....	50
Summary.....	55
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES.....	57
Purposes of the Study.....	57
Research Questions.....	58
Primary Research Questions.....	58
Secondary Research Questions.....	59
Research Design.....	60
Population.....	64

Instrumentation.....	67
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS.....	71
Population, Sample, and Response Rate.....	71
Data Analysis and Findings.....	76
Quantitative Data.....	78
Qualitative Data.....	113
Summary.....	125
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	127
Introduction.....	127
Discussion of the Findings.....	130
Conclusions.....	141
Recommendations for Practice, Policy, and Future Research.....	144
Concluding Remarks.....	155
REFERENCES.....	156
APPENDICES.....	165
A. SACS Institutions Surveyed.....	165
B. Survey.....	172
C. Invitation Letter to the Survey.....	179
D. Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part I	180
E. Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part II.....	191
F. Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part III.....	200
G. IRB Approval.....	206

LIST OF TABLES

1. Public Associate's College Categories of Classification.....	62
2. Primary and Secondary Research Goals.....	63
3. Percentage of Population.....	65
4. Population and Sample Sizes.....	66
5. Percentage Differences between Population and Sample by Carnegie Basic Classification of Public Associate's Colleges.....	74
6. Percentage Differences between Population and Sample by State.....	75
7. Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 21 through 35).....	79
8. Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 21 through 35).....	80
9. Means and Standard Deviations for Primary Research Question 1a.....	82
10. ANOVA Results for Primary Research Question 1a.....	82
11. Means and Standard Deviations for Primary Research Question 1b.....	83
12. ANOVA Results for Primary Research Question 1b.....	84
13. Percentages for Primary Research Question 1 under Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 21 through 35).....	85
14. Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19).....	87
15. Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19).....	89
16. Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 2a.....	90

17. ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 2a.....	91
18. Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 2b.....	92
19. ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 2b.....	92
20. Percentages for Secondary Research Question 2 under Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19).....	93
21. Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 37 through 45).....	95
22. Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 37 through 45).....	96
23. Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 3a.....	97
24. ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 3a.....	98
25. Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 3b.....	99
26. ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 3b.....	99
27. Percentages for Secondary Research Question 3 under Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 37 through 45).....	100
28. Means and Standard Deviations for Questionnaire Item 44 of Data Form Part III.....	102
29. Percentages for Research Question 4 (Questionnaire Item 44 under Data Form Part III).....	102
30. Means and Standard Deviations for Questionnaire Item 45 of Data Form Part III.....	103
31. Percentages for Research Question 5 (Questionnaire Item 45 under Data Form Part III).....	104
32. Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations of STEM Program/Content Areas under Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19).....	106
33. Percentages for Questionnaire Item 7 under Data Form Part I.....	107
34. Percentages for Questionnaire Item 8 under Data Form Part I.....	108
35. Percentages for Questionnaire Item 9 under Data Form Part I.....	109
36. Percentages for Questionnaire Item 12 under Data Form Part I.....	110

37. Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Questionnaire Item 2 under Data from Part I	111
38. Percentages for Questionnaire Item 2 under Data Form Part I.....	112
39. Responses for Questionnaire Item 20 under Data Form Part I by Associate College Type.....	113
40. Responses for Questionnaire Item 36 under Data Form Part II by Associate College Type.....	118
41. Responses for Questionnaire Item 46 under Data Form Part III by Associate College Type.....	120
42. Responses for Questionnaire Item 54 under Data Form Part IV by Associate College Type.....	122
43. Proportion of Adults with Bachelor's or Higher Degree, by State, 2008.....	133
44. Percentages for Questionnaire Item 33 under Data Form Part III.....	149

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the inception of the two-year colleges at the turn of the 20th century until today, community colleges' employment of part-time faculty to fulfill their missions remains a controversial academic discussion (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Kezar & Sam, 2010a, 2010b, Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Wallin, 2007, 2005; Benjamin, 2003, 2002; Yackee, 2000; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The percentage of part-time faculty at community colleges nearly doubled, increasing from 35% in the late 1960s to 65% in the mid-1990s (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; NCES, 2008; Yackee, 2000). Weispenning (2000) suggested that "flexibility in staffing and increasing enrollments are common reasons given by administrators for hiring part-time faculty" (p. 3). In 2002, Anthony and Valadez (2002) reported that an average of 58% of community college faculty members were part-time. Gordon (2003) also recognized the dramatic increases of part-time faculty over the years since the mid-1990s. Levin (2007) stated that part-time faculty accounts for 67% of community college faculty. Cohen and Brawer (2008) predicted that the ratio for full-time to part-time faculty "has stabilized at just under 40:60 and will be likely to remain there as administrators' desires to save money and faculty organizations' ability to protect full-time positions offset one another" (p. 456).

Even though Cohen and Brawer (2008) thought that the ratio for full-time and part-time faculty would stabilize at 40:60, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in a *Special Analysis 2008-Community Colleges*, using the data collected for fall 2007, recorded a 33.5:66.5 ratio for full-time to part-time faculty for public two-year colleges (Table PS2). The

NCES (2008) also noted that between 1974-75 and 2006-07, the number of community colleges in the U. S. increased by 17%, from 895 to 1,045 and in 2006-07 enrolled 6.2 million students, 35% of all postsecondary students enrolled that year. Also, NCES (2008) reported that 95% of the nation's community colleges have an open admissions policy. In early 2012, the American Association for Community Colleges (AACC) published in its article, "Reclaiming the American Dream," which stated that 68% of all community college faculty members are now part-time (p. 19). In 2011, the AACC estimated a 15% enrollment increase from fall 2008 to fall 2010. Headcount totals are listed at 12.4 million—7.4 million for credit students and 5 million for non-credit students. Based on enrollment from fall 2009 through fall 2011, AACC's 2012 facts recorded a 2.9% increase, which pushed enrollment to 13 million, increasing to 8 million for credit students and remaining at 5 million non-credit students. A national trend is clear. With increasing higher education demands and the public funding dilemmas nationwide, the percentages of part-time faculty continue to rise at community colleges in order to fulfill a vital element of their missions: access.

Although access normally refers to students' opportunities to an available education, new research proposes that the sheer numbers and working conditions of part-time faculty deny students access to their instructors. Benjamin (2003) argued that there is not enough focus on the undergraduate general education:

The central role of contingent appointees in undergraduate education is beyond dispute. In contrast, the implications for undergraduate learning are very much in dispute ...[A]lthough contingent faculty provide instruction at less direct cost and are often able individuals, they are less well qualified, less carefully selected and evaluated, less well supported, less involved in student learning, and less well integrated into the learning community.... The issue here is not whether students learn specific facts from specific instructors but whether they complete their education and acquire the broad competencies that are the aim of general education. (p. 108-9)

Because of similar concerns, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) began the Faculty and College Excellence (FACE) campaign to achieve equity for part-time faculty and to advocate for more full-time faculty. The *Just Ask* brochure encourages parents, grandparents, or loved ones of college-age students to ask vital questions of college and university representatives to ensure their students' success:

1. How likely is it that a first- or second-year student at your institution will be taught by full-time, permanent faculty members?
2. What percentage of undergraduate classes and discussion sections are taught by part-time faculty and graduate assistants?
3. How much do part-time faculty make per course at your institution?
4. Are part-time faculty required to hold office hours? Do they get paid to do so, and are they provided suitable office space to meet with students? (AFT, 2012)

The brochure also suggests that colleges are not investing in full-time faculty and that potential students will more than likely be taught by an underpaid, part-time instructor who lacks basic professional support, such as an office to meet with students (AFT, 2012).

Accrediting agencies have ambiguous and varying guidelines for the percentage of part-time faculty institutions should employ. Henry (2008) stated, "With 68 percent of college faculty holding non-tenure-track positions, an institutional dependence on contingent faculty might be expected to set off warning signals for accreditors." The author studied the published documents of the seven accrediting agencies and found that they differ in their recognition of full- and part-time faculty status, only two providing definitions of the term *part-time faculty*; therefore, he identified the term as a "misnomer" because many designated part-time faculty actually work full time for part-time pay with few or no benefits. Specifically, Henry (2008) concluded that only one of the seven accrediting agencies used language of warning for overuse: "The New England commission requires that 'the institution avoids undue dependence on part-time faculty, adjuncts, and graduate assistants to conduct classroom instruction.'"

Particular to this study, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) makes no distinction between part-time and full-time faculty in section 3.7.1 of its accreditation standards for qualifications, but SACS requires institutions to list part-time and full-time in separate categories when reporting. SACS does not provide a ratio for full- and part-time faculty, but state that the use of part-time faculty should be by “judicious assignment” in addition to “sufficient numbers” of “core faculty” (SACS, 2012b, p. 22). Benjamin (2003) reported that without specific guidelines, “Quality control in American higher education primarily depends on institutional self-evaluation and governance” (p. 109). Also, regional accrediting agencies need to take into account that “faculty qualifications, and the procedures for faculty selection, appointment, and support do affect student involvement in learning, and thereby, student outcomes” (Benjamin, 2003, p. 110). Schmidt (2012) explained that the conditions in which adjuncts work are not just considered a labor concern, but also an educational problem; however, convincing accrediting agencies “to drive change” may be difficult because they are hesitant “to get out in front of their member institutions and promote policies that are not widely accepted as necessary and realistic.”

Purpose of the Study

This study will focus on the policy and perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) regarding employment and use of part-time faculty accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and examine the same implementation procedures, perceptions, and practices. Also, this research will examine the governing body and the practice of hiring part-time faculty. Significantly, the primary activity of approximately 90% of faculty at community colleges is teaching, with almost no faculty devoted primarily to research, and a

majority of faculty, approximately 68%, holds part-time appointments (NCES, 2008). Even though the national average is high for part-time faculty at community colleges, Rankin's (2008) national survey of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) of rural community colleges revealed that 56% responded that there is a shortage of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) faculty, and 61% responded that there is a shortage of qualified part-time faculty in many academic areas (p. 59). Because two- and four-year college and university employees are hardest hit by the unprecedented financial challenges assaulting higher education, "Local and state governments squeeze their employees to produce more for less money" (Rosser, 2012, p. 113). Katsinas and Hardy (2012) argued that "[C]ommunity colleges generally and rural community colleges specifically operating in a very changed environment, where state-assigned missions in no way match the levels of state financing or public expectations,....makes operating rural community colleges particularly demanding" (453-4). The authors reported that of 13 commissioned issue briefs and papers, totaling 92 pages single spaced, published as part of the October 5, 2010 White House Summit on Community Colleges, only once mentioned the word *rural*, making rural community colleges relatively "invisible" in policy making even though "well over a third [3.5 million] of all US community college enrollments are at rural community colleges" (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012, p. 454-5). Given the financial burden placed on rural community colleges and the increasing demand for higher education, this research should support the theory that part-time and adjunct faculty demand will continue to increase at community colleges and should record the difficulty encountered by CIOs of SACS-accrediting agencies, especially in rural community colleges, with fulfilling requirements of demand, access, and policy.

Because of the many changes in higher education since Yackee's (2000) study in which she interviewed chief instructional officers at NCA, three secondary purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges regarding the amount of challenge experienced in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty.
2. To identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges regarding the commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty influence the decision to employ part-time faculty.
3. To compare differences by associate's college type, based on type of control (public), location (rural, suburban, urban, 2-year under 4-year), and size (rural small, medium, and large).

Significance of the Study

In 1996, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) was established to serve as a national advocate for voluntary self-regulation of higher education through accreditation. CHEA coordinates all six of the regional higher education accrediting bodies in the United States: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSCHE), New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC-CIHE), North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA-HLC), Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC-ACCJC), and Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior

Colleges and Universities (WASC-ACSCU). In 2011, CHEA defined itself as “A national advocate and institutional voice for self-regulation of academic quality through accreditation, an association of 3,000 degree-granting colleges and universities and recognizes 60 institutional and programmatic accrediting organizations” (CHEA, 2011, p. 2).

Yackee (2000) cited the CHEA 1997 report that announced its priorities, which included, “To design a strategy for both the chief academic officers and the team visit members to comment on the accreditation process” (CHEA, 1997a, p. 3). In accordance with these priorities, this research will allow the CIOs’ perceptions of the difficulty of following policy with practice at the second largest, SACS. Although this study will be a replication of Yackee’s 2000 research which gave opportunity to NCA’s CIOs to respond, the trend toward the necessity of increasing numbers of part-time faculty and declining state and federal funds should reveal some new difficulties in compliance. In addition, this researcher could find no study of the CIOs in SACS states on this subject; thus, they have not been surveyed.

Research Questions

Primary Research Questions

1. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate’s colleges perceive meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult?
 - a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate’s colleges?

- b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

Secondary Research Questions

- 2. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty as challenging?
 - a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?
 - b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate's colleges?
- 3. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty?
 - a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?
 - b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perception of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

4. To what extent are part-time faculty members employed as a vehicle to create and build new programs?
5. To what extent is there a preference for hiring as full-time faculty after first working as a part-time faculty member?
6. How difficult is it to hire part-time faculty in the following program/content areas:
Developmental, Fine Arts, English, Math, Science, Health Science, Computer Science, and Social Science.
7. To what extent is there a significant difference in difficulty in hiring part-time faculty for teaching online courses versus traditional courses?

Delimitations

The following delimitations apply to this study:

1. The scope of this study will be limited to chief instructional officers at SACS-accredited community colleges.
2. This investigation will be limited to regional/institutional accreditation and will not include specialized/ program/professional accreditation (see definitions below).
3. The ability to generalize the study's findings will be limited to the population under investigation.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following limitations and assumptions will apply to this study:

1. It will be assumed two-year colleges that achieved member status of accreditation met the minimum criteria recorded in 3.7.1 of the *Principles of Accreditation* guidelines for

Faculty Credentials for employing part-time faculty as defined the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, (SACS-COC):

- a. Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level: doctorate or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).
- b. Faculty teaching associate degree courses designed for transfer to a baccalaureate degree: doctorate or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).
- c. Faculty teaching associate degree courses not designed for transfer to the baccalaureate degree: bachelor's degree in the teaching discipline, or associate's degree and demonstrated competencies in the teaching discipline. (SACS, 2006)

All institutions in the survey population held SACS accreditation status as of November 17, 2012.

2. It will be assumed that the survey used, which will be reviewed by a panel of experts for the face and content validity, accurately measures perceptions of the study population.
3. It will be assumed that the individuals chosen by the researcher (based on their experience in the areas of part-time faculty, community colleges, national and regional accreditation processes, and survey design) to review the survey instrument are qualified and competent, as a group, to assess the validity and reliability of the survey instrument.
4. It will be assumed that survey respondents will answer survey items honestly and comprehensively.
5. It is assumed that the 2010 Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges (2011) is an appropriate tool for organizing the data by community college type.

Definitions

The following key terms were used in this study:

1. *Accreditation Status*: pending ... “Compliance with the Core Requirements is essential for gaining and maintaining accreditation with the Commission on Colleges. The requirements establish a level of development required of an institution seeking initial or continued accreditation. Compliance with the Core Requirements is necessary but not sufficient to warrant accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation.... Core Requirement 2.12 requires an institution to develop an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and show that the plan is part of an ongoing planning and evaluation process.... An applicant institution seeking membership with the Commission on Colleges is required to document compliance with Core Requirements 2.1 - 2.11 in order to be awarded candidacy, candidacy renewal, or membership” (SACS, 2004, p. 8).
2. *Affiliate Institutions*: Colleges and universities holding either SACS candidate or accreditation status.
3. *Associate’s Degree*: A degree granted for the successful completion of a sub-baccalaureate program of studies, usually requiring at least 2 years (or the equivalent) of full-time, college-level study. This includes degrees granted in a cooperative or work-study program (NCES, 2011).
4. *Candidate Status*: “An institution seeking authorization of a Candidacy Committee must first complete an application documenting its compliance with Core Requirements 2.1–2.11, Comprehensive Standards 3.3.1, 3.5.1, and 3.7.1, and Federal Requirements 4.1-4.7. These requirements are basic expectations of institutions seeking Candidacy. Compliance with these requirements, however, is not sufficient to warrant initial membership. After

gaining Candidacy status, institutions must demonstrate both continued compliance with the above requirements and compliance with all of the remaining Comprehensive Standards of the *Principles of Accreditation*” (SACS, 2012a, p. 1).

5. *Chief Instructional Officer*: The most senior ranking individual in a 2-year college, whose primary function is that of the direction and oversight of academic affairs. This title will be used in this study, but different titles are commonly used for the same responsibilities: chief academic officer, vice president of academic affairs, dean of academic affairs, or dean of instruction.
6. *Community College*: A publicly-supported institution regionally accredited to award the associate degree as its highest degree (Cohen & Brawer, 2008).
7. *Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)*: The non-profit organization of colleges and universities that recognizes higher education regional accrediting bodies and serves as the national advocate for voluntary self-regulation through accreditation for higher education. CHEA coordinates the country’s 6 regional accrediting entities: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSCHE), New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC-CIHE), North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA-HLC) , Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC-ACCJC), and Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (WASC-ACSCU) (CHEA, 2012).

8. *Full-time Faculty*: Faculty whose principal activity is teaching and who teach 15 credits or more per semester unless release hours for administrative or other duties lessen this teaching load (NCES, 2011).
9. *Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSCHE)*: “Degree-granting institutions which offer one or more postsecondary educational programs at least one academic year in length in Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and other geographic areas in which the commission now conducts accrediting activities” (CHEA, 2012).
10. *National Accreditor*: An accrediting organization created at the national level to enhance coordination of higher education accrediting activities and to recognize regional accreditation agencies.
11. *New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC-CIHE)*: “Institutions that award bachelor’s, master’s or doctoral degrees and associate degree granting institutions that include degrees in liberal arts and general studies in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont and other geographic areas in which the commission now conducts accrediting activities” (CHEA, 2013).
12. *North Central Association of Colleges and Schools-The Higher Learning Commission (NCA-HLC)*: “Degree granting institutions incorporated in Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming or federally authorized sovereign nations that are authorized (licensed) by the same state or

nation to award higher degrees (associate, baccalaureate, master's, first professional and/or doctoral degrees (both research and professional)). (2003)" (CHEA, 2011, p. 4).

13. *Part-Time /Adjunct Faculty*: Individuals an employing institution recognizes, legally and contractually, as less than full-time employees. This definition is consistent with that used by the U.S. Department of Education (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998; 2002).
14. *Regional/Institutional Accreditors*: Accrediting organizations which are recognized by CHEA. "Recognition by CHEA affirms that the standards and processes of the accrediting organization are consistent with the academic quality, improvement and accountability expectations that CHEA has established, including the eligibility standard that the majority of institutions or programs each accredits are degree-granting" (CHEA, 2011, p. 3).
15. *Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges*: "Regional accrediting body for degree-seeking institutions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and in Latin America (2003)" (CHEA, 2011, p. 5).
16. *Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC-ACCJC)*: "Associate degree-granting institutions in California, Hawaii, the Territories of Guam and American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands" (CHEA, 2013).
17. *Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (WASC-ACSCU)*: "Baccalaureate degree or higher institutions

in California, Hawaii, and the Territory of Guam; institutions incorporated within the region that do not offer degree programs in the region when such programs reviewed effectively by WASC-ACSCU processes and are American in style and offered in English; and joint accreditation for community colleges that offer one baccalaureate degree and meet the conditions of the joint policy with the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC-ACCJC)” (CHEA, 2013).

Summary

This chapter reported a short history of the increasing number of part-time faculty on associate’s college campuses and recorded some points of the existing debate in light of these increases. Chapter 1 also presented the purposes, significance, and research questions of the study. Finally, limitations, delimitations, and definitions were clarified to inform the entirety of the research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

A national trend of employing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction at two-year colleges is still a vital discussion in academia. However, not until the late 1980s and early 1990s did the discussions focus on anything other than perceived problems associated with their use (Yackee, 2000). Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) suggested that over twenty years of research and debate over instructional quality shows “little to no difference in the instructional ability of part-time faculty” compared to full-time faculty (p. 11). Yackee (2000) stated, “The concern expressed most often was part-time faculty negatively impacts the quality of students’ educational experiences,” yet empirical evidence for such concerns is lacking (p. 24). However, with the continuous increase in demand for higher education and increased use of adjunct faculty, the literature reveals a consistent debate on the advantages and disadvantages of hiring them. This chapter presents research on the demographics of part-time faculty, a brief history of Carnegie’s Classification for Associate’s Colleges, a history and explanation of the Southern Association’s Accreditation processes, procedures, and faculty guidelines, a literature review of the reasons, advantages and disadvantages commonly cited, for hiring part-time faculty, and documented practices for recruiting, developing, and retaining them.

Background

Part-time Faculty at Community Colleges: Demographics

In the early years of the two-year colleges, in 1953, almost half of the instructors were part-timers, recruited from local high schools. By 1968, as the colleges grew, so did the numbers of full-time faculty they were able to recruit and support. An observable shift occurred by 1978 which found that part-time faculty appointments had increased to 55% of all faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 94-95). Part-time faculty outnumbering full-time faculty on community college campuses has continued. The NCES (2008) reported that in fall 2003, two-thirds of faculty at community colleges were employed part time (over 240,000 faculty), and one-third were employed full time (approximately 121,000 faculty).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) created their own typology to study the characteristics of part-time faculty from Tuckman's (1978) taxonomy because they found that the individual experiences and patterns of employment were too complex for the narrow categories Tuckman offered (p. 46-9). Gappa and Leslie (1993) provided four broad categories:

1. *Career enders* are individuals in the process of retiring or have already retired, many coming from established careers outside academia and deciding to continue in academia for a plethora of reasons: the supplemental income, keeping up-to-date in the field, or because they enjoy the experience of teaching and remaining active.
2. *Specialists, experts, and professionals* are employed have full-time jobs elsewhere and come from a varied range of careers. They are hired for their specialized knowledge or success in certain fields, whether the arts or business. Because some are well-known in their fields of study, these specialists can also add prestige, benefitting the institution by having the person on its faculty roster. Rather than relying on the

faculty position for income, these faculty members often take the position simply because they enjoy teaching.

3. *Aspiring Academics* include faculty who are looking for a full-time or tenure-track position such as graduate students and individuals looking for a position at the same school as their partners. “Freeway fliers,” faculty who manage to create full-time schedules from part-time faculty positions, are also part of this category.
4. *Freelancers* are faculty who supplement their part-time appointments with other jobs not in academia or who may be caretakers at home and use the position for extra income but preferred not to have ties to a particular institution (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46-63).

Leslie and Gappa (2002) concluded that the majority of stereotypes, assumptions, and attitudes generated and popularized by the media about part-time community college faculty do not apply to the various experience of faculty who accept part-time appointments. Even though Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) study identified part-time faculty who create full-time work as “freeway fliers,” Eagan (2007) insisted that “only a small proportion of part-time faculty have more than one academic appointment at a postsecondary education institution. Instead, 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” (p. 5-6; Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW), 2012; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Kezar and Sam (2010b) noted new studies which revealed many “voluntary” part-time faculty members choose their status for various reasons, such as more or less classes to prepare and teach, geographic constraints, balance between work and life, fewer institutional responsibilities, and in some cases, supplemental salary and stipend. Also, “involuntary” non-tenure-track faculty members may

lack the degree requirements or credentials to become tenure-track faculty, but they remain because they enjoy teaching and working with students (Kezar & Sam, 2010b, p. 36-7).

Demographics for this varied group of part-time faculty have been generated by National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) until 2004 when the Department of Education stopped funding (CAW, 2012). Using the data of demographic characteristics of full- and part-time faculty from four different NSOPF surveys (1988, 1993, 1999, and 2004), Eagan (2007) found that “results over time demonstrate gender parity between full-time and part-time faculty” (p. 6). In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the majority of both part- and full-time faculty appointments at community colleges were held by men. In the NSOPF 2004 survey, faculty appointments for women and men had become essentially equal. Even though gender differences between part-time and full-time faculty have disappeared, “[C]ommunity college faculty does not reflect an image of diversity.... [since] faculty identifying as white still represent more than 82 percent of all community college faculty.” In addition, the NSOPF studies recorded no significance age difference between full- and part-time faculty (Eagan, 2007, p. 6).

In 2008, the NCES took a “Closer Look” at part-time faculty at community colleges and how they differ from their colleagues at public and private 4-year institutions. The results included that a majority of faculty at community colleges held part-time appointments; 67% of the faculty was part time versus 28% at public 4-year institution and 42% at private 4-year institutions; larger percentages of faculty at community colleges had a master's degree or less as their highest level of educational attainment; the percentage of male and female faculty was relatively equal unlike the public and private 4-year institutions where males constituted about 60% of faculty; more Black and Hispanic faculty were appointed than at public or private 4-year institutions; 90 percent of faculty duties at community colleges was teaching, with almost no

faculty devoted primarily to research, and only 3% of part-time faculty at community colleges reported administrative duties as their main activity compared to the 8 to 9% at 4-year institutions (NCES, 2008, *The Conditions of Education*). By early 2012, AACC reported that 68% of all faculty members at community colleges were part-time.

The trend of part-timers outnumbering full-time faculty has continued to the present, because as Cohen and Brawer (2008) argued, “Part-time instructors are to the community colleges what migrant workers are to the farms” (p. 95). Lurie (2003) referred to them as “sweat shop workers” since they are minimally paid, supported, and invested in the institutions they serve. Schmidt (2012) proposed that some higher education experts and advocates for part-time faculty would prefer that accrediting agencies ask the tough questions. Consequently, some of these questions should address working conditions, involvement, development, and support of part-time faculty.

Diversity of Community Colleges and Their Students

The American Association for Community Colleges (AACC) recognizes 1,132 institutions—986 of which are public—across the United States (American Association of Community Colleges, 2012). The same 2012 fact sheet, using fall 2009-2011 data, reported that community colleges account for 44% of all undergraduates and 43% of all first-time freshmen seeking higher education. Of these 13 million students, 59% are employed part time, and 21% are employed full time. Because the students served at community colleges are a diverse population with various reasons for attending and varying socio-economic backgrounds, many need some type of financial assistance: 32% are Pell Grant recipients, 10% receive campus-based aid, and 18% obtain academic competitiveness grants (AACC, 2012).

Eells (1931) first noted the complexity of the mission for two-year colleges. Cohen and Brawer (2008) outlined a five-point mission which defines the majority of the nation's associate's colleges today: academic transfer preparation, vocational-technical education, continuing education, developmental education, and community service (p. 22-6). However, the context in which these institutions struggle to achieve this mission varies significantly. Katsinas (1993) stated that variables, such as geographic area, population served, funding sources, and governance system, unequivocally result in institutional diversity, which is especially prominent when considering the influence of geographic service area. The first of these necessary distinctions serving dense populations can be found at urban institutions that enroll a high proportion of students who are low-income minorities and are more likely to require developmental education before attending college-level courses. Historically, as the two-year institutions most significantly affected by immigration, urban institutions act as an "Ellis Island" and serve a multicultural and socio-economically diverse student body. To meet their needs, which includes time on degree program as a major factor, urban two-year community colleges' curriculum emphasizes vocational programming leading directly to employment since, statistically, few of these students plan or achieve more education (Katsinas, 1993, p.14). A second category of community colleges, according to diversity of location, is suburban, which enjoys a well-funded local tax base because of industries' movement out of urban locales and higher local property values than that of rural and urban community colleges. Suburban colleges serve fewer first-time college students, focus on liberal arts/transfer education, and plan their vocational certification toward more high-technology-based occupations (Katsinas, 1993, p. 13-4). The final category based on diversity of location is the rural community college. These colleges constantly struggle to meet the five-point mission while operating in lagging economies

and fluctuating tax bases. Katsinas (1993) stated that rural community colleges most closely resemble the “idea” of a “comprehensive” college envisioned by the pioneers, such as Eells and Koos, which includes transfer, vocational, and “citizenry” education (p. 11). Katsinas (1993) also noted that rural community colleges suffer the most during economic recessions because vocational education is closely tied to the community industry needs. While they promote regional economic development, serve the greatest number of first-generation students, and act as the community centers in their rural setting, they receive little relief from local and state taxes (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012; Hardy & Katsinas, 2007; Roessler, Katsinas, & Hardy, 2006).

In spite of the diversity of the nation's institutions, much of the scholarly research on community colleges has been limited by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's classification system, which historically aggregated all two-year institutions into a single category (Hardy, 2005; McCormick & Zhao, 2005; Yackee, 2000; Katsinas, 1993). Katsinas (1993) argued, “From the perspective of those actively engaged in research related to the community college, the lumping of all 1,387 two-year institutions into a single classification category has impeded the incremental advance of the knowledge base regarding these institutions, the people who work in them, and the students whom they serve” (p. 7). Katsinas (2003) continued the complex discussion of classifying community colleges by examining the approaches being contemplated, based on geography and “justified by historical precedent” in the name of access, which allows these institutions to continue toward the goal of comprehensiveness (p. 23-4). In order for research on these institutions to be beneficial, Katsinas maintained that the classification of community colleges should include the categories of institutional control (public, private, and special use), geographic location (urban, suburban, and rural), governance (multi-campus and single-campus), and size (2003, p. 27). Yackee (2000)

tested these categories in her dissertation to distinguish the effects of accreditation standards for the use of part-time faculty, and the results from the chief instructional officers surveyed reinforced the notion of uniqueness at the community colleges that are members of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and the validity of the expanded schema. In his dissertation, Hardy (2005) argued that a further updating to the Carnegie Classification was needed to acknowledge the distinguishing characteristics of associate-degree colleges, so instead of the standard archival data, he used the prior work of Katsinas and Lacey and the 2000 United State Census data and 1993 Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to recast the model. Hardy (2005) also provided practical application of the classifications for two-year institutions and stated that without applying these “sorting steps” (i.e., the similarities and differences between groups of students, faculty members, and institutions) to the sampling phase and the analysis phase, “meaningful inference” in research is impossible (p. 46).

