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Part-time faculty is important to the instructional mission of community colleges. Community colleges rely on part-time faculty for a majority of their instruction and will be forced to hire more of these faculty to serve increasing student enrollments. This study was designed to determine and compare the perceptions of chief academic officers (CAOs), the academic department heads in technical/career programs (DH-CTs), and the academic department heads in pre-baccalaureate/transfer programs (DH-PBs) about the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. In addition, the study concerned a description and analysis of participant descriptions of the importance of employing, and the perceived ability to employ in specific disciplines as well as participants’ perceptions of the reasons why part-time faculty were employed at the institution.

A questionnaire was mailed to all 23 two-year, public community colleges in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. The results were analyzed
using descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, and percentages; and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

Major findings of the study include: (a) CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs placed all practices presented in the study in the “important” to “somewhat important” range indicating a positive approach towards the utilization of part-time faculty; (b) CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs have different mean scores for most employment, professional development, and integration practices indicating different perceptions about how these groups perceive the importance of the practices; (c) the most important employment practice is “institutional policies” and the least important is “institutional benefits package”; (d) the most important professional development practice is “departmental evaluation” and the least important is “paid membership”; (e) the most important integration practice is “equip with a syllabus” and the least important is “participation in academic senate”; (f) the most common employment practice in place for all three groups is “established salary policy”; (g) the most common professional development practice in place for all three groups is “departmental evaluation”; (h) the most common integration practice in place for all three groups was “equip with a syllabus”; (i) disciplines that are ranked as important to institutions vary by respondent group and have no correlation to the ability to employ in the same disciplines; (j) the most selected reason for employment of part-time faculty was “meeting student demand.”
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background of the Study

Community colleges in Appalachia will face faculty staffing challenges in the future. Even though they already rely on part-time faculty for a majority of their instruction, they will be forced to hire more of these faculty to serve an undereducated population in an economically disadvantaged region (Freeland, 1998). Addressing part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration issues in a proactive stance will help these institutions address part-time faculty recruitment and retention, and help them achieve their overall mission now and in the future (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Community colleges employ more part-time faculty than any other type of institution yet these faculty are referred to as invisible faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Part-time faculty represented 62% of the total faculty at two-year institutions in the fall of 1992 (Palmer, 2002). This percentage increased to 67% in the data provided by the latest NCES report (NCES, 2005). There are increasing pressures to hire more part-time faculty to meet the commitments to new programs, growing student enrollments, tightening resources, and the need for flexibility (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

There is very little information available about part-time faculty at the national level and particularly part-time faculty employed at community colleges in the Appalachian region. The Appalachian region, a 200,000 square mile area, includes the entire state of West Virginia and parts of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee,
and Virginia. Only 17.7% of the adults in the region have attained college degrees compared to the national average of 24%, and the central area of Appalachia has a poverty rate of 27% which is 11% above the overall rate of the region and 15% above the poverty rate of the nation (Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC], 2005).

Concerns exist about the extensive use of part-time faculty. Questions arise about the dependency on part-time faculty, the decreasing numbers of full-time faculty, intellectual support, and student learning to name a few. No matter how valid these concerns might be, the fact remains that community colleges would be severely challenged to meet their goals without part-time faculty. These same colleges must do everything possible to employ the best faculty, to make sure their faculty has professional development opportunities to stay current with academic standards, and to make faculty feel that they are an important part of the institution (Levinson, 2005).

Although there are negative views about the use of part-time faculty with strong feelings expressed about issues of quality and student learning (Pannapacker, 2000), this study will look at positive aspects on how part-time faculty practices are utilized by administrative personnel. Since part-time faculty is the norm for most institutions, it is important to better understand how they are incorporated into their colleges in order to strengthen these institutions that face greater economic and education challenges than their institutional peers in affluent and urban areas.

It is important that community colleges have part-time faculty to meet the needs of this region. It is equally important to understand the employment, professional
development, and integration of these faculty into the colleges, so that they can fulfill the needs of the region.

