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ABSTRACT

Universities and colleges have developed an over-reliance on adjunct faculty, and as a result, researchers have begun to study adjunct faculty satisfaction as it relates to their working conditions. Current research indicates that professional development is a source that can contribute to satisfaction at work (Hoyt, 2012). However, the research does not give us a sense of the adjunct experience with and perceptions of professional development. The purpose of this study was to examine the experiences and perceptions of adjuncts with professional development at a single Texas community college.

I conducted a qualitative design with a phenomenological approach. I interviewed sixteen participants. Of this 16, twelve were adjunct faculty, and four were administrators at a Texas community college in the Houston area. Interviews proceeded in 2 rounds and were guided by the major research question: what are adjunct faculty experiences with faculty development at a single institution.

During data collection and analysis, adjunct faculty stated they do not frequently participate in professional development; however, when they do participate, it lessens their feelings of being invisible on-campus and connects them to their colleagues. In addition, participants described meaningful professional development. I identified six key themes: scheduling, communication, level/target, content, focus, and participation.
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CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

There is an on-going dialogue about the status of part-time faculty, who are also referred to as adjunct or contingent faculty and sometimes non-tenure track faculty (NTTF). For the purposes of this study, the definition of adjunct faculty (also known as part-time) refers to higher education faculty members who are not on a tenure track and who are assigned to teach less than twelve hours per semester on a temporary, semester-by-semester contract (Baron-Nixon, 2007, p. 17; Hinkel, 2007, p. 6). Jenkins (2014) stated that the term adjunctification has come to signify the over-reliance on part-time faculty in higher education. As the part-time ranks have grown, so have the voices of those in these positions. Adjunct faculty members have begun to speak up about their working conditions forcing universities and colleges to take notice of them and their working conditions. Researchers have been studying adjunct faculty satisfaction as it relates to their working conditions. The research indicates lower levels of worker satisfaction with adjunct faculty. The research also points to the fact that professional development is one source that contributes to worker satisfaction. This fact drives the research on the perceptions of adjuncts on faculty development.

Common concerns among adjunct faculty are low pay, no benefits, and lack of job security, to name just a few (Hoyt, 2012; Kramer, Gloeckner, & Jacoby, 2014). The adjunct faculty plight is found in articles featured in such publications as the Chronicle of Higher Education and on the website Inside Higher Education as well as others. Discouraged adjuncts...
fill the comment sections of articles offering insight to the challenges they face in their part-time world. In addition, adjuncts voice concerns and issues throughout social media outlets such as Twitter on #NotYourAdjunctSidekick and #AdjunctNation. The social media site Twitter is full of tweets of articles on the abuse of part-time faculty with titles such as *The misery of adjunct professors keeps higher education booming* (Nolan, 2016), for example. Social media has become an avenue for the frustrated instructors to vent and spotlight the many hurdles they face.

Some specific adjunct stories have become popularized through social media, such as the story of Margaret Mary Vojtko, an adjunct professor at Duquesne University. She taught French at the university for 25 years but became ill with cancer later in life. Due to the medical bills that she had accumulated, she was not able to keep up with repairs on her house, which had nearly made her homeless. She lived without job security or any benefits, and even when she carried a full adjunct load at the university of three classes in the fall, three in the spring, and two in the summer, she still did not clear $25,000 (Kovalik, 2013). The university reduced her workload to one class a semester, which is not an uncommon practice in assigning adjunct's classes. She was then not even making $10,000 a year and could not afford electricity, she became homeless (Kovalik, 2013). She began to sleep in her office, but university officers ejected her from her office. During this period, Duquesne University adjuncts voted to unionize; however, the university administration fought to stop this (Kovalik, 2013). Margaret hoped that unionizing would be the answer to her medical insurance woes; however, she died of a heart attack before any changes could be realized. She died penniless and homeless (Sanchez, 2013).

Advocacy groups have been established in the wake of growing adjunct concerns. One such group is the New Faculty Majority, which formed in February 2009 after a dozen adjuncts faculty members came together after a discussion on a listserv (New Faculty Majority, N.D.).
The non-profit organization advocates for adjuncts and highlights current events and issues about part-time faculty. In 2012, New Faculty Majority co-founder and President Maria Maisto co-authored a report on adjunct working conditions and testified the following year before a House Committee on Education and Workforce on the topic (Boll, 2016). Maisto serves as an adjunct at Cuyahoga Community College and co-chair for the committee on Part-time, Adjunct, or Contingent Labor for the Conference on College Composition and Communication. She believes adjunct faculty are not being fully compensated for the work that they do and are afraid to speak out. In an interview with The Atlantic, she stated that adjunct instructors were afraid to challenge their students in class because any negative student evaluations could lead to them not being rehired (Segran, 2014). Because of this, Maisto stated, “College is no longer creating a critically-thinking citizenry who can participate actively in democracy” (Segran, 2014, p. 3). The position Maisto takes is that the adjunct working conditions are affecting the quality of education the students are receiving.

Many adjuncts have turned to unions for support in their struggle. Adjunct faculty at St. Louis University voted to unionize with the Service Employee International Union (SEIU) (Mytelka, 2016). The SEIU also conducted successful union drives with Washington University and St. Louis Community College (Mytelka, 2016). The SEIU strategy is to create union dominance in urban areas where adjuncts will have more leverage in negotiating terms (Mytelka, 2016). The SEIU’s campaign, known as Adjunct Action, has been successful in capturing 70% of adjuncts in the Washington DC area (Schmidt, 2014). It has been successful in also gaining ground in Boston, Los Angeles, and Seattle (Schmidt, 2014). Other unions such as the American Federation of Teachers and the United Steelworks have also been courting adjunct faculty in cities such as Pittsburgh and Philadelphia (Schmidt, 2014). With looming themes of
dissatisfaction across the country, and since higher education is not likely to decrease reliance on adjuncts, higher education should recognize the concerns of their part-time faculty and begin to consider what factors can support adjunct satisfaction.

**Background**

In 1975, part-time faculty represented only 30.2% of all faculty employed (Monks, 2009). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2015), 49% of all higher education faculty in the U.S. are part-time. Hagedorn (2010) reported that nearly 70% of all faculty at community colleges are adjuncts. The increased use of part-time faculty does not appear to be going away as it is an economical solution for institutions to manage the increasing financial crisis of increasing costs and decreasing state funding. Monk (2009) stated that the average basic salary for a full-time professor is $65,407 while a part-time adjunct makes on average $11,160 a year (Monk, 2009). To help make ends meet, many faculty teach courses at more than one institution to try to make a living wage. Monk (2009) found at least 17% of all faculty teach at multiple institutions, and nearly half hold full-time jobs.

Monk (2009) also found that only 35% of all part-time faculty want to hold a full-time position. Of that 35%, there are those without a Ph.D. or terminal degree who are not retired (68%), those with a Ph.D. or terminal professional degree who are not retired (19%), and retirees (14%) (Monk, 2009). The 65% of respondents who reported that they did not want to teach full-time can be divided into three groups as well with those whose position at the institution is not their primary position (72%) (Monk, 2009). There are those for whom teaching is their primary position, and they are not retired (16%) (Monk, 2009). Finally, there are those who are retired (12%) (Monk, 2009). The group of faculty who want to be full-time faculty consists of 78%
female adjuncts, with the average age at 46 years-old (Monk, 2009). Fifty-three percent of this group reported having children and an average salary of $21,608 (Monk, 2009).

Part-time faculty will continue to be a solution for colleges and universities. Howell and Hoyt (2007) proffered that with decreasing subsidies from state and federal coffers and increasing enrollment, adjunct faculty will continue to be in demand. Some critics point to the fact that this is not a new problem. The use of adjunct faculty, especially in community colleges, has been growing for decades, as evidenced by a study by Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) that warned even then that the use of adjuncts in community colleges had become widespread and common. Even in 1995, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron noted the issue with increasing adjunct faculty by stating, “there is a curious absence of any evidence to support any policy for appropriate ratios of part-time to full-time faculty” (pp. 17-18). Adjunct faculty are aware that they are the new faculty majority; however, part-time faculty are failing to see higher education embracing this shift.

Hoyt (2012) found that the majority of part-time faculty taught for altruistic reasons; however, they were less satisfied than full-time faculty with their overall teaching experience. The researcher also found that 98% of adjunct faculty agreed or strongly agreed that they enjoyed teaching classes even though they listed compensation as needing to be increased. Research has shown that money does not drive most faculty to teach; rather, it is commitment to the profession, even knowing they will never be heavily compensated (Hoyt, 2012).

Researchers have also shown that professional development is one factor that contributes to adjunct satisfaction (Diegel, 2013, Hoyt 2012). Guskey (2000) has defined professional development as
Those processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students…professional development is a purposeful and intentional process. It is a consciously designed effort to bring about positive change and improvement. (pp. 16-17)

**History of Faculty Development**

Professional development for faculty can be traced back to 1810 at Harvard University where faculty were given sabbatical leave (Ouellet, 2010). University administrators designed leave for faculty to give them the opportunity to further develop into scholars (Ouellet, 2010). According to Eble and McKeachie (1985), the sabbaticals offered faculty the chance to “gain sufficient competence to teach a subject” (p. 5). Further, “The sabbatical was clearly related to enhancing or renewing the scholar’s capacities” (p. 6). This form of faculty development continues today. In addition, institutions provided travel allowance, grants, fellowships, and support for attending conferences (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

Ouellet (2010) stated that the re-imagination of faculty life and the changing demographics of the college student in the 1960s and 1970s contributed to the need for professional development. During this time, the traditional focus on research began to shift the spotlight to teaching excellence (Ouellet, 2010). The need to improve teaching skills prompted institutions to begin to develop training that would enhance their teaching abilities. Cohen and Brawer (1996) stated that community colleges begin to offer in-service professional development for faculty. Hubbard and Atkins (1995) stated that

Early faculty development efforts of the 1970’s attempted to improve institutional effectiveness primarily by addressing the disciplinary expertise of pedagogical skills of faculty members. Subsequent approaches focused on understanding the complexity of the teaching/learning process and expanding faculty awareness of new emerging information about cognition and development. (p. 118)

In the 1980s, universities saw continued growth of faculty development until the economic recession of the mid-1980s. Watts and Hammon (2002) stated the loss of faculty
development programs were due in part to Title III funds expiring and institutions finding that they did not have the funds to support these types of programs. The 1990s saw a shift in philosophy from teaching excellence to student learning. Sorcinelli et. al. (2006) quoted Austin (2002) by saying, “Student learning rather than teaching took center stage-the teacher was no longer the ‘sage on stage,’ pouring knowledge into empty vessels, but a ‘guide on the side,’ facilitating student learning” (p. 3).

Professional development has become important at the community college level, as the number of adjunct faculty has increased. This concern became an issue in the 1990s. Cohen (1992) noted that “Part-time, substitute, adjunct, supplemental instructors have multiplied almost as fast as part-time students (p. 51). Gappa and Leslie (1993) explained that institutions failed during this time to offer development for adjunct faculty. The researchers stated that

- Professional development represents an investment in people’s future capabilities. Making such an investment in part-time faculty is a measure of how integral they are to the institution’s programs and an incentive for both the institutions and individual to continue their relationship…professional development of part-timers is one aspect of integration that needs to be more fully considered. (p. 200)

In this quote, Gappa and Leslie (1993) spoke to the investment in adjunct teaching success that is still applicable to this day and found in the literature.

**Statement of the Problem**

Once adjunct faculty are hired, it is the institution’s responsibility to make sure they are supported and that continued help in developing their teaching skills is provided (Burnstad, 2002). Analyzing the experiences of adjunct faculty in relation to professional development will give us better insight into how to better support adjuncts. It simply is not enough to say that adjuncts are motivated by professional development or that they want more of it. More research should be conducted into how they are experiencing and perceiving it.
Howell and Hoyt (2007) discussed the issue of increasing demand for adjunct faculty on campuses. They stated that

…not only will decreasing subsidies from state and governments contribute to this ongoing trend of hiring more part-time and fewer full-time faculty, but so will the planned growth among the population in general, and with more college-age students enrolling higher education. (p. 1)

As the number of adjunct faculty grows, especially at community colleges, adjuncts have become more vocal about concerns about their working conditions (Eagen, Yaeger, & Grantham, 2015).

Many people may ask why adjuncts continue to teach if conditions are so bad. Townsend and Haus (2002) found in their survey of part-time faculty that 53% of adjunct faculty would continue teaching rather than quitting altogether. Antony and Valadez (2002) found that 65% of adjunct faculty would choose academia again in choosing their careers again and they were less likely to leave their positions than full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty enjoy teaching; therefore, institutions should tap into ways to increase this enjoyment.

Research has shown that professional growth is important to adjunct faculty satisfaction (Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Effective professional development, orientation, and mentoring can increase adjunct satisfaction according to research (Hoyt, 2012). In addition, research has shown that professional development can increase faculty confidence in the classroom, which can affect student success in the classroom (Havland, Turley, & Shin, 2011). Elliott and Oliver (2015) found that faculty participation in professional development was related to student achievement in the classroom. The problem is many universities and colleges are not offering professional development opportunities to adjuncts, the lack of which in theory could affect their satisfaction levels. Watts (2002) stated, “The professional development programs of the past were loose connections of activities, and when enough of them were strung together they would
look fairly impressive” (p.1). Researchers should consider whether institutions are formulating professional development programs that are targeting adjunct needs or whether they are simply stringing together sessions in a hit or miss fashion. As Bellanca (2002) argued,

More than at any other time in their history, community colleges need to plan and provide comprehensive ongoing professional development programs for their faculty and staff. Faced with an increasingly diverse student body with varying expectations, learning styles and service preferences; new and growing completion; technological advancements; and changing governmental policies and societal demands, community colleges can no longer respond in traditional ways. (p. 35)

Unless we are able to identify what types of professional development adjunct faculty need, want, and value, practitioners will be unable to provide targeted support to part-time faculty. The lack of information creates a problem when trying to better serve the needs of the adjunct faculty population. As adjunct faculty continue to voice concerns about their teaching experience, institutions should strategize how to better meet their needs. Data may provide a roadmap to becoming more effective in delivering professional development to adjunct faculty. Such a roadmap could be significant because it could increase an institution's ability to better serve adjunct faculty, which could in turn contribute to higher satisfaction levels suggested in the literature (Diegel, 2013, Hoyt, 2012).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this phenomenological case study was to contextualize the perceptions of adjunct faculty with professional development at a community college. The goal was to learn how professional development opportunities are delivered and experienced by adjuncts. This study not only illuminated their experiences in this area but also provided insight into how to more effectively engage adjunct satisfaction through professional development offerings.

The main research question was what are adjunct faculty experiences with faculty development at a specific institution? This question laid the foundation for the research that was
carried out with subsequent interview questions (see Appendix B). The research questions and methods will be covered more fully in Chapter III.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study lies in the fact that higher education is relying more and more on adjunct faculty (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015). Institutions should become more in tune to the needs of their faculty majority, specifically part-timers. As the research shows, adjuncts repeatedly have indicated they desire more support and professional development. This is one tool that institutions can take advantage of to enhance their teaching experience (Diegel, 2013). This study provides valuable insight into the experience of part-time faculty with professional development. By discovering what professional development adjuncts received and what types they wanted, institutions may be able to provide a better working experience for adjuncts. The information I discovered allows faculty developers to better address the professional development needs of part-time faculty. Administrators may find this significant because it may give them a better sense of what adjuncts want as it relates to professional development. This is a finding that any institution can use to better meet the needs of their part-time instructors. Administrators now have concrete data to work with that has previously been missing in the literature. Since adjunct faculty are more prevalent at community colleges than other post-secondary institutions (Cataldi, Fahimi, Brdburn, & Zimbler, 2005; Smith, 2007). This study provided this majority an opportunity for their voices to be heard within a qualitative context that could potentially improve their working experience. If the quality of teaching is improved through more effective, targeted faculty development then added value theoretically benefits the students. Potentially, students who receive better instruction due to teaching skills being enhanced in the classroom may experience improved performance in the classroom. This
research then may provide a significant piece of the puzzle of how to better support adjunct faculty.

The hope is that professional development practitioners will see a snapshot of what professional development adjuncts are receiving currently, and what they say they want and need. This snapshot can be used for planning faculty development training in the future. Practitioners may recognize that they are out of step with the needs of adjunct, thus prompting them to review their professional development more closely.

**Operational Definitions**

*Adjunct Faculty:* Higher education faculty members who are not on a tenure track and who are assigned to teach less than 12 hours per semester on a temporary, semester-by-semester, contract (Baron-Nixon, 2007, p. 17; Hinkel, 2007, p. 6).

*Community College:* A two-year institution of higher education that offers a variety of courses including transfer classes, occupational curricula, and general education courses to the community in within it is located (Holmes, 2007). The community college focuses on teaching and learning as opposed to research (Bragg, 2001).

*Professional Development:* Those processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve student learning (Guskey, 2000, pp. 16-17).