In the September/October 2005 issue of *Change*, McCormick and Zhao reiterated the dangers of “lumping” colleges into a limited classification:

Significant problems arise when classification is seen as an adequate representation of an institution’s identity or character. Colleges and universities are complex organizations that differ on many more dimensions than the handful of attributes used to define the classification’s categories, and of course the very act of asserting similarity among institutions runs counter to the rhetoric of distinctiveness on our campuses. More important, the host of intangibles that constitute institutional identity could not possibly be incorporated into an empirically based classification system. (p. 55)

In November 2005, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching announced its new classification system which was developed as “new lenses through which the education community can view the institutional diversity in American higher education.” Carnegie Senior Scholar Alexander C. McCormick, who directed Carnegie’s Classifications

project, stated, “Colleges and universities are complex organizations....As valuable as it has been, the basic framework has blind spots. The five new Carnegie Classifications are organized around three key questions: What is taught? To whom? In what setting?” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2005). Thus, the 2005 Carnegie categories disaggregated two-year institutions on the basis of geographic service area and institutional size and recognized that community colleges are ultimately defined by the populations they serve by adding the term *servicing* to the geographic descriptions of rural, urban, and suburban institutions (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006a). Building upon the work of Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy, the new Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate’s Colleges categorized institutions as rural, suburban, or urban, based on the U. S. Census Bureau Office of Management and Budget definitions (U. S. Census Bureau, n.d.). According to these definitions, Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) have a population of at least 100,000 and contain a core large population nucleus of at least 50,000 and surrounding areas that are highly economically and socially integrated within the core area. Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSAs) are MSAs that have significant commuting interchange with another MSA (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2006b). Therefore, the new Carnegie classification system (2006b) defined urban-servicing and suburban-servicing institutions as those located within PMSAs or MSAs with populations of at least 500,000, respectively. Rural institutions are those outside PMSAs or MSAs or within PMSAs or MSAs with populations of less than 500,000. Charlier (2010) reported, “This definition is far more inclusive than that previously used by Vineyard (1978), which designated rural institutions as those within centers of less than 100,000, serving a wide geographic area and with a comprehensive institutional mission” (p. 5). The results of the 922 community college campuses now defined by Carnegie as rural provide opportunity to

enhance efforts to understand these unique institutions through comparison with their suburban and urban counterparts (Hardy & Katsinas, 2007).

Community College Funding

Since Grace Yackee's 2000 study of policy and practice within North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), state funding has become an ever-increasing problem for community colleges nationwide. Rosser (2012) insisted, "Program and department closures, mergers, and restructuring are now standard institutional responses to reduced state appropriations" (p. 113). Yackee (2000) reported that "Regardless of size, rural two-year colleges face unique challenges not faced by other types of institutions, namely suburban and urban two-year colleges" (p. 171). Katsinas, Alexander, and Opp (2003) suggested that "both access and excellence are threatened by state and federal policies related to institutional support, tuition, and student aid. These trends affect all community colleges, but they hit rural community colleges particularly hard" because state funding formulas continue to ignore their specific needs, especially the technical programs which are more costly but vital to rural economic development. As a result, rural community colleges have more operating costs per student and lower budgets to accomplish their missions, so they struggle just "keeping the doors open" (p. 1-3). Coupled with funding schemas which do not account for their uniqueness, "Small rural-serving institutions, long more dependent on state funding than other types of community colleges, saw a particularly significant decrease in state appropriations" (Roessler, Katsinas, & Hardy, 2006, p. 3). The authors explained that funding slippage must ultimately be made up in higher tuition and fees because of the insufficient local tax base. In a national survey of state directors, Katsinas, Tollefson, and Reamey (2008) found 30 directors predicting that

rural community colleges will face the greatest fiscal strain in the coming year at the same time they encounter record enrollment increases, 2.2 million in the five years from 2000-2001 to 2005-2006. Katsinas, D'Amico, and Freidel (2011) reported similar findings from 48 community college state directors surveyed: 24 of 34 state-level respondents foresaw enrollment increases, and 29 of 48 predicted an operating budget decrease for 2011 through 2012 (p. 4). Katsinas and Freidel (2010) surveyed state community college directors and reported that the 3 million students who will need to be accommodated in higher education between 2009 and 2012 may not find the door open due to the lack of funding, which results in lack of capacity, and current and past surveys "have shown overwhelming agreement [48 of 51 or 94% of respondents] that facilities represents a major need in most states, and that federal support would be helpful" (p. 1-2). Katsinas and Freidel (2010) observed,

Clearly, public colleges and universities at all levels are challenged to accommodate the all time record growth in traditional college-aged and young adults, a demographic reality that will occur whether or not our public community colleges, public master's colleges and universities, and public doctoral granting institutions are funded to serve them. (p. 3)

Katsinas and Freidel's (2010) analysis shows that community colleges will once again be asked to bear the "lion's share" and "be the portal of entry into the U. S. higher education for millions of Americans" (p. 1, 6).

In January 2012, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) State Relations and Policy Analysis Team summarized the funding issues associated with higher education:

While history was witness to many notable events that affected the United States and the world in 2011, the defining theme of the year was that of an increasingly and dangerously fragile interconnected global economy. The cascading effect of the lackluster domestic economy on higher education was felt in its most acute form yet, with 2011 marking a new low point in state funding for public colleges and universities. Hundreds of millions of dollars in funding cuts, combined with increasing student enrollments, resulted in per-student funding reaching a 30-year low.... For many, 2011 seemed to have marked a

somber turning point in which the major stock owner of the American public university switched hands—from that of the collective taxpayer, through funding allocated by the state, to that of students and their families, through funding paid for via tuition payments. (AASCU, 2012, p. 1)

Katsinas, D’Amico, and Freidel (2011) predicted what this funding dilemma would do for public access institutions and the first-generation students they serve:

[S]tudents and their families are being squeezed in this recession. Tuition is predicted to rise by more than double the rate of inflation, as measured by the HEPI estimate of 2.3% for 2011....[M]ore academically-talented, economically disadvantaged students and families may turn to federal student and private loans to make up the difference. With predicted state operating budget cuts nearly double the inflation rate next year, access institutions themselves are being squeezed financially. (p. 3-4)

The tuition increases will put a strain on families, but Katsinas, D’Amico, and Freidel (2011) wondered if they will offset the financial constraints already incurred by access institutions.

Now over twelve years old, Yackee’s (2000) survey of chief instructional officers at NCA-accredited institutions revealed, “CIOs at rural NCA-accredited community colleges perceived meeting criteria for part-time faculty and implementing effective practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty as more difficult and challenging...” (p. 172). The primary goal of community colleges is to provide access to historically disadvantaged populations: the educationally underprepared, minorities, unemployed and dislocated workers, low socioeconomic status, immigrants, and culturally underserved populations. Consequently, nationwide funding cuts and record enrollments will undoubtedly result in more reliance on part-time faculty to provide the access to higher education, yet rural-serving community colleges, already confronted with unique financial challenges, may encounter hardships in meeting the increasing demands to recruit, hire, and develop part-time faculty following good practices of accreditation regulations.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Accreditation

History

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools is a private, nonprofit, voluntary organization founded in 1895 in Atlanta, Georgia. Miller (1998) suggested the Southern Association “was born and grew in the space created by both popular and political resistance to the idea of federal or national control of education” (p. 304). Miller recorded the major events which fueled educational concerns leading to its formation and continuation: population growth, immigration, a rising middle class, war, and strong ideals that education could build “a new social order” (p. 14). James Kirkland announced the Association’s purpose at its first meeting:

1. To organize Southern schools and colleges for cooperation and mutual assistance.
2. To elevate the standard of scholarship and to affect uniformity and entrance requirements.
3. To develop preparatory schools and cut off this work from colleges. (Miller, 1998, p. 14)

The SACS organizational structure evolved from this centralized Association founded in 1895 by six Southern colleges and universities to fulfill these educational purposes (Stone, 2008). SACS eventually established three commissions: the Commission on Secondary Schools (founded in 1912), the Commission on Colleges (founded in 1919), and the Commission on Elementary Schools (founded in 1965), “with each Commission gradually assuming authority for accreditation decisions, policy development, and selection of personnel” (Stone, 2008, p. 1; Miller, 1998).

The Association is comprised of the Commission on Colleges (COC), which accredits higher education degree-granting institutions, and the Council on Accreditation and School Improvement (CASI), which accredits elementary, middle, and secondary schools. The Commission and Council, each separately incorporated, carry out their missions with autonomy;

they develop their own standards and procedures and govern themselves by a delegate assembly (SACS, 2010).

In the *SACS Commission on Colleges Annual Report (2007-2008)*, Philip Stone, the chair of the Commission on Colleges, stated that the Commission on Colleges became a separately incorporated entity under the structure of the parent organization, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Miller (1998) reported that the major institutional change came in June of 1963 when the Association was granted a Charter of Incorporation by the Fulton County Superior Court in Georgia. Miller explained that the change of becoming incorporated meant that the legal liability of the Association and its officers was limited, and the Association could compete for funding from foundations, which were “legally bound not to make grants to unincorporated organizations” (p. 235). The Association’s membership grew during the decade of the 1960s; in fact, the Commission on Colleges added 144 new members by 1969, more than any previous single decade. Many of the new members were two-year colleges, and “by 1971 they made up 41.6 percent of the Commission’s member institutions” (Miller, 1998, p. 235-6). Stone (2008) added that the change meant that almost 800 postsecondary institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges are now members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, Inc. (SACS-COC) rather than SACS.

In 1992, the face of SACS was altered by the adoption of bylaws that significantly decreased the number of board members and their powers. The bylaws also eliminated the centralized administration and vested more authority in the Commissions, including the hiring of each Commission’s chief executive officer. The historic functions of SACS are now assumed individually by SACS-CASI and SACS-COC, with their separate incorporations. However, Stone (2008) stated that “its brand name continues to represent a highly rigorous self-regulatory

process for defining institutions that meet established standards of quality and that strive to improve the learning experiences and achievements of their students." As a regional association, SACS requires "institutional commitment and engagement" in an effort to support its primary purpose of "elevating the standard of scholarship in the South" and a review process that depends on the "involvement of volunteers in all aspects of its activities" (p. 1-2).

In *A Centennial History of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools 1895-1995*, Miller (1998) concluded that founders, such as James Kirkland, might be surprised about the impact of social change on education, as education has been asked to be more relevant to society. Miller cited government involvement in the "nationalization" of education, such as the *GI Bill*, the women's movement, and the Civil Rights Movement and desegregation, as catalysts of the influence. Also, the shift toward accreditation itself, "a shift that gave it a radically different social role and image than the one originally envisioned by its creators," an education not dictated by a "materialistic" society's demands, proves that the Association has been willing to examine itself and adjust when necessary are "prerequisites of their organization retaining its relevance in a society characterized by constant change" (p. 301). Ultimately, the founders would not have been surprised at the impact that society and education, power and philosophy, have on each other.

The SACS (2010) *Principles of Accreditation* explained the organizational structure. The College Delegate Assembly is comprised of one voting representative (the chief executive officer or the officer's designee) from each member institution. Its responsibilities include electing the 77-member Board of Trustees of the Commission on Colleges and guiding the organization's work, approving all revisions in accrediting standards as recommended by the Board, approving the dues of candidate and member institutions as recommended by the Board, electing an

Appeals Committee to hear appeals of adverse accreditation decisions, and electing representatives to the Association's Board of Trustees. The Commission's Board of Trustees is responsible for recommending to the College Delegate Assembly standards for candidacy and membership, authorizing special visits, taking final action on the accreditation status of institutions, nominating to the College Delegate Assembly individuals for election to succeed outgoing members of the Board, electing an Executive Council that will act for the Board while it is not in session, appointing *ad hoc* study committees as needed, and approving the policies and procedures of the Commission on Colleges. The 13-member Executive Council is the executive arm of the Commission and functions on behalf of the Commission's Board and the College Delegate Assembly between sessions. However, the actions of the Council are subject to review and approval by the Board. The Council interprets Commission policies and procedures, develops procedures for and supervises the work of *ad hoc* and standing committees of the Commission, approves goals and objectives of the Commission, reviews and approves the Commission's budget, oversees and annually evaluates the work of its president, and initiates new programs, projects, and policy proposals (SACS, 2010, p. 4).

The Council receives and acts on reports from all *ad hoc* and standing committees and submits them to the Commission's Board of Trustees. In the case of institutions applying for candidacy, membership, or reaffirmation of accreditation, the Executive Council receives recommendations from the Committees on Compliance and Reports, which are the standing evaluation committees of the Commission, and, in turn, submits its recommendations to the total Board of Trustees of the Commission on Colleges (SACS, 2010, p. 4-5).

Mission

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) is the regional body for the accreditation of degree-granting higher education institutions in the 11 Southern states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Latin America, and other international sites approved by the Commission on Colleges that award associate, baccalaureate, master's, or doctoral degrees. "The Commission's mission is the enhancement of educational quality throughout the region and the improvement of the effectiveness of institutions by ensuring that they meet standards established by the higher education community that address the needs of society and students," serving as the link to "shared values and practices among the diverse institutions" (SACS, 2012b, p. 1).

To gain accreditation from SACS COC, an institution "voluntarily" provides evidence that meets the requirements:

1. It has a mission appropriate to higher education.
2. It has resources, programs, and services sufficient to accomplish and sustain that mission.
3. It maintains clearly specified educational objectives that are consistent with its mission and appropriate to the degrees it offers, and that indicate whether it is successful in achieving its stated objectives. (SACS, 2012b, p. 1)

Philosophy

SACS' accreditation philosophy aligns with a traditional U.S. philosophy: "that a free people can and ought to [voluntarily] govern themselves through a representative, flexible, and responsive system" (SACS, 2012b, p. 2). The process of accreditation relies on "integrity" and "trust" between the institution and itself to continue to "enhance the quality of student learning

and the institution's programs and services [and] provides an assessment of an institution's effectiveness in the fulfillment of its mission, its compliance with the requirements of its accrediting association, and its continuing efforts to enhance the quality of student learning and its programs and services" (p. 2). The accreditation process also allows an institution to demonstrate accountability to the public and its constituents.

The Commission on College's expectations are that institutions dedicate themselves to enhance the quality of their programs and services within the "context of their resources and capacities and to create an environment in which teaching, public service, research, and learning occur, as appropriate to the mission" (p. 2). The Commission supports certain rights of an institution: the right to pursue its established educational mission; the right of faculty members to teach, investigate, and publish freely; and the right of students to access opportunities for learning and for the open exchange of ideas. However, "the exercise of these rights should not interfere with the overriding obligation of an institution to offer its students a sound education" (SACS, 2012b, p. 2).

SACS-COC and Accreditation Procedure

The Commission on Colleges applies the requirements of its *Principles* to all applicant, candidate, and member institutions, regardless of the type of institution: private for-profit, private not-for-profit, or public. The Commission evaluates an institution and makes accreditation decisions based on compliance with the Principle of Integrity, compliance with the Core Requirements, compliance with the Comprehensive Standards, compliance with additional Federal Requirements, and compliance with the policies of the Commission on Colleges (SACS, 2012b, p. 6).

SACS-COC Components of the Review Process

The Commission conducts several types of institutional reviews: (1) Candidate Committee reviews of institutions seeking candidacy, (2) Accreditation Committee reviews of candidate institutions seeking initial membership, (3) Reaffirmation Committee reviews of member institutions seeking continued accreditation following a comprehensive review, (4) Special Committee reviews of member institutions seeking continued accreditation following evaluation of institutional circumstances that are accreditation related, and (5) Substantive Change Committee reviews of member institutions seeking approval and continued accreditation following the review of a change of a significant modification or expansion to the institution's nature and scope. Each of the above types of reviews has its own evaluation documents and peer review procedures and can be found on the Commission's website (SACS, 2012b p. 7).

SAC-COC requires preparation specific to and created by the member institution seeking reaffirmation of accreditation. As part of the reaffirmation process, the institution will provide two separate documents:

1. Compliance Certification

The Compliance Certification document, submitted approximately fifteen months in advance of an institution's scheduled reaffirmation, is intended to demonstrate the institution's judgment of the extent of its compliance with each of the Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements. Signatures of the institution's chief executive officer and accreditation liaison are required to certify compliance. By signing the document, the individuals certify that the process of institutional self assessment has been thorough, honest, and forthright, and that the information contained in the document is truthful, accurate, and complete.

2. Quality Enhancement Plan

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) document, submitted four to six weeks in advance of the on-site review by the Commission, is developed by the institution and (1) includes a process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment, (2) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution, (3) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation,

implementation, and completion of the QEP, (4) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP, and (5) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. The QEP should be focused and succinct (no more than seventy-five pages of narrative text and no more than twenty-five pages of supporting documentation or charts, graphs, and tables). (SACS, 2012b, p. 7-8)

SACS-COC and Faculty Policy

The Commission's faculty policy makes no differences between qualifications for full- or part-time faculty. Section 3.7 of its "Faculty Guidelines" lists its institutional policies regarding the employment of full and part-time faculty:

3.7.1 Faculty competence- The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty.

3.7.2 Faculty evaluation- The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status.

3.7.3 Faculty development- The institution provides ongoing professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners.

3.7.4 Academic freedom- The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom.

3.7.5 Faculty role in governance- The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. (SACS, 2012b, p. 30-1)

The Southern Association's *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation* (2012c) states in section 2.8: "The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution. The institution has adequate faculty resources to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs. In addition, upon application for candidacy, an applicant institution demonstrates that it meets Comprehensive Standard 3.7.1 for faculty qualifications" (p. 21-2).

The Commission provides requirements for the adequacy of full- and part-time faculty in its "Rationale and Notes":

Adequacy of faculty resources is necessary to ensure the quality and the integrity of an institution's academic programs. Moreover, the mission of the institution will govern the type of faculty employed, including the number of full-time faculty members. The achievement of the institution's mission with respect to teaching, research, and/or service will require a critical mass of permanent, full-time, qualified faculty to provide direction and oversight of academic programs. The number of such faculty will need to be sufficient to fulfill basic faculty functions of curriculum design, development, and evaluation; teaching; identification and assessment of appropriate student learning outcomes; student advising; research and creative activity; and institutional and professional service. The work of the core faculty may be supplemented and enhanced by judicious assignment of part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants whose

special qualifications broaden and enrich the curriculum and increase learning opportunities for students (SACS, 2012c, p. 22).

Included in the SACS (2012c) *Resource Manual* are “Relevant Questions for Consideration” when addressing the employment issues of part-timers in community colleges:

- What are the institution’s definitions of terms such as full-time faculty, regular/permanent faculty, student-faculty ratio?
- How does the mission of the institution determine the number and type of faculty employed?
- How does the institution determine the number of full-time faculty needed to achieve its mission?
- What are the responsibilities of full-time faculty members and do they constitute a sufficient resource for carrying out basic faculty functions? What are the ways in which members of the institution other than full-time faculty carry out some of these functions?
- How are full-time faculty distributed across academic programs? Across off-campus instructional sites? Across various modes of delivery?
- How does the number of full-time faculty affect faculty workloads?
- Policies governing the employment of part-time faculty and graduate assistants. (SACS, 2012c, p. 22)

SACS also includes specific examples to institutions, such as the number of full-time faculty, the proportion of courses taught by full-time faculty, and the comparison of ratios with peer institutions. With these questions, SACS provides institutions with an opportunity to examine and/or justify their missions with the ratio of full- and part-time faculty appointments.

In addition and relevant to these suggested questions, SACS’ *Principles of Accreditation* (2012b) provides the definition of good practices as “commonly-accepted practices within the higher education community which enhance institutional quality....[that] may be formulated by outside agencies and organizations and endorsed by the Executive Council or the Commission’s Board of Trustees” (p. 43-4). The question is how does the increasing percentage of part-time faculty in the community college affect quality of instruction and whether it is “good practice.”

Reasons for Employing Part-time Faculty

Advantages

Community colleges have traditionally depended on a part-time workforce in sizeable numbers for various reasons. Yackee (2000) listed some of the advantages given for hiring part-timers: they save institutions money, they increase institutional flexibility by matching demands of varying enrollments, they bring “real world” experience, and they also benefit themselves because they see it as a way to becoming a full-time employee (p. 23; Banachowski, 1997). Pearch and Marutz (2005) reported that there are other factors which are driving the hiring trend, such as the prediction that approximately 80% of current full-time faculty will retire within 20 years, a reflection of the U. S. economy where one in three workers is part-time, and the “traumatic” budget problems of the last decade. Pearch and Marutz (2005) stated that more specific reasons contributing to the hiring of adjuncts are the expanded need for developmental studies or specialized courses, replacements for full-time faculty on sabbatical or other types of leave, benefits for retired full-time faculty to teach a course or two, and encouraging potential full-time faculty by providing spouses with part-time assignments. Cohen and Brawer (2008) suggested, “They also enable small colleges to offer courses for which a full-time load could not be mounted,” such as a foreign language or religious studies course (p. 98). Kezar and Sam (2010b) added that part-time faculty strengthen connections with the community, gain knowledge from other institutions like hospitals or nonprofit organizations because part-timers usually come from local areas, and finally, they can provide a way for colleges to test new programs and fields of study, enriching the institutions and their students’ educations without investing much revenue in tenured faculty (p. 33). Cohen and Brawer (2008) explained, “[T]hey cost less; they may have special capabilities not available among the full-time instructors; and

they can be employed, dismissed, and reemployed as necessary” (p. 94). Gappa (1984) pointed out that “part-timers have long known that the primary feature of their status in higher education is their expendability” (p. 6). Kezar and Sam (2010b) reported that departments could respond more readily to any unexpected changes, such as demand for class, student enrollment, or fluctuations in the economy, by hiring part-time faculty (p. 32). Although this contingent nature of contract results in nonexistent security for adjuncts, institutions see it as part of the advantage of using them to provide flexible schedules for students, create or expand programs of study, and stay within an ever-shrinking budget.

Attrition and graduation rates and the use of part-time faculty have become a vital part of the debate. Johnson’s (2005) research at Indiana State University revealed that the negative correlation between exposure to adjuncts and retention rates “is marginal and disappears after controlling for other student characteristics,” such as the variable for enrollment status whether the students are full- or part-time (p. 13). Johnson reported, “The probability of taking 50% or more courses taught by part-time/temporary faculty increases as the overall number of courses taken by a student decreases”; thus, “The overall negative association between exposure to part-time faculty and retention is rather a statistical artifact caused by the correlation between a student enrollment status and the level of exposure to part-time faculty” (p. 12-3). Johnson (2005) concluded, “No potential risks for student attrition caused by employing part-time/adjunct faculty” existed at the study institution (p. 13). By adding the variable of student characteristics, the study proved no reason to view part-time faculty as a negative influence on student education, retention, or attrition.

Focusing on different variables, Bettinger and Long (2010) researched the relative effectiveness of instructor types on individual student outcomes by using a comprehensive,

longitudinal data set based on application and transcript information for over 43,000 students who began at a public 4-year college in Ohio during fall 1998 or fall 1999. Their study revealed, “[A]djunct instructors tend to have positive or no impact on student interest, with the largest impact in fields more directly tied to a specific occupation. The effects of having an adjunct on subsequent credit hours taken in the subject are especially positive in education, engineering, and the sciences” (p. 599). Bettinger and Long’s (2010) findings were that older adjuncts tended to be more effective than full-time faculty or younger adjuncts in subjects more closely tied to a specific profession, theorizing that older adjuncts bring practical and professional experience from their occupations to the classroom, and younger adjuncts produced more positive effects in academic subjects. Ultimately, their analysis suggested that adjuncts’ effectiveness varied by discipline, but that employing part-time faculty could allow full-time faculty to engage in research, making the departments more productive and also allowing colleges and universities a cost-effective way to screen potential full-time faculty.

More studies have offered some new evidence that part-timers’ contributions to community colleges extend beyond the dollar to students. Landrum’s (2009) study used data from eight academic departments and 361 courses taught during a semester. After examining differences between full-time and part-time faculty in the areas of general demographic variables, student evaluation of teaching outcomes, and the distribution of grades earned, the author concluded that even with scarce resources, adjuncts positively affect their institutions and students:

Given this data, it is remarkable what part-time faculty accomplish in light of the reduced resources available. Even though part-time faculty are less likely to have an office or a university e-mail account, teach a greater proportion of lower-division students compared to full-time faculty, and have less teaching experience, I found no significant differences in students’ evaluation of instruction or in course grade distributions. . . . For advocates for student learning, it is a positive outcome that part-time faculty perform just as well as

full-time faculty in regard to student evaluations of teaching and course grade distributions in this sample. (Landrum, 2009, p. 25-6)

Landrum's study revealed that although part-time faculty members do not surpass the skill of full-time faculty, "they do the same with less" support and resources, which he warns is a negative consequence and "may hasten an institution's reliance (or over-reliance) on adjunct faculty" (p. 25). These fears of overuse of adjunct faculty are not limited to Landrum and Banachowski.

Much of the research insisted that the most important reason for hiring part-time faculty is based on economics (Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Christensen, 2008; Adamowicz, 2007; Johnson, 2005; Gordon, 2002; Benjamin, 2002; Stephens & Wright, 1999; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Adamowicz (2007) stated, "For about two-thirds of the teaching load of full-time faculty [7.3 hours per week for every 11 hours per week that full-time faculty teach], part-timers earn about one-fifth the pay [\$9,782 for part-timers versus \$46,636 for full-timers]" (p. 24-7). Kezar and Sam (2010b) reported that scholars agree the employing of non-tenure-track faculty is connected to cost effectiveness. They explained that institutions can afford to hire more part-time faculty without benefits for the same dollars as one full-time faculty with benefits while meeting the demands of increasing enrollment (p. 31; Wallin, 2005). Cohen and Brawer (2008) provided specifics for California community colleges in 2006 when full-time faculty was earning three times more, plus the benefits, than part-time faculty. The authors concluded that catalyst for this steady increase in part-timers, from 34 percent in 1968 to 63 percent in 2003, was balancing the budget (p. 95-6). Even though community colleges are being forced by less federal dollars for higher education and lagging local economies, producing unprecedented budget constraints to negotiate and function within the financial world more as a business, they are surpassing business norms by their reliance on

part-time faculty (Pearch & Marutz, 2005). Wallin (2005) added that while state appropriations continue to decline because of the increased demand for federally-mandated social programs, such as Medicare and Social Security, state legislatures are turning to higher education, including community colleges which are already facing unprecedented financial hardship, to help them cut expenditures (p. 5; Katsinas & Hardy, 2012). Cohen and Brawer (2008) explained, “[A]s long as administrators need part-time, hourly rate instructors to help balance the budget, prorata pay will find few champions” (p. 457). Therefore, part-time faculty members continue to be a vital part of their community colleges’ function of providing access to higher education for the thousands of students whom they serve and could not without them.

Disadvantages

Some of the disadvantages cited are that part-time faculty harm full-time faculty because they take away full-time positions or overloads, they suffer as a result of their overuse for delivery of instruction, and the integrity of the two-year college teaching profession is undermined (Yackee, 2000, p. 23; Banachowski, 1997). Cohen and Brawer (2008) insisted,

The worst features of their use are when the college brings in two or more part-timers to teach similar courses as a way of avoiding employing a full-timer, or when they are overrepresented in classes that the full-timers prefer not to teach, such as developmental or those offered at night or on weekends. (p. 98)

There is also growing evidence that the dramatic increase in adjunct faculty in community colleges is a detriment to students as well. Benjamin (2002) argued that the advantages to the institution are strictly monetary because part-time faculty’s lower earnings and lack of benefits “are handicaps likely to interfere with their work” (p. 7). Furthermore, Kuh, Nelson, and Umbach (2004) predicted that student and faculty conferences outside the classroom would

decrease because part-time faculty do not have office space provided, resulting in less time spent on campus and, therefore, with students.

Some studies suggested that the teaching profession as well as students is negatively affected by the continued increase in part-time faculty. Benjamin (2002) reported that between 1975 and 1995 part-time faculty increased by over 100 percent: “Along with a 92 percent increase in non-tenure-track appointments and a 12 percent *decline* in probationary tenure-track positions, these changes reduced the proportion of full-time, tenure-track faculty to a little better than a third of those engaged in faculty work” (p. 4-5). Cohen and Brawer (2008) discussed the effects of part-time faculty and community college teaching as a profession and reported:

[T]he colleges’ reliance on part-timers has been consonant with developments in most other areas of the American workforce, where the tendency has been to convert as many jobs as possible to positions for which the employer has minimal responsibility for staff continuity or fringe benefits. (p. 98)

Adamowicz (2007) supposed that while part-time faculty members “cobble together multiple part-time teaching positions, [they] probably have little time or energy to meet with students, create new materials through reflection on their teaching practices, or serve on committees” (para. 2-3). Benjamin (2002) warned of the consequence of the significant increase in part-time faculty:

[S]taff with part-time, contingent appointments compose a substantial majority of those staff who provide lower-division instruction....This is self-evident in the two-year colleges, where almost 50 percent of first-time students begin their higher education and where about 63 percent of instructors are part-time appointees. (p. 5)

The fact that the number of part-time faculty continues to increase makes Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron’s (1995) statement in *Strangers in Their Own Land* even more pointed: “For many part-time and evening students, part-time faculty *are* the community college” (p. 9).

Benjamin (2002) examined the use of part-time faculty in community colleges to teach classes in the core curriculum and determined:

The increasing reliance on contingent appointees for undergraduate instruction in fields like English, composition, languages, history, and mathematics obviously shapes the core undergraduate experience. Moreover, unlike the use of part-time appointees in fields like business, journalism, the health professions, and the performing arts, contingent faculty in the basic liberal arts positions are less likely to compensate for their lack of time and academic credentials by providing pertinent 'real world' vocational and practical experience. Yet, even as the proportion of part-time faculty in the humanities, the social sciences, and mathematics has increased, the proportion of part-time faculty in business and vocational training—areas in which part-time faculty do offer some special advantages—has decreased. (Benjamin, 2002, p. 6)

The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) (2012) published its survey findings of part-time faculty which supported Benjamin's argument about the distribution of courses taught by part-time faculty: Of the 19,615 courses taught in the fall of 2010 by contingent faculty, "8,593 courses (44%) were taught in the humanities; 4,011 courses (20.5%) were taught in professional fields; 2,758 courses (14.1%); 2,686 courses (13.8%) were taught in the social sciences; and only 279 courses (1.4%) were taught in occupational specific courses" (p. 8). Jaeger and Eagan (2009) also agreed that hiring part-time faculty members to teach introductory core courses, such as composition, has "unintended consequences" for community colleges and their students.