**Importance of Part-Time Faculty**

Community colleges employ part-time faculty for a variety of reasons. Banachowski (1996) identified four advantages to the employment of part-time faculty. First, part-time faculty are paid less than full-time faculty; therefore they save the institution money. This is especially important in an environment of shrinking financial resources. Second, part-time faculty help institutions meet the demands of fluctuating student enrollments. Since part-time faculty work on term-by-term contracts, institutions can adjust course offerings as needed. Third, part-time faculty bring real world experience into the classroom. Their professional experience enhances the academic environment. Fourth, part-time faculty benefit personally from teaching because they enjoy the prestige and fulfillment of being connected to an academic environment (Banachowshi, 1996).

**Need for the Study**

*Part-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff: Who They Are, What They Do, and What They Think* by Conley and Leslie (2002) provided valuable data describing part-time faculty characteristics. Conley and Leslie (2002) reported that part-time faculty represented 62% of all instructional faculty at two-year public institutions in 1992 and that this increase in the numbers of part-time faculty had become a concern to policymakers, administrators, researchers, and the public. Since this report was published, the latest NCES report stated that the percentage of part-time faculty increased
to 67% (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Brandburn, 2005). Nonetheless, this study was extremely important in describing part-time faculty characteristics employed in two-year colleges at a national level; however we do not know how these national characteristics apply to the specific region of Appalachia. Beyond the numbers of faculty, we also need to know how they are employed and integrated into community colleges in general, and into the community colleges of Appalachia in particular, where the educational and economic needs of the people of the region are so great.

Ronald D. Eller (1993) confirmed that “it is a long standing belief in America that Appalachia represents part of that ‘other America’ which has not shared in the national experience of success, affluence, progress, and modernization” (p. 6). There are distinct differences in culture, demographics, educational policies and practices, and in economic factors.

Teaching positions are highly valued because they allow people to work and stay in the community. Teachers typically have been trained very close to home and have a strong commitment to place and family (Obermiller & Maloney, 2002). “Community colleges bring highly qualified and dedicated teachers to the region and are a boon to the economy. Educated groups don’t want to leave the area and community colleges provide employment which prevents brain drain” (Maloney, personal communication, January 15, 2006). However, the numbers of qualified faculty in the area are very low. For instance, less than 4% of the total population in Adams, Brown, and Highland counties in Ohio possesses a Masters degree or higher (Ohio Department of Development, 2006). These
areas are projected to have minimal population growth, therefore limiting the amount of qualified faculty relocating into the area.

“Currently, little has been done regarding the identification of local expertise in education, community, and research areas, as well as curricula or program areas pertinent to Appalachia” (Denham, 2005, p. 2). Since community colleges are the most locally based of all higher education institutions, it is important to understand how they identify individuals who will serve as part-time faculty and how they meet the needs of those people and students in doing so. While this information has been partially gathered by Conley and Leslie, their study is dated because it deals with 1992 faculty data.

**Statement of the Problem**

Part-time faculty is extremely important to community colleges, but not enough is known about employment, professional development, and integration practices of part-time faculty in rural Appalachian community colleges.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the present study was to assess part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community and community/technical colleges located in the Appalachian portions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. The perceptions of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs), the academic department heads in technical/career programs (DH-CTs), and the academic department heads in pre-baccalaureate/transfer programs (DH-PBs) were compared to the actual institutional behavior about selected employment, professional development, and integration practices for part-time faculty. Participants also compared the importance of
employing and the perceived ability to employ in specific disciplines. In addition, responses were controlled for by the type of respondent. Finally, respondents ranked the reasons why part-time faculty were employed at the institution. Community colleges in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia were selected for the study because these states are in the heart of the Appalachian region and share a common culture and similar demographics.

The final questionnaire (Appendix A) consisted of four parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to identify their position at the institution. Positions defined for this study included CAOS, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of three categories of practices: (a) employment, (b) professional development, and (c) integration of part-time faculty at the institution. The third part of the questionnaire consisted of two components. In the first component, the respondents were asked about the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines. Part four provided a list of reasons why part-time faculty was employed at the institution. Participants were asked to rank these reasons and were given an opportunity to provide an eighth reason.