**Summary**

Universities and colleges have found adjunct faculty to be an answer to tightening budgets and difficult financial times. As the reliance on part-time faculty has increased, so have the voices of adjuncts who advocate for better working conditions. Higher education institutions should search for ways to address adjunct satisfaction at work. Professional development is one
approach to addressing satisfaction and motivation of adjuncts. In Chapter II, I review the literature surrounding adjunct satisfaction and begin to unpack ways to address adjunct concerns through professional development.
CHAPTER II:
LITERATURE REVIEW

I searched the literature using key-term searches on adjunct satisfaction, adjunct loyalty, adjunct working conditions and employment, and adjunct faculty development. I also replaced the term adjunct faculty with part-time faculty, NTTF (non-tenure-track faculty), and contingent, in turn. I used ERIC, EBSCO, Google Scholar, and UA databases to find scholarly articles. Initially, I limited the search to the past ten years; however, interest in the topic began to increase about fifteen years ago; therefore, I allowed some articles published that were fifteen years old, I focused on the most current. Due to the limited number of articles within the past ten years, I remained open to research done at both four-year institutions as well as community colleges. I omitted articles if they focused on adjuncts in specialized programs such as nursing because these programs may have special needs. Only scholarly journal articles were used; thus, I included articles from such journals as *Journal of Higher Education*, *the Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, and the *Community College Journal of Research*.

I found four major themes in the literature. First, the research shows that adjunct faculty have employment concerns such as low pay, poor benefits, and lack of advancement opportunities. Next, faculty want to feel included in their department, which encompasses being included in department activities, being recognized for their contributions, and participating in a supportive, inclusive environment. Another major theme was adjunct faculty wanted more professional development, which includes mentoring programs and orientations. Despite areas
for improvement, the other theme was faculty teaching for the love of the profession and the students. I will address each of these themes and sub-themes in this chapter.

**Employment Concerns**

When discussing adjunct faculty satisfaction, a common area of concern is employment issues such as compensation, benefits, and lack of adequate facilities. Numerous studies have found such concerns to be sticking points for adjunct satisfaction. An early study by Feldman and Turnley (2001) helped to frame current research on adjunct satisfaction. The study included a sample of 105 non-tenure-track faculty and research associates at a large state institution. Out of the 105, seventy-two percent identified as adjunct faculty, with the remaining 28% identifying as research associates. The researchers identified and measured these job satisfaction factors, such as scheduling flexibility, coworkers, job autonomy, work challenge, quality of supervision, pay, fringe benefits, and advancement opportunities. The researcher asked some open-ended questions about the participants’ experiences at the end of the survey. The three lowest rated items were pay, fringe benefits, and advancement opportunities. Advancement opportunities indicated the highest level of dissatisfaction. One adjunct stated, “I have no job security. I never know when or if I will be offered employment beyond the current semester” (p. 7). After advancement, poor benefits and low pay were rated low for satisfaction (Turnley, 2001). These early findings have been mirrored in more recent adjunct satisfaction research.

Hoyt (2012) used the Herzberg Two Factor Theory as a framework to predict adjunct satisfaction and loyalty. Herzberg’s theory stated that there are hygiene variables and motivators. Hygiene variables are factors that can contribute to satisfaction on the job but are not motivators in themselves. For example, compensation, benefits, advancement, facilities are all hygiene factors. Motivators are those intrinsic items that can encourage someone to perform
such as recognition, feeling a sense of being part of a team, and sense of achievement. Hoyt (2012) conducted his study at Brigham Young University where he contacted 676 adjunct faculty of which 358 (51%) responded to the survey. Participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with certain aspects of the teaching role to determine loyalty. When asked specifically what could increase their satisfaction, adjuncts consistently suggested that pay and benefits (hygiene variables) needed to be addressed. Adjuncts pointed out their low pay and indicated that they wanted a pay-increase structure. In addition, adjuncts indicated that there was not a different pay scale for those who had significantly more experience versus someone who was brand new. They stated they wanted to participate in medical, dental, and retirement programs. Adjuncts also noted their compensation was not increased when their student class size was larger than other instructors that had fewer students in their class. Adjunct faculty brought up the concern in the study that facilities were an issue; for example, some did not have smart technology in their classrooms, and some indicated that their classrooms were too small for the number of enrolled students.

Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, and August (2012) also drew upon Herzberg’s theory in a qualitative study of non-tenure-track-faculty (NTTF) at twelve research universities. The researchers conducted focus groups consisting of NTTF with 220 faculty participants. There were four themes raised including 1) teaching and students, 2) personal life and flexibility, 3) respect and inclusion, and 4) terms of employment. Employment terms as a source of job dissatisfaction was a common finding from the focus groups. This theme encompassed dissatisfaction with such things as administrative policies, work conditions, salary, and job security. Job security surfaced as a major concern, with NTTF reporting that they did not know whether they would have a teaching contract from term to term. They wanted longer contracts
that they could depend on, noting the anxiety of not knowing until the last minute whether their class would make. The next issue was the lack of opportunities for advancement. NTTF stated there was not a clear path for advancing or promotion. Many NTTF noted there was not a career path or ladder to follow, thus leaving faculty wondering how to build on their careers. The authors suggested that creating career ladders with multiple-year contracts for each level might increase satisfaction.

Krammer, Gloeckner, and Jacoby (2014) researched adjunct faculty satisfaction at Colorado Community College System and had 405 survey respondents. Twelve percent of the total adjunct population participated. The researchers asked respondents to rate 16 independent variables influencing job satisfaction. Participants responded they were dissatisfied with salary, benefits, health coverage, and retirement programs. The authors suggested that salaries should be raised. One adjunct in the study stated,

We consider our students underpaid at $16-18 per hour at the AA level, but we are required to have master’s degrees for $16.21 without benefits. Ultimately, students may or may not get the education they deserve because your itinerant faculty are trying to put food on the table while teaching at three-to-six different institutions. (p. 296)

Another adjunct said, “Colorado Community College salaries are exploitative. This is an area, which needs some of the best teaching possible. Yet, low salaries make teaching at this level unattractive and more prone to teachers who go on to better things” (p. 296).

Maynard and Joseph (2008) further discussed adjunct employment concerns. The author’s goal was to examine job satisfaction and commitment of adjunct faculty. The researchers conducted the study at a mid-sized public four-year university in the Northeastern United States. Both full-time and adjunct faculty were surveyed (N=586) with 167 responding for a 29% response rate. Eighty full-time faculty responded, including 45 adjuncts who identified as involuntary part-time (adjuncts who would prefer to be full-time), and 30 adjuncts who
identified as voluntary part-time (adjuncts who chose to be part-time). The authors used an established job satisfaction survey: the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The results showed that those adjuncts who identified as being involuntary part-time faculty showed higher dissatisfaction with advancement, compensation, and security than the full-time or voluntary part-time faculty, which the authors had predicted. When looking at satisfaction, this may be an important distinction to make. If institutions have limited access to a full-time role, adjuncts may experience higher levels of dissatisfaction with their part-time role.

Anthony and Hayden (2011) analyzed data from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), a survey sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics. The survey was a comprehensive profile of full-time and part-time faculty at degree-granting institutions across the country. Of 34,330 faculty sampled, there was a 76% completion rate (26,110 faculty). The questionnaire asked faculty four questions on satisfaction with instructional issues and four questions on employment issues. While the part-time faculty were satisfied with overall job satisfaction, they indicated dissatisfaction with pay and benefits. The questionnaire distinguished between those who wanted full-time employment and those who did not. The survey results mirrored the Maynard and Joseph study in that adjuncts who wanted full-time employment expressed higher levels of satisfaction than those who did not seek full-time employment.

Inclusion and Respect

Research has shown that adjunct faculty feel valued within the classroom, but outside of the classroom among campus administrators and full-time faculty, they do not feel valued, appreciated, or respected. Kezar and Sam (2013) conducted a qualitative study to investigate institutional policies and practices that ultimately affect contingent faculty satisfaction. A total
of 30 campuses responded when contacted to participate. There was a total of four technical colleges, 12 four-year colleges and universities, and 14 community colleges. The researchers interviewed 45 faculty from the 30 institutions. The results of the study showed that the structure of institutional policies and practices left contingent faculty isolated from the rest of the department, including other contingent faculty. Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2013) found many adjunct faculty used the word *invisible* when describing how they felt about their role within the department. The authors conducted a qualitative study interviewing 19 adjunct faculty at community colleges across the U.S. Many adjuncts noted that they lacked a role in the department, and they felt as though they were easily replaceable and undervalued. One adjunct in the study stated, “I come, I teach my class, I go home. That is it. I am isolated,” (Jolley, Crosse, & Bryant, 2013, p. 227). Studying adjunct identity, Levin and Hernandez (2014) noted that adjuncts (n=14) in the qualitative study expressed strong self-value when describing their roles within the classroom; however, their view of themselves shifted when referencing their role within the department. Their confidence was much lower, as they felt they lacked professional status and experienced a sense of exclusion in the department. Levin and Hernandez determined through interviews the sense of exclusion was often due to their lack of participation in institutional service activities where they were able to interact with other faculty and learn about the institution and its values. Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, and August (2012) researched factors contributing to non-tenure-track faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The authors conducted a qualitative study of NTTF at 12 research universities using data from a 2008-2009 study. They also conducted 24 focus groups with 220 NTTF participating. They found one of the themes was NTTF felt that they were not respected or included in department activities. An NTTF member noted that all of the photos in the department were of the full-time
faculty. There was no representation of the part-time faculty. This finding points to the theme that emerged from many studies of how many adjuncts feel invisible within their departments. Other actions or lack of actions contribute to the over-arching theme of not feeling included.

One reason adjuncts may not feel a sense of inclusion is because they lack a relationship with the administration on their campus and feel disconnected with the full-time faculty. Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham (2015) conducted a qualitative study using data from a 2010-2011 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey that analyzed responses from 4,169 part-time faculty from across the U.S. The results showed that adjuncts were less likely to have an established relationship with administrators and full-time faculty, thus resulting in more negative views of administrators on their campus, which was a source of dissatisfaction. Hoyt (2012) found similar results noting the adjuncts wanted one-on-one meetings with the department chairs, more contact with administration, and invitations to departmental meetings. Jolley, Cross, and Bryant’s (2013) findings mirrored other studies’ results when looking at the relationship between adjuncts and administration and full-time faculty. When asked about her interactions with faculty, staff, and administration, one adjunct said, “We are that rare bird whom no one knows,” (p. 225). One adjunct faculty member stated she tried attending departmental meetings, but it was clear that no one notice or cared about her presence. Department chairs often do not invite adjunct faculty to department meetings to begin to build relationships with their full-time counterparts (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, & Miller, 2012). This disconnect contributes to adjuncts feeling less valued. One NTTF explained there are advantages to not having to attend departmental meetings. However, she said, “You end up being the cheap workhorse [because] you are not in governance,” (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, & Miller, 2012, p. 427).
Thirof (2013) found adjunct’s sense of professional identity is built on two core themes. One of the central themes is that adjunct’s identity is built on the love of teaching. However, she found that this passion gives way after time to a secondary theme that adjunct’s identity is built based upon their connections and interactions with full-time faculty. During this longitudinal study, three adjuncts were initially interviewed then interviewed a second time a year and half later. When one adjunct first started teaching, she spoke about her love of teaching and noted positive interactions with the full-time faculty. Upon being interviewed again a year and half later, she stated she felt, “less than or different” (p. 181) from full-time faculty. She stated there was a clear “us versus them” (p. 181) mentality. Another adjunct at the same institution, when asked what was her relationship with full-time faculty, stated,

I think they think of themselves as ‘the faculty’ and the rest are, you know, different, ‘other’…They don’t stop and talk to me for long periods of time, like I see them talking to themselves. So, it’s like any temporary relationship, you’re not going to become too invested, you know? (p. 181)

This adjunct, very early in her college teaching career, used the metaphor of temporary to describe how she is viewed, which affected her satisfaction and self-worth.

**Recognition as a Source of Inclusion**

Adjuncts in the research noted that their lack of recognition contributed to them feeling not valued or a part of the team. Hoyt et al. (2008) conducted a quantitative survey to assess adjunct job satisfaction. He used regression analysis to determine the predictors of job satisfaction and found that recognition was a significant predictor of satisfaction. The researchers found that faculty were motivated by intrinsic factors and that each campus should have in place some type of strategies to acknowledge the contributions of adjuncts. In another quantitative study, Krammer, Gloeckner, and Jacoby (2014) found similar results to Hoyt et al. The authors conducted their survey with the Colorado Community College System with 405
participants responding for a 12% response rate. The participants noted they did not feel good teaching is recognized at their institution. The authors stated that although adjunct faculty were dissatisfied with pay, benefits, and job security that establishing some type of recognition system could have an impact on satisfaction levels overall.

Hoyt (2012) found in his study of what creates satisfaction and loyalty among adjuncts that intrinsic motivators were extremely important to building adjunct loyalty. Recognition was one of those motivators with some faculty such activities as an appreciation dinner or simply verbal or written thank you notes. Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham (2015) found in their quantitative study of adjunct satisfaction that there was a positive correlation between job satisfaction and recognition. Participants in the study who identified with feeling the campus rewarded good teaching reported higher levels of job satisfaction. The authors found that lower order needs such as working conditions were critical to satisfaction; thus, respect and acknowledgement become essential to promoting job satisfaction.

**Department Culture as a Source of Inclusion**

One study pointed to the role the department culture plays in promoting an inclusive environment. Kezar (2013) studied department cultures and their impact on NTTF satisfaction. She performed a multi-case study at three, four-year institutions that had made changes to support NTTF. She conducted 107 individual interviews and asked questions about their role and experience as an adjunct within the department. There are four different types of cultures that emerged from the interviews. The themes of these cultures were destructive, neutral, inclusive, and learning. In the destructive environments, there was active disrespect for NTTF. There was no acknowledgement of their contributions or service in the department. One of the NTTF faculty that teaches within this culture said that “Tenure-track faculty think we are
incompetent, and they do not treat us as professionals” (p. 165). This environment was only found in 3 out of 25 departments. The next culture was classified as neutral where NTTF were not actively disrespected but instead were generally ignored. While NTTF were not actively disrespected in this department, they acknowledged the feeling of being invisible. Due to the feeling of invisibility, NTTF did not feel as supported or appreciated and thus maintained lower job satisfaction. This culture represented the majority of the ones identified with 13 out of 25 being labeled neutral. Inclusive cultures in general paid low salaries and offered minimal benefits, much like the destructive and neutral environments, but NTTF on the whole felt more respected and included in the department operations. Inclusive chairs included NTTF in decisions, worked to get them advance notice about teaching, included them in meetings, and made sure they were represented in department materials. This resulted in greater loyalty and satisfaction of the NTTF. The learning culture embraced all of the characteristics of an inclusive culture but took it a step further where there was not a distinction between full-time and NTTF. NTTF identified in this culture described feeling equal to their full-time colleagues. Learning cultures typically involve professional development, systematic feedback, and mentoring to NTTF. Although this type of culture was rare, it promoted a greater sense of a team with a common mission.

Professional Development

Perceptions of Faculty Development

Literature on institutions showing a commitment to adjunct success and satisfaction documents that they offer support in some form of professional development. Diegel (2013) specifically studied adjunct perceptions of support, mentoring and professional development at community college. Fifteen adjunct faculty members were interviewed along with three division
chairs. The humanities division chairperson felt professional development was extremely important. However, he felt spread thin and unable to spend a lot of time with the adjuncts; therefore, he promoted the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (FCTE). The main purpose of the FCTE was to orientate adjuncts and provide on-going professional development in the form of workshops and orientations. Humanities adjunct faculty felt supported by their chair but did agree that he was often not available. The faculty stressed that the professional development was important and the FTCE was appreciated. The English division chairperson felt very strongly about professional development and had developed a mentor system for English faculty. The English faculty that were interviewed expressed a high amount of satisfaction and felt professional development was a priority in their division. One English adjunct said, “I don’t think anyone could say there isn’t enough professional development happening. The opportunities through the FCTE are wonderful. I don’t have time to do all the things I want to” (p. 603). The Science division chairperson paired every adjunct with a mentor and provided science online webinars. The science faculty noted they did not have much interaction with their chair, but they appreciated the mentor who was assigned to them. One of the science adjuncts stated, “Either you give one hundred percent, or you don’t. I cannot teach halfway; that is impossible, so attending professional development maximizes my teaching potential,” (p. 604). The author noted that her study contradicted other literature that says most adjuncts do not get enough professional development. The author speculated that this adjunct could be more satisfied and connected because the community college had a strong professional development program offered through FTCE.
Mentoring as a Source of Professional Development

Diegel’s study noted numerous times that the community college she studied valued teaching mentors. Evidence of the value of mentoring of adjuncts to increase satisfaction is found in other literature. Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010), for example, conducted a study at a mid-sized, undergraduate, public university employing 277 adjunct faculty. Eighty-five surveys were completed for a 31% return rate. When investigating what would make adjunct faculty feel more included, the authors found that respondents wanted more outreach from their department. This theme encompassed numerous outreach approach one of which was mentoring. They found that 43% said having a mentor would helpful and 42% that mentoring might be helpful. In the qualitative section, one adjunct responded, “How is a new person, at any level, going to know what their expectation are without mentoring…[We] feel a bit lost” (p. 145). While the majority of respondents felt mentoring was important, they noted that it was not for everyone and should be optional. Hoyt et al. (2015) found mentoring to be a statistically significant predictor of adjunct satisfaction. The authors developed a survey instrument around 12 job satisfaction constructs and conducted the survey at Brigham Young University. There were 762 part-time faculty invited to take the survey with 346 responding (45%). A regression analysis determined that mentoring was a strong predictor of job satisfaction. Therefore, the authors suggested that all colleges and universities should develop some type of mentoring program to offer more support for adjuncts. Mentors could answer questions, evaluate teaching, make classroom observations, or simply offer advice.

Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham (2015) suggested that professional development was a key strategy to improving satisfaction. Their study focused on policies and practices related to adjunct satisfaction. One study finding indicated that adjuncts were not satisfied with their
growth opportunities, which the authors concluded identified as lack of advancement opportunities as well as lack professional development opportunities. The authors suggested that more on-going professional development opportunities would contribute to faculty’s higher-level needs of self-esteem, development, and self-actualization, which ultimately would have a greater relationship to satisfaction than salary. The authors stated professional development assists in the adjunct development and growth, thus aligning them for future opportunities in the department. Hoyt (2008) based his study on adjunct satisfaction on Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory. This theory posits that there are hygiene variables (pay, benefits, facilities) that lay the foundation for satisfaction, and there are motivators (work preference, personal growth, and recognition) that actually drive satisfaction through increasing motivation. He found in his study that the love of teaching was the number one motivator for adjunct; however, personal growth was ranked second. Participants in this study indicated that professional development was important to their satisfaction and that they were taking advantage of it on their campus (Brigham Young University). In Hoyt et al. (2008), the authors suggested that professional development and personal growth were key predictors to adjunct satisfaction and that campus departments should create professional development plans for each faculty member. They also suggested creating a senior adjunct faculty designation for adjuncts who complete an adjunct teaching certification program. The researchers found that adjuncts wanted more professional development focused on teaching techniques.

Linder (2012) sought to determine what types of professional development were needed for adjuncts to feel supported and successful. The highest rated topic of interest was teaching effectiveness, with 65% indicating this. The next rated highest topic was classroom technologies. One adjunct stated, “I would love to update my teaching skills and techniques,
especially improve my high tech knowledge, Blackboard and online teaching tools” (p. 40).

Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010) conducted a qualitative study of 85 part-time faculty at a mid-size, public university. The researchers identified factors that contributed to adjunct feelings of inclusion at their institutions. They found three core themes adjuncts noted in relation to their satisfaction: student engagement and learning, quality of work-life integration, and developing skills. Adjuncts noted their desire to continue to grow and excel at teaching. The authors found the respondents wanted more of these topics in this order: technology assistance, teaching strategies, course-planning strategies, and motivating students. The authors recommended holding an annual professional development day, sending out a monthly teaching tips newsletter, and offering on-going professional development sessions.

In addition to a mentor program and an on-going professional development program, holding orientations for adjuncts also appeared in the literature as an effective strategy for increasing effectiveness. As early at 2001, Feldman and Turnley suggested that orientations were important to laying the foundation for good working conditions. The authors stated that holding orientations helped faculty get on their feet more quickly. One participant in their study stated, “They need some type of orientation and more structured training…and get more permanent professors involved in that orientation and training” (p. 14). Hoyt (2012) found that providing an orientation to be an effective strategy to increasing adjunct satisfaction and improving loyalty.

Sources of Adjunct Satisfaction

The literature highlighted that adjuncts consistently list employment concerns, the need for more professional development, and respect and inclusion as areas that could be improved to increase satisfaction. Yet, research shows adjuncts are overall satisfied with their teaching role.
One important theme emerged when related to satisfaction. Faculty note that they enjoy the flexibility they have and ultimately teach for the love of teaching. Maynard and Joseph (2008) conducted research on adjunct satisfaction. The researchers surveyed full-time and part-time faculty at a mid-sized public four-year university in the northeastern United States. They contacted 586 faculty and had a 29% response rate. Of those, 85 identified as full-time, 45 identified with being involuntary part-time, and 30 identified with being voluntary part-time faculty. They measured affective commitment with a 12-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. They found that although they experience dissatisfaction with pay, benefits, and advancement opportunities, both voluntary and involuntary, overall they showed high levels of commitment. The authors questioned why part-time faculty seem to be content in spite of some areas of dissatisfaction and suggested that intrinsic motivators may offset those detractors. Therefore, the love of teaching itself could be enough to move past any areas of dissatisfaction. The authors suggested that increasing the sample size of their study could help better explain this phenomenon.

Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, and August (2012) studied factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction using Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory as a guiding framework. Herzberg’s hygiene variables such as pay and benefits must be adequate before intrinsic motivators can influence satisfaction. Waltman et al. found that the intrinsic motivators were the items that created a desirable job. In their qualitative study of 220 NTTF from 12 participating universities across the U.S., they found that teaching and working with student was a source of job satisfaction. The authors stated that across the institutions, NTTF taught due to their passion for teaching. An adjunct stated in the study, “It’s so exciting to be in classes, and so exciting to teach other people and know you’re good at it. That’s awesome, I love that
feeling” (p. 418). Passion for teaching was a common theme in the conducted focus groups. As one adjunct stated,

[Teaching] is the first job I ever loved. I worked as a graphic designer for many years, and I came to teaching and found that it was just the first thing I ever just purely loved doing…To be able to create this little world within the classroom is a fabulous thing. And to be able to teach the things that you love most [is] beautiful. (p. 418)

A subtheme of mentoring and supporting students emerged as an area of satisfaction. Many of the faculty in the focus groups drew satisfaction from seeing their students grow and develop. In addition, they felt rewarded by the overall learning process. One NTTF stated, “I love teaching [students]. I love watching them grow. I love…realizing that in whatever small way I helped somebody achieve the dream that they had” (p. 419). NTTF consistently stated that it was rewarding seeing their students learn and knowing that they were a part of that process. Overall, when researcher asked NTTF what they liked about their jobs, the response was teaching and students.

Researchers noted flexibility for personal life as a source of job satisfaction. The authors stated that one reason explaining why NTTF like their jobs is the flexibility and freedom that they have. A subtheme of this was less stress and pressure. Many in the focus groups noted they appreciated they enjoyed not having the pressure of publishing and worrying about earning tenure. Many NTTF appreciate not having to worry about committee assignments or other duties as assigned. An adjunct stated,

I wouldn’t give this up. It’s ideal. I can work part-time. I can be there for my kids. I can do most of my work at three o’clock in the morning and get it done and be there for my children. There are not that many jobs that would allow me to do that. So while I may be concerned about job security and the timing of my three-year contract, or salary, overall it’s a positive experience for me. (p. 421)
The question that arose from the focus groups was how many of those contributing to these themes or voluntary or involuntary part-time faculty. These data would provide better sense of the reliability of this research.

Thirolf (2013) researched faculty identities and how they change over time in a longitudinal study. The author used discourse analysis in interviewing in two rounds six faculty members: three humanities adjuncts, two English adjuncts, and one adjunct who taught in the social sciences at Frost Community College located in the midwest. Two main themes emerged from the discussions with the adjunct. The first theme was faculty identity is built on their love of teaching and students; however, over time, these feelings subside or weaken. The second theme was faculty identities are often diminished when working with full-time faculty. Focusing on the first theme, the author found that the faculty’s identity was built and constructed from within the classroom through daily interactions with students. During the first round of interviews conducted with the six faculty who were new to teaching, the faculty offered positive, optimistic views of their roles as adjunct faculty. For example, one adjunct highlighted the fact that students keep coming to him asking how they could get into his class, thus he saw his connection to the students as the primary source of job satisfaction. The author found this source of job satisfaction a common theme during the first round of interviews; however, the author conducted a second round of interviews with the same adjuncts a year and a half later and found those feelings had begun to erode. The same adjunct that mentioned deriving satisfaction from his students communicated more frustration with his role than he previously did. He stated that “The one thing that’s still true, no matter what. Adjuncts have a difficult road when it comes to helping students. You know, you have class time but you really don’t have a lot of time [outside of class to help]” (p. 180). He goes on to say, “I feel frustrated but I also understand that it’s the
nature of the beast” (p. 180). The author found from all of the second round interviews that these six adjuncts still derived their satisfaction from their love of teaching and especially due to their interaction with students. However, the limitations of the adjunct role and their feelings of not feeling connected to their department and the full-time faculty. A female adjunct in the humanities stated,

I was thinking yesterday, this life [as an adjunct] is going to kill me…There’s too much stress and too much work…I kinda don’t want to give up on teaching just yet because I think if I were teaching in more reasonable circumstances, I could still really like teaching, but being an adjunct, it takes it out of you. I mean it’s so exhausting; it makes you start to hate doing it. (p. 180)

The results of this study could explain why adjuncts say they are overall satisfied with their positions but have many concerns and areas that need improvement to increase their job satisfaction. The limitation of this study is the size of the sample. By interviewing more adjuncts perhaps by selecting numerous institutions at which to conduct the interviews, the study could increase the reliability of the results.

A study by Feldman and Turnley (2001) found different reasons why adjuncts love their positions despite concerns about job satisfaction. The researchers conducted a mixed methods study that addressed job satisfaction. The sample used 105 adjuncts and research associates which comprised 72% adjunct faculty. The researchers asked the participants to rank eight different satisfaction items. The authors found strong satisfaction with scheduling flexibility, coworkers, job autonomy, and work challenge. The authors found flexibility to be a strong selling point of the adjunct role in other studies. Coworkers were a satisfaction theme not seen in other studies. Adjunct faculty indicated they enjoyed the diverse network of faculty. One adjunct stated, “I love interacting with students and other teachers. I learn all the time-it’s a rich intellectual atmosphere.” While the love of working with students matches other studies, the
love of working with other teachers may contradict, some studies that state adjunct faculty do not have strong relationships with full-time faculty. However, this study did not define whether coworkers meant just other adjuncts or administrators/full-time faculty. Participants noted they enjoyed the challenge of the position and the autonomy. These are all areas of satisfaction for faculty. The question is whether the reasons for satisfaction listed in this paper outweigh the area of dissatisfaction.

**Theoretical Frameworks Reviewed**

I reviewed the theoretical frameworks researchers used in various studies. Many researchers did not use a theoretical framework. However, a few frameworks appeared multiple times. First, the most common theoretical framework used when framing adjunct working satisfaction was Herzberg’s two-factor theory. The framework worked well to help explain the thought process of adjuncts in relation to job satisfaction. Herzberg stated that there are hygiene factors such as salary, benefits, facilities that promote satisfaction. However, there are also motivators that increase satisfaction if hygiene factors are in place. These are intrinsic motivators such as feelings of inclusion, respect, affect student lives. The themes that emerged in the literature fall easily into the two-factor categories.

Another framework used was the underemployment theory, which posits that individuals who are usually part-time or underpaid for their level of experience and expertise and their work contributions are underemployed (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015). Adjuncts are considered underemployed. This theory suggests underemployed individuals show higher levels of dissatisfaction, lower work production, and feelings of disillusionment. Researchers apply this theory to explain why adjuncts are not happy; however, this theory is contradicted to some degree. Adjunct faculty, especially those who identify as involuntary adjuncts, express
dissatisfaction; however, this does not explain why they return to teach and identify overall satisfied with their teaching roles. Researchers use career stage theory to explain another angle of adjunct satisfaction (Feldman & Turnley (2001). This theory states that employees experience various levels of satisfaction depending on the stage in their career. Adjuncts at earlier stages of their career are going to experience higher levels of satisfaction, and those who are later in their teaching careers will be less satisfied. These results were found true in qualitative studies using the career stages frameworks. The theory does not explain why adjuncts who are considered to be in late career stages continue to teach despite being more disenfranchised.

**Gap in Literature**

The literature tells us that professional development is a motivator for faculty and that more faculty development is needed (Diegel, 2013; Hoyt, 2012; Waltman, Hollendshead, Miller, & August, 2012). This research provides institutions with insight about what they can do to provide better experiences for adjuncts; however, it does not tell them about the current experience with adjuncts with professional development and what types of professional development adjuncts need and want. The research points to adjuncts desiring more professional development, but it does not suggest what they are receiving or needing. There are quantitative studies that point to professional development as a motivator (Hoyt, 2012, Waltman, Hollendshead, Miller, & August, 2012; Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015). However, there are few qualitative studies that go in depth into why it is motivation. Essentially, we are able to quantify their motivation, but qualitative studies are needed to help explore in depth the phenomenon. Figure 1 demonstrates the intersections of adjunct job satisfaction, motivation, and adjunct professional development. There is research to support and explain each of these areas; however, it is where they intersect that we lack a deeper understanding of how professional
development influences their motivation. This is the impetus to researching adjunct perceptions on professional development.

Figure 1. The intersection of adjunct satisfaction, professional development, and motivation

Summary

Researchers have consistently demonstrated that adjuncts have concerns about pay, benefits, and job security, as well as maintaining the need for respect among peers (Hoyt, 2012, Diegel, 2013). However, research has also shown that adjunct faculty teach for altruistic reasons such as the pure joy of teaching (Hoyt, 2012). Because adjuncts want to teach and continue to be a major resource for colleges and universities, higher education should tap into areas of their satisfaction. Researchers have found professional development is one source that can motivate adjunct faculty and improve their satisfaction (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham 2015; Hoyt 2008, 2012). The research falls short of telling us about the experiences of adjuncts with professional development to help better serve their needs. In Chapter III, I will review the research protocol for this study.
CHAPTER III:

METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the qualitative research method I used and my rationale for its implementation. This phenomenological case study was designed to capture the lived experiences of adjunct faculty as they experience professional development. The purpose of this study was to investigate the adjunct experience with professional development at single community college based in the area of Houston, Texas. Community colleges have embraced the use of adjunct faculty as their student numbers have steadily grown to the point that many institutions cannot function without them (Lyons, 2007). Through this qualitative study, I reviewed what professional development adjuncts received and determined what additional faculty development they believed they needed. This chapter includes the research question and sub questions, research approach and design, site and subject selection, data collection and analysis, ethical considerations, and quality assurance, and it concludes with a summary.

Research Questions

The main research question of this study was as follows: What are adjunct faculty perceptions and experiences with professional development at a specific institution? This question laid the groundwork for interview questions to gauge what types of professional development faculty have received and consequently, what do need and want. Secondary research questions included 1) What do adjunct faculty find beneficial about professional development experiences; and 2) What do adjunct faculty find challenging about professional development experiences? The interview questions can be found in Appendix B.
I employed a semi-structured interview format that allowed for follow-up questions. I used probing questions and followed up and to clarify responses. Patton (2002) stated that probing questions are used “to deepen the response to a question, increased the richness and depth of responses, and gave cues to the participant about the level of response that were desired” (p. 372).

**Research Approach and Design**

I chose to use a qualitative approach to my research as I addressed personal experiences, which are not as easily captured through a quantitative tool. Savin-Baden and Major (2013) state that qualitative research provides researchers with an approach to capture human action and experiences. Because I wanted to learn more about the perceptions of adjuncts with professional development, a qualitative approach was best suited for capturing experiences. Qualitative researchers empower people to share their individual stories; therefore, researchers are able to understand the context of the situation (Creswell, 2007). Qualitative studies are appropriate when there is a lack of literature while quantitative studies revolve around problem where there is an abundance of literature (Creswell, 2003). Since there is literature that quantitatively supports the desire for more faculty professional development, this study rounds out these studies by providing us more insight to faculty needs and wants. The qualitative design allowed me to investigate the questions of what types of professional development adjuncts receive and their level of satisfaction with it is a phenomenological case study. A phenomenological case study allowed me to study the experience of adjuncts and participation with professional development.
Phenomenology

Savin-Baden and Major (2013) stated that a phenomenon is the object of awareness in an experience. The object in this study was professional development, which is framed by how adjunct faculty experience it. “Phenomenology provides a way of exploring lived experience—the actuality of the experience—from the inside, and to transform the lived experience into a description of essence” (Osborne, 1994, p. 170). My study focused on the lived experiences of adjuncts at a community college. A phenomenological study was the best approach because this method focused on the participants of the study and their perceptions of professional development.

…phenomenological researchers seek to understand participants’ conscious views of the situation under study whilst also recognizing the influence of their precociousness, their background and experiences, on the research. The starting point is a first-person perspective and the approach involves attempting to describe the essential features and elements of a given experience. (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 36)

Historically, phenomenology arose as a philosophy in Germany before World War I and has since been established as a research lens since then (McMillan, 2004). The research method developed due to the concern that some believed that scientific research did not take into account what the person was experiencing, including the connections between the human consciousness and objects that existed in the material world (Husserl as cited in Moustakas, 1994). German mathematician Edmund Husserl founded phenomenology as an epistemological philosophy (Dahlberg, Drew, & Nystrom, 2001). Husserl believed that phenomenology can reveal how human phenomena are experienced in our consciousness and how we seek to make meaning of it (Kvale, 1996).

In phenomenology, perception is the main source of knowledge (Moustakas, 1994). Husserl called the various angles of perception horizons (Moustakas, 1994).
In horizonalization of perceptions every perception counts; every perception adds something important to the experience. The entity or object is never exhausted in properties and meanings. The features of a whole are the horizons, but as with all horizons the moment we single out one meaning the horizon extends again and opens up many other perspectives. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 53)

In this study, the adjuncts’ perceptions of professional development are the focus of the research. It is from these perceptions that the researcher captures the experience. As Moustakas (1994) suggested, the researcher should focus on the intentional experiences, which are acts of consciousness. As he put it “every intentional experience, regardless of how vague or ambiguous it may appear in its origin, intimidates something and designates something” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 56).