Support is mounting for the negative effects of the overuse of part-time faculty. Using Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data and three different measures, Jacoby (2006) reported that as a reliance on part-time faculty increases, the graduation rates decrease, stating that the correlation may have to do with the low wages for which part-timers work. Jaschik (2006) interviewed Jacoby before his study was published in the *Journal of Higher Education*, and Jacoby stated that not only do the completion rates and part-time faculty suffer, but the study also revealed shortcomings in students' desired success. Jacoby (2006) suggested that even though cost study is needed, the bottom line is negative for students as well

as for community colleges, and the reasons for continuing the practice of hiring more part-time faculty are no longer valid. Benjamin (2002) contended that “[T]he growing proportion of contingent faculty in the core, liberal arts disciplines far exceeds the need for flexibility to meet any plausible expectation of enrollment variation or program changes” (p. 6).

Umbach (2007) investigated the impact of the use of part-time faculty on undergraduate education. By analyzing the *Faculty Survey of Student Engagement of 2004* and limiting responses to both full- and part-time faculty members who taught at least one class, Umbach focused on 17,914 faculty responses from 130 institutions to answer three questions: First, to what degree do contingent faculty members engage students in good practices as compared to their tenured and tenure-track counterparts? Second, to what extent does the proportion of contingent faculty on a campus influence the frequency with which faculty members engage in good practices? Third, how did the effect of having a contingent appointment vary between institutions and could differences be explained by institutional characteristics? He used six composites to embody practices that influence student learning as dependent variables: interactions with students, course-related interactions, non-course-related interactions, active and collaborative learning techniques, academic challenge, and time spent preparing for class. Umbach (2007) found that undergraduates were affected in the area of faculty interaction most severely, indicating that non-tenure-track faculty interacted with students less outside of class than tenured and tenure-track faculty. The conclusions of Umbach’s study require the attention of administrators who play a role in the hiring, development, inclusion, and evaluation of part-time faculty, especially in two-year colleges where faculty members advise on career directions, sponsor student clubs, and share in students’ first experiences of learning in college classrooms.

Jaeger and Eagan (2009) agreed with the fiscal advantages of hiring part-time faculty; however, their study examined how the exposure to part-time faculty members affects the likelihood that community college students will complete an associate's degree. Their study concluded that "exposure to part-time faculty members had a significant yet modest negative effect on completing an associate's degree.... [A]s students' exposure to part-time faculty members increased, their likelihood of completing an associate's degree significantly decreased" (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009, p. 11). Over ten years ago, Benjamin (2002) suggested,

[E]ven in these economically difficult times ... excessive dependence on contingent appointments is detrimental to undergraduate learning—especially for the majority of students unable to attend the few selective institutions that still staff their core programs with full-time, fully supported faculty. (p. 10)

Schmidt (2012) reported the campaign begun by the AFT (2012) in its attempt to force colleges and universities' representatives to prepare to answer some specific questions regarding part-time faculty and their use and compensation or benefits for teaching approximately 70% of freshman courses.

Research suggested that not involving part-time faculty in the entire mission of the institutions they serve is a threat to the "community." Adamowicz (2007) proposed an answer to the question about how institutional reliance on part-time affects the profession: "[I]t decreases the ability of all faculty—both full and part-time—to conduct research, determine the selections of texts and methods of teaching and testing in their own classrooms, and share in the governance of their institutions. It encourages full- and part-time faculty to remain divided."

Cohen and Brawer (2008) warned of the possible effect on the community:

The growing move toward assessing learning outcomes, as differentiated from graduation, transfer, and job-getting rates, could perforce involve the entire faculty in creating and employing student learning measures. The part-timers are the biggest stumbling block. Will they be treated as partners? If the conditions of their employment evolve so that they have rights and status equal to the full-timers, a professional

community could arise. If they receive pro rata pay and benefits but are still excluded from the mainstream of faculty functioning, the conditions for community will not follow. (p. 459)

Pearch and Marutz (2005) suggested, “Since part-time faculty members are here to stay, there is no point in arguing over how many should be employed. Community colleges must seriously consider strategies to retain [and involve] part-time faculty members” (para. 7-8). Pearch and Marutz concluded that even though most strategies for retaining part-time faculty are not new, some have not undergone sufficient study to verify their effectiveness over time.

Recruiting, Developing, and Retaining and Involving Part-time Faculty

Recruiting and Employing Part-time Faculty

Best practices for recruiting and hiring quality part-time faculty have been documented. Gappa and Leslie (1993) insisted that because they are often the first contact, recruitment and hiring processes are vital for employment relations between the part-time faculty member and the institution (p. 145). Nonetheless, Cohen and Brawer (2008) reported, “They are chosen less carefully, the rationale being that because the institution is making no long-term commitment to them, there is no need to spend a great deal of time and money in selection” (p. 96). Kezar and Sam (2010b) noted that community colleges tended to have more standardized qualifications or criteria than many other institutional types, which approach recruiting and hiring part-time faculty in a casual manner by having no formal or systemized process (p. 52). The American Federation of Teachers (2010) reported from its national survey of part-time faculty that “Faculty at two-year colleges are very satisfied,” with 68% responding *very* or *mainly* with the overall working conditions as opposed to public 4-year universities’ faculty who are less happy, with just 50% responding *very* or *mainly* satisfied (p. 10). However, part-time faculty members

questioned in AFT's study suggested that professional development needs improvement: they believe their institutions should provide greater access to training (14%), more funding for conferences and training (10%), more competitive salaries for faculty (8%), more overall funding for professional development (8%), and better communication with the administration (7%) (AFT, 2010, p. 15).

Based on his research at a Florida college, Lyons (1996) suggested that part-time instructors have some basic requirements:

- A thorough orientation to the institution, its culture, and its practices
- Adequate training in fundamental teaching and classroom management skills
- A sense of belonging to the institutions they serve
- Both initial and ongoing professional development
- Recognition for quality work that is perceived as appropriate and adequate (Lyons, 1996).

Developing Part-time Faculty

Historically, faculty development at community colleges in the last third of the twentieth century has been a struggle with limited success because of changes in demographics brought by an increasingly nontraditional student body, demanding different approaches to teaching and learning, one which most faculty are prepared for in graduate training (Murray, 2002b). The author argued that because the mission of the community college was and still is to serve a larger and more educationally diverse student population than that served by 4-year institutions, faculty employed there must "first accept the unique mission" and learning differences within the student body they serve (2002b, p. 90). After a review of the literature concerning faculty development, Murray's findings were that few community colleges made the effort to tie their

faculty development to their missions, few attempted to evaluate the success of faculty development programs, and faculty participation in most development activities was often minimal and often those who needed it most did not participate (p. 91).

Significant to all faculty members in community colleges, both part time and full time, Murray (2002a) suggested that the 11 professional development activities commonly used for faculty are the same as those from the 1970s, making them outdated and ineffectual (p. 62). Murray recommended, “Increasing calls for accountability at a time of shrinking resources require community colleges to demonstrate that they use their resources to advance the mission of the institutions” (p. 64). Murray (2002b) concluded that the “absence of demonstrable effects on student learning could in fact lead to reduced funding from state governing boards,” resulting in a lack of defense for institutional leaders for faculty development expenditures (p. 93). However, by designing and strategically connecting faculty development to teaching and learning and their missions, community colleges should have the ability “to provide faculty with the tools necessary for meeting the learning needs of the students entering through the open door” (Murray, 2002a, p. 51). In addition to community colleges’ diverse student body, Palmer (2002) argued that planning standardized faculty development programs across disciplines is a naïve and ineffective approach, suggesting instead designing them to fulfill the needs within disciplinary variations. In effect, full-time and part-time faculty would be more interested in faculty development opportunities and would learn more from the discipline-specific techniques and apply those to their classes.

Affording faculty development for both full-time and part-time faculty is yet another challenge for community colleges. In fact, with shrinking budgets recorded for all community college types, Rankin’s (2008) research noted that a “constant is the lack of professional

development funds across the community college universe” (p. 60). When Rankin (2008) asked chief executive officers (CEOs) to respond to the statement, “Our budget allows each faculty member to attend at least one national meeting per year,” 63% answered *No* in 2007; 64% in 2005; 69% in 2002; and 63% in 1999 (p. 60). Consequently, community colleges must design, connect, and provide professional development for both full- and part-time faculty which supports their missions themselves, keeping up with new technology and good practices which make it meaningful, up to date, and fit within their budgets, which is a challenge.

Since part-time faculty are so diverse and have such varying goals and experience, Yee (2007) suggested that multiple opportunities for development better meets their needs. His research at the University of Central Florida (UCF) began with asking part-time faculty to identify themselves by using Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) categories in *The Invisible Faculty*: aspiring academics, freelancers, specialists, experts, professionals, or career enders. Yee (2007) collected data from three opportunities created to respond to wide differences in availability for training and scheduling at UCF: Opportunity 1. short-duration (1 hour) workshops and a faculty center workbook, Opportunity 2. a medium-duration (1 day) retreat, and Opportunity 3. a long-duration (continuous) online course, hoping that “a diverse set of offerings [would] address the needs of all adjunct faculty, regardless of experience, availability, and schedule” (p. 22). Yee’s plan is an attempt to address the challenge of including adjunct faculty in professional development and improving instruction.

Retaining and Involving Part-time Faculty

The discipline and individual motivation help to shape part-time faculty experience. Bettinger and Long (2010) studied the effectiveness of adjunct characteristics on particular fields

of study and supported the idea that older adjuncts bring “real world” experience to the classroom and are more effectively used in particular disciplines leading to professions, such as education, engineering, and science, to encourage subsequent enrollments (p. 599-600). Also, The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) 2010 study reported that 57% of part-time faculty members teach because they enjoy teaching and compensation is not a major factor for agreeing to contingent positions (p. 10). These findings supported Kezar and Sam’s (2010b) study which may indicate the correlation of satisfaction, motivation, effectiveness, discipline, and culture:

[F]aculty in liberal arts fields such as composition or math have more negative departmental cultures than professional fields such as law or education, where non-tenure-track faculty are often given more respect and better working conditions. The motivation behind taking a non-tenure-track role influences the experience of faculty, particularly their satisfaction....Institutional type and culture also appear to shape experience. For example, institutions that are in more isolated places have to create a more intentional process for hiring and socializing non-tenure-track faculty, making the experience of non-tenure-track faculty more positive. (Kezar & Sam, 2010b, p. 50-1)

Involving part-time faculty in institutional obligation other than teaching is a challenge which needs improvement. Adamowicz (2007) discussed the issue of shared governance: “Sometimes, even when contingent faculty are encouraged by permanent faculty to participate in governance, they do not.” Kezar and Sam (2010b) examined the research on experiences of part-time faculty and concluded that part-time faculty were concerned that full-time faculty and administrators supported the idea that part-timers were the “have-nots with low pay, no job security, heavy workloads, and low status,” resulting in an added label of lower quality and in a negative experience for part-timers (p. 49; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). These labels for part-time faculty are sometimes ingrained in the language and in the culture of the colleges, and administrators and full-time faculty must facilitate positive change.

Bradley (2007) summarized the findings of the American Association of University Professors' recommendations for adjuncts at all types of institutions, and Wallin (2007) stated that twelve of these recommendations specifically apply to community colleges:

1. Make sure that the terms and conditions of every appointment are stated in writing.
2. Provide every faculty member with a telephone number, even if it is the general office number, and an institutional e-mail account.
3. Create dedicated work space for adjunct faculty to have access to computers, photocopying, file storage, and a place to meet with students.
4. Consider alternative or tiered pay scales for faculty who have taught long term as adjuncts.
5. Provide funding for conferences.
6. Invite adjunct faculty to faculty meetings, and provide adjuncts with faculty meeting minutes.
7. Prepare a handbook for new part-time faculty that provides the basics of departmental functions, forms, student services, grading scales and procedures, academic honesty policies, sample syllabi, and safety and security procedures.
8. Establish systems of communication between supervisors and part-time faculty.
9. Provide accessible professional development opportunities.
10. Create a mentoring system to help integrate adjunct faculty in the college culture.
11. Provide part-time faculty with access to library, recreational, and parking facilities.
12. Treat adjunct faculty as valued colleagues and encourage inclusiveness and collegiality.

Bradley (2007) insisted that, although surprising, “even the most fundamental of these suggestions—such as providing part-time faculty with access to photocopying facilities or with information about departmental events—are not in place at some institutions” (para. 26). On the other hand, Bradley suggested that administrators who are concerned with the working conditions of all faculty apply these simple, yet inclusive, techniques. Wallin (2007) agreed that

these recommendations “embody meaningful actions that can be taken, without great expense, to support the critical work of adjunct faculty in community colleges.” Wallin (2007) noted that adjunct faculty meet the need for specialized courses, high-enrollment courses, and clinical and laboratory assistance that community colleges must offer “to accomplish their mission of accessibility, equity, and affordability for the thousands of students aspiring to better their life circumstances through America's community colleges” (p. 72-3).

Kezar and Sam (2010b) stated that “working conditions, roles, and experiences for non-tenure-track faculty tend to be better on campuses that have unions and collective bargaining,” not because they are more satisfied, but generally their salaries or benefits are better and clearly defined roles, recruitment, and hiring processes are more intentional (p. 50). The AFT’s (2010) survey supported these findings, stating, “Unionized part-time/adjunct faculty members earn significantly more than their nonunion counterparts and are more likely to have some health and pension coverage” (p. 4). In their research of the data concerning faculty work history and projections, Hardy and Laanan (2006) concluded that with the significant number of faculty who will be retiring over the next decade, administrators should pay close attention to overall job satisfaction of the faculty who will remain (p. 809-10).

Kezar and Sam (2010a) studied 183 current collective-bargaining agreements negotiated by AAUP, AFT, NEA, SEIU, and independents, and found that “Only 39 contracts provided procedure for [non-tenure-track faculty] NTTF participation in governance” (p. 84). The authors inferred that the small number of notations meant that the need for inclusive language is a hindrance to involvement, stating that in many cases part-time faculty members are only included when there are not enough full-time faculty members to participate in the governance (p. 84). Kezar and Sam interviewed faculty leaders who insisted that it would not be an easy task

to elicit participation from NTTF because “Some campuses may have to deal with pre-existing inertia. Those campuses with considerable NTTF involvement created a culture that values and expects their inclusion,” improving practices over many years and “recommended enabling features in contract language, such as compensation and release time, as the key to getting greater involvement” (p. 89).

Kezar and Sam (2010a) agreed that part-time faculty’s involvement in governance is underdeveloped. Even though conditions have improved with new provisions in some contracts, compensation is not mandated, and “It is unfair” to expect part-time faculty to share in the governance without financial or other incentives. The authors concluded that even though pressing for more full-time faculty is ideal, “Faculty leaders must address the professional right—and responsibility—of NTTFs to participate in governance” because “Colleges are replacing retiring TTFs with NTTFs.” Therefore, “[E]xcluding NTTFs from governance will eventually eliminate the faculty voice. This exclusion places our colleges and universities—the world’s best—at risk” (2010a, p. 90).

The examination of the quality of education and rising pressure from regional accrediting agencies make it imperative that instructional leaders include part-time faculty in strategic planning for institutional effectiveness. Lyons (2007) insisted that strategic-minded leaders should focus on the potential of increased contributions of adjunct faculty members, such as developing instructional programs, providing expertise in critical fields, sharing passion for real-world perspectives, and insuring scheduling flexibility. However, to maximize the benefits of increasing student learning, improving student retention and other accountability outcomes, and achieving the rising expectations of accrediting agencies, employers, and other stakeholders, faculty leaders need to equip adjunct faculty with basic teaching and classroom management

skills, supported with resources that foster continuous self-improvement, and acknowledge them as colleagues (Lyons, 2007, p. 5-8).

In 1995, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron listed some “serious steps” that colleges must take toward improving the use and inclusion of part-time faculty: recruiting, selecting, and hiring them with clear purpose, requiring them to participate in orientation with faculty support structures, requiring them to participate in professional development activities, integrating them into the life of the institution, evaluating their performance, and providing them equitable pay schedules. The authors concluded that “[C]olleges must identify for themselves the strategies that will most effectively promote their own use and integration of these new citizens, these strangers, into their communities...[because] their sheer numbers and impact on instruction cannot and should not be ignored” (p. 157).

Summary

Ultimately, whether the focus is on the advantages or disadvantages of employing part-time faculty, community colleges have continued to depend heavily upon them for the services they provide to their institutions and their students. The goal for colleges is to focus on improving the lives and contributions of this necessary workforce by following some successful recommendations of inclusion and development reviewed in this chapter. Also, colleges need to avoid the tendency toward complacency when planning for and supervising part-time faculty. Studies have revealed some specific content areas of instruction for the placement of adjunct faculty which increase the likelihood of student completion rates of associate degrees, transfer readiness for community college students, and the overall satisfaction of part-time faculty (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Kezar & Sam, 2010a, 2010b; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Jaeger & Eagan,

2009; Jacoby, 2006). Maintaining the status quo is not an option when the demands for change are upon community colleges from economic forces, institutional constituents, accrediting agencies, and record numbers of students who are presently sitting in classrooms or preparing to attend associate's colleges across the country.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Introduction

Many changes have taken place over the last decade in higher education, especially in community colleges. After reviewing the literature involving part-time faculty, much of the debate centered on the use of part-time faculty who instruct two-thirds of the beginning freshmen at these teaching institutions (NCES, 2008) and whether they will be incorporated into the “community” by using good practices when hiring, developing, and retaining them, and if they will be compensated for involvement in other institutional work (Kezar & Sam, 2010a, 2010b; Murray, 2010, 2002a, 2002b; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Bradley, 2007; Lyons & Burnstad, 2007; Wallin, 2007, 2005; Yee, 2007; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Palmer, 2002; Lyons, 1996). Or, are they to remain outside the community, lacking essential development, creature comforts, and opportunities to participate in student life, curriculum development, and governance of the colleges they serve?

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and describe the perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) at associate’s colleges, accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC), regarding accreditation criteria for employing part-time faculty. Specifically, CIOs were asked to identify the level of difficulty in

meeting regional accreditation criteria and commonly cited practices within the higher education community.

Secondary purposes for the study included (a) to identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges regarding the amount of challenge experienced in implementing practices for effectively recruiting, employing, developing, and involving part-time faculty; (b) to identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges regarding the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty; (c) to compare differences in the data based on associate's college institutional control (public, private, special use), geographic location (rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year), governance (single-campus and multi-campus), and size (small, medium, large); and (d) to identify and describe the perceptions of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges regarding the difficulty employing part-time faculty for different programs/content areas of study.

Research Questions

Primary Research Questions

1. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult?
 - a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

- b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

Secondary Research Questions

- 2. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty as challenging?
 - a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?
 - b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate's colleges?
- 3. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty?
 - a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?
 - b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perception of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

4. To what extent are part-time faculty members employed as a vehicle to create and build new programs?
5. To what extent is there a preference for hiring as full-time faculty after first working as a part-time faculty member?
6. How difficult is it to hire part-time faculty in the following program/content areas:
Developmental, Fine Arts, English, Math, Science, Health Science, Computer Science, and Social Science?
7. To what extent is there a significant difference in difficulty in hiring part-time faculty for teaching online courses versus traditional courses?

Research Design

The first priority for any research project is selecting a topic; thus, this study was a replication of Yackee's (2000) dissertation which surveyed CIOs at North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), the largest of the six regional accrediting agencies. This research followed Yackee's (2000) methodology, using a quantitative survey with an opportunity for four additional qualitative responses.

Gall, Gall, and Borg (1999) defined survey research as "a form of descriptive investigation that involves collecting information about research participants' beliefs, attitudes, interests, or behavior through questionnaires, interviews, or paper and pencil tests" (p. 533), and they reported that studies involving surveys comprise a significant amount of the research done in the field of education. The main purpose of a survey is to estimate with significant precision the percentage of population that has a specific attribute by collecting data, using one or more variables, from a sample of the total population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Dillman, 2000).

Babbie (1998) stated that survey research is probably the most desired form of data collection to describe a population too large to observe directly, and according to Dillman (1978), surveys are an excellent choice for measuring perceptions. Salant and Dillman (1994) added that surveys can also be used to assess needs, evaluate demand, and examine impact (p. 2).

There are some exceptions in this replication of exploratory and descriptive research, which was updated for issues of relevancy only. The major departure from Yackee's (2000) study was to survey CIOs at Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the second largest regional accrediting agency. Yackee (2000) tested the viability of Katsinas and Lacey's classification model for associate's colleges by creating the present questionnaire, and Hardy's 2005 dissertation further established the necessity and reliability of the existing Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges (Table 1). Some comparison and contrast of the two largest regional accrediting agencies, NCA and SACS, on policy and practice resulted from the replication of Yackee's study of NCA-accredited associate's institutions and this study of public SACS-accredited associate's institutions, which used the 2011 Carnegie model in Table 1, and is presented in Chapter 5.

Another departure from Yackee's NCA study occurred after interviewing her. Dr. Yackee recommended adding more qualitative research questions because of the rich detail one question produced in her survey, a richness not gained in quantitative research. Therefore, three qualitative questions for each of the three main parts were added in addition to the original final opportunity to make any comments or additions. The qualitative questions were designed open-ended and allowed respondents to clarify their answers or their lack of response for each of the three major data forms. Respondents were not forced to answer but given the opportunity or proceed the next part of the questionnaire.

The final departure from Yackee's (2000) research came after considering several options for conducting the survey. The decision was made to administer the survey using an online survey system. According to Dillman (2000), Web surveys are the most efficient, economical, and effective vehicle when design fully incorporates the medium. Also, in Dillman's (2007) updated *Mail and Internet Surveys*, he observed that Web surveys have become commonplace as computers have improved, and there are far fewer surveys thwarted by people's inability use them. Unlike the general public, university students, schoolteachers, members of professional associations, and employees of many firms are well-versed in completing online surveys. Therefore, the survey was designed and distributed to respondents, CIOs of SACS-accredited associate's colleges, through an online survey platform. The survey instrument included three main sections, which incorporated subsections designed to illicit answers for both primary and secondary research questions, and to provide clarity for respondents.

Table 1

Public Associate's College Categories of Classification

Rural-serving small
Rural-serving medium
Rural-serving large
Suburban-serving single campus
Suburban-serving multi-campus
Urban-serving single campus
Urban-serving multi-campus
Special Use
2-yr under 4-yr
4-yr primarily associate's

Source: Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges, 2011

In order to answer the primary and secondary research questions, Table 2 demonstrates the survey design which targeted specific information from the population of SACS-accredited associate's colleges using Carnegie Basic Classification for Associate's Colleges as variables (i.e., public, rural small, medium, large, suburban, single and multi-campus, and urban, single and multi-campus) (listed in Table 1). The primary question focused on accreditation issues which were answered in Part II of the survey. The secondary questions concentrated on the commonly cited practices of employment and use of part-time faculty and were answered by Part I, III, and IV of the survey. By using Carnegie's Basic Classification for Associate's Colleges, the similarities and differences of the CIO's perceptions of difficulty or challenge of the various associate's colleges could be readily examined.

Table 2

Primary and Secondary Research Goals

Research Question: Analysis Items	Target Survey Questions
Primary Question: Accreditation	Part II: Questions 21 through 35
Secondary Questions: Cited Practices	
• Employment and Use	Part I: Questions 1 through 19
• Technology (Distance Education)	Part I: Question 2
• Specific Subject Area	Part I: Questions 4 through 12
• Influences for Employment	Part III: Questions 37 through 45
• Number of full and part-time	Part IV: Questions 47 and 48
• Office space	Part IV: Question 52
• Office hours	Part IV: Question 53
• Bargaining Unit	Part IV: Questions 47 through 49
Qualitative Questions:	Questions 20, 36, 46, 54

Population

In keeping with Yackee's initial survey design, the researcher agreed that the population selected for this survey consisted of all chief instructional officers (CIOs) at SACS-accredited public associate's colleges. The CIOs were chosen because "they were the most competent to answer the survey questions designed to measure the perceptions in this study" (p. 80). The CIOs are most likely the person charged with the oversight responsibility for part-time and full-time faculty activities and the people most involved with assessing the criteria for SACS-associated self studies and institutional accreditation processes.

Since the population for this research was defined, the researcher then considered sampling the population. The sample size chosen was based on information from Cochran (1977) and Salant and Dillman (1994) who stated that a sample's margin of acceptable error of 5% with a 95% confidence level, whereas $\alpha=.05$ with a t value of 1.96, meant that a population of 1000 would need 278 usable questionnaires to reach desired confidence. The researcher then consulted Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins' (2001) table which contained calculated results using both lower and higher margins of error. Using the same $p=.05$ margin of error with a t value of 1.96, a population of 300 would need 169 as a sample size (p. 48).

The researcher then examined the total number of public associate's colleges listed by the Carnegie Basic Classification for Associate's Colleges. In addition, SACS-accredited associate's colleges were listed according to the Carnegie classification scheme (Table 1), which had to be filtered on SACS' website by Level I colleges (i.e., 2-year colleges which grant associate degrees as the highest degree attainable) (SACS, 2012). The total number of associate-granting colleges cross referenced from both Carnegie (287, associate's colleges, excluding special use and 4-year primarily associate's) and SACS (282, Level I) was 273, excluding special use and 4-year

primarily associate's (Table 3). This cross reference of SACS' listing and Carnegie's listing of associate's colleges made it impossible to achieve the sample size of 169 from a population of 300 suggested by Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins' (2001) sample size table.

According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2003), a sample size of 100 is a sufficient minimum for descriptive research. However, because the 273 SACS-accredited (public only) community colleges was relatively small, the researcher determined that more would be needed to acquire sufficient sampling from all college types. Therefore, just as Yackee (2000) decided to survey all 340 CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges, 273 SACS-accredited, public associate's colleges' (excluding special use and 4-year primarily associates) CIOs would be surveyed.

Table 3

Percentage of Population

Category of Carnegie Public Associate's College	Institutions Nation	Institutions SACS	% Total Institutions
Rural-serving small	137	40	29%
Rural-serving medium	299	121	40%
Rural-serving large	134	38	28%
Suburban-serving single campus	109	17	16%
Suburban-serving multi-campus	104	17	16%
Urban-serving single campus	32	6	19%
Urban-serving multi-campus	137	31	22%
2-year under 4-year	48	3	6%
Total (public only and excluding Special Use and 4-yr Primarily Associates)	1, 028	273	27%

Note. *Category based on the 2010 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and totals based on 2012 numbers.

The researcher cross-referenced the SACS website (www.sacscoc.org) with the Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate’s Colleges to determine the number of CIOs to be contacted. SACS filters the associate-granting colleges by Level I and by state. A contact name with other information is listed for all SACS-accredited colleges. The researcher contacted those persons listed and retrieved the names, titles, and telephone numbers for the chief instructional officers. In cases when the contact person was not available, the Internet was used to acquire the information. Of these 273 associate-granting institutions, 256 CIOs listed in Appendix A were surveyed after initial contact because some of the chief instructional officer positions were vacant or in transition (Table 4).

Table 4

Population and Sample Sizes

Category of Carnegie Public Associate’s Colleges	Total Institutions SACS	Institutions SACS Population	% SACS Institutions
Rural-serving small	40	39	98%
Rural-serving medium	121	117	97%
Rural-serving large	38	32	84%
Suburban-serving single campus	17	16	94%
Suburban-serving multi-campus	17	14	82%
Urban-serving single campus	6	5	83%
Urban-serving multi-campus	31	30	97%
2-year under 4-year	3	3	100%
Total (public only and excluding Special Use and 4-year Primarily Associate’s)	273	256	94%

Note. 256 surveys distributed to ensure at least 80% percent of the Carnegie’s Basic Classifications of Associate’s Colleges’ types in SACS total institutions were surveyed.

Instrumentation

Yackee (2000) created the original survey instrument (paper/pencil sent by mail) following recommended practices for the Likert scale, which is “commonly used for attitude-based educational research and allows participants to respond to levels of agreement” within questionnaire items (Fraenkel & Wallen, p. 127). Yackee’s design, using four response levels of difficulty, was reviewed by her 22-member panel of experts. This researcher simply added relevant questions and adapted the survey to the online environment. After consulting another panel of experts, including two CIOs and one survey designer, the original Data Form Part I containing accreditation questionnaire items became Data Form Part II and vice versa. The idea was to present the accreditation section after some less difficult questions, considered a “warm-up” before more complex questions (K. Steele, personal communication, June 4, 2011). The “funnel technique” is often used in test and survey designs to make respondents feel at ease and give them a sense that they can accomplish the task. The complex, accreditation section was followed by other less difficult question sets, Data Form Part III and Data Form Part IV (Qualtrics, 2013). Because 12 years have passed and much has been added to the debate about part-time faculty, a few more specific program/content area questions seemed appropriate. Also, the researcher felt that it was important to address some current conditions, such as the part-time to full-time faculty ratio and office space and compensation/benefits for part-time faculty.

In order to answer these research questions, multiple contacts were used. According to Dillman (2007), using the same rules that apply to mail surveys helps to increase response rates. Dillman recommended four to five contacts in mixed mode (e.g., phone call and email) because Web surveys, or any other survey type, have yet to achieve the high response rates of mail surveys. Therefore, the 256 CIOs at SACS-accredited community colleges were contacted by an

initial phone call one week before the scheduled survey was to be sent. The telephone numbers and email addresses of the CIOs were obtained by using the Southern Association's website (sacscoc.org) public listing for contact person at all accredited colleges and schools and the Internet. The telephone numbers for CIOs from the Internet were cross referenced using the *Higher Education Directory*. The initial phone call served three purposes: to check the correctness of the CIOs' names and email addresses, to introduce the researcher, and to explain the importance of the survey. Once the email addresses were validated and when the date for the first round of the survey arrived, an invitation to participate in the survey by email (Appendix C) with a link to the questionnaire was sent via online software (Appendix B).