**Research Questions**

This study has four major research questions:

1. How do chief academic officers and academic department heads perceive the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices in Appalachian community colleges in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia and are there any significant differences among these perceptions?
2. How do chief academic officers and academic department heads perceive the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific pre-baccalaureate/transfer studies and technical career disciplines in their institutions, and are there any significant differences among these perceptions?

3. How do chief academic officers and academic department heads rank the reasons for employing part-time faculty at their institutions, and are there any significant differences in these rankings?

4. What additional perceptions and information can chief academic officers and academic department heads provide about the employment, development, and integration needs and practices for part-time faculty in Appalachian community colleges?

**Significance of the Study**

The information from this study will add to the overall knowledge base about community college faculty as well as to a specific knowledge base about part-time faculty in Appalachian community colleges. The questionnaire will identify what is actually being done in these institutions and the perceived importance of practices from both the CAO, who controls the overall budget and has authority to implement policy changes, and academic heads who work directly with part-time faculty. The results are important for college administration, faculty, regional and state authorities, and institutional research personnel who wish to understand and improve faculty conditions in rural Appalachian community colleges. Due to the projected faculty shortages and the increasing need for part-time faculty, all community colleges may be challenged to meet their missions if qualified part-time faculty are not available to teach, are not integrated
into the community college culture, and are not developed to teach at high levels of skill. This is especially important in rural regions where there is a strong need to increase college-going rates and improve the economic conditions of the area.

**Limitations of the Study**

Three limitations affected the study. First, the study was limited since a 100% response rate from the questionnaire was not achieved. Therefore any analysis and interpretations could be affected by the lower response rate. Second; it was assumed that the respondents would provide accurate information in response to the survey, but it was possible that some responses were modified in order to create a positive perception of an institution. Finally, the study concerned a population and anyone who wishes to generalize the study to other Appalachian community colleges will have to treat the population as a convenience sample and may have difficulty comparing to other regions.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The questionnaire was designed modifying portions of Leslie and Gappa’s (1998) survey, incorporating the results of a focus group of part-time faculty, interview with a college committee including administrators and faculty, and characteristics were suggested by a review of the research about the topic of this study. The study was bounded by these titles, places, and conditions:

1. The study was directed to chief academic officers and academic department heads.

2. The study was conducted in rural community colleges in the federally designated Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia.
3. It was assumed that the questionnaire used accurately measured the perceptions of the study population.

4. It was assumed that the individuals identified for the study were the key individuals who work directly with part-time faculty at their community colleges.

**Definition of Terms**

Community College – A community college is a two-year college which offers pre-baccalaureate/transfer degree programs, career/technical education programs, development education, workforce training, adult continuing education, and community service activities (Ohio Board of Regents, 1998). Some institutions fitting this definition are known as community-technical colleges, and they are referred to as a community college in this study.

Part-time Faculty – Faculty that usually work with contracts for one academic term and who hold the rank of instructor or lecturer and rarely have tenure (Berger, Kirshstein, YuZhang, & Carter, 2002).

Appalachia – A geographic region associated with the Appalachian Mountains and it’s residents. Appalachia encompasses 200,000 square miles from New York to Mississippi and includes all of West Virginia and parts of 12 other states. It is an area that struggles with issues of poverty and educational attainment (Denham, 2005).

Chief Academic Officer – the highest ranked administrator over academic affairs

Academic Department Head – an administrator or faculty member who has direct responsibility for hiring part-time faculty. Position titles may include dean, division coordinator, department head, or director.
Career/technical Programs – Associate degree programs of up to two years duration, designed to prepare students for careers which are generally at the semiprofessional level. Technical degree programs are frequently transferable into baccalaureate degree programs (Ohio Board of Regents, 1998).

Pre-baccalaureate/transfer education – Equivalent to the lower division or first two years of a baccalaureate degree program, generally consisting of liberal arts, sciences, and pre-professional studies designed either to enable students to transfer to a four-year institution for the completion of a baccalaureate degree or to provide a planned program of general education which is equivalent to that which is provided by four-year institutions at the freshman and sophomore levels (Ohio Board of Regents, 1998).

Employment – the recruitment, selection, and hiring of part-time faculty (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998)

Professional Development – systematic processes offered to groups of faculty in response to organizational needs and designed to promote growth, understanding, and improvement in the classroom (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998).