Moustakas (1994) outlined the principles of phenomenology in this statement:

The challenge facing the human science research is to describe things in themselves, to permit what is before one to enter consciousness and be understood in its meanings and essences in the light of intuition and self-reflection. The process involves a blending of what is really present with what is imagined as present from the vantage point of possible meanings; thus a unity of the real and the ideal. (p. 27)

Savin-Baden and Major (2013) stated there are three parts to a phenomenological study. The phenomena is the thing being investigated, which in this case is the delivery of professional development. My focus was on how adjunct faculty are experiencing professional development on their campus. Next, there were the participants in the study, which for the purposes of this study were adjunct faculty and administrators. I interviewed 12 adjunct faculty and four administrators familiar with professional development offered to adjuncts. Finally, there were the data in the study which was the information collected (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). For this study, this meant the information collected from interviews with adjunct faculty. The timeline for this study can be found in Appendix A. I intended for these components to capture the essence of perceptions of adjunct faculty with professional development.
Case Study

The phenomenological case study focused on the lived experience of the subject while embracing the subject or case within the real-life contemporary context or setting. The case study was a methodology bounded by time or place (Creswell, 2013). According to Creswell (2013), there are seven defining features of the case study. First, the case must be based on a concrete entity such as a person, small group, or organization. In our case, adjunct faculty are the defined entity. The case must be bounded by parameters, such as time, which in this case was the academic year 2015-2016. The second feature is the intent of conducting the case study must be unique or important. Third, the case study should provide an in-depth look and thorough knowledge of the case. Fourth, the selection of data analysis will be different for each case. Fifth, the key to understanding a case is identifying themes, patterns, and issues surrounding in each case. The sixth feature of a case study is the themes and issues, which must be organized in chronology to search for similarities. Finally, the last feature is the case study ends with the researcher drawing conclusions about case which are often called assertions (Creswell, 2013). These features provided the structure for the research. The phenomenological case study provides a framework for understanding the adjunct experiences with professional development.

Site Selection

Because the majority of faculty at community colleges are adjuncts, I selected a single community college in Texas to conduct my research. Nationally, more than 50% of all faculty at community colleges are adjunct faculty (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). I assigned the pseudonym of Houston Suburb Community College (HSCC) to the campus I selected. HSCC is part of larger community college system in the Houston, TX area. HSCC had a fall semester
2016 enrollment of approximately 9,000 students. There is currently an adjunct pool of 170 part-timers out of 270 total faculty. This number represents 63% of their total faculty pool.

The campus is served by the Center for Organizational and Teaching Excellence (COTE), which provided professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. COTE is one resource for faculty professional development on-campus. In the 2015-2016 academic year, the center hosted 45 professional development sessions. Of those opportunities, six were specifically targeting faculty. However, those opportunities consisted mainly of online teaching support sessions for the college’s learning management system. COTE established a new position, Faculty Fellow for Professional Development, for the 2016-2017 academic year. The institution selected a faculty member to serve in this position and provided a three-class release to produce more faculty-specific professional development opportunities. Many community college campuses do not have a department or even a position that specifically targets professional development opportunities. This campus also has a professional development unit when reviewing the data. The perceptions of adjunct faculty on professional development may be very different from a college that does not have a teaching excellence center or someone charged with the task of meeting professional development needs.

**Subject Selection**

I used purposeful sampling in the selection of the participants. Creswell (2002) states there are four basic goals to purposeful sampling. First, I worked to get a representativeness in the context. Next, I captured the heterogeneity in the population. Third, I examined cases that are important for the theories underlining the study. Finally, I compared the difference between settings or individuals. The purposeful sample was heterogeneous using maximum variation sampling. Creswell (2013) stated that maximum variation sampling is the most popular of all the
sampling techniques in qualitative research. I employed this method to differentiate the participants and allow various perspectives to be obtained. It increases the likelihood that different perspectives will be found (Creswell, 2013).

In order to protect the identity of adjuncts being interviewed, I have given the college the pseudonym of Houston Suburb Community College (HSCC). To obtain a maximum variation sample, I worked with the president of Houston Suburb Community College and the campus chief innovation strategist to identify 16 adjuncts from across their four different divisions on the selected campus. I sought adjuncts who completed a minimum of two full semesters of teaching so that these faculty have had the opportunity to participate in professional development on that campus during the timeframe selected (2015-2016 academic year). Thus they should have some insight into what professional development they need. I believe selecting adjuncts who have completed at least two semesters of teaching created an experienced pool of part-time faculty who had insight and experience into what professional development they have experienced and what they need. I tried to have representation of adjuncts across each of their four divisions on that campus. However, this proved challenging, so I decided to interview any volunteer adjunct who met the requirements. The college sent me a list of all adjunct faculty who had served more than one year of the time of the study by division. Savin-Baden and Major (2013) explained that convincing potential interviewees that they should take time out of their schedule can be a challenge. This presented challenges for me as adjuncts are not on campus often and many work full-time jobs in addition to teaching their adjunct classes. I sent an email to all adjuncts who were eligible to participate requesting to interview them. When I did not initially obtain my goal for number of adjuncts to interview, the vice president of instruction forwarded my email to build more interest. The faculty fellow for professional development also forwarded the
recruitment email. The goal was to interview 15 adjuncts who served from fall 2015 to fall 2016. I recruited 12 adjunct faculty to interview. In addition, I interviewed four administrators about their perceptions and experience with adjunct professional development. These interviews allowed me to triangulate the data to see if adjunct and administrator perceptions agreed. The administrators I interviewed had responsibility for faculty development in their areas. In total, I interviewed 16 participants. I conducted interviews on weekdays and weeknights to capture this population when available.

**Data Collection**

I used a semi-structured interview protocol over the course of two rounds of interviews. The semi-structured format allowed me to guide the interviews but also gave me the freedom to deviate as needed to further explore topics and potential patterns (Creswell, 2013). The semi-structured format allows for flexibility when the researcher needs to gain a deeper understanding of a phenomenon or needed the participants to elaborate further. A structured interview format would have been too rigid and would not allow the researcher the opportunity further clarify and dig deeper in the interview. I built flexibility into the process to allow the ability to go off script to follow up and clarify points that are made during the interview. This flexibility allowed me the opportunity to expand on areas of interest and adapt the interview process as needed to gain the most valuable information (Creswell, 2013).

The semi-structured interview’s flexibility also allowed me to build a rapport with the interviewee through follow-up questions. The conversational nature and confidentiality of the interview eased the participants’ apprehension about sharing. Through follow up with probing questions, the interview experience may have felt more personalized than a highly structured
interview. Because the study focused on the experiences of adjuncts, the results were personal as they often tapped into the participants’ feelings and emotions.

The semi-structured interview tool was an effective method to capture the lived-experience of the adjuncts because I was able to directly question individuals about their thoughts and feelings. The first round of interviews was the primary investigation into the adjunct experience. I used a second round of interviews for additional clarification. I set up one-hour interview times. The interview consisted of numerous open-ended questions from the semi-structured interview protocol (see Appendix B). I emailed each selected adjunct and sent them a consent form to complete and send back (see Appendix C). I established a rapport with each participant using an interview script. An audio recording was made of the interview. I asked for permission to record, which participants gave in the consent form (see Appendix C). I gave participants the opportunity to clarify any of their responses at the conclusion of the interview. Participants were told at the conclusion that I might request a second round of interview to clarify any themes that emerge from the data. I thanked participants for their service, and I sent thank you emails the following week.

**Data Analysis**

Phenomenological case study data analysis identified thematic content of the investigated phenomena in a meaningful way that contributes to understanding any existing phenomena or case. I reviewed the interviews for themes and patterns. I followed Creswell’s (2015) six steps in analyzing qualitative data. Those steps included 1), collecting the data 2), preparing data for analysis (transcribes field notes) 3), reading through data (obtains a general sense of the data) 4), coding the data (locating text segments and assigning a code label to them) 5), coding the text for description in the report, and 6) coding text into themes to be used in the report.
These steps guided the process of analyzing the data of going over the qualitative data. After I identified the study participants, step one involved conducting the interview and collecting the data. This was done using the interview protocol and through audio recording the interview. The transcribed data were stored in Microsoft Word and NVivo software. During step two, I transcribed all of the interviews using notes and the audio recordings. Next, in step three, I read the notes numerous times to familiarize myself with the data collected.

Steps four through six were more of a challenge as large amounts of data were analyzed and coded. I pulled out descriptions and themes and organized using Creswell’s (2013) Data Analysis Spiral. This method allowed for flexibility in organizing the data as opposed to a linear approach. Holistic and axial coding were used to classify the data. Saldaña stated a code is “…most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (2013, p. 3). Holistic coding is not only coding but it is also about finding linkages in the data which results in a cyclical act (Saldaña, 2013). Saldaña (2013) stated holistic coding is preparatory work to begin more detailed coding. It is the first cycle in the coding process where the researcher chunks the data into large categories or broad topics that will later be broken down in more detail in the next phase of coding (Saldaña, 2013).

Axial coding is used as a second round coding system that searches for linkages between the data that was broken up during the first round of coding (Saldaña, 2013). Saldaña (2013) stated that one of the goals of this type of coding is that it is used to achieve saturation when there are no new data or dimensions to explore anymore. Researchers frequently use illustrations to demonstrate the linkages when presenting the findings (Saldaña, 2013). After I concluded the initial holistic coding, I assigned themes, and I conducted a second round of axial coding to
determine whether there were linkages between the themes of data. I used a peer reviewer to assess the data and results of the study. The peer reviewer read all transcriptions and field notes and checked for emergent themes. I asked the peer reviewer whether she agreed or disagreed with the coding categories as established by the researcher. The reviewer agreed with the established coding. This was another layer to ensure trustworthiness.

One limitation of this study was the possibility that those adjuncts who volunteered for the study were more active on campus, thus more likely to participate in professional development; therefore, they may or may not represent the true picture of the experience of all adjuncts on that campus.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical considerations were taken into account to provide guidelines for a responsible study. I submitted the study for consideration to the Institutional Review Board of both The University of Alabama and Houston Suburb Community College (HSCC) where the study was conducted (see Appendix D). The HSCC Institutional Review Board website states it reviews human subject research to ensure that 1) the rights and welfare of subjects are protected; 2) risks have been considered and minimized; 3) potential benefits have been identified and maximized; 4) all potential participants are being provided with legally effective informed consent; 5) all research is completed in an ethical manner, and in compliance with established standards; and 6) all private information is kept confidential.

Before I submitted the study to the institutional review boards, I met with the president, and the chief innovation strategist to discuss the process and approach of the study; therefore, I obtained consent from the top administrators at the college where the research would be conducted. The president of the community college wrote a letter of support for the research to
be submitted with the IRB application. Savin-Baden and Major (2013) stated the informed consent is a show of respect for the participants. It will inform of the benefits and potential risks of participating.

Participants’ names were not used anywhere in the study. I coded each participant in the study for anonymity and gave him or her a pseudonym name. I made participants aware at the interview that I would assign him or her a pseudonym. I explained this up front in hopes of making the participants feel more comfortable about sharing their experience.

Quality Assurance

I took steps to assure the quality of the research and its dependability. The trustworthiness of the study was ensured through a few processes such as using an audit trail, performing member checking, and using peer review. An audit trail is a description of the entire research process (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Essentially, all of the raw data, analysis process, and process notes were kept, so that the study could be reconstructed if necessary. Next, member checking involves allowing interview participants to verify the researcher’s interpretation of the interview. Lincoln and Guba (1985) considered this technique to be “the most critical technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314). I completed this step after interviews were complete. A peer reviewed all of the interpretations to confirm accuracy. Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined the role of the peer reviewer as the devil’s advocate. It is their responsibility to keep the researcher honest through asking questions and challenging assumptions. The peer review assists in detecting in researcher bias. I used peer examination throughout the process to give an objective review of the research. The peer reviewer would challenge me throughout the process and encourage me to look at the data through different angles. These steps increased the trustworthiness of the research.
Researcher Bias

At the time of the study, I, the researcher, was employed as a full-time administrator in the Houston Suburb Community College System and seeing over a faculty and professional development program. In addition, I was an adjunct faculty at one of the HSCC colleges. In order to limit or reduce bias in the study, the research was conducted at a campus different from the one I was employed for. Therefore, I did not know any of the HSCC faculty or administrators.

Summary

Consistently, the literature cited adjuncts desire for more professional development to help them to be more effective in the classroom. However, research does not tell us what types of professional development are helpful in increasing satisfaction. Most studies stop short of telling us what is needed, whether that is mentoring programs, orientations, support groups, technology training, or effective teaching strategies. Additional studies could be conducted that would determine specifically what types of professional or faculty development promote increased job satisfaction. I designed this study to capture the lived experiences of adjunct faculty with professional development on their campus. The goal was not to determine if professional development increased their satisfaction as the literature already indicates. Instead, the focus of this qualitative study was to determine what professional development initiatives and related opportunities on that campus had the adjuncts experienced, and what types of faculty development adjuncts believed would be supportive and beneficial. The interviews conducted illuminated the topic. Through this research, I developed a better understanding of how to
support adjuncts through professional development that hopefully can assist campuses and faculty development practitioners going forward.
CHAPTER IV:
RESULTS

In this chapter, I will present the findings from the research I conducted pertaining to adjunct experiences with and perceptions of professional development. These questions guided the research included the following main question and two subquestions:

1. What are adjunct faculty perceptions and experiences with faculty development at a specific institution;
   a) What do adjunct faculty find beneficial about professional development experiences; and
   b) What do adjunct faculty find challenging about professional development experiences?

These research questions provided the structure to the interview questions. The initial timeframe examined in the study was the 2015 to 2016 academic year; however, I allowed participants to recall trainings they attended outside of that timeframe as it became clear that part of the phenomenon was adjuncts might not have experienced meaningful or impactful professional development within specified timeframe.

In this chapter, I provide a description of the research participants. I present the themes identified.
Description of the Research Participants

I interviewed 16 individuals from Houston Suburb Community College. Of the 16, twelve adjunct faculty from various disciplines and four administrators (one dean, two department chairs, and a faculty member who served in a formal role conducting professional development for faculty). The administrators had all served as adjuncts at some point in their careers. I interviewed the administrators to triangulate the data. The disciplines of the adjunct faculty varied but covered the following areas as math, business, education, psychology, English, geography, and French. The years of adjunct experience varied from two to over 20 years of experience. The average years of adjunct teaching experience was 6.3 years with a mode of 3 years of teaching experience. Of the 16 interviewed, 2 males and 14 females participated. Five had earned doctorates.
Table 1

*Participant Descriptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Discipline Taught</th>
<th>Years Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaShaun</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamra</td>
<td>Professional Development Facilitator</td>
<td>3 years as adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willa</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1 year as adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>5 years as adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1 year as adjunct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defining Professional Development**

I asked both the administrators and adjunct faculty to explain what professional development means to them. The goal of this question was to establish the foundation for the questions that I would follow up later in the interview. I wanted to know if the participants had a common or diverging view of professional development. I determined that the participants held similar definitions of professional development. One common view was that professional development is anything that helps improve or enhances their abilities in the classroom.
Lauren, an English adjunct, stated that professional development offered “opportunities to grow my knowledge both in my discipline and outside of it.” June, a math adjunct, had a similar view of professional development. She said that it was “studies that enhance my ability to either teach in the classroom or learn more about my subject.” Rhonda, a psychology adjunct, said, “…I guess professional development to me is increasing skills that are both personally and professional useful.” Collin, a dean, offered this statement about professional development:

It’s going to include everything from classroom management, to effective teaching strategies, to courses on building the syllabus, possibly even some subject matter in their field, policies, procedures, rules, things that they need to understand if you’re going to be an employee for HSCC.

The fact that adjunct faculty and administrators have a common understanding of what professional development is provides a starting point to understanding the phenomenon. Through exploring the phenomenon of adjunct professional development, I found that adjuncts had some similar experiences.

Adjunct Experiences with Professional Development

When exploring the experiences of adjuncts with professional development, I found a common occurrence among all of the participants. The adjunct faculty that were interviewed were all challenged to think of meaningful professional development that they had attended at HSCC. The majority of the adjuncts interviewed had attended only one professional development during the timeframe of 2015-2016. I questioned them about experiences at HSCC during the selected time, but I also allowed them to think beyond that timeframe to capture more insight into their experience with professional development. The fact that eight out of the 12 adjuncts had only attended one professional development during that year is telling in itself about their experience. Adjunct faculty regular attendance at professional development is not the norm. While there were numerous opportunities for professional development, the majority of
adjuncts interviewed did not participate with frequency in these events (see Appendices F and G). Infrequent participation is a common piece of the adjunct experience with professional development. I explored this phenomenon further and delved into the topic of participation which is discussed in detail in the section on providing meaningful professional development.

Another aspect of the adjunct experience with professional development, I learned is that many adjuncts have other opportunities for professional development beyond just what HSCC offers. With many of the adjuncts teaching at multiple colleges or campuses, they are presented with many opportunities for professional development; therefore, they may be participating in professional development even if not at HSCC. Heather, a business adjunct, acknowledged that she might not attend training at HSCC because there is training more convenient at another campus where she is teaching. I focused on the professional development at HSCC when questioning the participants; however, I allowed them to recall opportunities from other campuses for some questions related to participating in meaningful professional development experiences. Many adjuncts work at multiple institutions; therefore, they should pick and choose what professional development events to participate in, which is an important facet to understanding their experiences and perceptions of professional development.

I also discovered that professional development is related to adjuncts feeling connected to their peers as well as to their campus as a whole. Participating in professional development is one way an adjunct can feel more connected to the campus mission or other faculty. While interviewing adjuncts in the study, the notion of “feeling invisible” appeared several times. Several adjuncts stated they often felt like an invisible member of the team and that participating in professional development helped them network.
Valerie, an adjunct instructor who teaches education courses, responded by saying, …it’s when I’m on campus there’s…no interaction. You just go to your class and home…and it feels so much like an island situation, and it’s great to go to a training and see someone you know, but then you don’t see them again until next semester when you go to the beginning of the semester…so that’s why I was like, ‘I wish they offered more (professional development).’