In the second wave of distribution, only non-responders to the survey were sent a reminder email titled "Second Opportunity: Perceptions of Chief Instructional Officers of Part-time Faculty and SACS" with another invitation and a copy of the link to the survey (Appendix C). Following Dillman's (2007) recommendation, individual emails were sent, rather than group emails which are seen as less important and sometimes immediately discarded as spam. The second emails were followed by additional telephone contacts. The CIOs were reminded of the importance of their participation either by personal conversation or by telephone message left by the researcher or their executive assistants. The respondents who requested additional information were contacted by email and/or telephone in a timely manner.

After the expiration of the survey deadline, the survey results, which were tabulated electronically by Qualtrics, were exported to Microsoft Excel and analyzed. Standard calculation methods were performed to gather basic descriptive statistics, such as percentages, case counts, and means, during this initial stage of the analysis. Then the data were transferred to IBM SPSS Statistics 21.0 (SPSS 21) for more analysis.

In replicating Yackee's 2000 study of perceptions of CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges, the research questions were addressed through the analysis of the mean scores of perceptions and standard deviations for each of the 43 quantitative questionnaire items. Responses were analyzed by applying a Likert-type scale. A score of 1 on the scale was noted as the least affirming perception while a score of 4 was the most affirming. Because 2.50 is the central number between 1 and 4, it was used as the determinant between non-affirming and affirming responses; therefore, mean scores smaller than 2.50 indicated a non-affirmative perception, and mean scores of 2.50 and larger indicated an affirmative perception.

Standard deviations were used to identify the extent to which individual scores clustered around the mean or spread away from it. In any normal distribution, the standard deviations, "the most useful index of variability," indicate how far to go above and below the mean to include approximately two-thirds of all cases; therefore, "68 percent of the scores fall within one standard deviation of the mean [34 above and 34 below]; 27 percent of the observations fall between one and two standard deviations away from the mean; [and] 95 percent... fall within two standard deviations of the mean" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006, p. 199-200). For example, a mean score of 2.44 with a standard deviation of .99 would indicate that two-thirds of the respondents had a score between 1.43 and 3.41: $(2.42-.99)$ and $(2.42+.99)$, respectively. The means and standard deviations for survey items under Data Form Parts I, II, and III are presented in the aggregate. The means and standard deviations by associate college type for each survey items under Data Forms Parts I, II, and III are provided in Appendices D, E, and F.

Responses to the four qualitative questions were read and coded by the researcher. Emerging themes (i.e., common concerns and/or responses from CIOs in the survey population) were noted then categorized, according to institutional type, location, and size, and were then

summarized following the analysis of the statistical information. Results are recorded and resulting analysis are discussed at length in Chapter 4. A major portion of the qualitative data was also included in the discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of Chapter 5 of this study.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

According to the literature review concerning part-time faculty included in Chapter 2 of this study, researchers still have much to learn about the impact of part-time faculty and how to improve their working conditions and guide training because they embody a diverse population with diverse reasons for choosing to teach at community colleges. Yackee's (2000) research revealed vital information about the level of difficulty experienced by CIOs of NCA-accredited community when hiring, developing, supervising, and meeting accreditation requirements of part-time faculty. The purpose of this research was to focus on the experiences and practices of CIOs at SACS-accredited, public associate's colleges. The data analysis is organized into the following sections: (a) population, sample, response rate; (b) data analysis and findings; and (c) chapter summary.

Population, Sample, and Response Rate

Data for this research were generated using an online survey created in Qualtrics. The survey was created in advance, adapted from Yackee's (2000) mail survey of 338 CIOs of NCA-accredited community colleges, and was sent to 256 CIOs of SACS-accredited, public associate's colleges on November 17, 2012. The invitation email contained important information regarding informed consent, a preview of the research objectives, an approximate time to allow for completion, and a link to survey. After fall semester ended and spring semester

began on January 7, 2013, a second wave of surveys was distributed by individual email link to those CIOs who did not respond to the first email invitation.

Two CIOs, one from rural large and one from rural medium community college, who were members on the panel of experts who reviewed the survey instrument were excluded from the survey population. Of the 256 questionnaires emailed, 112 were returned for a response rate of 42%; 1 was partially complete (20 items answered and considered useable; 5 were incomplete and unusable). Ultimately, 107 questionnaires were analyzed to answer the research questions.

In an effort to address the possibility of response bias/response selectivity, differences between respondents and refusals on the two known characteristics of the population, associate college type and state, were analyzed. The analysis of the response rate for CIOs from each of the eight associate's college type subgroups revealed an acceptable rate of return. Because at least 38% of CIOs responded, representing all Carnegie's public associate's college types, no significant differences were found in the survey response rates between respondents and refusals in terms of those types. Specifically, as presented in Table 5, the proportion of associate's colleges by type within the respondent population was almost identical to the proportion of associate's colleges by type within the surveyed population, giving the appearance of a representative stratified sample (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006, p. 96).

The issue of response selectivity was also examined through an analysis of the data by state. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) is responsible for conducting the accreditation process in 11 states, the second largest accrediting agency. The study population included CIOs from all 11 of these states, which provided "an equal chance of being selected" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006, p. 108). There were small differences between the percentage of associate's colleges by state in the population and in

the sample (Table 6). At least 17% of each state's population of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges responded; however, because the CIOs' associate college location was not a variable under consideration for the study, any differences between the surveyed and respondent populations in terms of state were deemed unimportant.

Table 5

Percentage Differences between Population and Sample by Carnegie Basic Classification of Public Associate's Colleges

Associate College Type	Number of SACS-Accredited Associate's Colleges			Percentage of SACS-Accredited Associate's Colleges		
	Population	Sample	Response Rate	Population	Sample	Difference
Rural-serving Small	39	15	38%	15.2	14.0	-0.1
Rural-serving Medium	117	48	41%	45.7	44.9	-0.8
Rural-serving Large	32	15	47%	12.5	14.0	+1.5
Total	188	78	41%	73.4	72.9	-0.5
Suburban-serving Single Campus	16	6	38%	6.3	5.6	-0.7
Suburban-serving Multi-campus	14	6	43%	5.5	5.6	+0.1
Total	30	12	40%	11.8	11.2	-0.4
Urban-serving Single Campus	5	2	40%	1.9	1.9	0.0
Urban-serving Multi-campus	30	13	43%	11.7	12.1	+0.4
Total	35	15	43%	13.6	14.0	+0.4
2-year under 4-year	3	2	67%	1.2	1.9	+0.7
Grand Total	256	107	42%	100	100	n/a

Note. 256 CIOs were surveyed; 112 questionnaires were returned. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Table 6

Percentage Differences between Population and Sample by State

State	Number of SACS-Accredited Associate's Colleges			Percentage of SACS-Accredited Associate's Colleges		
	Population	Sample	Response Rate	Population	Sample	Difference
Alabama	22	11	50%	8.6	10.3	+1.7
Florida	6	1	17%	2.3	0.93	-1.4
Georgia	18	7	39%	7.0	6.5	-0.5
Kentucky	16	6	38%	6.3	5.6	-0.7
Louisiana	9	2	22%	3.5	1.9	-1.6
Mississippi	15	9	60%	5.9	8.4	+2.5
North Carolina	57	19	33%	22.0	17.8	-4.2
South Carolina	16	8	50%	6.3	7.5	+1.2
Tennessee	14	5	36%	5.5	4.7	-0.8
Texas	59	28	47%	23.0	26.2	+3.2
Virginia	24	11	45%	9.4	10.3	+0.9
Total	256	107	42%	100	100	n/a

Note. 256 CIOs were surveyed. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.
Source: The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (2012)

Data Analysis and Findings

This section presents the results of the study and subsequent findings, which are divided into two sections of research analysis: the quantitative and the qualitative. Quantitative data for survey items included in Data Form Part I, numbered 1 through 19; Data Form Part II, numbered 21 through 35; and Data Form Part III, numbered 37 through 45 will be followed by the results of the qualitative data: survey items numbered 20, 36, 46, and 54. Data Form Part IV (considered out of the scope of this replication) items numbered 47 through 53 of the survey will be discussed in the Chapter 5.

As described in Chapter 3 of this study, the data, gathered using the Likert scale responses, are described using percentages (*P*), frequencies (*f*), means (*M*), and standard deviations (*SD*). The findings related to the research questions are presented in narrative form, accompanied by tables. The qualitative question in each section, Part I through Part IV, provided the respondents an opportunity to clarify the answers chosen and allowed for the explanation of additional influence and/or difficulty in the process of hiring, supervising, developing, and employing part-time faculty that were not acknowledged in the quantitative questions of the survey.

Since the respondent population was representative of the surveyed population, it was treated as a sample (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Inferential statistics were used to make inferences about the larger population. Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) suggested that

When researchers desire to find out whether there are significant differences between means of *more than* two groups, they commonly use analysis of variance....When more than two groups are being compared, the *F* test will not, by itself, tell us which of the means are different. A further (but quite simple) procedure, called a *post hoc analysis*, is required to find this out. (p. 236)

Keeping with Yackee's (2000) study and using SPSS 21, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance and Tukey's HSD test for multiple comparisons, which can be done simultaneously in SPSS, were applied to analyze significant differences in the data by associate's college type at the .05 alpha levels.

When researchers use one-way analysis of variance, the process of looking up the resulting value of F in the F distribution, is proven to be reliable under three basic assumptions:

- Normality- The values in each of the groups (as a whole) follow the normal curve.
- Homogeneity of variance- The variances of the group distributions will be statistically similar, and the different population averages impose no restriction on the use of ANOVA.
- Independence- Scores on one variable or for one group should not be dependent on another variable or group. It assumes that the populations' standard deviations are equal and, in practice, is deemed safe if the largest sample standard deviation is not larger than twice the smallest (Colgate University, 2013; Mesa Community College, 2013; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006, p. 236; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003).

Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) explained that the basis of ANOVA is the portioning of sums of squares into between-class (SS_b) and within-class (SS_w); it enables all classes to be compared with each other simultaneously rather than individually.

To explore the differences among the group means of CIO perceptions of meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty, of implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty, and of influencing factors to employ part-time faculty, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare responses of CIOs between and within the levels of Carnegie's Basic Classification for public associate's colleges (i.e., between and within type,

location, and size). Because this study was a replication of Yackee's 2000 study, ANOVA was conducted for the primary research question and the first two secondary research questions (i.e., research questions 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b), and the results are presented, along with ANOVA tables produced in SPSS.

Quantitative Data

Research Question 1. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult?

Data Form Part II (questionnaire items 21 through 35) measured the perceptions of CIOs regarding the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges' (SACS COC) criteria for accreditation for part-time faculty. As presented in Table 7, the sample of CIOs perceived meeting accreditation criteria as less than difficult ($M < 2.50$). On a Likert scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not difficult and 4 being very difficult, the mean response for all questionnaire items under Data Form Part II for the survey population was 2.20. The standard deviation (SD) of the mean of responses for questions 21 through 35 was .99, meaning two thirds of the respondents had a score between 1.21 and 3.19 ($2.20 - .99$) and ($2.20 + .99$), respectively.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 21 through 35)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experience in meeting each of the following SACS-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty.		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
		2.20	.99
<hr/>			
Average Number of Responses	103		
Missing Responses	4		
Total Number in Population	107		

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1=not difficult | 3=moderately difficult |
| 2=slightly difficult | 4=very difficult |

Even though the mean of the responses for Data Form Part II indicated that CIOs on average perceived meeting SACS accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as less than difficult ($M < 2.50$), the means for 4 out of the 15 questionnaire items under Data Form Part II (i.e., items 25, 33, 34, and 35) were larger than 2.50 as presented in Table 8. CIOs perceived meeting the following criteria as difficult ($M > 2.50$): upgrading the credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees ($M = 2.52$), including part-time faculty in institutional governance ($M = 3.02$), including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational programs ($M = 2.94$), and including part-time faculty in evaluation of the institution's educational programs ($M = 2.84$).

Table 8

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 21 through 35)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting each of the following SACS-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty.			
Questionnaire Item	Number in Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation
25. Upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degree, whether or not they possess special training experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is ...	100	2.52	1.09
33. Including part-time faculty in institutional governance is ...	104	3.02	0.92
34. Including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational programs is ...	105	2.94	0.92
35. Including part-time faculty in evaluation of the institution's educational programs is ...	103	2.84	0.92

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
 2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

CIOs in the aggregate perceived meeting these four SACS' accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as difficult ($M > 2.50$). However, the standard deviation (.99) indicated a sizable amount of variability of scores around the mean (1.28 to 3.26). An examination of subgroup means revealed that CIOs at some types of two-year colleges perceived meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as more difficult than CIOs at other types of two-year colleges. For example, 2-year under 4-year associate's colleges perceived meeting accreditation requirements

as more difficult than other college types on 11 out of the 15 questions. They achieved a mean score of 2.63 for the 15 questions regarding the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting accreditation criteria. Specifically, CIOs at 2-year under 4-year colleges perceived that ensuring part-time faculty who teach transfer courses complete graduate-level degrees in three to five years ($M=3.00$) and adopting criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty who teach general education courses hold appropriate degrees in their fields of study ($M=3.00$) as significantly more difficult. Means and standard deviations by associate's college type are presented in Appendix E.

Research Question 1a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p<.05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among public associate college types, namely rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year levels. The means and standard deviations between and within groups are recorded in Table 9. The ANOVA results indicated no statistically significant differences in means of CIO perceptions of difficulty as presented in Table 10, $F(3, 101) = 0.482, p = .696$.

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations for Primary Research Question 1a

Carnegie Classification	Mean	SD	n
Rural	2.33	0.675	77
Suburban	2.32	0.672	11
Urban	2.14	0.65	15
2 under 4	2.63	0.707	2

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Table 10

ANOVA Results for Primary Research Question 1a

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.650	3	.217	.482	.696
Within Groups	45.451	101	.450		
Total	46.101	104			

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

Key to Calculations:

Source of Variance =between groups (b); within groups (w)

SS =sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df =degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS =mean squared (estimate of variance of population: $MS = SS/df$)

F =F ratio (difference among variance as tested by using the F distribution as the sampling distribution: $F = MS_b/MS_w$)

Research Question 1b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited community colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p < .05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty at rural-serving small, medium, and large public associate's colleges. The means and standard deviations between and within groups are presented in Table 11. The ANOVA results indicated no statistically significant difference existed in CIO perceptions based on public rural-serving associate college size, $F(2, 74) = 1.192$, $p = .309$ (see Table 12).

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Primary Research Question 1b

Carnegie Classification	Mean	SD	<i>n</i>
Rural-serving Small	2.53	0.75	15
Rural-serving Medium	2.24	0.60	47
Rural-serving Large	2.33	0.82	15

Note. Data from 77 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Table 12

ANOVA Results for Primary Research Question 1b

Source of Variance	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	1.081	2	.541	1.192	.309
Within Groups	33.548	74	.453		
Total	34.629	76			

Note. Data from 77 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
 2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

Key to Calculations:

Source of Variance =between groups (b); within groups (w)

SS =sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df =degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS =mean squared (estimate of variance of population: $MS = SS/df$)

F =F ratio (difference among variance as tested by using the *F* distribution as the sampling distribution: $F = MSb/MSw$)

As presented in Table 13, percentages for the primary research question 1, based on frequency and using a Likert scale, showed the level of difficulty recorded for items 21 through 35 under Data Form Part II concerning SACS accreditation criteria. CIOs across associate's college types reported experiencing the most difficulty (moderately to very difficult) with including part-time faculty in institutional governance (71%), including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational programs (68%), and including part-time faculty in evaluation of the institution's educational programs (67%).

Table 13

Percentages for Primary Research Question I under Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 21 through 35)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experience in meeting the following SACS-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty.

	<i>n</i>	Percent			
		ND	SD	MD	VD
21. Employing part-time faculty who have earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to level of instruction offered by your institution is...	106	22	36	33	10
22. Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees is...	106	37	37	22	5
23. Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study (a minimum of 18 semester hours at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is...	105	33	34	23	10
24. Ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is ...	103	27	30	31	12
25. Upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees, whether or not they possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is...	100	23	25	29	23
26. Ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the required degrees expected at your institution are nearing completion of these degrees, or, are with instructional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years is ...	98	34	23	21	21
27. Adopting criteria and processes for hiring and Replacing part-time faculty who require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...	103	38	32	23	7

28. Implementing criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty who require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...	104	39	33	24	4
29. Demonstrating a pattern that your institution is moving to improve its part-time faculty's qualifications as evidenced in recent changes (i.e., over the last three years) in the composition of the faculty is ...	101	44	26	28	3
30. Employing a sufficient number of full-time faculty is...	105	23	34	31	11
31. Employing at least one full-time faculty member for as many majors as your institution offers is ...	105	32	37	22	9
32. Limiting your institution's program offering to those that it can adequately staff is ...	104	25	38	29	8
33. Including part-time faculty in institutional governance is...	104	6	24	33	38
34. Including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational programs is ...	105	7	25	36	32
35. Including part-time faculty in evaluation of the institution's educational programs is ...	103	9	24	41	26

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= ND not difficult 3= MD moderately difficult

2= SD slightly difficult 4= VD very difficult

Research Question 2. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty as challenging?

Data Form Part I (questionnaire items 1 through 19) measured the perceptions of CIOs regarding the amount of challenge experienced in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty (i.e., recruiting, finding, selecting, hiring, orienting, supervising, evaluating, involving, developing, and monitoring). As presented in Table 14, CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceived implementing commonly cited practices for employing part-time faculty as challenging ($M > 2.50$). On a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not a

challenge and 4 being a strong challenge, the mean for 106 average responses for all questionnaire items under Data Form Part I was 2.83. The standard deviation was .61, meaning two thirds of respondents had a score between 2.22 and 3.44: (2.83-.61) and (2.83+.61), respectively.

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty.		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
		2.83	.61
Average Number of Responses	106		
Missing Responses	1		
Total Number in Population	107		

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

- 1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge
 2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

As presented in Table 15, the means for 15 out of the 19 questions under Data Form Part I were larger than 2.50. CIOs perceived implementing commonly cited practices for recruiting ($M=2.92$), selecting/hiring part-time faculty ($M=2.65$), orienting part-time faculty ($M=2.81$), supervising part-time faculty ($M=2.67$), evaluating part-time faculty ($M=2.53$), providing faculty development opportunities ($M=2.93$), and hiring part-time faculty in fine arts ($M=2.69$) as challenging. CIOs perceived finding part-time faculty well-versed in technology ($M=3.13$), hiring part-time faculty in mathematics ($M=3.06$), hiring part-time faculty in science ($M=3.42$), Hiring part-time faculty in health science ($M=3.18$), hiring part-time faculty in computer science ($M=3.04$), hiring part-time faculty in a technical field such as engineering ($M=3.15$), involving

part-time faculty ($M=3.15$), and monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty stay current in their discipline ($M=3.00$) as particularly challenging. CIOs perceived only four questions under Data Form Part I as a slight to moderate challenge ($M<2.50$): hiring part-time faculty in developmental studies ($M=2.30$), hiring part-time faculty in English ($M=2.27$), hiring part-time faculty in social science ($M=2.28$), and retaining part-time faculty ($M=2.49$).

The new discipline-specific questions were added to Yackee's (2000) survey (questionnaire items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12). It is important to note that science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) subjects were among the most challenging areas to hire part-time faculty (Table 15).

As presented in Table 14, the standard deviation of the mean of responses for all questionnaire items 1 through 19 under Data Form Part I was .61, indicating a small amount of variability of scores around the mean of 2.83 (2.22 to 3.44). An examination of the 107 total responses revealed that CIOs at public associate's colleges in the survey population experienced similar challenges (i.e., $M>2.50$, moderate to strong challenges) when implementing commonly cited practices for employing part-time faculty. The means and standard deviations by associate's college type for all questionnaire items under Data Form Part I are presented in Appendix D.

Table 15

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty.

Questionnaire Item	Number in Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Recruiting part-time faculty is ...	106	2.92	0.81
2. Finding part-time faculty well versed technology-based teaching and learning (Distance Education) is ...	107	3.13	0.87
3. Selecting/hiring part-time faculty is ...	104	2.65	0.87
5. Hiring part-time faculty in Fine Arts is ...	106	2.69	0.91
7. Hiring part-time faculty in Mathematics is ...	106	3.06	0.99
8. Hiring part-time faculty in Science is ...	106	3.42	0.84
9. Hiring part-time faculty in Computer Science is ...	103	3.04	0.84
10. Hiring part-time faculty in Health Science is...	104	3.18	0.87
12. Hiring part-time faculty in a technical field (e.g., engineering) is ...	102	3.53	0.66
13. Orienting part-time faculty is ...	107	2.81	0.93
14. Supervising part-time faculty is ...	106	2.67	0.81
15. Evaluating part-time faculty is ...	107	2.53	0.88
16. Involving (e.g., curriculum development/ Governance) part-time faculty is...	105	3.15	0.87
17. Providing faculty development opportunities is ...	106	2.93	0.92
18. Monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty stay current in their discipline is ...	107	3.00	0.86

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge

2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

Research Question 2a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p < .05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty among public associate college locations, namely rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year levels. The results of the means and standard deviations for public associate's colleges are shown in Table 16. Presented in Table 17, the ANOVA results indicated no statistically significant differences in means of CIO perceptions of difficulty based on location, $F(3, 102) = 0.531, p = .662$.

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 2a

Carnegie Classification	Mean	SD	n
Rural	2.85	0.617	78
Suburban	2.80	0.523	11
Urban	2.68	0.66	15
2 under 4	3.15	0.50	2

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Table 17

ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 2a

Source of Variance	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	.599	3	.200	.531	.662
Within Groups	38.305	102	.376		
Total	38.904	105			

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
 2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

Key to Calculations:

Source of Variance =between groups (b); within groups (w)

SS =sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df =degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS =mean squared (estimate of variance of population: $MS = SS/df$)

F =F ratio (difference among variance as tested by using the *F* distribution as the sampling distribution: $F = MS_b/MS_w$)

Research Question 2b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and using part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p < .05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding challenge in implementing commonly cited practices for employing and utilizing part-time faculty at rural-serving small, medium, and large public associate's colleges. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 18. The ANOVA results indicated no statistically significant difference existed in CIO perceptions based on rural-serving associate's college size, $F(2, 75) = .790, p = .458$ (Table 19).

Table 18

Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 2b

Carnegie Classification	Mean	SD	<i>n</i>
Rural-serving Small	3.03	0.60	15
Rural-serving Medium	2.82	0.61	48
Rural-serving Large	2.77	0.67	15

Note. Data from 78 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Table 19

ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 2b

Source of Variance	<i>SS</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	.605	2	.302	.790	.458
Within Groups	28.715	75	.383		
Total	29.320	77			

Note. Data from 78 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

Key to Calculations:

Source of Variance =between groups (b); within groups (w)

SS =sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df =degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS =mean squared (estimate of variance of population: $MS = SS/df$)

F =F ratio (difference among variance as tested by using the *F* distribution as the sampling distribution: $F = MS_b/MS_w$)

Table 20

Percentages for Secondary Research Question 2 under Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty.

	<i>n</i>	Percent			
		NC	SLC	MC	SC
1. Recruiting part-time faculty is ...	106	4	25	45	25
2. Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning (Distance Education) is...	107	5	18	37	40
3. Selecting/hiring part-time faculty is...	104	11	29	45	15
4. Hiring part-time faculty in Developmental Studies is...	106	20	35	41	5
5. Hiring part-time faculty in Fine Arts is...	106	11	27	42	19
6. Hiring part-time faculty in English is...	106	25	29	38	8
7. Hiring part-time faculty in Mathematics is...	106	9	18	30	42
8. Hiring part-time faculty in Science is...	106	5	8	26	60
9. Hiring part-time faculty in Computer Science is...	103	4	21	42	33
10. Hiring part-time faculty in Health Science is...	104	6	13	39	42
11. Hiring part-time faculty in Social Science is...	103	22	31	43	4
12. Hiring part-time faculty in a technical field (e.g., engineering) is...	102	1	6	32	61
13. Orienting part-time faculty is...	107	9	26	38	26
14. Supervising part-time faculty is...	106	7	35	43	15
15. Evaluating part-time faculty is...	107	13	34	40	13
16. Involving (e.g., curriculum development/governance) part-time faculty is...	105	6	14	39	41
17. Providing faculty development opportunities for part-time faculty is...	106	8	23	39	31
18. Monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty stay current in their discipline is...	107	6	20	44	31
19. Retaining part-time faculty is ...	107	14	34	42	10

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= NC not a challenge 3= MC a moderate challenge
 2= SLC a slight challenge 4= SC a strong challenge

As presented in Table 20, percentages for Research Question 2, based on frequency and using a Likert scale, clarified the level of challenge recorded for items numbered 1 through 19 under Data Form Part I. For example, recruiting part-time faculty presented a 70% moderate to strong challenge, involving part-time faculty recorded an 80% moderate to strong challenge, providing faculty development opportunities indicated a 70% moderate to strong challenge, and monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty stay current in their discipline produced a 75% moderate to strong challenge across associate's college types. In fact, the least amount of challenge reported for items 1 through 19 was hiring part-time faculty in Developmental Studies or English with 46% moderate to strong challenge.

Research Question 3. To what extent do CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceive commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty?

Data Form Part III (questionnaire items 37 through 45) measured the perceptions of CIOs regarding the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty have on the decision to employ part-time faculty. Over all, CIOs perceived commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty as influential on the decision to employ part-time faculty ($M > 2.50$). On a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not an influence and 4 being a strong influence, the mean score for questionnaire items under Data Form Part III was 2.84. The standard deviation (SD) was .50, meaning that two thirds of the respondents had a score between 2.34 and 3.34: (2.84-.50) and (2.84+.50), respectively (see Table 21).

Table 21

Means and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 37 through 45)

Data Form Part III: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has on your institution's (s') decision to employ part-time faculty. (Choose one response for each item.)	
	<u>Mean</u>
	2.84
	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
	.50
Average Number of Responses	103
Missing Responses	4
Total Number in Population	107

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= not an influence 3= a moderate influence

2= a slight influence 4= a strong influence

As presented in Table 22, the means for 7 out of 9 questionnaire items under Data Form Part III (i.e., questionnaire items 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, and 45) were larger than 2.50. CIOs employ part-time faculty because doing so affords institutional flexibility to match staffing to fluctuating enrollments ($M=3.19$), brings professional expertise to the classroom ($M=2.96$), brings current experience to the classroom ($M=2.94$), brings practical experience to the classroom ($M=2.99$), saves on costs of faculty salaries ($M=3.12$), and saves on costs of faculty benefits ($M=2.99$). CIOs also consider part-time employment as influential when hiring full-time faculty ($M=2.71$). In contrast, CIOs *did not* perceive the employment of part-time faculty as a means to provide teaching experience to those who are seeking full-time faculty positions ($M=2.24$) or employing part-time faculty as a vehicle to create and build new programs ($M=2.37$) as influential in their decisions.

Table 22

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 37 through 45)

Data Form Part III: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has on your institution's (s') decision to employ part-time faculty.			
Questionnaire Item	Number in Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation
37. Affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments is ...	104	3.19	0.87
38. Bringing professional expertise to the classroom is ...	104	2.96	0.84
39. Bringing current experience to the classroom is ...	104	2.94	0.86
40. Bringing practical experience to the classroom is ...	104	2.99	0.86
42. Saving on costs of faculty salaries is ...	103	3.12	0.92
43. Saving on costs of faculty benefits is ...	104	2.99	1.07
45. Taking part-time employment at your institution into consideration when hiring full-time faculty is ...	104	2.71	0.95

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= not an influence 3= a moderate influence

2= a slight influence 4= a strong influence

As presented in Table 21, the standard deviation of the mean of responses for questions 37 through 45 was .50, indicating some variability around the mean (2.34 to 3.34). An examination of the associate's college location revealed that all CIOs at public associate's colleges in the survey population perceived commonly cited reasons for employing part-time

faculty as *influential* on the decision to employ part-time faculty. The means and standard deviations by associate's college type for all questionnaire items under Data Form Part III are presented in Appendix F.

Research Question 3a. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year public SACS-accredited associate's colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p < .05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among public associate college types, namely rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year levels. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 23. The ANOVA revealed no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) in means of CIO perceptions of influential reasons, $F(3, 99) = 1.625, p = .188$ (Table 24).

Table 23

Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 3a

Carnegie Classification	Mean	SD	n
Rural	2.80	0.50	77
Suburban	2.93	0.50	10
Urban	3.06	0.57	14
2 under 4	2.44	0.50	2

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Table 24

ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 3a

Source of Variance	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	1.217	3	.406	1.625	.188
Within Groups	24.721	99	.250		
Total	25.938	102			

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
 2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

Key to Calculations:

Source of Variance =between groups (b); within groups (w)

SS =sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df =degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS =mean squared (estimate of variance of population: $MS = SS/df$)

F =F ratio (difference among variance as tested by using the *F* distribution as the sampling distribution: $F = MS_b/MS_w$)

Research Question 3b. What, if any, are the significant differences in the perceptions of influential reasons for employing part-time faculty among CIOs at small, medium, and large rural SACS-accredited associate’s colleges?

The one-way ANOVA test for significance was applied to determine if there were significant differences ($p < .05$) in the perceptions of CIOs regarding influential reasons for employing part-time faculty at rural-serving small, medium, and large public associate’s colleges. The means and standard deviations are recorded in Table 25. The ANOVA results indicated no statistically significant difference existed in CIO perceptions based on rural-serving associate’s college size, $F(2, 74) = .187, p = .829$ (see Table 26).

Table 25

Means and Standard Deviations for Secondary Research Question 3b

Carnegie Classification	Mean	SD	n
Rural-serving Small	2.76	0.62	15
Rural-serving Medium	2.83	0.44	47
Rural-serving Large	2.75	0.54	15

Note. Data from 77 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Table 26

ANOVA Results for Secondary Research Question 3b

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.092	2	.046	.187	.829
Within Groups	18.195	74	.246		
Total	18.287	76			

Note. Data from 77 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

1= not difficult 3= moderately difficult
2= slightly difficult 4= very difficult

Key to Calculations:

Source of Variance =between groups (b); within groups (w)

SS =sum of squares (square each deviation score and sum the squared deviations across all subjects in all groups)

df =degrees of freedom (number of rows in the calculation minus one times the number of columns in the calculation minus one)

MS =mean squared (estimate of variance of population: $MS = SS/df$)

F =F ratio (difference among variance as tested by using the *F* distribution as the sampling distribution: $F = MS_b/MS_w$)

Table 27

Percentages for Secondary Research Question 3 under Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 27 through 45)

Data Form Part III: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has on your institution's (s') decision to employ part-time faculty.					
		Percent			
	<i>n</i>	NI	SLI	MI	SI
37. Affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments is ...	104	5	15	36	44
38. Bringing professional expertise to the classroom is...	104	5	22	45	28
39. Bringing current experience to the classroom is...	104	4	28	38	30
40. Bringing practical experience to the classroom is...	104	5	23	40	32
41. Providing teaching experience to those who aspire to be full-time faculty members is...	103	17	48	28	7
42. Saving on costs of faculty salaries is...	103	6	19	32	43
43. Saving on costs of faculty benefits (e.g., health insurance) is...	104	13	19	25	43
44. Employing part-time faculty as a vehicle to create and build new programs is...	103	23	30	33	14
45. Taking part-time employment at your institution into consideration when hiring full-time faculty is...	104	13	23	42	21

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= NI not an influence 3= MI a moderate influence

2= SLI a slight influence 4= SI a strong influence

As presented in Table 27, percentages for Research Question 3, based on frequency and using a Likert scale, showed the amount of influence recorded for items 37 through 45 under Data Form Part III concerning reasons to employ part-time faculty. Specifically, of the 9 items, CIOs responded that only questionnaire items numbered 41 and 44 (providing teaching experience to those who aspire to be full-time and employing part-time as a vehicle to create and build new programs) were below 60% moderate to strong influences concerning their

institution's decision to employ part-time faculty. These percentages supported the fact that affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments (80%), bringing professional expertise to the classroom (73%), bringing current experience to the classroom (68%), bringing practical experience to the classroom (72%), saving on costs of faculty salaries (75%), saving on costs of faculty benefits (68%), and taking part-time employment into consideration when hiring full-time faculty (63%) are *moderate to strong influences* on the decisions to employ part-time faculty across associate's college types.

Research Question 4. To what extent are part-time faculty members employed as a vehicle to create and build new programs?

As presented in Table 28 and included in Appendix F, means and standard deviations questionnaire item 44 Data Form III revealed that CIOs at all associate's college types perceived that employing part-time faculty as a vehicle to create and build new programs as less influential ($M < 2.50$) in their decision to employ part-time faculty. However, as shown in Table 29, examination of the percentages of all responses and across associate's college types, using a Likert scale, resulted in a moderate influence for hiring part-time faculty to create and build new programs for rural medium (58.7%), suburban single campus (50%), and 2-year under 4-year associate's colleges (50%). Notably, the percentages based on frequency produced a 47% slight to moderate influence across associate's college types on the decision to employ part-time faculty to create and build new programs.

Table 28

Means and Standard Deviations for Questionnaire Item 44 of Data Form Part III

Question 44: Employing part-time faculty as a vehicle to create and build new programs is...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.39	1.04	15	0	15
Medium	2.37	1.00	46	2	48
Large	2.38	1.00	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.31	1.00	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.42	1.02	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.39	1.00	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.37	0.99	103	4	107

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

1= not an influence 3= a moderate influence
 2= a slight influence 4= a strong influence

Table 29

Percentages for Research Question 4 under Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Item 44)

Question 44: Employing part-time faculty as a vehicle to create and build new programs is...					
	<i>n</i>	NI	SLI	MI	SI
		Percent			
Rural-serving					
Small	15	46.7	20.0	26.7	6.7
Medium	46	15.2	26.1	45.7	13.0
Large	15	26.7	33.3	26.7	13.3
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7
Multi-campus	5	20.0	40.0	0.0	40.0
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	100	0.0	0.0
Multi-campus	12	25.0	41.7	16.7	16.7
2-year under 4-year	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Total	103				
Response Categories:		1= NI not an influence	3= MI a moderate influence		
		2= SLI a slight influence	4= SI a strong influence		

Research Question 5. To what extent is there a preference for hiring full-time faculty after first working as a part-time faculty member?

As presented in Table 30 and included in Appendix E, means and standard deviations for questionnaire item 45 under Data Form III revealed that CIOs at all associate college types in the survey population perceived that taking part-time employment into consideration when hiring full-time faculty was a slight to moderate influence ($M \geq 2.50$). It is also important to note that even though only 2 of the 5 CIOs from Urban-serving single campuses in the survey population of SACS-accredited associate's colleges responded, the mean was 3.50, indicating a moderate to strong influence for hiring from the ranks of part-time faculty when full-time positions are available.

Table 30

Means and Standard Deviations for Questionnaire Item 45 of Data Form Part III

Question 45: Taking part-time employment at your institution into consideration when hiring full-time faculty is...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.75	0.98	15	0	15
Medium	2.72	0.96	47	1	48
Large	2.72	0.95	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.64	0.98	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.75	0.99	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.70	0.97	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.71	0.95	104	3	107

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed. Response Categories:

- 1= not an influence 3= a moderate influence
 2= a slight influence 4= a strong influence

As presented in Table 31, further examination of percentages, based on frequency and using a Likert scale, illuminated that first working as a part-time faculty member was a moderate to strong influence on the decision to employ full time. CIOs across associate's college types responded with a minimum of 50% moderate to strong influence on the decision to employ for full-time positions from those who first work part time for their institutions. Specifically examining the frequency of CIO responses from rural associate's colleges, 66.7% for rural-serving small, 63.8% for rural-serving medium, and 53.3% for rural-serving large perceived that working first as a part-time faculty member was a moderate to strong influence on the decision to employ as full-time faculty.

Table 31

Percentages for Research Question 5 under Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Item 45)

Question 45: Taking part-time employment at your institution into consideration when hiring full-time faculty is...					
		Percent			
	<i>n</i>	NI	SLI	MI	SI
Rural-serving					
Small	15	20.0	13.3	46.7	20.0
Medium	47	14.9	21.3	46.8	17.0
Large	15	13.3	33.3	33.3	20.0
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	33.3	16.7	16.7	33.3
Multi-campus	5	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Multi-campus	12	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
2-year under 4-year	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Total	104				
Response Categories:	1= NI not an influence	3= MI a moderate influence			
	2= SLI a slight influence	4= SI a strong influence			

Research Question 6. How difficult is it to hire part-time faculty in the following programs/content areas: Developmental, Fine Arts, English, Math, Science, Health Science, Computer Science, and Social Science?

As previously reviewed in Table 12 and included in Appendix D, Data Form Part I (questionnaire items 4 through 12) showed that CIOs perceived hiring part-time faculty in fine arts, mathematics, science, health science, computer science, and technical fields such as engineering as *challenging* ($M > 2.50$). The means and standard deviations increased, however, when taking only the STEM content areas (questionnaire items 7, 8, 9, and 12) into consideration as shown in Table 32. After excluding other content areas in Data Form Part I, the means and standard deviations of perceived challenge when hiring part-time faculty in STEM content areas increased from ($M=2.83$) to ($M=3.26$), indicating *a moderate to strong challenge* concerning hiring part-time faculty in STEM disciplines.

Table 32

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations of STEM Program/Content Areas under Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 19)

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty.

Questionnaire Item	Number in Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation
7. Hiring part-time faculty in Mathematics is ...	106	3.06	0.99
8. Hiring part-time faculty in Science is ...	106	3.42	0.84
9. Hiring part-time faculty in Computer Science is ...	103	3.04	0.84
12. Hiring part-time faculty in a technical field (e.g., engineering) is ...	102	3.53	0.66

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge
 2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

As presented in Tables 33, 34, 35, and 36, further examination of the percentages, based on frequency using a Likert scale, revealed that hiring in the STEM disciplines across associate's college types was challenging. Specifically, a minimum of 50% moderate to strong challenge was reported for hiring part-time faculty in STEM disciplines for all associate's college types in the survey population. Notably, engineering presented the strongest challenge to hire part-time faculty across associate's college types, with six of the eight subgroups reporting 100% moderate to strong challenge (see Table 36).

Table 33

Percentages for Questionnaire Item 7 under Data Form Part I

Question 7: Hiring part-time faculty in Mathematics is ...					
		Percent			
	<i>n</i>	NC	SLC	MC	SC
Rural-serving					
Small	15	0.0	6.7	40.0	53.3
Medium	48	10.4	18.8	29.2	41.7
Large	15	20.0	20.0	33.3	26.7
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Multi-campus	5	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Multi-campus	13	15.4	15.4	23.1	46.2
2-year under 4-year	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Total	106				
Response Categories:					
1= NC not a challenge			3= MC a moderate challenge		
2= SLC a slight challenge			4= SC a strong challenge		

Table 34

Percentages for Questionnaire Item 8 under Data Form Part I

Question 8: Hiring part-time faculty in Science is ...					
		Percent			
	<i>n</i>	NC	SLC	MC	SC
Rural-serving					
Small	15	0.0	13.3	20.0	66.7
Medium	48	4.2	2.0	31.3	62.5
Large	15	20.0	13.3	13.3	53.3
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Multi-campus	6	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Multi-campus	12	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
2-year under 4-year	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
Total	106				
Response Categories:					
1= NC not a challenge			3= MC a moderate challenge		
2= SLC a slight challenge			4= SC a strong challenge		

Table 35

Percentages for Questionnaire Item 9 under Data Form Part I

Question 9: Hiring part-time faculty in Computer Science is ...					
		Percent			
	<i>n</i>	NC	SLC	MC	SC
Rural-serving					
Small	15	6.7	6.7	40.0	46.7
Medium	47	4.3	27.7	38.3	29.8
Large	15	0.0	26.7	53.3	20.0
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Multi-campus	5	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Multi-campus	11	9.0	18.2	36.4	36.4
2-year under 4-year	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Total	103				
Response Categories:					
1= NC not a challenge				3= MC a moderate challenge	
2= SLC a slight challenge				4= SC a strong challenge	

Table 36

Percentages for Questionnaire Item 12 under Data Form Part I

Question 12: Hiring part-time faculty in a technical field (e.g., engineering) is ...					
	<i>n</i>	Percent			
		NC	SLC	MC	SC
Rural-serving					
Small	15	0.0	0.0	13.3	86.7
Medium	46	0.0	10.9	45.7	43.5
Large	14	7.1	7.1	14.3	71.4
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3
Multi-campus	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	0.0	100	0.0
Multi-campus	13	0.0	0.0	30.8	69.2
2-year under 4-year	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Total	102				
Response Categories:					
1= NC not a challenge			3= MC a moderate challenge		
2= SLC a slight challenge			4= SC a strong challenge		

Research Question 7. To what extent is there a significant difference in difficulty in hiring part-time faculty for teaching online courses versus traditional courses?

As presented in Data Form Part I (questionnaire item 2) and Appendix D, associate's college CIOs reported that hiring part-time faculty well-versed in technology-based teaching and learning was a challenge ($M=3.13$). As presented in Table 37, CIOs from 2-year under 4-year associate's colleges responded that hiring faculty to teach online courses versus traditional courses was less challenging ($M=2.50$) than other associate's colleges in the survey population. All other associate's college CIOs perceived a moderate to strong challenge ($M=>3.00$) when hiring part-time faculty well-versed in teaching and learning through distance education.

Also on a Likert scale, further examination of the percentages, based on frequency of the 107 useable responses, for questionnaire item 2 under Data Form Part I indicated the amount of challenge experienced finding part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning (see Table 38). It is important to note that the percentages confirm the ANOVA test of variance, meaning CIOs perceived finding part-time faculty to teach using distance education as a moderate to strong challenge across associate's college types.

Table 37

Means of 2.50 and Larger and Standard Deviations for Questionnaire Item 2 under Data Form Part I

Question 2: Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning (Distance Education) is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.21	0.82	15	0	15
Medium	3.11	0.87	48	0	48
Large	3.12	0.87	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.13	0.87	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.23	0.83	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.11	0.88	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Total	3.13	0.87	107	0	107

Note. Data from 107 useable questionnaires were analyzed.

Response Categories:

1= not a challenge 3= a moderate challenge

2= a slight challenge 4= a strong challenge

Table 38

Percentages for Questionnaire Item 2 under Data Form Part I

Question 2: Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning
(Distance Education) is ...

	<i>n</i>	Percent			
		NC	SLC	MC	SC
Rural-serving					
Small	15	6.0	20.0	26.6	53.3
Medium	48	4.2	14.6	43.8	37.5
Large	15	0.0	26.7	33.3	40.0
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	0.0	50.0	16.7	33.3
Multi-campus	6	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	0.0	100	0.0
Multi-campus	13	7.7	15.4	30.8	46.2
2-year under 4-year	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Total	107				

Response Categories:

1= NC not a challenge

2= SLC a slight challenge

3= MC a moderate challenge

4= SC a strong challenge

Qualitative Data

Questionnaire items 20, 36, 46, and 54 (one question per each of the four data forms) provided respondents an opportunity to clarify answers for all sections of the survey. All qualitative data are separated according to Data Form I, II, III, and IV. The respondents' associate's college types, identified by Carnegie Basic Classifications for Associate's Colleges, are recorded in appropriate tables.

Qualitative Research Question 1. Please specify any additional challenges involving the employment of part-time faculty.

As presented in Data Form Part I of the survey (questionnaire item 20), 35 CIOs representing each college type responded. As presented in Table 39, respondents' comments and clarifications are identified by associate's college type.

Table 39

Responses for Questionnaire Item 20 under Data Form Part I by Associate College Type

Question 20: Please specify any additional challenges involving the employment of part-time faculty.

Rural-serving Small

- College is located in a very sparsely populated area, so finding qualified part-time faculty, particularly in the sciences, health science, and the technologies.
- Most of my responses are tied to the fact that my institution operates in a very rural environment. The population is low and therefore qualified candidates are fairly scarce—especially when coupled with the fact that many may not want to live in such a rural area. When oil and gas is booming, as it is now, the competition for qualified individuals is even more intense. It becomes very difficult to compete with the private sector.
- Our service area has a large number of retired people who only spend their summers here. They return to much warmer climates for the late fall, winter, and early spring. Thus, we have difficulty finding qualified part-time faculty who will be here during the times that we need them.

Rural-serving Medium

- Salaries
- We do not involve PT faculty in governance. We are discussing this possibility, but it probably will not change. In most areas PT faculty are not involved in curriculum development. This only occurs in areas in which we do not have FT faculty.
- Developing personal relationships and ensuring that part-time faculty have the resources and support they need.
- We are a small college in a rural setting. Greatest obstacles include dollar resources to pay attractive wages, especially compared to the workplace for master prepared faculty. Other needed resources include number of faculty in area with advanced credentials, resources to send faculty to professional development or bring it in. Having employees to be present at development, orientations, and teaching faculty the updates and use of technology [are] all challenging, to say the least.
- Physics is perhaps the toughest area to recruit and maintain PT faculty.
- Providing equitable pay for continuing part-time faculty who are not re-assessed each year to ensure that their pay level is comparable to that of new hires—particularly if they have completed “X” years of service and/or additional graduate hours or degrees.
- It is particularly difficult to find qualified part-time faculty who can teach courses when students most demand courses to be offered (daytime from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m.). It is also more challenging to find faculty who are well versed in distance education.
- Communication with part-time faculty so that all are on the “same page.” Training part-time faculty.
- Qualifications and time constraints of part-time faculty when they also work a full-time job elsewhere is the main challenge.
- One of our most significant challenges is salary. The community college salary schedule is not competitive for adjunct faculty. We are located three miles from a regional university where the same adjunct faculty can earn 50-75% more for teaching the same classes.
- Working from a small town, almost rural area, presents difficulties in having an adequate pool of adjuncts.
- Part-time faculty in the technical fields are especially hard to find. Our College has made great efforts in improving our relationship and responsiveness to adjunct faculty personnel. The Faculty Council has a group of faculty that serve to assist PT faculty as they come on board and develop at the College over time.

- Dual Studies courses taught at the high school during typical secondary education times.
- Integrating them into the culture of a department and/or the College is a challenge. We want them to come to division meetings and/or professional development activities but we don't pay them to do so. And, with the new [regulations], apparently coming from the IRS, if we go above a certain level of hours per week, we may be forced to give them health care benefits per the new law.

Rural-serving Large

- Keeping morale up since our pay for part-time faculty has not changed in 7 years.
- Too many universities tell students that getting a master's degree in education with emphasis in a field is fine for teaching at a community college. That is misleading. Community colleges need and want people with a least a master's degree directly in the field they are teaching, not in education. Master's degrees or doctoral degrees in education are to prepare people for K-12 education. Degrees in things like higher education administration or education administration can help some become an advisor or other type of staff person, but are not the correct preparation for faculty. Graduate courses geared solely towards K-12 educators are not what we are looking for in faculty members. This is one of the major reasons that we have difficulty with recruiting. We are also very interested in people who have a Ph.D. in the field of teaching expertise, and I do not believe that is shared with most graduate students.
- We have had challenges in certain disciplines (Government, Math, Natural Sciences) with finding faculty who have correct credentials. We have been working to give more professional development opportunities to part-time faculty, but this is mitigated in part by the fact that part-time faculty are sometimes so busy working that they can't take advantage of these opportunities.
- Number of hours part-time faculty may work and labor laws.
- Availability of qualified part-time faculty for face-to-face instruction in rural areas is often challenging.
- Many times part-time faculty are teaching for multiple institutions and do not want to be involved in professional development or campus activities.
- Due to part-time faculty members' other full-time jobs there can be schedule conflicts or no shows which pose issues for the institution and students.

Suburban-serving Single Campus

- We have challenges to provide a competitive pay rate for part-time faculty.

- Although faculty may be experts in their field, most do not have any understanding of pedagogy so their actual skills as a teacher need to be developed.
- Competitive salaries. Finding adjuncts to teach classes at certain times of the day.
- The ability of the college to provide sufficient pay incentives to attract adequate numbers of adjuncts.

Suburban-serving Multi-campus

- As a community college, we compete with quite a few four-year colleges and universities in our area who pay much higher salaries for adjunct faculty. Therefore, we cannot attract certain areas of faculty such as science, math, and computer science because these instructors get higher wages from the four-year colleges.
- We are in a large metro area with a lot of competition for qualified adjuncts. Our pay scale is considerably lower than the four-year universities so we struggle to attract quality adjuncts because of pay.

Urban-serving Single Campus

- Regional accrediting organizations are on a trend of requiring increasingly specific credentials for faculty. For example, to teach Anatomy and Physiology, a Masters in Biology is not necessarily sufficient. 18 graduate hours of Anatomy and Physiology related coursework is required. Five to ten years ago, this was not the case. That degree of specialization in 100 and 200 level courses is difficult for smaller colleges to manage. We anticipate that the new affordable health care act will pose a challenge.

Urban-serving Multi-campus

- Challenges in recruitment and retention of part-time faculty vary widely by discipline. For example, in the social sciences, it is currently very easy to find historians, but very difficult to find sociologists. Often these trends change over time as certain disciplines become more or less prevalent in the local population.
- As the Affordable Healthcare Act goes into effect, as well as various teacher retirement requirements at the state level, we will find our shrinking resources (budget cuts and enrollment declines) crashing headlong into additional payment for adjunct faculty, which will severely impact the number we can employ.
- Tracking adjunct attendance continues to be a challenge for our college.

2-year under 4-year

- Having the tenure track full-time faculty buy-in and respect part-time instructors is a challenge because they are often perceived by the full-time faculty as a different class. I have found that part-time faculty are often more technology capable and curious than many full-time faculty.

Note. 35 responses recorded from 107 useable questionnaires.

Questionnaire item 20 under Data Form Part 1 revealed emerging themes for CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges when they were given opportunity to specify the challenges involving the employment of part-time faculty: competitive pay for qualified adjuncts, qualifications of adjuncts, including qualified part-time faculty for STEM classes based on size and location, and busy schedules of part-time faculty which interfere with preferred class scheduling and opportunities for faculty development. These specific challenges were distributed equally across associate's college types, which indicated that all types were represented in the 35 written responses.

Qualitative Research Question 2. Please discuss any additional concerns or difficulties regarding part-time faculty and accreditation.

As presented in Data Form Part II of the survey (questionnaire item 36), 16 CIOs who represented each college type, except 2 under 4-year, responded. As presented in Table 40, respondents' comments and clarifications are identified by associate's college type.

Table 40

Responses for Questionnaire Item 36 under Data Form Part II by Associate College Type

Question 36: Please discuss any additional concerns or difficulties regarding part-time faculty and accreditation.

Rural-serving Small

- We only hire part-time faculty who meet SACs credentials. If they do not meet the required SACS credentials, we do not hire them.
- Alabama community colleges must follow state board policies regarding hiring practices. Many of the above items were marked “not difficult” because institutions do not have the option of not following board policy regarding instructor qualifications.

Rural-serving Medium

- We would never hire someone without a graduate degree to teach a transfer class. Hiring adjuncts or FT faculty with the minimum academic preparation is not difficult, simply because we would not hire them if they did not meet the minimum requirements.
- [_____] has several PT faculty very involved in program evaluation and the accreditation process. Most of them are PT faculty who have been here for a long time.
- I’m not sure how to answer some of these. For instance, it is not “difficult” to limit our program offerings to those we can staff because we have no other choice. A better way to ask it may be whether we have not offered programs that we believe would have been popular because we couldn’t find the staff. Employing a full-time faculty member for every major we offer is also not “difficult” because we can’t offer the major otherwise. I don’t have situations where I’m out of compliance on these matters and finding it difficult to be in compliance—we just don’t make the choice to be out of compliance.
- We have had in place, for several years, a process by which part-time faculty are “qualified” to teach at [_____]. If the person does not hold proper credentials, the person is not hired. Our SACSCOC liaison will deny the person’s application.
- Our biggest problem is finding Government teachers with 18 hours in government or PSCI specifically.
- First, we do not hire adjunct faculty who are not qualified. A few of our CTE adjunct faculty do not possess master’s degrees, but they meet the requirements of the *Principles of Accreditation*.

Rural-serving Large

- We do not employ part-time faculty who do not fully meet accreditation guidelines.
- We have some minor challenges with technical faculty in specific areas (welding, CNC, Industrial Maintenance). We do not have difficulty in general education or nursing.

Suburban-serving Single Campus

- The item left unanswered is due to the fact there is not a “Not Applicable” answer. We do not hire any faculty that we cannot demonstrate is qualified to teach in their area either through degrees or workforce credentials and degrees. As the highest level of degree attainment at our College is an associate’s degree, it is easier to achieve the standards.
- Part-time faculty are not involved with college committee work, Faculty Senate, department meetings, or regular office hours.

Suburban-serving Multi-campus

- The majority of our adjunct faculty are full-time employees in other industries or work full-time in other institutions of higher learning. Time is the issue in asking adjunct faculty to serve on committees or participate in governance.

Urban-serving Single Campus

- Our part-time faculty credentials meet qualifications. Our strategic plan does not address improving those qualifications.

Urban-serving Multi-campus

- Difficulties in involving part-time faculty members in the activities described above are primarily due to the logistics of time—most of our part-time faculty work full-time at another institution or business and do not have a lot of “extra” time for such service activities. Most, however, are very happy to assist when we can solicit their ideas via email or online.
- Many times it is difficult to engage adjunct faculty in the institution because they are here primarily in the evening and not available during the day.

Note. 16 responses recorded from 107 useable questionnaires.

Questionnaire item 36 under Data Form Part II revealed themes for CIOs at SACS-accredited associate’s colleges when they were given opportunity to discuss any additional

concerns or difficulties regarding part-time faculty and accreditation. The almost unanimous theme among CIOs across associate's college types was that their institutions were in compliance with SACS-COC because unless adjunct faculty members meet the academic requirements of accreditation, they cannot and do not hire them; therefore, they have little difficulty in meeting accreditation requirements. However, two respondents reported have some minor difficulties demonstrating credential requirements of adjunct instructors who teach technical courses.

Qualitative Research Question 3. Please specify other considerations and the amount of influence regarding decisions to employ part-time faculty.

As presented in Data Form Part III of the survey (questionnaire item 46), 11 CIOs from 5 out of the 8 associate's college types responded. As presented in Table 41, respondents' comments and clarifications are identified by associate's college type.

Table 41

Responses for Questionnaire Item 46 under Data Form Part III by Associate College Type

Question 46: Please specify other considerations and the amount of influence regarding decisions to employ part-time faculty.

Rural-serving Small

- We hire part-time faculty as needed to meet class demands.
- Whether to support award a sabbatical to a full-time faculty member [influences decisions to employ part-time faculty].
- Adjunct instructors are not considered part-time faculty due to the differences in payment. Part-time faculty are paid on a prorated D faculty schedule and adjunct instructors are not.

Rural-serving Medium

- Taking stress off full-time faculty who have a significant project (such as program accreditation) going on.
- [____] full-time faculty teach [more than] 70% of all classes. However, in today's economic environment the college is very deliberate in hiring new FT faculty.
- I would clearly differentiate between workforce and transfer teaching in answering these. Practical experience is a very big plus for the workforce side. We serve several large industries and work very closely with them in hiring our faculty and placing our graduates. On the transfer side, however, I rarely look at qualifications other than teaching experience and credentials earned.
- Roughly 75% of all courses are taught by full-time faculty. We have a few areas where enrollment requires additional adjuncts. We try to never exceed 50% of credit hours taught in any area by adjuncts. There are a few exceptions. Where we teach one section of a course per term, we use a professor emeriti and for a few areas where there is not a full teaching load, we use adjuncts. In chemistry, for example, we use two research chemists with PhD's and over 30 years each in research position.

Rural-serving Large

- All full-time positions are advertised internally first. If there is enough interest in the position from internal applicants, interviews will be conducted and a part-time faculty will be hired for the position. If none of the applicants are considered suitable for the position, the position will be advertised.
- Budgets are always an issue. Do you hire part-time or decrease student access due to low funding, which prohibits full-time hiring?

Suburban Multi-campus

- Degrees and certifications for area of expertise. Job performance in full-time positions which would be provided by letters of reference.

Urban Multi-campus

- Moving faculty from part-time to full-time status as openings emerge or as the student population rises to the point a new full-time line is needed is a common occurrence at my institution.

Note. 11 responses recorded from 107 useable questionnaires.

Questionnaire item 46 under Data Form Part III provided CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges an opportunity to specify other considerations and the amount of influence regarding decisions to employ part-time faculty. They indicated some reasons for employing part-time faculty not addressed in the survey. CIOs noted that support of full-time faculty who may need to take a sabbatical or simply taking the stress off of a full-time faculty member who is working on another major project for the institution are also influences for the employment of part-time faculty. Two respondents indicated that over 70% of all classes are taught by full-time faculty. Also, more than one CIO clarified that part-time faculty are given first opportunity to apply for full-time positions, if and when a full-time faculty position is needed and finances are available. Some CIOs made the point that institutions are very deliberate when it comes to adding new full-time faculty because of budgeting and fluctuating enrollments.

Qualitative Research Question 4. Please provide additional comments and/or suggestions.

As presented in Data Form Part IV of the survey (questionnaire item 54), 22 respondents from 6 out of the 8 associate's college types added comments and/or suggestions. Noted in Table 42, CIOs' comments and clarifications are identified by associate's college type.

Table 42

Responses for Questionnaire Item 54 under Data Form Part IV by Associate College Type

Question 54: Please provide additional comments and/or suggestions.

Rural-serving Small

- We provide office space for those part-time faculty who consistently teach for us and who teach several courses each term.

Rural-serving Medium

- Office space as available. Computer workstations are located in each building for faculty use (not really office space).
- Some PT faculty have shared office space.
- We ask that part-time faculty meet with students before or after class or make appointments with them and that they are also available via phone and college-provided email.
- Office space is usually a common office for multiple PT faculty. PT faculty are required to have 30 minutes of office time for every class taught.
- We provide office space but it is limited, and shared. We require office hours but far fewer than we require for full-time faculty.
- We offer some office space but not for all.
- We require technology training for adjuncts. We pay adjunct to develop online courses.
- We base our load on FTE assignment, not headcount.
- Office space is based on availability. We only require part-time faculty to keep 30 minutes of office per course they teach.
- Only part-time faculty on temporary contracts are required to hold office hours.
- Office space is provided if there is any available. There are some who do have an office or office space but there are very few who have an office.

Suburban-serving Single Campus

- This survey is difficult to read in italics.

Suburban-serving Multi-campus

- The number of part-time faculty fluctuate each semester based on enrollment. However, our faculty produce 72% of our credit-hour production.
- We do not have an office for each PT faculty but make general space available for student conferences. PT faculty are required to be available before and after class for students. No other office hours.
- We have adjunct centers where they have mostly shared space, but do have conference rooms for meetings with students, if needed.

Urban-serving Single Campus

- Adjuncts have to be available, but don't have to keep formal office hours.

Urban-serving Multi-campus

- My institution does employ a small number of part-time faculty who are required to keep office hours, in exchange for higher pay per credit hour for the additional work.
- Office space and office hour requirements vary by campus.
- The office space provided to part-time faculty members is shared.
- Based on contact hours, 52% of our contact hours are taught by full-time faculty and 48% by adjunct faculty.
- Office space is shared, not individual offices.

Note. 22 responses were recorded from 107 useable questionnaires.

Questionnaire item 54 under Data Form Part IV allowed CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges an opportunity to specify other comments and/or suggestions regarding the survey and part-time faculty. Overwhelmingly, the 22 respondents clarified their *yes* or *no* answers to whether their institutions provide office space for part-time faculty. Some reported that part-time faculty members are provided a shared space to meet with students; some noted that office space was provided for part-time faculty who consistently teach classes for their institutions; and others provided office space when it was available. Another recurring theme was office hours. Again, CIOs were asked in Data Form Part IV whether part-time faculty were required to hold office hours, given the option for *yes* or *no* answer. The respondents clarified their answers with a variety of requirements for time spent in offices for part-time faculty. Overall, office hours for part-time faculty vary from no hours required, to 30 minutes for each class taught, to regular hours for temporary appointments, depending upon the institution and course

load. Finally, two CIOs returned to the subject of part-time faculty to full-time faculty ratios at their institutions. Both reported that full-time faculty members teach the largest portion of their classes, based on contact hours and FTE, not headcount.