This adjunct was referring to an all department meeting held at the beginning of each semester. While this event is more meeting than actual professional development by definition, many of the adjuncts recognized this beginning of the semester meeting as a professional development event.

Gloria, an adjunct who teaches online French, stated she would like to see more professional development held within her department. She believes it would build more cohesion by highlighting what a great college they worked at and connecting colleagues within the department. Another online adjunct instructor, Rhonda, who teaches psychology, indicated she often felt “disposable” because she was part of an “invisible group.” Both of these adjunct faculty members enjoyed teaching online but stated it was easy to feel disconnected which was somewhat remedied through attending professional development.

LaShaun, an adjunct who teaches geography, stated interacting with other adjuncts at professional development events helped her to build rapport with colleagues whom she would not have met otherwise. Without participating in professional development, she said she would go to her classroom and straight home afterwards and never interact with other adjuncts. She stated that professional development provided “fellowship” and community building on-campus. LaShaun went on to say that she would require professional development for all adjuncts. LaShaun said,

I think there’s so many adjuncts at HSCC, as compared to other colleges I work for, that you can really feel like you’re this little leaf floating in the wind somewhere out by
...so I do think that getting involved with the community more, in that sense...and I don’t think they should make you take 20 hours (of professional development)...but something to keep you involved with the mission.

Other adjunct faculty felt that participating in professional development minimized the feelings of being invisible or on an island. Elizabeth, an adjunct math instructor, stated that “...one of the things that professional development on this campus does for me, it pulls me into a larger setting as an adjunct, and it makes me feel connected to what’s going-on on campus.”

While not all adjuncts mentioned feeling invisible, many mentioned, much like Elizabeth, that professional development contributed to their networking on campus and feeling more connected. It appeared that the networking and sense of connectedness contributed to validating their worth on campus. Elizabeth spoke to the role professional development plays, “It’s just connecting with the school. It’s developing relationships not just with the school but also with faculty, or adjuncts in this case. It just brings you into a group that you can identify with.”

Willa, a department chair, believes that adjunct networking is extremely important to them connecting to the mission and feeling sense of belonging. “I just think it’s good for them to see the faces, again, to that point of connection, so I think that’s really good for them to see the team we’re all working with,” Willa stated. “They need to feel like they’re a part of a team and they’re not isolated and out there doing this on their own,” she said. Heather, a business adjunct faculty, believes that the most meaningful professional development she attended was impactful due to the camaraderie of interacting with other adjuncts and learning from what they do in the classroom. She stated that knowing there were others who understood what she was going through provided a layer of support. She theorized,

It’s just one of those things that…it’s all about relationships. We as humans, we’re not designed to work isolated. We’re just not, and so, the more that you work with people, you build that camaraderie, and you establish that relationship, and any time there is an emotional connection that you have with another person, then it becomes memorable, and
that actually offers a way for you to remain motivated, but if you don’t have that connection with people, you are going to fizzle out.

It appeared from the research that participation in professional development decreases feelings of disconnectedness and invisibility which is a common adjunct experience. Professional development provides opportunities for adjuncts to meet, interact, and commensurate.

When questioning adjuncts about their experience with and perceptions of professional development, some noted that professional development was a waste of time. As noted earlier, adjuncts receive professional development from many sources not just HSCC which means that any negative perceptions about professional development may not have been formed at HSCC, but carry over to it. For example, Valerie, an education adjunct, stated an obstacle to her attending professional development is the negative perception she has from years of “bad” professional development she participated in as high school instructional coach. Valerie said,

> When I hear the phrase ‘professional development.’ I hear ‘pain in the ass.’ I want to go and feel like I’m not wasting my time…that’s just from years of being here at the college level and just being a traditional classroom teacher at a public school setting.

Valerie was not alone in this perception. Leslie, a math adjunct, teaches high school math during the day and at the college at night. Leslie offered a very similar story to Valerie’s stating that she had become jaded toward any type of professional development because what she had been offered at the school district was not engaging or interesting. She said, because of this experience, she probably had not given professional development at HSCC a fair chance. Leslie stated,

> Professional development, coming from where I come from, coming from the high school, if it’s not mandatory, we’re probably not going to do it because we have been so raked over the coals with these boring four-five hour-long, get-me-out-of-here type of professional development from the public school system. I mean, I’ve been teaching since what? 13 years…and I can really honestly say I’ve been to two seminars that I actually got something from.
HSCC should dispel these types of perceptions when trying to promote and encourage attendance at their training. Adjuncts do not want to feel like their time is being wasted, so providing engaging professional development and getting people to give it a chance is an obstacle. HSCC should strategize how to change the perceptions of adjuncts like Valerie and Leslie, which is a challenge.

Understanding these experiences is important in learning more about providing meaningful professional development. In the next section, I will address research questions two and three and determine based on their experience with professional development at HSCC what conditions are desirable and/or undesirable.

**Providing Meaningful Professional Development**

Through capturing the adjuncts’ experiences with professional development, I was able to determine what adjuncts felt were desirable conditions for training which produced meaningful professional development. Research questions two and three guided this research. Ultimately, I was able to make some determinations about what they liked and did not like about their experiences. I will review six key areas of the adjunct professional development experience, which are scheduling, communication, level/target, content, training focus, and participation. In each of these sections, I will review the thoughts of participants on the topics. The first topic that I will review is scheduling of professional development.

**Scheduling**

One thing is common among all adjuncts; they want professional development to be scheduled at a time that is convenient to them. Professional development providers have been unable to capture what the perfect time or solution to scheduling is. Timing appeared to be the most common challenge among adjuncts for participating in professional development.
Repeatedly, adjuncts commented that the sessions offered were never at the right time or at a time that was convenient for them. Howard, a business adjunct, echoed this sentiment by saying that adjuncts have difficulty finding time to come to professional development when they work a full-time job during the day and teach at night. This common combination is one of the biggest obstacles to getting professional development to adjuncts.

Willa, a department chair, agreed that timing is the number one challenge to getting adjuncts to professional development. She said,

Just timing... Finding a good time that everybody could participate... A lot of ours have children that come home from school... daytimes are not good if they work during the day. Evenings aren’t good if they have to make dinner and get their kids in bed... Saturdays, they have ball games.

Willa tries a variety of things to get participation from offering a variety of times or querying first to see what the best time is. She described her efforts as follows: “I try to go with the majority because there’s not a perfect time or day to have it, but I try to do what’s most convenient for the most number of people, even if it’s unbelievably inconvenient for me.”

At the time of the interview, Gloria, a French adjunct, said her chair had just sent out an email advertising a department professional development that was being held during the week at 4 p.m. Gloria stated there was no way she could get off work early to attend a 4 p.m. training and even if she could, she still had to worry about her kids. She said, “…and then you have kids that just makes it even harder... My kids have something every day.” She stated she would then have to pay a babysitter for a training for which she was not being compensated. She said even if the training was held at a later time, she would still have to find a way to accommodate her children, so for her it is almost impossible to participate in professional development.
LaShaun, a geography adjunct, said the timing is always her challenge. She said she does not want to stay late for an evening session on the days she has taught, and she does not want to come in on the days she is not teaching. Lauren, an English adjunct, stated,

Well, depending on when your classes are, you may not be on campus when certain things are held, and if you have to drive here and you’re not being paid, right, to go to it then you might say no.

Lauren finished by saying, “If it happens to occur right when my class is ending, sure, maybe I’ll stay on campus and attend, but I just don’t think adjuncts would drive here especially for it.”

Many adjuncts teach at multiple campuses or for school districts that offer professional development, which makes it challenging to attend all of the opportunities. Rhonda, a psychology adjunct, said,

…the time required to come to campus for that opportunity is often prohibitive because of the fact that adjuncts are often putting together several jobs, and so now you’re saying, please get to campus at this non-teaching time when you may have other commitments.

Collin, a dean, acknowledges most adjuncts want to come to professional development. He believes there are very few who do not want to come, but the trouble he said is “an adjunct who’s teaching three or four different places and trying to cobble together a schedule and survive, support a family, and so they just can’t physically do all that.”

To address the issue of timing, I asked the participants whether offering professional development online was a viable option to solve this problem. The majority of the participants agreed this was a solution, but were conflicted because they wanted more face-to-face time with other adjuncts. It should be noted that during the 2015-2016 academic year, HSCC did not offer any professional development specific to instruction online.

Valerie, an education adjunct, signed up for a professional development offered on a Saturday that was canceled due to low enrollment. She stated,
I wish instead of just canceling it full out, that they would take it, and repackage the material, and put it online…and maybe make it a self-driven course so that people could have it more within their time frame to access the material and get the training done.

She went on to say that with the push for more online classes, having faculty participate in online professional development is good experience since it puts them in the role of the student. Faculty would learn about the professional development topic as well as learn what it feels to be a student in an online course.

Heather, a business adjunct, said that she sees the value in online professional development for adjunct faculty, but the networking that takes place from adjuncts interacting with each other cannot be lost. Heather stated, “…I think you need to offer the face-the-face, because not everybody learns strictly online, so if you have both options available I think that would help.” Heather stated that if online professional development were offered that it needed to have a component where the facilitator could check in on the participants. Heather said, “I think if you’re going to do online formats, that it might be helpful to have somebody touch base with the people…” She stated this would help keep people online engaged. Leslie, a math adjunct, did not want to lose the face-to-face format of professional development; however, she said online might work better due to the timing. Leslie added, “I would have to say that I would be more apt to do it online than I would be face-to-face because of the time issue.” This sentiment seemed to be the norm when interviewing participants. Most adjuncts want the opportunity to meet other adjuncts, but the timing issue is such a huge obstacle that online seems like the most logical solution to the problem.

Willa said she tries to record training and then archive it so that adjuncts can come and watch it whenever they like. However, the challenge is that there is no process in place to acknowledge that the adjunct completed the video or to give them credit for doing so. Adjuncts
must be self-motivated to watch the videos for growth opportunities. However, this one solution has been put in place to accommodate adjunct faculty. This solution is not a campus-wide initiative. This delivery strategy is something only Willa has done in her department to address the adjunct need for on-demand professional development. Rhonda echoed the challenge of not being able to come to campus for professional development because she said there were no options for her. Expressing her frustration, she said, “There’s nothing specifically geared toward faculty who are not able to be on campus.” HSCC has not addressed this issue, creating an obstacle to participating in professional development for an adjunct who teaches strictly online and does not have easy access to campus. In fact, several of the participants said they did not live near campus, and one adjunct even lives outside of the United States. Geographical distribution presents a challenge to making sure all adjuncts have access to on-going professional growth opportunities.

Adjuncts and administrators see the need for more online delivery of professional development to provide the flexibility that adjuncts need to complete training. However, administrators cannot eliminate face-to-face training. Administrators and professional development providers will have to face the challenge of finding the right balance between offering online training and face-to-face. Another challenge HSCC must contend with is communicating professional development events to adjuncts, which I will discuss next.

Communication

Many adjuncts acknowledged that they often do not know when professional development events are occurring. Adjuncts at HSCC are invited to attend professional development at any campus within their system, but many adjuncts were not aware of this or alternately did not know how to find where those opportunities were advertised. The system
office posts the majority of the professional development online. Adjuncts acknowledged that they often missed the emails sent out by the Center of Teaching Excellence (COTE). However, those same adjuncts stated they never miss any emails or information sent to them by their department chair.

Leslie, a math adjunct, summed up the view of many adjuncts by stating, “The amount of emails HSCC system sends out on a daily basis, if it’s not from one of my students or from one of my immediate bosses, I rarely (read it).” Mary, a math adjunct, also stated that unless the email was from her chair, it did not get her full attention. Mary expanded, “Well, I’m definitely going to read one from the chair, because I’m assuming there is something that she felt was important enough to send to me, and knowing it’s coming from the math department.” LaShaun, a geography adjunct, stated that more adjuncts would be aware of upcoming professional development if chairs or deans were the ones sending it. He said,

If I get emails from my chair, I read them. My dean, I read them. It does not matter if they are just little, trivial, you know, ‘I stepped on a banana peel this morning.’ I’m still going to read it if it’s from the dean … or maybe something that came down from the chair.

It would appear that the obstacle of not knowing when professional development is offered could be remedied by involving the chair or dean in disseminating this information. This is not currently the practice, but the feedback from adjuncts was clear that they value the information that their chair and deans send. None of the participants had any feedback for how to filter the mass amounts of emails sent to them, but they stated that if a training had the stamp of approval from their supervisor that they might be more likely to try to attend. One adjunct suggested that a centralized website could list all the faculty development sessions being offered throughout the system. This would reduce the need to filter through all of the emails and allow an easy, centralized place to view upcoming events. It is clear that the current model of general
email blasts is not working. In addition to improving the communication system, adjuncts wanted professional development targeted to their teaching experience level. In this process, they also wanted their level of experience to be targeted for the delivery of professional development, which I will explore in the next section.

Level/Target

Many adjuncts expressed that they wanted their level of teaching experience to be taken into consideration in two different ways. First, adjuncts wanted fewer sessions that are for beginning instructors. They wanted tracks where there is training that targets adjuncts who have more years of experience. Secondly, adjuncts with years of teaching experience wanted to be asked to present professional development sessions. Asking experienced adjuncts to present acknowledges their level of experience. I will address each aspect of the topic level/target.

Valerie believed that most of the training being offered at HSCC was entry-level training designed for new faculty. She acknowledged that it might be the marketing of the professional development sessions or how they packaged it, but she said she does not attend because she believes her experience is beyond what they are offering. Elizabeth, a math adjunct who also teaches high school math, felt that most of the training offered was for faculty who were brand new to teaching. She said she wished there was more training that did not focus on students struggling with math. She felt that the same training was always offered on underperforming students, but she wanted new, innovative ideas that addressed teaching math for all students.

LaShaun, a geography adjunct who also taught at the middle school level, felt similar to Elizabeth and Valerie who both taught high school. She expressed, “I’m a K through 12 certified teacher and I’ve taught three years in middle school, so I know how to teach…quite frankly, I am tired of people who know how to teach less than I do… I just sit there and nod my head when
they give me their (teaching) suggestions.” She went on to say that she believed that the majority of the training that HSCC offered was for new faculty. She did not attend a lot of training because there was nothing offered that was new to her.

Rhonda, a psychology adjunct, also believes most of the training offered to adjuncts is targeted at an entry level. She attended a technology related training that was offered by COTE in the past. She stated that she found herself frustrated because she would be on step ten of the training process, but the instructor was stuck on step three with the rest of the class, so she did not feel attending those types of professional development sessions were a good use of her time.

She acknowledged that this perception might lead her to miss something new that she could learn. Rhonda offered,

…so we talk about classroom management. I think, ‘Oh, for God’s sake, I can manage my classroom. I’ve been doing that for 24 years.’…so I think there is a feeling of…I could teach that, so why am I going to attend….and that may be false, right? It may be, had I gone to the class, I might learn something interesting…there is a perception, true or not, that for, probably both full-time and adjunct, okay, but I’ve been there, done that.” This perception appeared throughout the interviews with adjuncts.

Although many adjuncts feel the training is entry level, Willa, a department chair, did not agree with this assessment: “…we’re helping to try to make them better instructors, so we’re giving them engaging ideas, actually teaching strategies that can be used in class.” When pressed on the topic based in the adjunct view, she said she believed in her department that she and her department leads provided the adjuncts with information about basic topics such syllabus 101 and classroom management. She said she felt that the department should handle basic professional development as opposed to the Center of Teaching Excellence (COTE).

Alice, department chair, said she also believed some of the basic teaching topics should be handled by the department as well, but she felt the topics that were not entry level that COTE should focus on were “…how do I deal with a level of student resistance to a particular idea…”or
in a one-on-one teaching, coaching, mentoring scenario, how do you reach that student who is just so full of preconceived notions.” Alice went on to say she would like to see a partnership with COTE where they would offer training to her department that would not be considered entry-level.

Adjuncts also wanted their experience level to be targeted to present professional development sessions. Several adjuncts addressed the issue that they would like to present on professional development topics. However, they felt like their expertise was minimalized because they were part-time employees. Heather stated she had been asked to present at another college she taught at and found it very fulfilling. She stated she wanted to present professional development for HSCC, but she did not know the process.

Valerie stated she felt others thought she was not knowledgeable enough to lead professional development because she was not full-time. She expressed her thoughts:

I feel very much like the bottom of the swamp in the whole hierarchy of it, and I’m not saying I’m an expert at all, but I do feel like I do have something I can share that maybe somebody else could find value in for sure, and I think that would alleviate the sense of you feeling like an island on-campus.

Valerie went on to say that “…Obviously, they (adjuncts) outnumber the full-time, and just by the mass of that number wise, you will obviously hit topics or ideas that maybe would not…and it’s not being tapped into enough, I don’t think.” Valerie stated she wanted the opportunity to present professional development. She indicated, “I would like providing professional development…the invitation to provide content that I created and present information.”

Willa, a department chair, agreed that having adjuncts conduct professional development was a great idea that she had tried in the past and encouraged other chairs to do the same. She added, “I think the adjuncts really enjoyed having one of their own present…so a lot of my
adjuncts are great presenters and having them present is fantastic idea.” She offered advice to other chairs to include more adjuncts in professional development. She stated chairs could ask the adjuncts who they want to hear from in the department because they know who the good speakers are.

Adjunct faculty want their experience level to be acknowledge. While there are many new faculty each semester, the vast majority have numerous years of experience that should be addressed both in the professional development opportunities delivered and through the invitation to be a part of the delivery of professional development. When addressing targeting professional development to their level, adjuncts also addressed what type of professional development content they wanted.