Summary

This chapter presented the evidence to answer the research questions and subsequent findings. It was divided into three sections. A case for the absence of response bias/response selectivity was made in the first section. An analysis of the difference between respondents and non-respondents revealed that response bias/response selectivity had little to no effect on the results of the survey, which suggests that the findings of the study can be generalized to the population (i.e., to all public SACS-accredited associate's colleges).

The data analysis section was divided into quantitative data analysis and qualitative data analysis. The quantitative data analysis for survey items numbered 1 through 19, 21 through 35, and 37 through 45 was presented in the first part of the section. The data were described using frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The findings related to the research questions were presented in narrative form, accompanied by tables. Each research question was addressed through the analysis of the mean scores of perceptions for each of the 42 questionnaire items. Responses were analyzed by applying a 4-point Likert-type scale. A score of 1 on the scale was deemed the least affirming perception and a score of 4 the most affirming. Mean scores smaller than 2.50 were considered non-affirming responses, and mean scores of 2.50 or larger were considered affirming. Each research question was also presented through percentages based on frequency and included in the discussion.

Because the respondent population was representative of the surveyed population, it was treated as a sample (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 173). The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance was applied to analyze significant differences ($p < .05$) in the data of the primary research question (1a and 1b) and the first two secondary research questions (2a and 2b; 3a and 3b) by associate's college type.

Qualitative data from questionnaire items 20, 36, 46, and 54 were reported and analyzed in the second part of the data analysis section. These questions offered respondents the opportunity to clarify answers and/or add comments which were not addressed in the questionnaire items of each of the four data forms of the survey. Questionnaire item 20 allowed respondents to specify any additional challenges involving the employment of part-time faculty; questionnaire item 36 provided opportunity to discuss additional concerns or difficulties regarding part-time faculty and accreditation; questionnaire item 46 encouraged respondents to record other considerations and/or influences regarding decisions to employ part-time faculty; and questionnaire item 54 afforded respondents space for making any comments and/or suggestions not identified elsewhere on the survey.

A discussion of the findings, conclusions of the study, and recommendations for practice, policy, and future research are presented in Chapter 5 of this study. Because this study is a replication of Yackee's 2000 study of 338 NCA-accredited community colleges, some comparison and contrast of CIO responses between SACS-accredited and NCA-accredited institutions are also included.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Since the middle of the twentieth century, issues related to the employment and uses of part-time faculty at two-year colleges have been at the forefront of discussion within academe (Wallin, 2005; Yackee, 2000; Lyons, 1996; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The percentage of faculty teaching part-time at community colleges significantly and steadily grew between the 1960s until the late 1990s, increasing from 43% in 1963 to 62% in 1998 (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 95). During this period, discussions about the use of part-time faculty for delivery of instruction focused on the problems associated with the practice. However, by 2003, 63% of the faculty were working part time. Cohen and Brawer (2008) stated that the number of part-time faculty employed at two-year colleges “depends on growth and decline in various areas of the curriculum, state and accrediting association guidelines, workforce availability, and numerous other factors” (p. 95). In 2012, the number of part-time employees reached 68% with no predictions of decline (AACC, 2012; NCES, 2008). Therefore, with declines in local, state, and federal budgets, the discussions about the employment of part-time have shifted from criticism of the escalating number to effective practices, including discipline-specific content area (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Murray, 2010, 2002a, 2002b; Palmer, 2002), because two-year colleges have been especially hard hit by the financial crisis (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012) which all institutions of higher education face in the twenty-first century.

The change in focus was not only the financial crisis, but was also triggered by regional accrediting agencies. As Yackee (2000) stated, “By 1990, most of the country’s higher education institutional accreditors developed measures of quality for faculty and effective teaching, which were incorporated into their overall evaluations of colleges and universities” (p. 146-7). Additionally, accrediting agencies began to scrutinize institutional effectiveness practices, which included criteria for the processes for judging faculty credentials and practices. Today, all six regional accrediting agencies—Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSCHE), New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC-CIHE), North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA-HLC), Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (WASC-ACCJC), and Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (WASC-ACSCU)—have published statements on institutional standards and policies regarding both full- and part-time faculty (Henry, 2008; Yackee, 2000). Although each accrediting agency has faculty guidelines, these policies are as varied as the regions they govern, leaving details about full-time to part-time ratios to the institutions themselves.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) is the regional accrediting agency that was the focus of this investigation. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) conducts the SACS postsecondary accreditation process. Yackee’s (2000) NCA study was the first examination of the implementation of faculty standards from the viewpoint of administrators. Before 2000, no data existed to measure the amount of difficulty experienced by administrators at the 340

NCA-accredited two-year colleges in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. Similarly, this study is the first examination of the difficulty experienced by administrators at the 256 SACS-accredited associate's colleges in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. However, unlike Yackee's 2000 study, this investigation was limited to public institutions.

This study provided an opportunity for chief instructional officers (CIOs) at public associate's colleges accredited by SACS to comment on the difficulty experienced in meeting SACS accreditation criteria for part-time faculty. It also allowed CIOs the opportunity to provide information about the challenge experienced in implementing effective practices for employing and using part-time faculty and to comment on the influence of commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty on the decision to employ part-time faculty. In addition to Yackee's original survey, discipline-specific questions were added to provide CIOs an opportunity to identify challenges in hiring/selecting part-time faculty for those particular content areas.

A replication of Yackee's (2000) questionnaire was adapted by the researcher for the online environment using Qualtrics online software prior to distribution. Specifically, qualitative questions were positioned at the end of each of the data form parts, and other questions were added for relevancy. One hundred and twelve (112) surveys were returned. The data from 107 useable surveys, which represented a 42% response rate, were organized by type, using 2010 Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges. Institutions were then subcategorized according to their locations (i.e., rural, suburban, urban, and 2-year under 4-year) and size according to population served (i.e., rural small, medium, and large; suburban single and multi-campus, and urban single and multi-campus).

Statistical treatments used to analyze the data included percentages (*P*), frequencies (*f*), means (*M*), standard deviations (*SD*), and the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test for significance. The findings of the study should be used to improve the practices and policies related to the employment, use, and most effective placement of part-time faculty.

This chapter includes the following sections: a discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for practice, policy, and future research. Closing remarks are also included.

Discussion of the Findings

The results of the study provided evidence to answer the research questions. Because the respondent population was representative of the surveyed population, it was treated as a sample. The findings of the study are as follows:

Finding 1

Overall, chief instructional officers (CIOs) at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceived meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty as not difficult. However, CIOs perceived some criteria as difficult.

On a Likert-type scale of 1 to 4, with a score less than 2.50 considered a non-affirmative response, and a score 2.50 or higher as an affirmative response, the mean scores for all responses for questionnaire items under Data Form Part II, which addressed the amount of difficulty experienced in meeting SACS accreditation criteria, was 2.30. However, the CIOs perceived meeting the criteria related to upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees, whether or not they possess special training, experience, creative

production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments, as difficult ($M=2.52$). In addition, they perceived including part-time faculty in institutional governance ($M=3.02$), including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational programs ($M=2.94$), and including part-time faculty in evaluation of the institution's educational programs ($M=2.84$) as difficult.

Although the CIOs perceived meeting criteria for upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees as difficult, they perceived meeting criteria related to ensuring part-time faculty teaching transfer courses ($M=1.94$) or general education courses ($M=2.09$) hold master's degrees as not difficult. This same contradiction was revealed in Yackee's (2000) study of 338 NCA-accredited community colleges; this study of 256 SACS-accredited colleges found similar results and may also be explained by the diversity of the curriculum offered among the associate's colleges assessed in the population. Some of the SACS associate degree-granting colleges included are truly comprehensive community colleges while others are technical colleges. In Alabama, for example, 4 of Alabama's 25 associate's colleges are strictly technical; in Wisconsin, just 3 of the 17 technical colleges offer associate's degrees for transfer. Comprehensive community colleges offer both transfer and vocational programs, and technical colleges offer vocational/professional programs of study. Therefore, in the case of hiring part-time faculty, evidence of experience in a particular vocational/professional field is often used to substitute minimum qualifications such as possession of a baccalaureate degree. One CIO at a large rural community college explained the differences in meeting the accreditation criteria: "We have some minor challenges with technical faculty in specific areas (i.e., welding, CNC, Industrial Maintenance). We do not have difficulty in general education or nursing." Another CIO at a rural medium college stated, "First, we do not hire adjunct faculty

who are not qualified. A few of our CTE adjunct faculty do not possess master's degrees, but they meet the requirements of [SACS'] *Principles of Accreditation*." Still another CIO from a suburban single campus explained the SACS standard for hiring part-time faculty:

The item left unanswered is due to the fact there is not a 'Not Applicable' answer. We do not hire any faculty that we cannot demonstrate is qualified to teach in their area, either through degrees or workforce credentials and degrees. As the highest level of degree attainment at our college is an associate's degree, it is easier to achieve the standards. (See Chapter 4 for the complete list of comments under Data Form Part II.)

The finding that the CIOs perceived upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than a baccalaureate degree as difficult may be influenced by simply a lack of qualified part-time faculty in the SACS region. As presented in Table 43, 9 out of the 11 states in the study population are among the 26 states in the country with the lowest proportion of (under 26.5%) of adults who hold bachelor's degrees or higher (U. S. Census Bureau, 2008). Therefore, 81% of the states within the SACS region are in the lower 20 percentile of adults who have earned 4-year degrees. Significantly, 3 of those 11 states are in the bottom 10 percentile of the country. It should not be surprising that finding more part-time faculty, especially in specialized areas such as science, engineering, and physics, would be difficult, given the smaller pool that exists in rural areas.

Most institutional practices and policies require the same credentials for full-time and part-time faculty (SACS, 2012b; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Henry, 2008; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). However, comprehensive associate and technical colleges offer a wide variety of courses for which professional license, certification, and expertise in the field do not require the degree. Also, with a smaller pool of adjuncts from which to hire (i.e., those who hold a bachelor's degree or higher within the SACS region), it would logically follow that once part-time faculty meet the essential functions in a continuing education

course and/or technical or professional field of study and SACS' *Principles of Accreditation*, upgrading those credentials would prove difficult.

Table 43

Proportion of Adults with Bachelor's or Higher Degree, by State, 2008

State	%	Rank	State	%	Rank
Alabama*	22.0	44	Montana	27.1	22
Alaska	27.3	21	Nebraska	27.1	22
Arizona	25.1	31	Nevada	21.9	45
Arkansas	18.8	49	New Hampshire	33.3	7
California	29.6	14	New Jersey	34.4	5
Colorado	35.6	2	New Mexico	24.7	34
Connecticut	35.6	2	New York	31.9	9
Delaware	27.5	19	North Carolina*	26.1	26
District of Columbia	48.2	X	North Dakota	26.9	24
Florida*	25.8	27	Ohio	24.1	37
Georgia*	27.5	19	Oklahoma	22.2	43
Hawaii	29.1	16	Oregon	28.1	18
Idaho	24.0	38	Pennsylvania	26.3	25
Illinois	29.9	13	Rhode Island	30.0	12
Indiana	22.9	41	South Carolina*	23.7	39
Iowa	24.3	36	South Dakota	25.1	31
Kansas	29.6	14	Tennessee*	22.9	41
Kentucky*	19.7	47	Texas*	25.3	30
Louisiana*	20.3	46	Utah	29.1	16
Maine	25.4	29	Vermont	32.1	8
Maryland	35.2	4	Virginia*	33.7	6
Massachusetts	38.1	1	Washington	30.7	11
Michigan	24.7	34	West Virginia	17.1	50
Minnesota	31.5	10	Wisconsin	25.7	28
Mississippi*	19.4	48	Wyoming	23.6	40
Missouri	25.0	33			

Source: U. S. Census Bureau, 2008.

* States within the SACS region

Finding 2

There are no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges based on the geographic location of their institutions.

Even though the ANOVA revealed no statistical difference, an examination of mean scores revealed that CIOs of 2-year under 4-year associate's colleges perceived meeting accreditation requirements as being more difficult than other college types on 11 out of the 15 questions under Data Form Part II, achieving a mean score of 2.63 for the section. Specifically, CIOs at the 2-year under 4-year institutions perceived that ensuring part-time faculty who teach transfer courses complete graduate-level degrees in three to five years, adopting criteria and processes for hiring ($M=3.00$), and replacing part-time faculty who teach general education courses hold appropriate degree in their fields of study ($M=3.00$) as significantly more difficult than other college types. This result is tempered by the fact that there are only three public, associate-degree-granting 2-year under 4-year colleges in the SACS region from which to gather information. For this study, two CIOs returned the survey for a 67% response rate.

Finding 3

CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceived implementing commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty as challenging.

On a Likert-type scale of 1 to 4, with a score less than 2.50 considered a non-affirmative and 2.50 or higher an affirmative response, the mean score for questionnaire items under Data Form Part I, which addressed the amount of challenge experienced in implementing commonly cited practices for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty, was 2.83. CIOs

perceived implementing commonly cited practices for recruiting part-time faculty ($M=2.92$), selecting/hiring part-time faculty ($M=2.65$), orienting part-time faculty ($M=2.81$), supervising part-time faculty ($M=2.67$), evaluating part-time faculty ($M=2.53$), and providing part-time faculty development opportunities ($M=2.93$) as challenging.

Data Form Part I also included discipline-specific questions which were added to Yackee's (2000) study. CIOs perceived hiring part-time faculty in fine arts as challenging ($M=2.69$). However, CIOs from all college types perceived finding part-time faculty well-versed in technology (distance education) ($M=3.13$), hiring part-time faculty in mathematics ($M=3.06$), hiring part-time faculty in science ($M=3.42$), hiring part-time faculty in health science ($M=3.18$), hiring part-time faculty in computer science ($M=3.04$), hiring part-time faculty in a technical field such as engineering ($M=3.15$), involving part-time faculty ($M=3.15$), and monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty stay current in their discipline ($M=3.00$) as particularly challenging. According to these results, STEM content areas were perceived as the most challenging to hire part-time faculty by all associate's college types based on geographic location and size.

As noted by the literature review, rural community colleges have consistently found it more difficult to attract qualified part-time faculty, and the degree of reliance on them varies with academic discipline (Charlier, 2010; Rankin, 2008; Benjamin, 2002; Yackee, 2000). Specifically, Rankin (2008) surveyed 500 CAOs and found 61% indicated that "qualified part-time faculty in many academic areas are not available in this area." Also, Yackee (2000) recorded similar difficulties from CIOs at rural NCA-accredited community colleges with credentialing part-time faculty: "We are a small rural college providing services to a large number of small communities (average community population of 1,000-3,000 people). It is very

difficult to find part-time faculty with the required academic credentials” (p. 155). This study concluded that although rural community college CIOs perceived statistically similar challenges as other 2-year associate’s colleges, based on Rankin’s (2008) survey, the limited adjunct pool which historically exists for rural community colleges would become even more scant in STEM content areas.

Finding 4

CIOs at SACS-accredited public associate’s colleges perceived hiring part-time faculty in the specific disciplines of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) as challenging.

On a Likert-type scale of 1 to 4, with a score less than 2.50 considered a non-affirmative and 2.50 or higher an affirmative response, this study recorded a mean score of 3.26 at all college locations and sizes, indicating a moderate to strong challenge concerning hiring part-time faculty in STEM discipline areas. These results supported Rankin’s (2008) findings that 56% of chief academic officers reported a shortage of STEM faculty. For example, in this research, one CIO from rural large community college noted, “We have had challenges in certain disciplines (... , Math, Natural Sciences) with finding faculty who have correct credentials.” Another CIO at a rural medium college stated, “Part-time faculty in the technical fields are especially hard to find.” Also, a CIO from a rural medium added, “Working from a small town, almost rural area, presents difficulties in having an adequate pool of adjuncts.” One CIO from a rural small college stated, “Our college is located in a very sparsely populated area, so finding qualified part-time faculty, particularly in the sciences, health science, and the technologies [is challenging].” Finally, a CIO from a rural small associate’s college summarized the frustrations:

Most of my responses are tied to the fact that my institution operates in a very rural environment. The population is low and therefore qualified candidates are fairly scarce—especially when coupled with the fact that many may not want to live in such a rural area. When oil and gas is booming, as it is now, the competition for qualified individuals is even more intense. It becomes very difficult to compete with the private sector.

The shortage of available part-time faculty for the STEM disciplines is not limited to rural associate's colleges as noted by the comment of a CIO from a suburban multi-campus:

As a community college, we compete with quite a few four-year colleges and universities in our area who pay much higher salaries for adjunct faculty. Therefore, we cannot attract certain areas of faculty such as science, math, and computer science because these instructors get higher wages from the four-year colleges.

(See Chapter 4 for the complete list of comments from Data Form Part I.)

The literature has documented trends in the employment and best practices for the use of part-time faculty at two-year colleges. Researchers agree that implementing effective strategies for the recruiting, selecting/hiring, orienting and involving, evaluating, and providing meaningful professional development result in the employment of qualified part-time faculty and increased rates of retention among those instructors (Charlier, 2010; Kezar & Sam, 2010a, 2010b; Murray, 2010; Christensen, 2008; Bradley, 2007; Yee, 2007; Wallin, 2005; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Murray, 2002a, 2002b; Palmer, 2002; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Also significant to include in the list of effective strategies for the employment and use of part-time faculty, as revealed in Chapter 2 of this study, is the trend toward research that examines best practices for hiring part-time faculty in specific discipline/content areas (Bettinger & Long, 2010; Kezar & Sam, 2010a; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; Costanzo, 2007; Benjamin 2003, 2002; Cross & Goldenberg, 2003).

The results of this study revealed that CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges had almost identical challenges in utilizing the practices commonly identified as important for effectively employing and utilizing part-time faculty as Yackee's (2000) survey results of NCA-

accredited community colleges. In both studies, these same practices, outlined by Gappa and Leslie in 1993, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron in 1995, and Lyons in 1996, were perceived as challenging to implement.

Finding 5

CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges agreed that commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty influence the *decision to employ* part-time faculty. This was the case regardless of the type based on geographic location and size of their institutions.

On the Likert-type scale of 1 to 4, with a mean score less than 2.50 considered a non-affirmative response and a mean score of 2.50 or higher considered an affirmative response, the mean score for questionnaire items under Data Form Part III was 2.84. These items addressed the amount of influence commonly cited reasons for employing part-time faculty has on the decision to employ part-time faculty. There were no statistically significant differences among the mean responses of the CIOs for individual questionnaire items regarding the reasons for employing part-time faculty for all associate college types based on geographic location, nor were there statistically significant differences based on the size of the institution. (See Appendix F for a complete list of means and standard deviations for Data Form Part III).

Regardless of institutional location or size, the findings revealed that the CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges agreed that employing part-time faculty for the delivery of instruction enhances the function and promotes the viability of their institutions. Specifically, employing part-time faculty affords institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments, brings professional expertise and current experience to the classroom, and saves on costs of faculty salaries and benefits.

Some CIOs recorded that they hire part-time faculty very deliberately to benefit not only students and the institution, but also full-time faculty. In fact, a CIO from a rural medium college replied, “[Hiring part-time faculty] takes stress off of full-time faculty who have a significant project (such as program accreditation) going on.” Also, another CIO from a rural medium college remarked:

Roughly 75% of all courses are taught by full-time faculty. We have a few areas where enrollment requires additional adjuncts. We try to never exceed 50% of credit hours taught in any area by adjuncts. There are a few exceptions. Where we teach one section of a course per term, we use professor emeriti and for a few areas where there is not a full teaching load, we use adjuncts. In chemistry, for example, we use two research chemists with PhD’s and over 30 years each in research position.
(See Chapter 4 for the complete list of comments from Data Form Part III.)

This selective use of adjunct faculty was noted in Charlier’s (2010) research involving shortage versus attraction and employment. Charlier and Williams (2011) suggested that even though unmet demand was reported for all rural colleges (Rankin, 2008), rural practitioners are less reliant on part-time faculty because they are resigned to the fact that the limited available employment pool has always existed.

In return for part-time faculty members’ contributions, the CIOs also considered those who teach part-time when hiring full-time faculty. For example, a CIO from an urban multi-campus wrote, “Moving faculty from part-time to full-time status as openings emerge or as the student population rises to the point a new full-time line is needed is a common occurrence at my institution.” Also, a CIO from a rural large college added, “All full-time positions are advertised internally first. If there is enough interest in the position from internal applicants, interviews will be conducted and a part-time faculty will be hired for the position.”

This finding was very similar to Yackee’s (2000) findings of perceptions of CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges. CIOs at NCA-accredited (2000) and SACS-accredited

(2013) associate's colleges agreed that part-time faculty were a vital part of achieving the missions at their institutions.

Finding 6

No statistically significant differences existed in the perceptions of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges regarding the issues addressed in this study based on the geographic location and the size of their institutions.

This was a surprising finding based on the literature review of Chapter 2 of this study. Research documents the struggles which are unique to rural institutions, including but not limited to providing access, balancing budgets, and attracting available and qualified faculty (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012; Charlier, 2010; Rankin, 2008; Roessler, Katsinas, & Hardy, 2006; Katsinas & Moeck, 2002; Yackee, 2000; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Katsinas, 1993). In fact, Roessler, Katsinas, and Hardy (2006) studied NCES' IPEDS data for each five-year period from 1980-1981 to 2000-2001 and reported that rural community colleges, as compared to urban and suburban institutions, were the most negatively impacted from the downward spiral of state funding and increased enrollments. Small rural institutions were most dramatically affected by funding decreases because of their dependence on local tax bases. In addition, Katsinas, Alexander, and Opp (2003) argued that rural colleges also have higher operating costs per student because of their smaller budgets and state funding formulas do not take these extra expenses into account, and as a result, expensive technical curricula, which could improve local economic development, are often unaffordable because they are geographically located within low-wealth tax districts. Katsinas and Hardy (2012) concluded that although rural community colleges serve more students (38% or 3.5 million), including first generation, low income, and

minority students, than their urban and suburban counterparts (31% and 29% respectively), not one of the 575 publically controlled rural community college presidents was asked to serve on the American Council on Education's Commission on Access, Admissions, and Success in Higher Education nor the College Board's National Commission on Community Colleges, both meeting in 2008, making them practically "invisible" and silencing their voices on policy.

Ultimately, this study revealed that CIOs from SACS-accredited associate's colleges perceived similar challenges and/or difficulties in the processes of meeting regional accreditation criteria for part-time faculty and employing and utilizing part-time faculty, regardless of institutional location or size. Notably, Yackee's (2000) research produced approximate results when measuring perceptions of CIOs at NCA-accredited community colleges.

The findings of this study could be affected by the financial crisis of the nation which has created similar challenges for all associate's college types and higher education in general (CAW, 2012). Specifically, the influences for employing part-time faculty ultimately afford institutional flexibility for fluctuating enrollments and promote their viability. Nonetheless, experts agree that geographic location and size of the institution does matter.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are made from the findings of this study.

Conclusion 1

There are no significant differences in the perceptions regarding difficulty in meeting accreditation criteria for part-time faculty among CIOs at SACS-accredited, public associate's colleges based on geographic location or institutional size.

Since this replication of Yackee's (2000) study did not include measuring perceptions based on institutional control (i.e., private, public, federally chartered/special use), but was limited to public associate's colleges only, the conclusions are different for the primary research question. Yackee found that there were "obvious differences" based on institutional control and location in meeting accreditation criteria at NCA-accredited community colleges (p. 163). In fact, Yackee found that public community colleges perceived ensuring part-time faculty possess credentials as more difficult than other associate's college types.

Conclusion 2

Commonly cited practices which contribute to the effective employment and utilization of part-time faculty are the same practices that pose the greatest challenges to CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges.

Recruiting, hiring, developing, and including part-time faculty create challenges across associate's college types; however, Kezar and Sam (2010a) stated that rural colleges do a better job at recruiting part-time faculty than other associate's colleges. Their reasoning is that rural community colleges find it harder to attract them (Charlier, 2010; Rankin, 2008), so they spend more time incorporating them into the community. Katsinas and Hardy (2010) found that rural community colleges depend on part-time faculty less than their suburban and urban counterparts.

Conclusion 3

STEM disciplines create greater challenges when recruiting and hiring for all types of public SACS-accredited associate's colleges based on size and geographic location.

Even though this research produced no statistically significant difference in the perceptions among CIOs at SACS-accredited community colleges, the STEM-specific mean score of CIO responses representing all associate's college types in the survey population was 3.19 (see Appendix D for means and standard deviations under Data Form Part I). These results, which recorded challenges for CIOs in hiring part-time faculty for STEM-specific disciplines, supported Rankin's (2008) survey findings for all Carnegie types of two-year colleges: 56% of the CAOs responded that their institutions experienced faculty shortages for the STEM disciplines. Rankin (2008) also pointed out that a lack of funding for technology-based curriculum and instruction, beginning with training of administrators, will inhibit two-year colleges in their missions of training the workforce of the future.

Conclusion 4

Regardless of institutional type, CIOs at public associate's colleges accredited at SACS perceived the same *influences* on the decision to employ part-time faculty.

Alarming percentages have been recorded in the last decade on the use of part-time faculty. Cohen and Brawer (2008) predicted that the full-time to part-time ratio would stabilize at 40:60; however, NCES (2008) reported that 66.5 % of all faculty at community colleges worked part time. In 2012, it is commonly reported to be 68%. As presented in Chapter 2 of this study, one of the most influential reasons researchers stated that the percentage is remaining this high is to balance underfunded budgets.

This study resulted in the confirmation that cost effectiveness is a major influence on the decision to employ part-time faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). CIOs reported that affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments ($M=3.19$), saving on costs of faculty

salaries ($M=3.12$), and saving on costs of faculty benefits ($M=2.99$) were moderate to strong influences for employing part-time faculty (see Appendix E for means and standard deviations under Data Form Part III). One CIO from a rural large college concluded, “Budgets are always an issue. Do you hire part-time or decrease student access due to low funding, which prohibits full-time hiring?” (See the complete list of comments in Chapter 4 from Data Form Part III.)

Recommendations for Practice, Policy, and Future Research

Recommendations for Practice

Recommendation 1. The data in this study revealed that many of the key issues surrounding the employment and use of part-time faculty revolve around the differentiation between technical and academic courses and programs. Several CIOs in this study indicated that the questionnaire and the findings would be more informative if distinctions were made between part-time faculty teaching general education/transfer courses and those teaching technical/vocational courses. CIOs especially found this distinction important when answering the accreditation questions as noted by their comments in Data Form Part II, questionnaire item 36 (see Chapter 4 for a complete list of comments). In addition, CIOs indicated that the amount of difficulty for ensuring credentials for part-time faculty was dependent on staffing for technical/vocational or general education/transfer courses. In fact, their comments implied that employing part-time faculty who held 18 hours in the discipline and a master’s degree was less difficult than providing credentials for accreditation of experience, expertise, and license for teaching technical/vocational courses. For example, a rural community college CIO stated,

I’m not sure how to answer some of these. For instance, it is not 'difficult' to limit our program offerings to those we can staff because we have no other choice. A better way to ask it may be whether we have not offered programs that we believe would have been popular because we couldn’t find the staff. Employing a full-time faculty member for

every major we offer is also not 'difficult' because we can't offer the major otherwise. I don't have situations where I'm out of compliance on these matters and finding it difficult to be in compliance—we just don't make the choice to be out of compliance.

More research is needed to provide these specifics involved in accreditation. (See questionnaire item 36 under Data Form Part II in Chapter 4 for additional comments about concerns or difficulties regarding part-time faculty and accreditation.)

It is recommended that further research make the distinction between the two types of coursework in which the part-time faculty are being utilized, general education/transfer and technical/vocational. It would be easy enough to add a questionnaire item to the survey which distinguishes within associate's colleges the courses for which part-time faculty are hired: general education/transfer or technical/vocational education. To study each type separately could alter the findings and distinguish the difficulty, challenge, and influences of hiring part-time faculty across associate's college types.

Recommendation 2. The qualitative data revealed that the alarming percentages reported for the ratio of part-time compared to full-time faculty is misleading, many times basing the percentage only on the number employed. For this study, CIOs provided the number of both part-time and full-time faculty included in Data Form Part IV. However, those who added comments on the qualitative question item 54 clarified their numbers, insisting that they are careful not to employ more part-time than full-time faculty.

Upon concluding this study, it is recommended that as a professional practice these percentages should be measured based on contact hours instead of the number of both part-time and full-time faculty (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995). Charlier (2010) surveyed 347 chief academic officers (CAOs) at community colleges across the country and based the findings for

part-time to full-time ratio on two measures: percentage of part-time faculty employed on a part-time basis and the percentage of credit hours taught by part-time faculty. Charlier found that even though CAOs from rural community colleges reported 60% part-time faculty were employed, only 39% credit hours were taught by part-time faculty; suburban institutions reported 59% part-time faculty, yet they taught 50% of the credit hours; and although urban institutions recorded 67% of faculty were employed part-time, they taught 48% of the credit hours (Charlier & Williams, 2011, p. 171). Another important note about Charlier's (2010) statistics, which supported Katsinas and Hardy's (2010) findings, is that rural community colleges rely less on part-time faculty than suburban or urban institutions.

This research supports the contentions of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) that an accurate measure of part-time faculty reliance must take into account the faculty workload. Consequently, the results of this research and the qualitative comments made by CIOs from SACS-accredited associate's colleges suggested that asking simply for the number of part-time and full-time faculty revealed an inaccurate measure of reliance of part-time faculty, and any future research should investigate part-time faculty and the contact hours they generate.