Content

Adjuncts expressed their desire for content that is discipline-specific. At the time of the interviews, adjuncts felt the majority of the professional development being offered was focused on general teaching strategies and classroom technology innovations. While the adjunct faculty did not have issue with these topics, they did communicate that they wanted more professional development that was discipline-specific. For example, education adjuncts may want training that is going to speak to current and trending information about education as opposed to general teaching strategies sessions. June, a government instructor, stated she wanted more speakers in her field. “This last year on Constitution Day, two professors spoke on social media and elections...absolutely riveting, fantastic,” she said. This example mirrors what numerous participants in the interviews stated.

Lauren, an English adjunct, agreed that more discipline-specific professional development was needed. “I think it would be beneficial if they had more faculty lectures where
faculty present on their own research or maybe even speak about what they’re working on their dissertations on…or bring in speakers in their own academic discipline,” Lauren stated. Mary, a math adjunct, offered a different plan to providing content-specific training. Mary felt some of the most meaningful professional development she had participated in was specific to her discipline. She liked when the publisher of the textbook came in to discuss how to effectively use the textbook and its resources. Mary believed the training was practical and offered tips that she could use to better convey math principles. She especially appreciated the fact that the training focused specifically on math. Elizabeth, a math adjunct, attended the same training and felt very similar to Mary. She said it was some of the most meaningful professional development offered.

Leslie, a math adjunct, participated in the department training on how to use the math book. She said the session had meaning to her because not a lot of professional development is offered specifically for math. Leslie stated she does not attend professional development that is focused on math due to her experience with teaching professional development in high school. She explained,

…whenever we do non-content-specific PD (professional development), there’s nothing ever for math. I mean, to me, it’s broken up into you can use that in English/History, but you really can’t use it in math/science, and so if it pertained to math/science, then of course, I would attend, but most of the time it doesn’t.

Valeria, an education adjunct, believes more professional development should be offered from each of the departments. She believes training would be more meaningful if it came from the specific department she teaches in and involved the adjuncts in the process. Yolanda, an English adjunct, teaches both high school and college English. She embraces discipline-specific training but would like to see more professional development on the specific difference between teaching English at the high school level and at the college level. Yolanda felt this would help
her teach her subject matter more effectively. Other adjuncts who taught at the high school level voiced this concern in some form or another, so there is a need for content-specific training that distinguishes what English taught at the college level looks like versus the high school level.

When discussing professional development that they felt had an impact on them or was meaningful, a reoccurring theme was the need for more training that is focused on their specific discipline. Administrators should find the right balance between important sessions on general teaching strategies, technology innovations, and discipline-specific training. A theme that emerged stemming from adjuncts wanting discipline-specific training is the focus of training on practical information, which I will discuss next.

**Focus**

Meaningful professional development to adjuncts can be defined as having a focus on useful information or practical information. Tagging onto wanting discipline-specific training, they want the focus of this information to be in the form of information that they can immediately use in the classroom. Useful professional development may seem like a broad, difficult to define terminology; however, the common thread appeared that useful professional development was practical information or strategies that could be implemented immediately into the classroom.

Tamra, a faculty member who works with professional development, said her goal is to make the professional development “real” for everyone. She stated, “My mission is when you walk away from a session with me, you should have something that you can use in your classes on Monday… or next week, the next day.” She defines meaningful professional development as training that has an immediate impact or change in the faculty’s instruction methods.

…I have one instructor and at the beginning, his PowerPoints were just black and white, and they were kind of boring, and now (after participating in professional development)
he uses color, and there are visuals…so students are noticing that their instructors are
doing these things…They’re (the students) learning the material better…that’s a huge impact.

Elizabeth, a math adjunct, attended the technology professional development session
offered by Tamra. She believes that what made it impactful was it offered information that she
could easily implement into the classroom. She explained that “…Probably the one professional
development that I appreciated the most was the one that it did talk about technology that’s
available here on campus…now to me that was professional development.”

Willa, department chair, agreed with what many adjuncts were stating. She believed that
training should offer practical strategies and solutions saying, “I think the most meaningful
(professional development) is actually giving them things that they can do, the real life things
that actually work, that have been tried.” Willa proffered that adjuncts will come even if there is
not compensation if they can walk away with something tangible to use in the classroom. She
asserted that department chairs have a role in professional development and by simply offering
share and learn sessions, adjuncts would attend and benefit from interacting with each other. She
said,

  …Making the share sessions and training valuable is what brings them in even without
compensation…that’s the thing. I need to make them worth coming to, so they’re worth
giving their time up…but I have a history of offering great professional development, and
so that’s the reason I get really good turnout.

Collin, a dean at HSCC, also believed he had a responsibility for meaningful professional
development when he was a chair. He designed a professional development series when he was
a chair with another department chair and called the series, Third Thursdays. Every third
Thursday he would have training specifically targeting the adjunct faculty. He offered practical
training that provided tips and tricks that could be used in the classroom. Collin argued that
professional development cannot be static and that it must be constantly changing as the student
population is constantly evolving and changing. He said a key to meaningful professional development when targeting adjuncts is it must constantly change and update to accommodate a population that is not static. He concluded that there must be a takeaway from the session that would be useful in the classroom.

Rhonda, a psychology adjunct, addressed the issue of practical professional development. She took a course at another institution on higher education as a public good. She said the course was practical and inspired her to read more about the topic. She exclaimed that

It (the course) was so timely, and it was so exciting to say, ‘Wow. This stuff is not just stuff that I’m thinking about in the classroom.’ It is stuff that clearly other people in higher education are thinking about and dealing with, so it absolutely inspired me to read (more about the topic)…

The research demonstrated that the focus of any professional development should be on “ready-to-implement” information. Adjuncts want to feel like they are receiving information that they can easily implement in their class. Professional development providers should be aware of this need and make sure that is the focus and goal of any training provided. The final theme I discovered was participation. In the next section, I will delve into what encourages and discourages adjuncts to participate in professional development that is offered

**Participation**

With the findings spotlighting various aspects of what adjuncts consider meaningful professional development, this leads to the question of what are motivators to attending training in the first place. Two factors emerged as important to participation in professional development events, and they are compensation and acknowledgement. Both of these factors will be explored as they relate to adjuncts experience with professional development. First, I will explore the concept of compensating adjunct faculty for participation in professional development.
How do you incentivize attending professional development? This question arose in numerous interviews. The HSCC standard is they do not compensate adjuncts for professional development. One program that several of the adjuncts participated in is called the Adjunct Certification Program, which is offered on each campus in the HSCC system. Participants who complete this multi-session program are compensated $500. Other than this program, there is not any funding set aside to compensate adjuncts for their time. Lack of compensation is an obstacle to more participation from adjuncts in professional development. In the example of the adjunct who stated she would have to hire a babysitter to attend professional development, without any compensation for attendance, attending professional development would actually cost her money. While compensating adjuncts for professional development is a common thread not all adjuncts agree that they should be compensated. Some adjuncts believe that intrinsic motivation should be enough reward. I will review both views.

Willa, a department chair, strongly believes that adjuncts should be compensated for participating in professional development. She said,

I wish they were because they would be more likely to come, and yes, I think that they should (be compensated). I mean, I think it is only fair. I don’t think adjuncts make very much, and when I was an adjunct I didn’t feel like I made very much, and I was asked to attend a lot of meetings, and attend a lot of things, and I did…but yes, I absolutely think do (need to be compensated).

Lauren, an English adjunct, believes the biggest reason adjuncts do not attend is that they are not paid for their time. She said that when presenters ask why more people did not come the reason is “well, they have a daytime job, or they’re not going to drive here if they’re not getting paid.”

Collin, a dean, stated that compensation was one of the biggest barriers to getting adjunct involved with professional development, but he stated he did not have the funds to pay them and even if he did that he would have to then be concerned about their workload due to the
Affordable Care Act requirements. Alice, a department chair, stated that it is a “no-brainer;” if there is no incentive to coming, that many adjuncts will not participate in professional development. However, she said there are more incentives than just money that would encourage adjuncts to attend. Several adjuncts mentioned they would be more likely to attend professional development if they knew it was being considered when interviewing for a full-time teaching position. Rhonda, a psychology adjunct, stated if adjuncts were told that certain professional development would make them look like more desirable candidates, this would incentivize professional development. Heather, a business adjunct, said she participated in professional development because she believed it would make her seem like a more attractive candidate when applying for full-time jobs.

While pay and incentivizing professional development is attractive, several of the interview participants believed that altruistic reasons should drive adjuncts to participate in professional development. Tamra, a full-time faculty member who frequently offers professional development, believes that learning is a part of the job of an educator and that adjuncts should intrinsically want to learn more about their profession. Tamra went on to say that, she would even require a certain number of required hours of professional development because she felt strongly in the importance in participating in professional development. Yolanda, an English adjunct, said her motivator for participating in professional development is knowing that ultimately knowing her students will reap the benefits of what she brings to the classroom. Believing professional development makes her better in the classroom was her source of motivation for participating in faculty development.

Howard, a business adjunct, noted that professional development was his responsibility regardless of whether there was an incentive. He stated,
I figure that’s all investment in my professional development, and I don’t hesitate to do that. I do not expect someone to pay me to make myself better. It’s nice and I take advantage of it when it’s offered to me, but I don’t feel like it is somebody else’s job.

Gloria, a French adjunct, held a similar view to Howard and stated, “I don’t think I should be compensated for it because I think I am being compensated for it. I am getting a free class…I think that is enough.”

While compensation was a motivator for many of the adjuncts, it was not conclusively the main motivator; therefore, I looked at other forms of motivation to participate in training. A common theme among the adjuncts was they did not feel administrators (vice presidents, deans, and chairs) noticed when they went the extra mile to attend professional development, especially since they were not compensated for it. I followed up on this expressed concern with the question would adjuncts be more likely to attend professional development if they were acknowledged for their participation by upper administration including their supervisor (chair).

June, a math adjunct, stated acknowledgement from administration would mean something to her, so they could see she still cared about growing and developing because at this point in her career as a retired high school math teach, she did not have to attend any professional development. LaShaun stated if her administrators noticed her participation, it would influence her decision to participate in more training. She explained, “I would say (to myself) ‘Hey, somebody knows what I am doing. They want me to do a good job and do better and improve, and they’re taking note.’ I do think that would have an impact, especially those adjuncts who do not know how they fit into this college.” Valerie noted that no one acknowledges her participation in professional development and offered this: “Honestly, I don’t think they care…Well, it comes off as that they don’t care, which is bad, being on the reception
of that, but I think they just don’t know what to do, and so they don’t do it.” Lauren, an English adjunct, said it would be nice to be recognized for participating in professional development:

It would seem very personable, maybe that is part of the reason why they (adjuncts) do not make an effort. Like I said, it has always been a struggle for adjuncts to feel like they have a human connection on-campus. They drive up, teach class, there is nowhere to go in-between classes, so they awkwardly wait in the commons, they teach their class, and then they leave. If they did feel they were developing and it was acknowledged… it would help entice them to make the effort to come.

Alice, a department chair, admitted she did not acknowledge when adjuncts completed professional development because she said she was unaware of how to get that information. She stated she could see how recognition could have an impact, but she had never really put a lot of thought into it. Tamra, who works to offer professional development on-campus, said she believed a better effort could be made to notify chairs when their faculty have completed professional development. Collin, a dean on-campus, said departments needed to be notified when their adjuncts completed professional development. He said he wanted to see more adjuncts sharing what they learned at the professional development within. This could serve the dual role of acknowledging their participation and allowing others to hear what they learned.

Both compensation and acknowledgement of participation were two major factors that played a role in encouraging faculty to attend training. There was not one clear motivator that emerged as the single most motivating strategy to getting more adjuncts to participate. However, these findings point to compensation and acknowledgement as factors, I will explore these points further in chapter 5 implications for professional development.

**Summary**

After the second round of coding, I discovered several aspects of the adjunct experience with professional development. First, adjuncts did not frequently attend professional development opportunities at HSCC. Consistent attendance at training events was not part of
their professional development experience. In addition, adjuncts were not relegated to educational opportunities solely at HSCC. Because many adjuncts teach at multiple campuses, they had to choose what opportunities they want to participate in. An interesting piece of the experiences of these adjuncts was that participating in professional development made them feel less “invisible” on-campus. Adjunct faculty felt the professional development experience connected them to their colleagues as well as the mission of the campus. This aspect of connectedness was key to the adjunct experience with professional development.

The findings paint a picture of what is meaningful professional development to adjuncts. We are able to see what current aspects of professional development they like and do not like. The adjuncts voiced their needs and wants in creating meaningful professional development, which accordingly to the literature can lead to increased satisfaction. In Chapter V, I will discuss the finding and review implications for higher education professional development.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

I conducted a phenomenological case study research on the experiences and perceptions of adjunct faculty with professional development. The goal was to explore, analyze, and learn about the phenomenon of the lived-experienced of adjuncts participating in professional development and to establish what meaningful professional development is. I selected this topic because I felt there was a gap in the literature when discussing adjunct satisfaction at work. Researchers found that professional development was a motivator and contributed to their overall satisfaction (Diegel, 2013; Hoyt, 2012; Waltman, Hollendshead, Miller, & August, 2012). The research was incomplete regarding types of professional development being offered and types they needed. The research did not offer insight into the adjunct experience with professional development. This gap prompted me to further investigate the phenomenon. I chose a qualitative approach to delve into lived experience of adjuncts. In this chapter, I will review and discuss the results, establish implications for professional development, provide feedback for future research, and finally, offer some personal reflection on the research experience.

Summary of the Results

The primary research questions used to guide the research was what are adjunct faculty perceptions and experiences with faculty development at a specific institution? This question formed the basis of my research and was supported by two other research questions: 1) what do adjunct faculty find beneficial about professional development experiences; and 2) what do adjunct faculty find challenging about professional development experiences?
From these guiding research questions, I formulated interview questions and conducted semi-structured interviews. After conducting two rounds of interviews with 16 participants, I identified various themes of the adjunct experience with professional development.

I found the adjunct experience with professional development is limited. Adjuncts do not attend professional development with frequency. When they do attend, they may not attend at HSCC because they work at multiple institutions. When working at multiple institutions, adjuncts must decide what opportunities they want to take advantage of participating in. Therefore, administrators cannot assume they are not receiving professional development if they are not participating in at HSCC. Some adjuncts mentioned they felt that the professional development was often a waste of their time. These factors are a part of the adjunct experience with professional development and set the foundation for the next discovery.

During the course of the interviews, adjuncts stated that they often felt invisible or not part of team. This corresponds to the literature (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015; Hoyt, 2012; Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2013). Adjuncts felt professional development gave them the opportunity to network and connect with their peers, thus reducing the feeling of being invisible.

When answering the second and third research question, I found some key components to experiencing meaningful professional development. First, scheduling of professional development is pivotal in the process of delivering professional development. Finding the right time to offer professional development is an on-going challenge, thus more online learning could be effective. How HSCC professional development providers communicate their offerings is also key. Faculty supervisors (department chairs) should play a role in advertising these opportunities. Targeting adjuncts’ teaching level of experience is important when offering professional development and when recruiting adjuncts to present professional development.
Next, adjuncts want more content that is discipline specific. More training focused specifically on the disciplines they teach is important. In addition, the focus of this training should be on useful or practical information that can in turn be easily used in the classroom. Adjuncts want to learn information that they can infuse into class lectures. I discovered that there are two factors that can motivate adjuncts to attend professional development. The first factor is compensation for participation is a motivator for some adjuncts although not all adjuncts agreed that they needed pay for participation. Some adjuncts noted that administrators acknowledging their participation could in itself encourage them to participate more. All of the factors listed above contribute to meaningful professional development. These factors present a guide to better understanding the adjunct experience with professional development thus providing a guide to providing meaningful professional development.

**Discussion of the Results**

The main research question was what are adjunct faculty perceptions and experiences with faculty development at a specific institution? It was clear from the interviews that the adjunct experiences with professional development cannot be limited to one institution as they receive their development from a variety of sources. The majority of the adjuncts interviewed worked at more than one institution; therefore, they may have the opportunity for professional development at other institutions. While my focus was on HSCC, it became clear that receiving professional development from just one source was not realistic for this population. This said, I did guide the questions to be specific to HSCC, so I could capture the experience on this particular campus. I will further discuss and elaborate on the three themes that I found during my research.
The literature focusing on adjunct satisfaction clearly states that adjuncts want to be embraced by their institutions and acknowledged as professional educators (Hoyt, 2012). However, I was not prepared for this sentiment to be expressed as strongly as it was when discussing professional development. I demonstrated in the literature review that professional development was a source of satisfaction; however, I never expected to find that it was also a source leading to validation. Several adjuncts used the word “invisible” to describe how they felt on the campus and within their departments. Participating in professional development connects them with their peers but it also connects them to the mission of the institution. Interacting with other adjuncts provides a layer of support that is often felt by adjuncts to be missing. Professional development provides a vehicle for networking that influences their satisfaction. Part-time faculty want to feel a part of the team, which I believe, can lead to increased job satisfaction.

Next, I addressed questions two and three, which are “what do adjunct faculty find beneficial about professional development experiences” and “what do adjunct faculty find challenging about professional development experiences?” These two questions provided the basis for what adjuncts consider meaningful professional development. I will expound on the results.

Scheduling

One common theme that was clear is there is never the “right” time for professional development. There was not consensus among those interviewed about their experience of when the right time was for training. Adjunct schedules vary so much that administrators state they have a hard time capturing this population. Due to this reason, almost all adjuncts stated they wanted more “on-demand” or online professional development. Online professional
development would give them the ability to self-pace their learning and accommodate their schedules. This did not surprise me considering the challenges of the adjunct schedule. However, I challenged them when they indicated online learning as a solution.

As noted earlier, adjuncts stated that they not only wanted more interaction with other adjuncts but also they needed this time. This is in direct contradiction to their desire to wanting more on-demand training, which cuts out the person-to-person interaction. Adjuncts are faced with tough choices. They can make the time to come to campus so they can network with their peers, or they can forgo this desire and participate in more online learning. This dilemma will need to be addressed by professional development providers. Unfortunately, two of the adjuncts’ needs conflict with each other. When I challenged adjuncts on this dilemma, there were few solutions with many adjuncts simply shrugging their shoulders. I will address this challenge more in my implications for professional development section of this chapter.

Communication

It became clear from the interviews that the department chairs were one among most influential people that adjuncts interacted with at their campus. Participants wanted their chairs to offer more professional development for their department. In addition, participants stated that they read all of their chairs’ emails to them. However, when asked how they learned about professional development, most stated through email, but many admitted they often missed emails about professional development opportunities unless their chairs pointed them out. It appears that the most direct method to reach adjuncts about professional development is through the department chair spotlighting upcoming events. Other marketing emails about professional development often are deleted in the deluge of daily emails. Marketing professional development is a challenge; however, department chairs can assist in minimizing this challenge.
**Level/Target**

I addressed level/target from two viewpoints. One viewpoint is that adjuncts want professional development that targets their level of teaching experience and the second viewpoint is that adjuncts want their teaching experience targeted when recruiting presenters for professional development. A clear point from the results was adjuncts want professional development to be targeted to their level of experience and focused more on discipline-specific content. While I will discuss this more in the implications for professional development section of this chapter, training should be targeted to experienced adjuncts. Many adjuncts felt that professional development mainly focused on entry-level teaching topics. This conflicted with the view of several administrators who felt professional development did target various levels. It may be how the training is marketed that needs to be reviewed. Adjuncts also felt that professional development that was discipline-specific was beneficial.

Finally, adjuncts want to be professional development presenters. The act of securing part-time faculty to present on various topics is significant for a couple of reasons. First, it says the institution acknowledges you as a contributing member of the team. Second, it communicates that the adjunct is competent and knowledgeable (experience level). Adjuncts are a great source of professional development ideas and presentations. One department chair said that simply asking an adjunct to lead a discussion during a department meeting could have an impact on connecting the adjunct to the institution. Professional development provides opportunities for adjuncts to connect with their college and peers. Based on this one snapshot of the adjunct experience, professional development may be a source that contributes to their professional worth.
Content

Adjuncts want to learn more about their specific discipline as opposed to general teaching strategies. This observation points to the need for department chairs to offer more professional development. I discuss this more in my implications for professional development section, but chairs need to play a more active role in providing professional development in their departments to accommodate content-specific training. Providing discipline-specific training keeps adjuncts up-to-date on their current discipline. It can also provide information to infuse into their lectures. When asked to talk about meaningful professional development, many of the adjuncts cited training that specifically focused on their disciplines they teach.

Focus

Adjuncts want the focus of training to be on information they can easily use in the classroom. As mentioned, adjuncts work full-time jobs, teach at multiples campuses, and are challenged to get to campus for professional development. Therefore, the interview participants voiced the importance of receiving meaningful professional development that translates into practical/useful information that can be brought to the classroom. The view of many adjuncts was meaningful professional development was not their experience at HSCC. Adjunct faculty believe professional development is beneficial when they can take something back and use the next day in class. They are seeking something tangible when learning.

Participation

To encourage participation, I explore two motivating aspects. I explored compensation and acknowledgement of participation. When I addressed the topic of incentivizing professional development, I received a mixed response. It was clear to me that compensation did not appear to the biggest motivator to getting participation. All participants acknowledged compensation
did not hurt, but in many cases, it was not necessary. According to the administrators I interviewed, there are no plans to budget for compensation for adjuncts attending professional development. With tightening budgets at most higher education institutions, compensating adjuncts for participating in professional development does not appear to be a viable option. I will revisit this in implications for professional development section of this chapter.

None of the adjuncts stated that they seek acknowledgement for their efforts when they participate in professional development. However, almost all of them stated it would be nice if someone, especially their chair, acknowledged when they do participate in some type of professional development. Attending training is difficult when you work a full-time job or work at several colleges. Therefore, the acknowledgement feels good when it happens. It makes them feel noticed which could be significant if you already feel invisible and ultimately encourage them to attend more in the future.

Adjuncts want to participation in meaningful professional development. The points discussed provide guidance to professional development providers that can be used to be more effective in delivering training to adjuncts. Through exploring the experiences and perceptions of adjuncts with professional development, we can better address their needs. In the next section, I will review the implications to practice for professional development providers.

**Implications for Professional Development**

The research gives institutions insight into addressing adjunct professional development. Examining the everyday experiences of adjuncts with professional development addresses the gap in the literature and gives some practical guidance to professional development providers. First, the obstacle of how to get professional development to adjuncts should be addressed. As discussed earlier, there is a need for adjunct networking as well as convenience of the sessions.
This will be a challenge for all institutions, and both needs are important. Therefore, there is a need for both face-to-face and online learning. Both options should be offered for adjuncts to have the opportunity to select a method that works best for them. Trial and error will dictate the balance that is found between the two methods. Based on my research, equal weight should be given to the delivery method of face-to-face and online, so developing options will create more opportunities for adjuncts to grow and develop.

Department chairs should play an integral role in the adjuncts’ professional development experience. Campuses like HSCC that have centers for teaching and learning should acknowledge the significance that the chair can play in offering professional development to adjuncts, thus partnerships should be formed between the centers and department chairs. Centers for teaching and learning need to reframe how they support faculty and reposition themselves to coach and support department chairs to offer more content-specific training. With adjuncts indicating that professional development was more meaningful when offered by the department, department chairs should set faculty development goals for their department. Teaching and learning centers while not abandoning their department mission and goals should assess how they can support chairs in offering more training and development. Chairs should also play a role in spotlighting professional development opportunities as well. The research indicates that adjuncts are more likely to read about professional development if the chair points it out.

A final thought about the role of the chair and adjunct professional development is acknowledgement from the chair when adjuncts participate in a training is key to making the adjunct feel noticed. A simple email thanking the adjunct for taking time to complete training could make an adjunct feel valued. The role of the department chair cannot be minimalized.
when it comes to supporting and offering quality training and development. Chairs should be a part of the discussion of how to support the growth and development of part-time faculty.

Based on this research, professional development providers should be cognizant that adjunct participation in professional development connects adjuncts to the campuses mission, thus giving them a sense of being a part of team. With that being said, opportunities should be offered to present or train their peers on topics of their expertise. Institutions can survey adjuncts to see if any volunteers who would like to offer professional development presentations. This is a win-win for the adjunct who wants to be involved, and for the institution that needs volunteers to deliver training and development. My research indicated that adjuncts were also receptive to participating in training delivered by their peers. Selecting adjuncts to present to their peers acknowledges their competence and knowledge. Going forward, adjuncts could be a solution to providing professional development.

Finally, institutions should ensure that quality professional development is being offered. Teaching and learning centers can play a role in ensuring that session learning objectives offer tangible takeaways. Part-time faculty want information that they can embrace and implement in their classrooms easily. Therefore, session outcomes should present opportunities for adjuncts to walk away with information or strategies that can be infused the next day in class. In achieving this goal, all professional development providers on-campus collaborate to devise an adjunct professional development strategic plan each year. Efforts to develop adjuncts should be intentional and connected to institution's academic mission and initiatives.
Implications for HSCC

Based on the research findings, HSCC administrations should create an adjunct faculty professional development strategic plan. First, administrators should address the scheduling concerns. As I mentioned earlier, a mixture of on-demand training and face-to-face should be offered. The on-demand training will provide flexibility for many adjuncts to participate in professional development as their convenience.

Administrators should investigate vendors that offer on-demand faculty training such as GO2Knowledge.com. Scheduling face-to-face training is challenging as there is never a perfect time for everyone. However, departments can send out polls to determine days/times that work best for the majority. Training sessions can also be held more than once to allow multiple opportunities to participate.

To improve communication, HSCC should offer a website with all faculty development in the HSCC system listed in one place. This will make it easy to find what sessions are being offered. HSCC department chairs should encourage attendance through helping promote professional development by sending out emails advertising these sessions. These simple solutions will assist in promoting professional development.

When planning professional development, two tracks of professional development sessions can be offered. One track can be for adjuncts who have taught two years or less and one track can be for adjuncts who have three plus years. This will target to their experience. HSCC should send out a survey asking adjuncts to submit professional development session proposals if they would like to present a session. This gesture would encourage adjuncts to participate in the delivery of professional development.
Administrators should scrutinize all training proposals to ensure that it contains practical information that will enhance the classroom experience. All training should be engaging and contain practical tips ready to be implemented in the classroom. Since adjuncts want more discipline-specific information, department chairs should offer one professional development session a semester. The Center of Teaching Excellence should meet with department chairs to discuss how they can assist with delivering discipline-specific information.

Finally, if compensation is not a possibility, administrators should discuss the best method to recognize adjuncts when they attend professional development. The adjunct professional development strategic plan should address acknowledging adjunct participation.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This phenomenological case study addressed the experiences of adjuncts with regard to professional development. Because there is a gap in the literature when it comes to what professional development and adjunct faculty and their needs, I was motivated to address this topic. After completing this study, I believe more research can be done on this topic. While I took a qualitative approach, I believe there is an opportunity for quantitative research on the topic as well. Researchers could address specific types of training which adjuncts want and need (i.e., do more adjuncts want training on classroom management or learning management system training)? My study stops short of specifying the specific topics that are needed for adjuncts to feel successful. This area could provide more insight into the types of professional development that contributes to satisfaction at work.

I am intrigued by my findings that face-to-face professional development is important in connecting with peers and feeling a part of the team, but they want more online professional
development. More research on this dilemma is needed to explore where the balance of their professional development delivery needs are.

Another area worthy of more research is adjunct validation. Adjuncts discussed feeling invisible and not valued. I would recommend studying the conditions that contribute to adjunct feeling invisible. More research is needed on this topic. More research is needed on the role of teaching and learning centers in delivery of faculty development. In the literature, research on adjunct professional development and teaching and learning centers were mentioned as providers, but these articles did not discuss the role of the teaching and learning center in faculty development. Finally, the results indicated that the department chair had influence on the adjuncts. Therefore, I recommend research be conducted on the relationship between the chair and the adjunct, as well as, the influence the chair has with the adjunct.

**Researcher’s Reflections**

I taught my first college course as an adjunct in 1997. I was excited to teach, but I did not even know the first thing about teaching or even how to write a syllabus. I do not remember any adjunct training to support me as I started. If there was, I was blindly unaware. Little did I know that 20 years later, I would become a Director of Professional Development and still teach as an adjunct. I am now an advocate for professional development for adjunct faculty. I am continuously working on strategies to reach the adjunct population. My research has opened my eyes to the experiences of adjunct faculty with professional development. There is information that I can take away to use to better reach this population.

I selected this topic because of my interest in both adjunct issues and professional development, which are two of my passions. My research has solidified my belief that adjunct professional development is crucial and should not be optional. There are many benefits to
adjuncts participating training as I have noted. I have learned more about the adjunct population. I have grown as a researcher and a professional development provider throughout this process. The doctoral study experience has allowed me to become a scholar in my professional field, which has been invaluable.

Some lessons learned are that adjunct faculty are difficult to schedule for interviews. I had a very difficult time getting adjuncts to volunteer. I was very flexible in my schedule to capture them when they were available. This led me to introduce administrators into the study. If I were to do the study again, I would interview a few more administrators as they had a unique perspective in adjunct professional development, which helped triangulate the data.

**Conclusion**

The literature stated that adjunct faculty want professional development, which can contribute to their overall satisfaction at work. This fact was consistent in the research; however, what was not clear was what professional development were they receiving and needing. The adjunct experience with professional development was not clear. Through this study, I sought to provide insight into the experiences and perceptions of adjunct faculty with professional development. I attempted to address the gap in the literature and to bring new light on the topic. I conducted phenomenological case study research to uncover the live-experiences of adjunct faculty with professional development. The research questions provided guidance to addressing the literature gap. I conducted personal interviews to learn more about the current experiences of adjuncts with professional development at a Texas community college.

The major findings of this study indicate that that professional development can be a source of validation for them as teaching professionals. Validation is important to adjunct faculty and professional development can influence this feeling. Next, adjuncts want meaningful
professional development opportunities. Adjunct faculty want to feel that their time is being honored and that the professional development that is offered provides real, tangible, takeaways. Finally, adjuncts face many challenges to participating in professional development. Many issues should be addressed in order for adjuncts to be able to fully participate.

The results can influence institutions address training and development for part-time faculty. All professional development key stakeholders at institutions should meet to discuss if they are effectively reaching their part-time teaching audience. The results from this study can provide insight into how best to deliver training to adjuncts. Ultimately, the winner when adjuncts learn and grow as instructors is the students in their classes.
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APPENDIX A:

RESEARCH PLAN

Fall Semester 2016
- Request permission from President of Houston Suburb Community College to solicit adjunct volunteers to be interviews (October)
- Submit IRB application to University of Alabama and Houston Suburb Community College (December)

Spring Semester 2017
- Obtain an updated list of adjunct faculty that meet the requirements of the research (January)
- Email selected adjuncts potential participants with introduction to research and a google doc sign-up sheet (February)
- Conduct Interviews (February/March)
- Transcribe data (March)
- Allow participants to review the transcripts for accuracy (March)
- Follow-up interviews (March)
- Review and code data (March/April)
- Analyze the data (April)
APPENDIX B:

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FORM

Round One Interview

R. Mark Miles Dissertation Research Project: “Adjunct Perceptions of Professional Development at a Texas Community College.”

Date __________________________
Time __________________________
Location ________________________

Interviewer:  R. Mark Miles, University of Alabama
             Doctoral Candidate-Higher Education Administration

Interviewee ______________________________________________________
Discipline Taught____________________________________________________
Years of experience____________________________________________________
Release form signed? YES/NO
Round one interview/Round two interview

Notes to interviewee:
Thank you for your participation. I believe your input will be valuable to this research and in helping grow all of our professional practice.
Confidentiality of responses is guaranteed
Approximate length of interview: Two rounds of interviews: 45-60 minutes each time

Purpose of research:
The purpose of this research is to better understand the experiences of adjunct faculty at Houston Suburb Community College campus with professional development.

Round One Interview Questions

1. What constitutes professional development to you?
2. What professional development activities did you participate in during the 2015-2016 academic year?
3. What format were these professional development activities offered in?
4. Were they required or optional activities?
5. What was not offered that you would have found interest in?
6. Were you paid to participate in professional development?
7. What was the most meaningful professional development experience you participated in?
8. Tell me about a professional development experience that was useful to you personally or professionally and specifically how did you benefit from it?
9. How has your teaching been impacted by your professional development experience?  
10. Did you benefit from your interaction with other adjunct faculty in the professional development activity?  
11. Did the professional development activity inspire you to do more research or reading on the topic?  
12. What did you learn from one of your experiences?

Reflection by Interviewer

- Closure
  - Thank you to interviewee
  - reassure confidentiality
  - ask permission to follow-up ______

Interview Protocol Form
Round Two Interview
R. Mark Miles Dissertation Research Project: “Adjunct Perceptions of Professional Development at a Texas Community College.”

Date ___________________________
Time ___________________________
Location ________________________

Interviewer: R. Mark Miles, University of Alabama  
Doctoral Candidate-Higher Education Administration

Interviewee ____________________________________________________________
Discipline Taught________________________________________________________
Years of experience_______________________________________________________
Release form signed? YES/NO
Round one interview/Round two interview

Notes to interviewee:
Thank you for your participation. I believe your input will be valuable to this research and in helping grow all of our professional practice. Confidentiality of responses is guaranteed
Approximate length of interview: Two rounds of interviews: 45-60 minutes each time

Purpose of research:
The purpose of this research is to better understand the experiences of adjunct faculty at Houston Suburb Community College campus with professional development.

Round Two Interview Questions

1. What are obstacles to participating in professional development opportunities?  
2. What can be done to address those obstacles?  
3. Are there other challenges or obstacles with the professional development offered?
4. Do you feel professional development is targeted to your level of teaching experience?
5. Are the professional development opportunities at your institution offered in a manner that is convenient to you? Why or Why not?
6. What professional development format works best for your needs?
7. How do administrators track your participation?
8. Is your participation in professional development important to your evaluation structure?
9. Is participation in professional development considered in full-time hiring decisions?
10. Does your institution recognize your participation in professional development?
11. How do they acknowledge your participation in professional development?

Reflection by Interviewer
   • Closure
     ○ Thank you to interviewee
     ○ reassure confidentiality
     ○ ask permission to follow-up _______
APPENDIX C:

ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FORM

Administrator Perspective on Adjunct Perceptions and Experiences with Professional Development

R. Mark Miles Dissertation Research Project: “Adjunct Perceptions of Professional Development at a Texas Community College.”