Recommendations for Policy

Recommendation 3. It is recommended that SACS needs to clarify part-time to full-time ratios for associate's colleges administrators. As presented in literature review of this study, SACS' "Rationale and Notes" states that the number of full-time faculty will need to be "sufficient" to fulfill basic faculty functions of curriculum design, development, evaluation; teaching; identification and assessment of appropriate student learning outcomes; student advising; research and creative activity; and institutional and professional service. The work of

the core faculty may be supplemented and enhanced by “judicious assignment” of part-time faculty (SACS, 2012c, *Resource Manual*, p. 22). Cohen and Brawer (2008) suggested that the movement toward student learning outcomes required that part-time faculty be incorporated into the community. This insight suggested that there will not be enough full-time faculty members to do the extra work required if the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty continues in unbalanced direction without finding ways to include part-time faculty in this work. NCES (2008) and AACC (2012) reported that 68% of associate’s college faculty is now part-time. This percentage is alarming, and the CIOs’ responses to the qualitative question, “Please specify other considerations and the amount of influence regarding decisions to employ part-time faculty,” suggested that they are concerned with keeping that percentage at 50% or lower:

- “Roughly 75% of all courses are taught by full-time faculty....We try never to exceed 50% of credit hours taught in any area by adjuncts.”
- “[____] full-time faculty teach [more than] 70% of all classes.
- “Based on contact hours, 52% of our contact hours are taught by full-time faculty and 48% by adjunct faculty.”

(See Chapter 4 for a complete list of comments.)

These three comments suggested that a clearly defined policy for employment ratio for full-time to part-time faculty by SACS could help these administrators in their efforts to ensure their institutions’ missions are achieved instead of the ambiguous “critical mass” of full-time faculty now required (SACS, 2012c, p. 22).

Recommendation 4. As policy, SACS should require the institutions it governs to submit plans for part-time faculty’s participation in their institutions’ governance. As reported in

Chapter 2 of this study, SACS makes no differences between qualifications required for full-time and part-time faculty. As stated in SACS' *Principles of Accreditation*, Section 3.7.5 "Faculty Guidelines" (2012b), "The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters" (p. 31). However, SACS does not offer a clear direction in this policy for institutions to follow.

Kezar and Sam (2010a) suggested that it is the "professional right" of part-time faculty to participate in governance, and if institutions do not include them, it jeopardizes the missions of the institutions because non-tenure-track faculty members are being hired in greater numbers than tenure-track faculty, also replacing retiring faculty, on campuses across the nation. Also, Kezar and Sam determined that to exclude them from governance will eventually silence the faculty voice (2010a, p. 90). Lyons (2007) insisted that it is imperative that instructional leaders focus on the potential of increased contribution of part-time faculty in strategic planning for institutional effectiveness. Cohen and Brawer (2008) concluded that if part-time faculty members at associate's colleges are included in every aspect of faculty functioning, a professional community could arise, but if they are not, the "community" cannot exist (p. 459).

This study offered an opportunity for CIOs at 256 SACS-accredited associate's colleges to reply to the level of difficulty when including part-time faculty in institutional governance. Based on percentages for all associate's college types, a minimum of 50% of CIOs experienced moderate to strong difficulty including part-time faculty in the governance of their institutions (see Table 44). As examples, rural-serving small associate's colleges' CIOs reported 78.6% moderate to very difficult involving part-time faculty in their institutions' governance, followed by rural-serving medium with 71.8%, urban-serving multi-campus with 69.3%, and rural-serving large with 66.6%. Clearly, the CIOs of SACS-accredited institutions across associate's college

types have difficulty involving part-time faculty and, therefore, need clear guidelines and specific strategies to improve the level of part-time faculty participation in institutional governance.

Table 44

Percentages for Questionnaire Item 33 under Data Form Part II

Question 33: Including part-time faculty in institutional governance is ...					
	<i>n</i>	Percent			
		ND	SLD	MD	VD
Rural-serving					
Small	14	7.1	14.3	42.9	35.7
Medium	46	6.5	21.7	34.8	37.0
Large	15	6.7	26.7	13.3	53.3
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	6	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7
Multi-campus	5	0.0	40.0	0.0	60.0
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Multi-campus	13	0.0	28.6	46.2	23.1
2-year under 4-year	2	0.0	0.0	100	0.0
Total	104				
Response Categories:					
1= ND not difficult			3= MD moderately difficult		
2= SLD slightly difficult			4= VD very difficult		

Recommendations for Future Research

Recommendation 5. This study revealed that STEM disciplines present even more challenges than other disciplines for hiring part-time faculty across college types, and even more severe shortages exist for rural colleges in the SACS region. Therefore, it would be interesting to replicate this section of the research, Data Form Part I, at all six accrediting agencies,

including NCA, since discipline-specific questionnaire items were added to Yackee's original survey. Future research would also need to include all associate's college types based on the type of control, geographic location, and size. It would also be interesting to investigate whether the type of control (i.e., public, private, or special use/federally chartered) would produce statistically significant outcomes for SACS-accredited associate's colleges since this research was limited to public institutions.

The funding for future research could be sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF). In fact, the NSF states that "With an emphasis on two-year colleges, the Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program focuses on the education of technicians for the high-technology fields that drive our nation's economy" (NSF, 2013). In addition, the program involves partnerships between academic institutions and employers to promote improvement in the education of science and engineering technicians at the undergraduate level. The ATE also supports curriculum development, professional development, and invites proposals focusing on research to advance the knowledge base related to technician education.

Recommendation 6. This survey of CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges revealed that providing professional development opportunities is challenging for all college types. Based on the questionnaire items from Data Form Part I and qualitative question item 20 comments, CIOs are challenged to provide meaningful professional development opportunities because part-time faculty members usually work other jobs during daytime hours and cannot participate with full-time faculty activities. The study done by the American Federation of Teachers (2010) also supported the fact that part-time faculty themselves realized that they needed more professional development (AFT, 2010, p. 15). One CIO in this study remarked,

“Although faculty may be experts in their field, most do not have any understanding of pedagogy so their actual skills as a teacher need to be developed.” Another CIO added, “Other needed resources... [are] to send faculty to professional development or bring it in. Having employees to present development, orientations, and teach faculty the updates and use of technology [are] all challenging, to say the least.” Finally, a CIO from a rural medium institution commented on the financial challenge of providing professional development:

We want [part-time faculty] to come to division meeting and/or professional development activities, but we don't pay them to do so. And, with the new regulations apparently coming from the IRS, if we go above a certain level of hours per week, we may be forced to give them healthcare benefits per the new law.
(See Chapter 4 for a complete list of comments for questionnaire item 20.)

A lack of funding for professional development across all college types was recorded by Rankin's (2008) research and is supported by this study's qualitative responses from CIOs at SACS-accredited associate's colleges.

Therefore, since faculty development remains a challenge across associate college types, it is recommended that more research is needed on cost-effective approaches for providing professional development, especially for financially burdened two-year colleges (Bradbury, 2007; Wallin, 2007). In addition, Yee (2007) suggested that colleges could affordably provide faculty development through online delivery because two-year colleges have already allocated funds to provide for distance education. Yee argued that providing faculty development online, as a part of a multiple opportunity plan, would allow part-time faculty members to work at their convenience and use the site as an ongoing faculty resource. As presented in the qualitative data of this study, time is a major theme because most part-time faculty members work at other jobs during the daytime hours when most faculty development takes place. Finally, because STEM discipline professional development creates such a great need across college types for hiring

part-time faculty, the ATE, a program of the NSF, provides grants to promote professional development in technology and science. According to their website, out of the 40,000 grant proposals submitted to the NSF each year for research, approximately 11,000 are funded (NSF, 2013). Based on these results, grants could be submitted to the ATE and funding possibly procured for future research regarding part-time faculty training and STEM disciplines.

Recommendation 7. This study revealed that CIOs are aware of the working conditions and minimal compensation of part-time faculty. In questionnaire item 52 under Data Form Part IV, CIOs were asked whether their institutions provided office space for part-time faculty, and 78% of them answered *Yes* while the remaining 22% who answered *No* were allowed to voice their concerns over lack of or shared office space in questionnaire item 54 under Data Form Part IV. Also, questionnaire item 53 asked CIOs if their part-time faculty were required to hold office hours, and 40% responded *Yes*. One CIO from an urban institution replied, “My institution does employ a small number of part-time faculty who are required to keep office hours, in exchange for higher pay per credit hour for the additional work.” Another CIO from a rural small institution remarked, “We provide office space for those part-time faculty who consistently teach for us and who teach several courses each term.” Still another rural medium CIO stated, “We offer some office space but not for all.” The office space and office hours comments from the CIOs vary just as the institutions they serve. However, a recurring theme from this qualitative response is that their efforts to provide office space are not always rewarded with private space for part-time faculty to meet with their students because of facilities and fluctuation in the number of part-time faculty employed per term. (See Chapter 4 for a complete list of comments under questionnaire item 54.)

More research needs to be done which focuses on the specifics of improving working conditions for part-time faculty across associate's college types. A specific study could be designed for future research to incorporate qualitative questions concerning funding for facilities for dealing with fluctuating enrollment and, therefore, the inconsistent number of part-time faculty needed for each term. Also, institutions themselves should examine the availability of office space at their institutions in order to improve the inclusion of part-time faculty into their own communities (Cohen & Brawer, 2008) and to improve the status of part-time faculty in the eyes of their students and full-time faculty (Lyons, 2007; Yee, 2007; Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1995; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Recommendation 8. This study revealed that new research should focus on the impact of funding and the pressure it places on associate's colleges to hire increasing numbers of part-time faculty. Much work has been done on the increases in the use of part-time faculty (AFT, 2012; CAW, 2012; Charlier, 2010; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009; NCES, 2008; Benjamin, 2003, 2002) and funding for community colleges (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012, Roessler, Katsinas, & Hardy, 2006), yet combining the two issues which all types of associate's colleges face in this financial climate could reveal new data for use when appealing to legislative bodies for funding. Comments from this survey revealed that CIOs are extremely concerned about their ability to be competitive with the salaries they are able to offer part-time faculty. Overwhelmingly, they feel that they cannot compete with other colleges and industries when trying to attract them for high-tech positions, such as STEM disciplines.

It would be interesting for future research, focusing on funding and the use of part-time faculty, to design a survey which incorporates the differences based on 2010 Carnegie Basic

Classification of Associate's Colleges. Part of the study could include a historical timeline of these financial fluctuations and the increasing use of part-time faculty.

Recommendation 9. It is recommended that further study needs to be done to investigate the relationship of size and the influences for employing and utilizing part-time faculty within rural small, medium, and large associate's colleges. This study was limited to public SACS-accredited CIO perceptions of 78 rural associate's colleges. With only 15 CIOs each to represent rural small and rural large institutions, further study could result in significant differences if the number of CIOs was expanded to include all rural associate's colleges in the nation.

This study could be sponsored as a political statement by the AACC or the Rural Community College Alliance in order to solicit changes in the current funding strategies and a voice in national policy. This study could also be expanded to include the accreditation section and be funded by the accrediting agencies themselves. This could allow the six regional governing bodies to demonstrate that they are concerned with the challenges or lack of challenges which rural associate's colleges have with their own accreditation criteria, satisfying external constituents who are pressuring them for tougher and/or consistent standards nationwide.

Concluding Remarks

In the end, the six higher education accreditors are responsible for measuring the quality and effectiveness of instruction delivered at member institutions, yet this regional system of voluntary accreditation for colleges and universities is frequently attacked for being ambiguous in their standards on the topic of the percentage of part-time faculty which are adequate to achieve the missions of the institutions they represent (Henry, 2008; Costanzo, 2007; Leatherman, 1997). However, it is ultimately the responsibility of the institutions themselves to determine the appropriate balance between full-time and part-time faculty (Benjamin, 2003; Cross & Goldenberg, 2002). Forces such as record enrollments and decreasing federal and state appropriations are driving change in all of higher education (CAW, 2012; Rosser, 2012), yet they are particularly pronounced and devastating for associate's colleges across the country (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012; Katsinas, D'Amico, & Freidel, 2011; Katsinas & Freidel, 2010). The percentage of part-time faculty members which these institutions are employing has reached 68% (AACC, 2012).

A lack of funding to support the extraordinary missions of associate's colleges is indicative across associate's college types. Many of the CIO comments for the qualitative questions in this study referred to the fact that associate's colleges need to stay competitive: in offering more pay for part-time faculty, in providing professional development opportunities, in recruiting part-time faculty to teach in distance education and STEM disciplines, and in balancing of the budgets of their institutions. It seems that associate's colleges, rural community colleges alone serving 3.5 million students, have become as "invisible" to lawmakers (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012) as part-time faculty were until Gappa and Leslie's (1993) monumental work *The Invisible Faculty* was published.

REFERENCES

- Adamowicz, C. (2007, November). On adjunct labor and community colleges. *Academe*, 93(6), 24-27. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2011). *2011 community colleges: Fast facts*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2012a). *2012 community colleges: Fast facts*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2012b). *Reclaiming the American dream: Community colleges and the nation's future*. A report from the 21st-century commission on the future of community colleges. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/21stcenturyreport/index.html>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (January 2012). *A higher education policy brief: Top 10 higher education state policy issues for 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.aascu.org/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=5142>
- American Federation of Teachers. (2010). *American academic: A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.
- Antony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 41-56.
- Babbie, E. (1992). *The practice of social research* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Banachowski, G. (1997). Advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time faculty in community colleges. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (ED 405 037).
- Bartlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J. W., & Higgins, C. C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Informational Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19(1), 43-50.
- Benjamin, E. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Peer Review*, 5(1), 4-10.

- Benjamin, E. (2003). Reappraisal and implications for policy and research. *New Directions in Higher Education*, 123, 79-113.
- Bettinger, E. P., & Long, B. T. (August 2010). Does cheaper mean better? The impact of using adjunct instructors on student outcomes. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(3), 598-613.
- Bradley, G. (2007, March 13). How to help adjuncts. *Inside Higher Ed*, n.p. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/03/13/bradley>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2005a). *Basic classification methodology*. Retrieved from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/methodology/basic.php>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2005b). *New basic classification press release*. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/press-releases/carnegie-releases-new-classifications-higher-education-institutions>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006a). *Basic classification description*. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/sub.asp?key=791>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006b). *Basic classification technical details*. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=798>
- Charlier, H. D. (2010). *The attraction of adjunct faculty to rural community colleges*. Ph.D. dissertation, Old Dominion University, United States -- Virginia. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 407041).
- Charlier, H. D., & Williams, M. R. (2011). The reliance on and demand for adjunct faculty members in America's rural, suburban, and urban community colleges. *Community College Review*, 39(2), 160-180. doi: 10.1177/0091552111405839
- Christensen, C. (2008). The employment of part-time faculty at community colleges. *New Directions in Higher Education*, 143, 29-36.
- Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (June 2012). *A portrait of part-time faculty members: A summary of findings on part-time faculty respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce survey of contingent faculty members and instructors*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicworkforce.org/survey.html>
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.) New York: Wiley.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college*. 5th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Colgate University (2013). Department of Mathematics. Assumptions of ANOVA. Retrieved from <http://math.colgate.edu/math102/Common/examples/ANOVA/anovahyp.html>
- Costanzo, R., et al. (2007). Part-time faculty: A look at data and Issues. *NEA Update*, 11(3), 1-12.
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2013). *Directory of regional accrediting agencies*. Retrieved from <http://www.chea.org/Directories/regional.asp>
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2010). *Recognition and policy*. Retrieved from http://www.chea.org/pdf/Recognition_Policy-June_28_2010-FINAL.pdf
- Cross, J. G., and Goldenberg, E. N. (2002). Why hire non-tenure-track faculty? *Peer Review*, 5(1), 25-30.
- Cross, J. G., and Goldenberg, E. N. (2003). How does university decision making shape the faculty? *New Directions in Higher Education*, 123, 49-59.
- Cross, J. G., and Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). *Off-track profs: Nontenured teachers in higher education*. Cambridge, MA; MIT Press.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New Jersey: Wiley and Sons.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. 2nd ed. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley and Sons.
- Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. 2nd ed. 2007 Update with new internet, visual and mixed-mode guide. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley and Sons.
- Eagan, K. (2007). A national picture of part-time community college faculty: Changing trends in demographics and employment characteristics. *New Directions in Community Colleges*, 140, 5-14.
- Eagan, M. K., and Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, 168-188.
- Eells, W. C. (1931). *The junior college*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2003) *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (1999). *Applying educational research: A practical guide* (4th ed.) New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.) Boston: Pearson Education.
- Gappa, J. (1984). *Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report no. 3. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Gappa, J., and Leslie, D. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gordon, M. (2002). Part-time faculty in community colleges: The jury is still out. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (ED 472 020).
- Hardy, D. E. (2005). *A two-year college typology for the 21st century: Updating and utilizing the Katsinas-Lacey classification system*. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton, TX.
- Hardy, D. E., & Katsinas, S. G. (2006). Using community college classifications in research: From conceptual model to useful tool. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30: 339-358.
- Hardy, D. E., & Laanan, F. S. (2006). Characteristics and perspectives of faculty at public 2-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 30(10), 787-811.
- Henry, E. (2008). Looking the other way? Accreditation standards and part-time faculty. *Academe*, 94(2). Retrieved from <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.libdata.lib.ua.edu>
- Jacoby, D. (2006). The effects of part-time faculty employment upon community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 1081-1103.
- Jaeger, A. J. & Eagan, M. K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. [Report]. *Community College Review*. North Carolina State University, Department of Adult & Community College Education. 2009. *HighBeam Research*. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com>
- Jaschik, S. (2006, October 16). Adjuncts and graduation rates. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2006/10/16/parttime>
- Johnson, I. Y. (2005). *Examining part-time faculty utilization and its impact on student retention at a public research university*. Scholarly paper presentation. Track 4: Institutional Management and Planning. Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN.
- Katsinas, S. G. (1993). *Toward a classification system for community colleges*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Universities and Colleges, Portland, OR.

- Katsinas, S. G. (2003, Summer). Two-year college classifications based on institutional control, geography, governance, and size. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (122). Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
- Katsinas, S. G. (2007, October 26). Rural community colleges are the land-grant institutions of this century. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(9). Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com.libdata.lib.ua.edu/article/Rural-Community-Colleges-Ar/25806/>
- Katsinas, S. G., Alexander, F. K. & Opp, R. D. (2003). *Preserving access with excellence: Financing for rural community colleges* (Rural Community College Initiative Policy Paper). Chapel Hill, NC: MDC.
- Katsinas, S. G., & Moeck, P. (2002). The digital divide and rural community colleges: Problems and prospects. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(3), 207-224.
- Katsinas, S. G., Palmer, J. C., & Tollefson, T. A. (2004, October 26). *State funding for community colleges: Perceptions from the field*. Washington, DC: National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges.
- Katsinas, S. G., Tollefson, T. A., & Reamey, B. A. (2008). *Funding issues in U. S. community colleges: Findings from a 2007 Survey of State Directors of Community Colleges* [Report]. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Katsinas, S. G., & Freidel, J. N. (2010). *Uncertain recovery: Access and finance issues in public higher education. The 2010 survey of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama. Retrieved from http://uaedpolicy.weebly.com/uploads/6/1/7/1/6171842/2010_directors_survey.pdf
- Katsinas, S. G., D'Amico, M. M., & Freidel, J. N. (2011, September 15). *Access and funding in public higher education—the 2011 national survey; students, workers, and access colleges squeezed*. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: Education Policy Center, The University of Alabama. Retrieved from http://uaedpolicy.weebly.com/uploads/6/1/7/1/6171842/the_2011_state_survey.pdf
- Katsinas, S. G., & Hardy, D. (2012). Chapter 10. Rural community colleges—Promoting access and building sustainable regional rural innovation. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Vol. 27. Eds. John C. Smart and Michael B. Paulsen. New York: Springer. 453-520.
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010a). Beyond contracts: Non-tenure track faculty and campus governance. *The NEA 2010 Almanac of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/img/PubAlmanac/KezarSam_2010.pdf
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010b). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education. *ASHE*, 36(4). Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

- Kuh, G. D., Nelson, T. F., & Umbach, P. D. (2004). Aligning faculty activities. *Liberal Education, 90*(4), pp. 24-31.
- Landrum, R. E. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty? *College Teaching, 57*(1), 23-6. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Leatherman, C. (1997). Do accreditors look the other way when colleges rely on part-timers? Adjuncts say agencies ignore their own rules about the need for full-time faculty members. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 44*(11), A12-A14. Retrieved from Research Library. (Document ID: 22094013).
- Leslie, D. W., & Gappa, J. M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. *New Directions for Community Colleges, summer*(118), 59-67. Levin, J. S. (2007). Multiple judgments: Institutional context and part-time faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 140*, 15-20.
- Lurie, Maxine N. (2003). *Major problems result from the growing use of part-time and adjunct faculty*. Organization of American Historians. Retrieved from <http://www.oah.org/pubs/nl/2003feb/lurie.html>
- Lyons, R. E. (1996). *A study of the effects of a mentoring initiative on the performance of new, adjunct community college faculty*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida.
- Lyons, R. E. (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Lyons, R. E., & Burnstad, H. (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Paper presented at The Chair Academy 2007 Conference. Retrieved from http://chairacademy.com/conference/2007/papers/best_practices_for_supporting_adjunct_faculty.pdf
- McCormick, A. C., & Zhao, C. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. *Change, 37*(5), 51-57.
- Mesa Community College (2013). Assumptions of ANOVA. Retrieved from http://www.mesacc.edu/~derdy61351/230_web_book/module4/anova/index.html
- Miller, J. (1998). *A centennial history of the southern association of colleges and schools: 1895-1995*. Decatur, GA: The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
- Monks, J. (2007). The relative earnings of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education. *Journal of Labor Research, 28*, 487-501.
- Murray, J. P. (2002a). Faculty development in SACS-accredited community colleges. *Community College Review, 29*(4), 50-66.

- Murray, J. P. (2002b). The current state of faculty development in two-year colleges. In C. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges. New Directions for Community Colleges, Summer*(118), 89-97.
- Murray, J. P. (2010). Preparing to Hire the Best in the Perfect Storm. *New Directions For Community Colleges*, (152), 5-14.
- Palmer, J. C. (2002). Disciplinary variations in the work of full-time faculty members. In C. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges. New Directions for Community Colleges, Summer*(118), 9-19.
- Pearch, W. J. & Marutz, L. (2005, April 1). Retention of adjunct faculty in community colleges. *The Community College Enterprise*. Schoolcraft College. 2005. *HighBeam Research*. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com>
- Qualtrics (2013). *Questionnaire sequence, flow, and style*. Retrieved from <http://www.qualtrics.com/university/researchsuite/research-resources/survey-basics/questionnaire-sequence-flow-and-style/>
- Rankin, K. R. (2008). *Perceptions of institutional chief executive officers and chief academic officers of community colleges regarding issues, problems, and challenges related to economic and community development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL.
- Roessler, B. C., Katsinas, S. G., & Hardy, D. E. (2006). *The downward spiral of state funding for community colleges, and its impact on rural community colleges*. Partnership Brief for the Midsouth Partnership for Rural Community Colleges.
- Rosser, V. J. (2012). How did you hear that you might lose your job? *The NEA 2012 Almanac of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/_2012_Almanac_Rosser_final.pdf
- Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1995). *Strangers in their own land*. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2004). *Principles of accreditation: Core requirements*. Retrieved from <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/PrinciplesOfAccreditation.PDF>
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2006). *Principles of accreditation: Faculty credentials*. Retrieved from <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/faculty%20credentials.pdf>
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2010). *Principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement*. Retrieved from <http://sacscoc.org/pdf/2010principlesofacreditation.pdf>

- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2012a). *Accreditation procedures for applicant institutions: Policy statement*. Retrieved from <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Accreditation%20Procedures.pdf>
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2012b). *Principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement*. Retrieved from <http://sacscoc.org/pdf/2012principlesofaccreditation.pdf>
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2012c). *Resource manual for the principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement*. Retrieved from <http://sacscoc.org/pdf/ResourceManual.pdf>
- Schmidt, P. (2012, March 25). Accreditation is eyed as means to aid adjuncts. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Accreditation-Is-Eyed-as-a/131292/?sid=cc&utm_source=cc&utm...
- Stephens, A. R., & Wright, S. (1999). The part-time paradox. *Community College Week*, 11(13), 6-10.
- Stone, Philip. *2007-2008 Annual Report and Proceedings*. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Retrieved from <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/Annual%20Reports/AnnualReport2007-2008.pdf>
- The National Science Foundation (2013). Division of Undergraduate Education. Advanced Technological Education (ATE). Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5464&org=NSF
- Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 91-123.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2008). *Persons 25 years old and over with bachelor's degree or more*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/ranks/rank19.html>
- U. S. Department of Education (2002). National Center for Education Statistics. *Statistical Analysis Report, March 2002: Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think?* Retrieved from <http://www.nces.ed.gov>
- U. S. Department of Education (2005). National Center for Education Statistics, 2005-06. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2008/analysis/sa02f.asp>
- U. S. Department of Education (2008). National Center for Education Statistics. *Special analysis 2008: Community colleges*. Retrieved from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2008/analysis/sa02f.asp>

- U. S. Department of Education (2008). National Center for Education Statistics. *The Conditions of Education. Closer Look 2008: Community College*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/analysis/2008-sa02f.asp#info>
- Wallin, D. L. (2005). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Wallin, D. L. (2007). Part-time faculty and professional development: Notes from the field. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 140, 67-73.
- Weispfenning, J. (2000). *Department Strategies for avoiding the abuse of part-time instructors*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (86th, Seattle, WA, Nov. 9-12).
- Yackee, G. B. (2000). *Perceptions of chief instructional officers at community colleges regarding the employment and utilization of part-time faculty*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo, Toledo, OH.
- Yee, K. (2007). Ensuring an effective start for adjunct faculty: Orientation with multiple options. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty* (pp. 10-24). Boston, MA: Anker Publishing, Inc.