Date __________________________
Time __________________________
Location ________________________

Interviewer:  R. Mark Miles, University of Alabama
             Doctoral Candidate-Higher Education Administration

Interviewee ____________________
Administrator Position__________________________
Years of experience___________________________
Were you ever an adjunct__________________________
Release form signed?  YES/NO
Round one interview/Round two interview

1. What constitutes professional development for adjunct faculty?

2. During the 2015-2016 academic year, did you provide any professional development opportunities to adjunct faculty?

3. What format were these professional development activities offered in?

4. Were they required or optional activities?

5. How do you feel adjuncts should be compensated for professional development?

6. What was the most meaningful professional development you have seen offered to adjuncts?

7. How do you feel professional development impacts the adjunct’s teaching experience?

8. How do you feel adjuncts benefit from interacting with other adjuncts during professional development activities?
9. What are obstacles to participating in professional development opportunities?

10. What can be done to address those obstacles?

11. Are there other challenges or obstacles with the professional development offered?

12. How do you feel professional development is targeted to all teaching levels?

13. Do you think the manner or format that professional development is delivered to adjuncts is convenient to them?

14. How do administrators track adjunct participation in professional development?

15. How is professional development participation considered in the adjunct’s performance evaluation?

16. How is adjunct participation in professional development considered in the full-time hiring decisions?

17. Does HSCC recognize adjunct participation in professional development in any way?

18. How does an adjunct find out about professional development being offered?

Reflection by Interviewer

- Closure
  - Thank you to interviewee
  - reassure confidentiality
  - ask permission to follow-up
APPENDIX D:

CONSENT OF PARTICIPATION

Adjunct Faculty Perceptions of Professional Development

R. Mark Miles, The University of Alabama
Doctoral Candidate
281-290-2920
rmark01@hotmail.com

You are being asked to take part in a research study. This study is called Adjunct Perceptions of Professional Development at a Texas Community College. The study is being conducted by R. Mark Miles, Doctoral Candidate at the University of Alabama.

What is this study about?
This study is being conducted to explore adjunct faculty’s experiences with professional development.

Why have I been asked to be in this study and how many people will be in this study?
Approximately 16 adjuncts who have completed at least one full year of teaching at Houston Suburb Community College (Fall 2015 and Spring 2016) and come from a range of disciplines will be randomly asked to participate. The research will employ a basic qualitative design.

Why is this study important or useful?
Through studying adjunct’s experiences with professional development, administrators may be better able to address their professional development needs more effectively.

What will I be asked to do?
If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to do the following.
  1. Participate in two rounds on separate days of audio recorded interviews lasting between 45 minutes to 1 hour in length.
  2. Review and respond to transcription of interview.

Will being in the study cost me anything? Will I be compensated for being in this study?
The only cost to you from this study is your time given to the interviews. Your participation is strictly voluntary; therefore, there will not be any compensation.

What is the risks and benefits in participating in this study?
Risks for participating in this study are minimal. There may be no direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. You will not be paid for the study, and the only cost to you is the cost of your time for participating. However, the information you provide may prove beneficial to the
understanding of how to more effectively serve adjunct faculty through professional development. It should yield information on what types of professional development adjuncts want more of, so that professional development administrators can more effectively plan and execute faculty development at their campus.

**Is your participation required?**
Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. You may refuse to answer any of the questions. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. Not participating or choosing to leave the study will not result in any penalty or loss of any benefits you would otherwise receive.

**Is the researcher being paid for this research?**
The researcher is not being paid to research this topic. There is no funding associated with this research.

**Is this research developing a product that will be sold, and if so, will the investigator profit from it?**
This research will not produce a product that will be sold nor is there any funding associated with this product.

**Does the investigator have any conflict of interest in the study?**
The investigator does not have any ties or relations with the site of the study, Houston Suburb Community College. However, the investigator, R. Mark Miles, is employed by the Houston Suburb Community College System at another campus as the Director of Professional Development and adjunct faculty.

**How will my privacy be protected?**
You will be interviewed in a private room and your participation not shared with other faculty.

**How will my confidentiality be protected?**
You confidentiality will be protected in the study first by using a pseudonym for the college. The actual name of the college will not be used. Participant names will be coded and given a pseudonym. Participant’s real names will not be used any in the study. Audio recording and notes will be kept locked by the investigator at all times and not shared with Houston Suburb Community College administration.

**What are the alternatives to not being in this study? Do I have other choices?**
The alternative to being in this study is not to participate. This study is strictly voluntary.

**What are my rights as a participant in this study?**
Taking part in this study is voluntary. It is your free choice. You can refuse to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. There will be no effect on your relations with Houston Suburb Community College or the University of Alabama.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The Ethics Review Board may review study records from time to
time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned. This study has been approved through the Houston Suburb Community College Institutional Review Board as well as the University of Alabama IRB.

**Contact Information**
If you have questions about the study right now, please ask them. If you have questions about the study later on, please call the investigator R. Mark Miles at the contact information listed above. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at toll-free 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](http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html) or email the Research compliance office at participationoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have read this consent form. The study has been explained to me. I understand what I will be asked to do. I freely agree to take part in it. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree to the interviews being audio-recorded  □ yes  □ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTIGATOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E:

HSCC INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD RESEARCH APPLICATION FORM

Note: IRB approval may be granted only for human subjects research conducted by Houston Suburb Community College faculty, staff, students (on or off-campus), and eligible external applicants.

E-mail completed form along with any attachments

Check One:  [ ] New  [ ] Continuing  [ ] Modification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(may not be an undergraduate student at HSCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator connection to HSCC (if any):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator E-Mail Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator Phone Number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Type: check one

- [ ] Faculty Research
- [ ] Student Research (under faculty direction)
- [ ] Student class project (under faculty direction)
- [ ] HSCC Honors Project
- [ ] Federal grant
- [ ] Non-federal grant
- [ ] Thesis or dissertation
- [ ] Other __________________________

Institution Conducting Study:

Faculty Sponsor (if outside institution):

Proposed Start Date:

Duration of Study (months):

Research Locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Investigator(s):</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Primary Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Investigator(s):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please answer all questions below.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description: Check Yes or No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will you be requesting data from the HSCC Office of Analytics &amp; Institutional Reporting (AIR)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this project or study involve collection of data that identifies individuals (e.g., cohort databases include SSN# data on individuals, surveys, or interviews identifiable by name or student number etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will data identifiable by individual be shared with anyone (such as in a performance report for a funding source, conference presentations, published articles and reports, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the participants being offered one or more of the incentives to participate (such as money, extra credit for the class, etc.)? If yes, list the incentive(s) here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is participation in this project or study voluntary for the individuals participating in the program or study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will participants be videotaped during the project or study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will participants be fully informed about the benefits and any risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will participants’ privacy and personal information be protected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will participants be debriefed following completion of the project or study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will participants, prior to the project, indicate informed consent to participate by completing and signing a written form?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are data sources clearly identified (such as interviews, survey, existing project data such as services received, reports, grades, existing school records, focus group, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(There is no character limit – field will expand as you type.)

1. State the overall objectives and specific aims of the research.
2. Who are the subjects and how will they be recruited?

3. Describe the procedures to be used for data collection and whether data collection will be confidential, private or anonymous. Describe who will have access to the records and what will happen to data after completion of study.

4. What risks are faced by subjects participating in this research, e.g., injury, pain, emotional distress, or invasion of privacy? What measures will be taken to minimize these risks?

5. Will there be any costs to be borne by subjects by virtue of their participation in this research?

6. Will there be any compensation or reimbursement to subjects in this research (i.e. monetary payments, course credit, services etc.)?

7. What are the likely benefits of this research to the subjects as well as to public knowledge?

8. How will information be disseminated at the close of the study (i.e. dissertation, presentation, publication). If information is for classroom or institutional use, please describe.
ATTACHMENTS:

Please attach all documents that apply to your proposal here.

- Informed Consent Form (first page on letterhead of organization sponsoring study)
- Surveys, questionnaires, or other data gathering forms
- Any disclosures explaining risks or procedures
- Letters of approval from cooperating entities
- Any approvals or documentation from external IRBs
- Letters, flyers, questionnaires distributed to subjects or posted to recruit
- NOI-IRB: Notice of Intent is **required**, to be signed by president(s) of HSCC college(s) at which you will collect data or conduct research
- Principal Investigators are **required** to submit a Human Subject Protection Training certificate with their application. NIH offers a 1-2 hour online training course, which can be found at [http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php](http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php). Please attach your certificate here. Applications without training certificates will not be reviewed until the training is complete. Training from NIH must be renewed every year, so please be sure your certificate is up-to-date.
APPENDIX F:

HSCC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (FACULTY SPECIFIC)

2015 – 2016
Professional Development Specifically Targeting Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/20/2015</td>
<td>D2L Special Topics - Supplementing Face-to-Face Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2015</td>
<td>D2L Open Lab - Desire2Learn Learning Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2015</td>
<td>D2L Special Topics: D2L Semester Beginning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/2015</td>
<td>D2L Special Topics – Managing Assessments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/02/2016</td>
<td>D2L Basic Foundation Course</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/07/2016</td>
<td>D2L Basic Foundation Course</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2016</td>
<td>D2L Basic Foundation Course</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2016</td>
<td>D2L Basic Foundation Course</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2016</td>
<td>D2L Basic Foundation Course</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G:
HSCC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (NON-FACULTY SPECIFIC)

2015 – 2016
Professional Development Open To All HSCC Employees
(Non-Faculty Specific)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2015</td>
<td>Honors College Professional Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2015</td>
<td>Adobe InDesign Basic Workshop</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2015</td>
<td>Lecture Series - Build Your Bucket List</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2015</td>
<td>Lunch &amp; Learn Lynda.com</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2015</td>
<td>Tips and Tricks for Outlook 2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2015</td>
<td>Lecture Series - Technophobia Presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2015</td>
<td>HSCC 20</td>
<td>20 What’s Next Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/2015</td>
<td>Lecture Series - Steroid Hormones in Food</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2015</td>
<td>Microsoft: Excelling with Excel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2015</td>
<td>Intro to Spanish in the Workplace</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2015</td>
<td>HSCC 20</td>
<td>20 Present Beliefs Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2015</td>
<td>Adobe Photoshop Basic Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2015</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Supporting Alternative Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/2016</td>
<td>Employee Grievance Policy Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2016</td>
<td>Microsoft Word 2013: Mail Merge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2016</td>
<td>Civic and Social Engagement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2016</td>
<td>HSCC 20</td>
<td>20 Present Beliefs Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/01/2016</td>
<td>Microsoft: What’s New - Windows 10 and Office 2016 Intro</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2016</td>
<td>Microsoft: Excel 2016 - Pivot Tables</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H:

PERSONAL INTERVIEW RECRUITMENT EMAIL

You are invited to take part in a research study of adjunct faculty perceptions of professional development opportunities and experiences at Houston Suburb Community College. You were selected for the study because you served as an adjunct faculty member for Houston Suburb Community College for the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Dolly R. Mark Miles, who is a doctoral student at the University of Alabama.

What is this study about?

The purpose of my study is to ascertain adjunct faculty member perceptions of their professional development opportunities and experiences at HSCC. The research questions are designed to collect information that would illuminate adjunct experiences with professional development.

What would be required of me if I participate?

The researcher is seeking a total of 16 adjunct faculty volunteers to participate in two interviews. If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to participate in two separate one hour personal interviews. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

Is there compensation?

Participation in the two interviews will be strictly voluntary; therefore, there is no compensation. However, your participation will contribute to the knowledge base regarding adjunct experiences with professional development which could help higher education institutions better address the development needs of their adjunct faculty.
How will my confidentiality be protected?

Your information will remain confidential and there is little to no risk associated with this study. Participants will be given pseudonyms to protect their identity in the study. Upon agreement to participate more information will be given about your participant rights.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the volunteer participate form (google doc). You may contact me with questions about the study at researcher@hotmail.com or 299-299-2999.

Thank you,

R. Mark Miles
Researcher
Doctoral Student
University of Alabama
APPENDIX I:

NOTICE OF INTENT TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Resource Development and Administration (RDA) Office: Institutional Review Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please attach to the Institutional Review Board Application Form, with enough detail to explain your research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LOCATION: Research using students/staff on an HSCC campus must be approved by the campus president, whose signature indicates that the president of the campus will allow this research to take place on their campus, once it has been approved by the HSCC-IRB. Please complete a separate form for each campus/location. (See attached list for contact information.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. DATA: If you plan to collect student data from the HSCC Office of Analytics and Institutional Research (AIR), be aware that it can only be released according to regulations set forth by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). It is the responsibility of the researcher to work with AIR to assure that the data will be available to you once you obtain IRB approval. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. RESEARCH PROJECT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI connection to Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator email address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution conducting study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Sponsor (if outside institution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed start date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH &amp; DATA COLLECTION METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a University of Alabama dissertation study of the perceptions of adjunct faculty at a single Texas Community College (Houston Suburb Community College) on the professional development being offered on that campus. It will be phenomenological study involving two rounds of interviews with 16 adjuncts. I hope to learn adjunct's perceptions and experiences with professional development on their campus I have permission from the campus president to obtain a list from HR of all adjunct faculty who taught the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. I will recruit 16 volunteer participants. My goal is to get a minimum of 4 administrator participants and 12 adjuncts for a total of 16 interview participants. I will have them sign a consent to participation. I will conduct two rounds of interviews with the same 16 participants. Each interview will be approximately 1 hour long. A pseudonym will be used for the college to disguise it as well as pseudonym's used for participant's names as well. Information will be saved on my personal drive and locked up, so no one can access the data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. RESEARCH LOCATION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSCC Campus(es), Satellite(s) or System Office: Houston Suburb Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated number of HSCC Employees involved as subjects: 16 Adjunct Faculty
Number of HSCC Students involved as subjects: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. SIGNATURE BLOCK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J:

IRB APPROVAL

January 9, 2017

R. Mark Miles
Higher Ed. Admin.
College of Education
Box 370232

Re: IRB#: 17-OR-005 “Adverse Perceptions of Professional Development at a Texas Community College”

Dear Mr. Miles:

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. 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 January 8, 2018. 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 Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent form to provide to 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,

[Signature]
Director & Research Compliance Officer

358 Rose Administration Building | Boz 370232 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0147
205-348-8431 | Fax 205-348-7189 | Toll Free 1-877-820-3066
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Consent of Participation

R. Mark Miles, The University of Alabama
Doctoral Candidate
281-290-2920
rmark01@hotmail.com

You are being asked to take part in a research study. This study is called Adjunct Perceptions of Professional Development at a Texas Community College. The study is being conducted by R. Mark Miles, Doctoral Candidate at the University of Alabama.

What is this study about?
This study is being conducted to explore adjunct faculty’s experiences with professional development.

Why have I been asked to be in this study and how many people will be in this study?
Approximately 16 adjuncts who have completed at least one full year of teaching at ___ (Fall 2015 and Spring 2016) and come from a range of disciplines will be randomly asked to participate. The research will employ a basic qualitative design.

Why is this study important or useful?
Through studying adjunct’s experiences with professional development, administrators may be better able to address their professional development needs more effectively.

What will I be asked to do?
If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to do the following.
1. Participate in two rounds on separate days of audio recorded interviews lasting between 45 minutes to 1 hour in length.
2. Review and respond to transcription of interview.

Will being in the study cost me anything? Will I be compensated for being in this study?
The only cost to you from this study is your time given to the interviews. Your participation is strictly voluntary; therefore, there will not be any compensation.

What is the risks and benefits in participating in this study?
Risks for participating in this study are minimal. There may be no direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. You will not be paid for the study, and the only cost to you is the cost of your time for participating. However, the information you provide may prove beneficial to the understanding of how to more effectively serve adjunct faculty through professional

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 1/9/17
EXPIRATION DATE: 1/8/2018
development. It should yield information on what types of professional development adjuncts want more of, so that professional development administrators can more effectively plan and execute faculty development at their campus.

Is your participation required?
Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. You may refuse to answer any of the questions. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. Not participating or choosing to leave the study will not result in any penalty or loss of any benefits you would otherwise receive.

Is the researcher being paid for this research?
The researcher is not being paid to research this topic. There is no funding associated with this research.

Is this research developing a product that will be sold, and if so, will the investigator profit from it?
This research will not produce a product that will be sold nor is there any funding associated with this product.

Does the investigator have any conflict of interest in the study?
The investigator does not have any ties or relations with the site of the study, __________. However, the investigator, R. Mark Miles, is employed by the __________ at another campus as the Director of Professional Development and adjunct faculty.

How will my privacy be protected?
You will be interviewed in a private room and your participation not shared with other faculty.

How will my confidentiality be protected?
You confidentiality will be protected in the study first by using a pseudonym for the college. The actual name of the college will not be used. Participant names will be coded and given a pseudonym. Participant’s real names will not be used any in the study. Audio recording and notes will be kept locked by the investigator at all times and not shared with __________ College administration.

What are the alternatives to not being in this study? Do I have other choices?
The alternative to being in this study is not to participate. This study is strictly voluntary.

What are my rights as a participant in this study?
Taking part in this study is voluntary. It is your free choice. You can refuse to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. There will be no effect on your relations with [redacted] College or the University of Alabama.

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The Ethics Review Board may review study records from time to time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned. This study has been approved through the [redacted] College Institutional Review Board as well as the University of Alabama IRB.

Contact Information
If you have questions about the study right now, please ask them. If you have questions about the study later on, please call the investigator R. Mark Miles at the contact information listed above. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at toll-free 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](http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html) or email the Research compliance office at participationoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.

I have read this consent form. The study has been explained to me. I understand what I will be asked to do. I freely agree to take part in it. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

I agree to the interviews being audio-recorded  [ ] yes  [ ] no

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

INVESTIGATOR

DATE

DATE

[University of Alabama]

CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 11/17/2017

EXPIRATION DATE: 11/13/2018