Appendix A

SACS INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED

SACS Level I Institutions by State

Carnegie Public Associate's

Alabama

1. Alabama Southern Community College	RS
2. Beville State Community College	RM
3. Bishop State Community College	U-MC
4. Calhoun Community College	RL
5. Central Alabama Community College	RM
6. Chattahoochee Valley Community College	RM
7. Enterprise State Community College	RM
8. James H. Faulkner State Community College	S-MC
9. Gadsden State Community College	RL
10. George C. Wallace Community College	RM
11. George Corley Wallace State Community College	RM
12. Jefferson Davis Community College	RS
13. Jefferson State Community College	U-MC
14. Lurleen B. Wallace Community College	RS
15. Marion Military Institute	RS
16. Northeast Alabama Community College	RM
17. Northwest-Shoals Community College	RM
18. Shelton State Community College	RL
19. Snead State Community College	RM
20. Southern Union State Community College	RM
21. T. A. Lawson State Community College	U-MC
22. Wallace State Community College	RM

Florida

23. Brevard Community College	RL
24. Florida Keys Community College	RS
25. Hillsborough Community College	U-MC
26. North Florida Community College	RS
27. Pasco-Hernando Community College	S-MC
28. Tallahassee Community College	RL

Georgia

29. Albany Technical College	RM
30. Athens Technical College	RM
31. Atlanta Technical College	U-SC
32. Augusta Technical College	RM
33. Bainbridge College	RM

Appendix A

34. Central Georgia Technical College	RL
35. Chattahoochee Technical College	S-SC
36. Columbus Technical College	RM
37. Georgia Northwestern Technical College	RM
38. Georgia Perimeter College	S-MC
39. Gwinnett Technical College	S-SC
40. Middle Georgia Technical College	RM
41. Savannah Technical College	RM
42. South Georgia Technical College	RS
43. Southwest Georgia Technical College	RS
44. Waycross College	RS
45. West Georgia Technical College	S-SC

Kentucky

46. Ashland Community and Technical College	RM
47. Big Sandy Community and Technical College	RM
48. Bluegrass Community and Technical College	RL
49. Bowling Green Technical College	RM
50. Elizabethtown Community and Technical College	RM
51. Gateway Community and Technical College	S-MC
52. Hazard Community and Technical College	RM
53. Henderson Community College	RM
54. Hopkinsville Community College	RM
55. Jefferson Community and Technical College	U-MC
56. Madisonville Community College	RM
57. Maysville Community and Technical College	RM
58. Owensboro Community and Technical College	RM
59. Somerset Community College	RL
60. Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College	RM
61. West Kentucky Community and Technical College	RL

Louisiana

62. Baton Rouge Community College	U-SC
63. Bossier Parish Community College	RM
64. Delgado Community College	U-MC
65. L. E. Fletcher Technical Community College	U-MC
66. Louisiana Delta Community College	RS
67. Louisiana State University at Eunice	2 under 4
68. Elaine P. Nunez Community College	S-SC
69. River Parishes Community College	S-SC
70. South Louisiana Community College	RM
71. Southern University at Shreveport	2 under 4

Appendix A

Mississippi

72. Coahoma Community College	RS
73. Copiah-Lincoln Community College	RM
74. East Central Community College	RM
75. East Mississippi Community College	RM
76. Hinds Community College	RL
77. Holmes Community College	RL
78. Itawamba Community College	RM
79. Jones County Junior College	RM
80. Meridian Community College	RM
81. Mississippi Delta Community College	RM
82. Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College	RL
83. Northeast Mississippi Community College	RM
84. Northwest Mississippi Community College	RL
85. Pearl River Community College	RM
86. Southwest Mississippi Community College	RS

North Carolina

87. Alamance Community College	S-MC
88. Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College	RL
89. Beaufort County Community College	RS
90. Bladen Community College	RS
91. Blue Ridge Community College	RM
92. Brunswick Community College	RS
93. Caldwell Community College	RM
94. Cape Fear Community College	RL
95. Carteret Community College	RS
96. Catawba Valley Community College	RM
97. Central Carolina Community College	RM
98. Central Piedmont Community College	U-MC
99. Cleveland Community College	RM
100. Coastal Carolina Community College	RM
101. College of The Albemarie	RM
102. Craven Community College	RM
103. Davidson County Community College	S-SC
104. Durham Technical Community College	U-SC
105. Edgecombe Community College	RM
106. Fayetteville Technical Community College	RL
107. Forsyth Technical Community College	U-SC
108. Gaston College	S-SC
109. Guilford Technical Community College	S-MC
110. Halifax Community College	RS
111. Haywood Community College	RM
112. Isothermal Community College	RM

Appendix A

113. James Sprunt Community College	RS
114. Johnston Community College	S-SC
115. Lenoir Community College	RM
116. Martin Community College	RS
117. Mayland Community College	RS
118. McDowell Technical Community College	RS
119. Mitchell Community College	RM
120. Montgomery Community College	RS
121. Nash Community College	RM
122. Pamlico Community College	RS
123. Piedmont Community College	RM
124. Pitt Community College	RL
125. Randolph Community College	S-SC
126. Richmond Community College	RS
127. Roanoke-Chowan Community College	RS
128. Robeson Community College	RM
129. Rockingham Community College	RM
130. Rowan-Cabarrus Community College	S-MC
131. Sampson Community College	RS
132. Sandhills Community College	RM
133. South Piedmont Community College	RM
134. Southeastern Community College	RM
135. Southwestern Community College	RM
136. Stanly Community College	RM
137. Surry Community College	RM
138. Tri-County Community College	RS
139. Vance Granville Community College	RM
140. Wake Technical Community College	U-MC
141. Wayne Community College	RM
142. Western Piedmont Community College	RM
143. Wilkes Community College	RM
144. Wilson Community College	RM

South Carolina

145. Aiken Technical College	RM
146. Central Carolina Technical College	RM
147. Denmark Technical College	RS
148. Florence-Darlington Technical College	RM
149. Greenville Technical College	U-MC
150. Horry-Georgetown Technical College	RM
151. Midlands Technical College	U-MC
152. Northeastern Technical College	RS
153. Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College	RM
154. Piedmont Technical College	RM
155. Spartanburg Community College	U-SC

Appendix A

156. Technical College of the Lowcountry	RM
157. Tri-County Technical College	S-SC
158. Trident Technical College	U-MC
159. Williamsburg Technical College	RS
160. York Technical College	S-SC

Tennessee

161. Chattanooga State Community College	RL
162. Cleveland State Community College	RM
163. Columbia State Community College	RM
164. Dyersburg State Community College	RM
165. Jackson State Community College	RM
166. Motlow State Community College	RM
167. Nashville State Community College	U-MC
168. Northeast State Community College	RM
169. Pellissippi State Community College	U-MC
170. Roane State Community College	RM
171. Southwest Tennessee Community College	U-MC
172. Volunteer State Community College	S-SC
173. Walters State Community College	RL

Texas

174. Alvin Community College	RL
175. Amarillo College	RL
176. Angelina College	RM
177. Austin Community College	U-MC
178. Blinn College	RL
179. Brookhaven College	U-MC
180. Cedar Valley College	U-MC
181. Cisco College	RM
182. Clarendon College	RS
183. Coastal Bend College	RM
184. College of the Mainland	RM
185. Collin County Community College	S-MC
186. Del Mar College	RL
187. Eastfield College	U-MC
188. El Centro College	U-MC
189. El Paso County Community College	U-MC
190. Frank Phillips College	RS
191. Galveston College	RM
192. Grayson College	RM
193. Hill College	RM
194. Houston Community College	U-MC
195. Howard College	RM

Appendix A

196. Kilegore College	RM
197. Lamar Institute of Technology	S-SC
198. Lamar State College—Orange	RM
199. Lamar State College—Port Arthur	RM
200. Laredo Community College	RL
201. Lee College	S-MC
202. Lone Star College System	S-MC
203. Mountain View College	U-MC
204. Navarro College	RL
205. North Central Texas College	RL
206. North Lake College	U-MC
207. Northeast Texas Community College	RM
208. Northwest Vista College	U-MC
209. Odessa College	RM
210. Palo Alto College	U-MC
211. Panola College	RM
212. Paris Junior College	RM
213. Ranger College	RS
214. Richland College	U-MC
215. Saint Philip's College	U-MC
216. San Antonio College	U-MC
217. South Plains College	RL
218. Southwest Texas Junior College	RM
219. Tarrant County College District	U-MC
220. Temple College	RM
221. Texarkana College	RM
222. Texas State Technical College—Harlingen	RM
223. Texas State Technical College—Marshall	RS
224. Texas State Technical College—Waco	RM
225. Texas State Technical College—West Texas	RS
226. Trinity Valley Community College	S-MC
227. Tyler Junior College	RL
228. Vernon College	RM
229. Victoria College	RM
230. Weatherford College	S-SC
231. Western Texas College	RM
232. Wharton County Junior College	RL

Virginia

233. Blue Ridge Community College	RM
234. Central Virginia Community College	RM
235. Dabney S. Lancaster Community College	RS
236. Danville Community College	RM
237. Eastern Shore Community College	RS
238. Germanna Community College	RM

Appendix A

239. J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	U-MC
240. John Tyler Community College	S-MC
241. Lord Fairfax Community College	RL
242. Mountain Empire Community College	RM
243. New River Community College	RM
244. Northern Virginia Community College	S-MC
245. Patrick Henry Community College	RM
246. Paul D. Camp Community College	RS
247. Piedmont Virginia Community College	RM
248. Rappahannock Community College	S-MC
249. Richard Bland College	2 under 4
250. Southside Virginia Community College	RL
251. Southwest Virginia Community College	RM
252. Thomas Nelson Community College	S-SC
253. Tidewater Community College	S-SC
254. Virginia Highlands Community College	RM
255. Virginia Western Community College	RL
256. Wytheville Community College	RM

Sources: SACS Level I colleges and Carnegie Basic Classification of Associate's Colleges

Abbreviations:

RS= Rural Small

RM= Rural Medium

RL= Rural Large

S-SC= Suburban Single Campus

S-MC= Suburban Multi-campus

U-SC= Urban Single Campus

U-MC= Urban Multi-campus

2under4= 2-year under 4-year

Appendix B

DATA FORM—Part I

Employing Part-Time Faculty: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty. (Choose one response for each item.)

1. Recruiting part-time faculty is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
2. Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning (Distance Education) is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
3. Selecting/hiring part-time faculty is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
4. Hiring part-time faculty in Developmental Studies is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
5. Hiring part-time faculty in Fine Arts is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
6. Hiring part-time faculty in English is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
7. Hiring part-time faculty in Mathematics is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
8. Hiring part-time faculty in Science is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
9. Hiring part-time faculty in Computer Science is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge
10. Hiring part-time faculty in Health Science is ...
not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

Appendix B

11. Hiring part-time faculty in Social Science is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

12. Hiring part-time faculty in a technical field (e.g., engineering) is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

13. Orientating part-time faculty is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

14. Supervising part-time faculty is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

15. Evaluating part-time faculty is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

16. Involving (e.g., curriculum development / governance) part-time faculty is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

17. Providing faculty development opportunities for part-time faculty is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

18. Monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty stay current in their discipline is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

19. Retaining part-time faculty is ...

not a challenge a slight challenge a moderate challenge a strong challenge

20. Please specify any additional challenges involving the employment of part-time faculty.

Appendix B

DATA FORM—PART II

Accreditation: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting the following SACS-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. (Choose one response for each item.)

21. Employing part-time faculty who have earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

22. Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

23. Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study (a minimum of 18 semester hours at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

24. Ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

25. Upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees, whether or not they possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

26. Ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the required degrees expected at your institution are nearing completion of these degrees, or, are with instructional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

27. Adopting criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty who require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

Appendix B

28. Implementing criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty who require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

29. Demonstrating a pattern that your institution is moving to improve its part-time faculty's qualifications as evidenced in recent changes (i.e., over the last three years) in the composition of the faculty is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

30. Employing a sufficient number of full-time faculty is...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

31. Employing at least one full-time faculty member for as many majors as your institution offers is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

32. Limiting your institution's program offering to those that it can adequately staff is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

33. Including part-time faculty in institutional governance is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

34. Including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational programs is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

35. Including part-time faculty in evaluation of the institution's educational programs is ...

not difficult slightly difficult moderately difficult very difficult

36. Please discuss any additional concerns or difficulties regarding part-time faculty and accreditation.

Appendix B

DATA FORM—PART III

Reasons for Employing Part-Time Faculty: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has your institution's (s') decision to employ part-time faculty. (Choose one response for each item.)

37. Affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments is ...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

38. Bringing professional expertise to the classroom is ...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

39. Bringing current experience to the classroom is ...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

40. Bringing practical experience to the classroom is ...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

41. Providing teaching experience to those who aspire to be full-time faculty members is...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

42. Saving on costs of faculty salaries is ...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

43. Saving on costs of faculty benefits (e.g., health insurance) is ...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

44. Employing part-time faculty as a vehicle to create and build new programs is...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

45. Taking part-time employment at your institution into consideration when hiring full-time faculty is...

not an influence a slight influence a moderate influence a strong influence

Appendix B

46. Please specify other considerations and the amount of influence regarding decisions to employ part-time faculty.

DATA FORM—PART IV

Other Information

47. Is your institution's full-time faculty represented by a collective bargaining unit?

_____yes _____no

48. Is your institution's part-time faculty represented by a collective bargaining unit?

_____yes _____no

49. Are part-time faculty and full-time faculty at your college represented by the *same* or *separate* bargaining unit(s)?

_____the same bargaining unit

_____separate bargaining unit

_____not applicable

50. How many full-time faculty members are employed at your institution?

51. How many part-time faculty members are employed at your institution?

52. Does your institution provide office space for part-time faculty?

_____yes _____no

Appendix B

53. Does your institution require part-time faculty to keep office hours?

_____yes

_____no

54. Please provide additional comments and/or suggestions.

Thank you. Your feedback and support for this research are greatly appreciated.
Copies of the final report are available upon request.

Charlotte Speer
Doctoral Student
The University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Appendix C

Dear Chief Instructional Officer:

My name is Charlotte Speer, a doctoral student from the University of Alabama, and I am conducting a survey called Changing Perceptions of Employment and Use of Part-time Faculty among Chief Instructional Officers at SACS-accredited, Public Associate's Colleges. The study will be supervised by Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas, Professor of Higher Education and Director Education Policy Center at the University of Alabama. Dr. Katsinas is also the past president of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges and is presently a consulting scholar for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

This study will focus on the changes in policy and perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) regarding employment and use of part-time faculty accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and examine the same implementation procedures, perceptions, and practices.

Since you have been identified as your institution's officer for faculty oversight, I am inviting you to take part in this study which involves completing a web survey link attached to this email address. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete and contains three sections: challenges, accreditation and implementation procedures, and reasons regarding the employment and use of part-time faculty.

We will protect your confidentiality by using only summarized data, according to Carnegie Classifications for Associate's Colleges, in presentations and publications. Only Dr. Katsinas and I will have access to the resulting data, which will be coded and categorized and will be password protected within Qualtrics, with IP addresses cleared once the survey is closed. There will be no monetary benefit to you; however, the findings should be useful to advance the knowledge of trends in higher education concerning part-time faculty employment and accreditation and implementation procedures for associate's colleges.

Your participation is completely voluntary, and the chief risk is comfort level, but you are free to skip any question you do not wish to answer or stop the survey at any time before you submit and still receive a summary of the results by request. If you have questions about this study, please contact me at 205-522-7352 or by email at charlotte.speer@yahoo.com. If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html, or by email at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

If you understand the statements above, are at least 19 years old, and freely consent to be in this study, click on the survey link to begin.

Appendix D

*Means and Standard Deviation by Carnegie Basic Classification of Public Associate's Colleges,
Data Form Part I (Questionnaire Items 1 through 20)*

Data Form Part I: Please indicate the amount of challenge posed to your institution(s) by each of the following activities related to employing part-time faculty. (Choose one response for each item.)

Response Category:

1= not a challenge

2= a slightly challenge

3= a moderate challenge

4= a strong challenge

Question 1: Recruiting part-time faculty is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.98	0.86	15	0	15
Medium	2.91	0.81	47	1	48
Large	2.93	0.80	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.96	0.81	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.98	0.85	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.96	0.82	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.92	0.81	106	1	107

Appendix D

Question 2: Finding part-time faculty well versed in technology-based teaching and learning (Distance Education) is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.21	0.82	15	0	15
Medium	3.11	0.87	48	0	48
Large	3.12	0.87	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.13	0.87	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.23	0.83	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.11	0.88	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Total	3.13	0.87	107	0	107

Question 3: Selecting hiring part-time faculty is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.70	0.86	15	0	15
Medium	2.64	0.87	47	1	48
Large	2.64	0.87	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.62	0.83	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.74	0.84	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.63	0.88	11	2	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.65	0.87	104	3	107

Appendix D

Question 4: Hiring part-time faculty in Developmental Studies is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.34	0.86	15	0	15
Medium	2.28	0.83	48	0	48
Large	2.30	0.83	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.25	0.83	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.37	0.85	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.30	0.81	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.30	0.84	106	1	107

Question 5: Hiring part-time faculty in Fine Arts is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.73	0.91	15	0	15
Medium	2.68	0.91	48	0	48
Large	2.67	0.91	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.64	1.00	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.76	0.92	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.67	0.90	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Total	2.69	0.91	106	1	107

Appendix D

Question 6: Hiring part-time faculty in English is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.34	0.91	15	0	15
Medium	2.26	0.93	48	0	48
Large	2.28	0.93	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.23	0.93	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.35	0.91	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.33	0.93	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	1.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.27	0.93	106	1	107

Question 7: Hiring part-time faculty in Mathematics is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.10	1.01	15	0	15
Medium	3.04	0.99	48	0	48
Large	3.06	0.99	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	1.06	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.11	1.01	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.09	0.99	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	3.06	0.99	106	1	107

Appendix D

Question 8: Hiring part-time faculty in Science is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.42	0.87	15	0	15
Medium	3.42	0.84	48	0	48
Large	3.43	0.85	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.34	0.88	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.43	0.88	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.41	0.84	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	4.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	3.42	0.84	106	1	107

Question 9: Hiring part-time faculty in Computer Science is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.09	0.85	15	0	15
Medium	3.02	0.84	47	1	48
Large	3.02	0.85	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.94	0.89	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.11	0.86	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.04	0.86	11	2	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	3.04	0.84	103	4	107

Appendix D

Question 10: Hiring part-time faculty in Health Science is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.15	0.88	15	0	15
Medium	3.18	0.87	47	1	48
Large	3.19	0.85	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.18	0.91	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.14	0.88	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.18	0.87	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	3.18	0.87	104	3	107

Question 11: Hiring part-time faculty in Social Science is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.30	0.83	15	0	15
Medium	2.27	0.86	48	0	48
Large	2.29	0.85	14	1	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.26	0.88	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.34	0.81	4	2	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	2.00	1	1	2
Multi-campus	2.33	0.85	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Total	2.28	0.86	103	4	107

Appendix D

Question 12: Hiring part-time faculty in a technical field (e.g., engineering) is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.61	0.61	15	0	15
Medium	3.52	0.66	46	2	48
Large	3.53	0.66	14	1	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.53	0.66	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.62	0.61	4	2	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.54	0.64	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	3.53	0.66	102	5	107

Question 13: Orienting part-time faculty is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.80	0.94	15	0	15
Medium	2.80	0.93	48	0	48
Large	2.81	0.94	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.81	0.92	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.80	0.95	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.80	0.95	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.81	0.93	107	0	107

Appendix D

Question 14: Supervising part-time faculty is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.67	0.78	15	0	15
Medium	2.66	0.82	48	0	48
Large	2.67	0.83	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.62	0.82	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.67	0.77	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.63	0.83	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.67	0.81	106	1	107

Question 15: Evaluating part-time faculty is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.52	0.87	15	0	15
Medium	2.52	0.99	48	0	48
Large	2.53	0.90	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.49	0.91	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.52	0.87	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.52	0.92	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.53	0.88	107	0	107

Appendix D

Question 16: Involving (e.g., curriculum development / governance) part-time faculty is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.23	0.84	15	0	15
Medium	3.15	0.88	48	0	48
Large	3.13	0.88	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.04	0.95	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.25	0.80	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	4.00	4.00	1	1	2
Multi-campus	3.09	0.90	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	3.15	0.87	105	2	107

Question 17: Providing faculty development opportunities is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.98	0.92	15	0	15
Medium	2.93	0.93	47	1	48
Large	2.94	0.94	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.84	0.91	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.99	0.92	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.91	0.92	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.93	0.92	106	1	107

Appendix D

Question 18: Monitoring the extent to which part-time faculty stay current in their discipline is

...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.06	0.84	15	0	15
Medium	2.99	0.86	48	0	48
Large	3.02	0.84	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.99	0.86	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.07	0.84	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.01	0.85	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	3.00	0.86	107	0	107

Question 19: Retaining part-time faculty is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.50	0.91	15	0	15
Medium	2.47	0.86	48	0	48
Large	2.45	0.85	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.43	0.88	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.53	0.90	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.45	0.84	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.49	0.86	107	0	107

Appendix D

Question 20: Please specify any additional challenges involving the employment of part-time faculty.

Type	<i>n</i>	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving		
Small	3	15
Medium	14	48
Large	7	15
Suburban-serving		
Single Campus	4	6
Multi-campus	2	6
Urban-serving		
Single Campus	1	2
Multi-campus	3	13
2-year under 4-year	1	2
Total	35	107

Appendix E

Means and Standard Deviation by Carnegie Basic Classification of Public Associate's Colleges, Data Form Part II (Questionnaire Items 21 through 36)

Data Form Part II: Please indicate the amount of difficulty your institution(s) experiences in meeting each of the following SACS-accreditation criteria regarding part-time faculty. (Choose one response for each item.)

Response Category:

1= not difficult

2= slightly difficult

3= moderately difficult

4= very difficult

Question 21: Employing part-time faculty who have earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.33	0.95	15	0	15
Medium	2.28	0.91	47	1	48
Large	2.30	0.91	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.31	0.89	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.34	0.95	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.33	0.92	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.30	0.84	106	1	107

Appendix E

Question 22: Ensuring that all or nearly all part-time faculty teaching transfer courses hold graduate degrees is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	1.98	0.88	15	0	15
Medium	1.93	0.88	47	1	48
Large	1.94	0.89	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	1.94	0.92	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.01	0.88	6	0	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	1.95	0.91	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	1.94	0.88	106	1	107

Question 23: Ensuring part-time faculty teaching general education courses hold graduate degrees that include substantial study (a minimum of 18 semester hours at the graduate level) appropriate to the academic field in which they teach is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.12	0.99	15	0	15
Medium	2.07	0.97	47	1	48
Large	2.08	0.98	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.04	0.93	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.14	0.98	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.10	0.98	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.09	0.97	105	2	107

Appendix E

Question 24: Ensuring that part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.33	1.02	15	0	15
Medium	2.26	1.00	45	3	48
Large	2.28	1.00	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.19	0.94	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.35	1.01	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.25	0.99	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.27	0.99	103	4	107

Question 25: Upgrading the academic credentials of part-time faculty who hold less than baccalaureate degrees, whether or not they possess special training, experience, creative production, or other accomplishments or distinctions that qualify them for their specific assignments is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.63	1.08	15	0	15
Medium	2.52	1.08	44	4	48
Large	2.52	1.09	14	1	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.60	1.07	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.63	1.08	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.55	1.10	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.52	1.09	100	7	107

Appendix E

Question 26: Ensuring that part-time faculty who do not hold the required degrees expected at your institution are nearing completion of these degrees, or, are with instructional encouragement and support, actively pursuing courses of study that will lead to these degrees within three to five years is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.41	1.13	15	0	15
Medium	2.30	1.16	43	5	48
Large	2.29	1.17	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.30	1.16	5	1	6
Multi-campus	2.43	1.12	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	2.12	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.28	1.18	11	2	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.31	1.15	98	9	107

Question 27: Adopting criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty who require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.01	0.93	14	1	15
Medium	1.97	0.94	46	2	48
Large	1.97	0.95	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	1.91	0.88	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.07	0.94	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	1.98	0.94	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	1.99	0.94	103	4	107

Appendix E

Question 28: Implementing criteria and processes for hiring and replacing part-time faculty who require possession of the degree typical for the level of instruction offered by your institution is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	1.95	0.89	15	0	15
Medium	1.92	0.89	46	2	48
Large	1.92	0.89	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	1.84	0.80	6	0	6
Multi-campus	1.93	0.89	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	1.92	0.89	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	1.92	0.89	104	3	107

Question 29: Demonstrating a pattern that your institution is moving to improve its part-time faculty's qualifications as evidenced in recent changes (i.e., over the last three years) in the composition of the faculty is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	1.94	0.91	15	0	15
Medium	1.89	0.91	46	2	48
Large	1.90	0.92	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	1.85	0.88	6	0	6
Multi-campus	1.94	0.91	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	1.00	3.00	1	1	2
Multi-campus	1.90	0.93	11	2	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	1.90	0.91	101	6	107

Appendix E

Question 30: Employing a sufficient number of full-time faculty is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.37	0.98	15	0	15
Medium	2.32	0.95	47	1	48
Large	2.32	0.96	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.32	0.96	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.37	0.98	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.34	0.97	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.31	0.95	105	2	107

Question 31: Employing at least one full-time faculty member for as many majors as your institution offers is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.06	0.96	15	0	15
Medium	2.09	0.94	47	1	48
Large	2.11	0.94	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.06	0.94	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.06	0.97	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.15	0.97	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.07	0.94	105	2	107

Appendix E

Question 32: Limiting your institution's program offering to those that it can adequately staff is

...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.22	0.95	15	0	15
Medium	2.19	0.89	46	2	48
Large	2.20	0.89	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.18	0.96	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.20	0.95	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.22	0.91	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.19	0.90	104	3	107

Question 33: Including part-time faculty in institutional governance is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.05	0.92	14	1	15
Medium	3.03	0.93	47	1	48
Large	3.04	0.94	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.94	0.94	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.04	0.92	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.01	0.94	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	3.02	0.92	104	3	107

Appendix E

Question 34: Including part-time faculty in developing the institution's educational programs is

...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.95	0.90	15	0	15
Medium	2.95	0.92	47	1	48
Large	2.94	0.92	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.90	0.93	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.94	0.90	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	1.41	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.93	0.93	13	0	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.94	0.92	105	2	107

Question 35: Including part-time faculty in evaluation of the institution's educational programs

...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.83	0.93	15	0	15
Medium	2.85	0.92	46	2	48
Large	2.86	0.93	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.78	0.91	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.81	0.93	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.85	0.92	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.84	0.92	103	4	107

Appendix E

Question 36: Please discuss any additional concerns or difficulties regarding part-time faculty and accreditation.

Type	<i>n</i>	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving		
Small	2	15
Medium	6	48
Large	2	15
Suburban-serving		
Single Campus	2	6
Multi-campus	1	6
Urban-serving		
Single Campus	1	2
Multi-campus	2	13
2-year under 4-year	0	2
Total	16	107

Appendix F

Means and Standard Deviation by Carnegie Basic Classification of Public Associate's Colleges, Data Form Part III (Questionnaire Items 37 through 46)

Data Form Part III: Reasons for Employing Part-Time Faculty: Please indicate the amount of influence each of the following reasons has your institution's (s') decision to employ part-time faculty. (Choose one response for each item.)

Response Category:

1= not an influence

2= a slight influence

3= a moderate influence

4= a strong influence

Question 37: Affording institutional flexibility to match fluctuating enrollments is ...

Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.23	0.81	15	0	15
Medium	3.21	0.87	47	1	48
Large	3.23	0.87	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.20	0.87	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.21	0.82	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	4.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.29	0.84	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	4.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	3.19	0.87	104	3	107

Appendix F

Question 38: Bringing professional expertise to the classroom is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.99	0.80	15	0	15
Medium	2.96	0.84	47	1	48
Large	2.96	0.86	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.99	0.85	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.99	0.80	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.96	0.87	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.96	0.84	104	3	107

Question 39: Bringing current experience to the classroom is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.99	0.81	15	0	15
Medium	2.94	0.87	47	1	48
Large	2.93	0.87	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.96	0.86	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.99	0.82	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.92	0.88	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Total	2.94	0.86	104	3	107

Appendix F

Question 40: Bringing practical experience to the classroom is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.05	0.82	15	0	15
Medium	3.01	0.87	47	1	48
Large	3.01	0.87	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.86	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.04	0.83	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.00	0.87	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.99	0.86	104	3	107

Question 41: Providing teaching experience to those who aspire to be full-time faculty members is...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.30	0.83	15	0	15
Medium	2.26	0.82	47	1	48
Large	2.24	0.83	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.26	0.80	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.31	0.82	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.26	0.81	11	2	13
2-year under 4-year	1.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.24	0.82	103	4	107

Appendix F

Question 42: Saving on costs of faculty salaries is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	3.10	0.89	14	1	15
Medium	3.12	0.93	47	1	48
Large	3.13	0.93	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	3.00	0.95	6	0	6
Multi-campus	3.10	0.90	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	3.12	0.91	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	3.12	0.92	103	4	107

Question 43: Saving on costs of faculty benefits (e.g., health insurance) is ...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.98	1.05	15	0	15
Medium	3.00	1.07	47	1	48
Large	3.01	1.07	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.87	1.10	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.96	1.05	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.98	1.07	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.99	1.07	104	3	107

Appendix F

Question 44: Employing part-time faculty as a vehicle to create and build new programs is...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.39	1.04	15	0	15
Medium	2.37	1.00	46	2	48
Large	2.38	1.00	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.31	1.00	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.42	1.02	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	2.00	0.00	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.39	1.00	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.00	1.41	2	0	2
Total	2.37	0.99	103	4	107

Question 45: Taking part-time employment at your institution into consideration when hiring full-time faculty is...					
Type	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	Missing	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving					
Small	2.75	0.98	15	0	15
Medium	2.72	0.96	47	1	48
Large	2.72	0.95	15	0	15
Suburban-serving					
Single Campus	2.64	0.98	6	0	6
Multi-campus	2.75	0.99	5	1	6
Urban-serving					
Single Campus	3.50	0.71	2	0	2
Multi-campus	2.70	0.97	12	1	13
2-year under 4-year	2.50	0.71	2	0	2
Total	2.71	0.95	104	3	107

Appendix F

Question 46: Please specify other considerations and the amount of influence regarding decisions to employ part-time faculty.

Type	<i>n</i>	<i>N</i>
Rural-serving		
Small	3	15
Medium	4	48
Large	2	15
Suburban-serving		
Single Campus	0	6
Multi-campus	1	6
Urban-serving		
Single Campus	0	2
Multi-campus	1	13
2-year under 4-year	0	2
Total	11	107

October 16, 2012

Appendix G

Office for Research
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

Charlotte Speer
ELPTS
College of Education
The University of Alabama



Re: IRB # 12-0R-344 "Changing Perceptions of Employment and Use of Part-Time Faculty among Chief Instructional Officers at Southern Association of Colleges as Schools-Accredited Community Colleges"

Dear Ms. Speer:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of documentation of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below :

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on October 15, 2013. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved informed consent form to obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



 T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama



358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870 127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
FAX (205) 348-7189
TOLL FREE (877) 820-3066

Appendix G

I#: 12-OR-344

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

I. Identifying information

	Principal Investigator	Second Investigator	Third Investigator
Names:	Charlotte Speer	Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas	
Department:	Educational Leadership, Policy & Technology Studies	Educational Leadership, Policy & Technology Studies	
College:	Education	Education	
University:	The University of Alabama	The University of Alabama	
Address:	P. O. Box 220	212 Carmichael Hall	
Telephone:	205 522-7352	205-348-2470	
FAX :			
E-mail :	charlotte.speer@yahoo.com	skatsina@bamaed.ua.edu	

Title of Research Project: Changing Perceptions of Employment and Use of Part-Time Faculty among Chief Instructional Officers at Southern Association of Colleges and Schools-Accredited Community Colleges

Date Submitted: 7/19/2012

Funding Source: None

Type of Proposal New

Exempt

<input type="radio"/> Revision	<input type="radio"/> Renewal Please attach a renewal application	<input type="radio"/> Completed
Please attach a continuing review of studies form		
Please enter the original IRB # at the top of the page		

UA faculty or staff member signature: _____

II. NOTIFICATION OF IRB ACTION (to be completed by IRS): Type of Review: Full board Expedited

IRB Action:

Rejected Date: _

Tabled Pending Revisions Date: _

Approved Revisions
 Date: 10-15-13 **Approved-this** proposal complies with University and federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

date: 10-15-13 IRB (dated) effective until the following

Trans. approved

Approval signature

1/2012

10/16

Appendix G

Research Invitation

Dear Chief Instructional Officer:

My name is Charlotte Speer, a doctoral student from the University of Alabama, and I am conducting a survey called Changing Perceptions of Employment and Use of Part-time Faculty among Chief Instructional Officers at SACS-accredited, Public Associate's Colleges. The study will be supervised by Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas, Professor of Higher Education and Director Education Policy Center at the University of Alabama. Dr. Katsinas is also the past president of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges and is presently a consulting scholar for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

This study will focus on the changes in policy and perceptions of chief instructional officers (CIOs) regarding employment and use of part-time faculty accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and examine the same implementation procedures, perceptions, and practices.

Since you have been identified as your institution's officer for faculty oversight, I am inviting you to take part in this study which involves completing a web survey link attached to this email address. The survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete and contains three sections: challenges, accreditation and implementation procedures, and reasons regarding the employment and use of part-time faculty.

We will protect your confidentiality by using only summarized data, according to Carnegie Classifications for Associate's Colleges, in presentations and publications. Only Dr. Katsinas and I will have access to the resulting data, which will be coded and categorized and will be password protected within Qualtrics, with IP addresses cleared once the survey is closed.

There will be no monetary benefit to you; however, the findings should be useful to advance the knowledge of trends in higher education concerning part-time faculty employment and accreditation and implementation procedures for associate's colleges.

Your participation is completely voluntary, and the chief risk is comfort level, but you are free to skip any question you do not wish to answer or stop the survey at any time before you submit and still receive a summary of the results by request.

If you have questions about this study, please contact me at 205-522-7352 or by email at cspeer@bscc.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html, or by email at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

If you understand the statements above, are at least 19 years old, and freely consent to be in this study, click on the I AGREE button to begin.