Integration – the effort the college makes to connect and keep in touch with part-time faculty and to help faculty feel that they are involved in the mainstream of college life (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998).

Organization of the Study

The research report was divided into five chapters:
Chapter One included the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, the significance of the study, the limitations and delimitations of the study, and the definitions of terms appropriate to the study.

Chapter Two contains the review of literature relevant to the study. The literature review focused on the demand for part-time faculty, the rural community college labor market, characteristics of part-time faculty in community colleges and the role they play in these institutions, the national perspective of part-time workers, and the role of department chairs in relation to part-time faculty. The main emphasis was placed on employment, professional development, and integration issues related to part-time faculty. Information about Appalachia was also incorporated.

Chapter Three includes the outline of the research design which incorporated a questionnaire that was mailed to all 23 two year, public community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. The questionnaire consisted of four parts. In the first part, participants were asked to identify their position at the institution. The second part consisted of three categories of practices: a) employment, b) professional development, and c) integration of part-time faculty. The third part, consisted to two components; the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines. In part four, participants were asked to indicate their reasons for employing part-time faculty.

Chapter Four includes the results of the study. All 23 college presidents (100%) responded to the initial request to identify their CAOs and department heads and indicated their support of the study. A total of 126 questionnaires were mailed to the
CAOs and department heads with 82 returned for a 65% response rate. Results identify the responses by respondent groups using descriptive statistics and analysis of variance.

Chapter Five includes the summary, conclusions, implications for practice and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

Introduction

Of the faculty in community colleges, 67% are part-time (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005). Part-time faculty have continued to grow at a steady pace in all types of institutions; however a larger percentage is found in community colleges. One contributing factor to the growth and demand of part-time faculty is the prediction that there will be a major shortage of faculty in the future (Freeland, 1998). Rural community colleges, especially in the economically disadvantaged Appalachian regions, will be most affected by both the high demand for part-time faculty and the shortages of part-time faculty due in part to the smaller faculty labor pools and the small percentage of individuals with advanced college degrees (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998). These institutions will need to incorporate effective employment practices, professional development programs, and integration programs into their institutions in order to recruit and retain part-time faculty. College administration’s support of these programs is essential to their successful implementation and effectiveness (Banachowski, 1996).

Studies have been conducted to learn more about part-time faculty characteristics and usage on a national level; however little is known about faculty in specific rural regions and institutions. The National Center for Education Statistics has conducted several studies related to part-time faculty which has provided insight into their diversity and complexity (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005). Leslie and Gappa (2002) completed an extensive survey of both administrators and part-time faculty that was one of the first
studies to look extensively at part-time faculty issues. In addition, Conley and Leslie (2002) and Palmer (1999) conducted extensive research about part-time faculty. These studies provide a snapshot of part-time faculty characteristics and employment on a national level but do not provide details about the administrative perceptions and actual practices that affect part-time faculty in community colleges located in rural Appalachian regions.

This chapter will examine literature pertaining to part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration. In addition, literature pertinent to the characteristics and demographics of part-time faculty and the Appalachian region will be reviewed. One purpose of the study is to identify the actual practices and the perceived importance of incorporating employment, professional development, and integration related to part-time faculty in rural Appalachian community colleges.

The Appalachian region is very large and very diverse; therefore a smaller study has the potential to provide a more realistic picture of what actually occurs in a particular region that has similar demographics and cultural identities. The states of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia were chosen because they have very similar demographics and cultural identity.

Demand for Part-time Faculty

It is predicted that higher education will see a serious shortfall of qualified community college instructors in the next decade and beyond (Freeland, 1998). Overall it is expected that a shortage of approximately 500,000 faculty will be seen during the twenty-five year period from 1985 to 2010 (Roueche, Roueche, & Milleron, 1998). Over
one half of the faculty in the United States is part-time and it is predicted that these numbers will continue to increase. Beginning in the early 1960’s, part-time faculty began to grow steadily (Banachovski, 1996). Interestingly, part-time faculty comprised only 20% of the total faculty in 1970 (Mcardle, 2002). Currently, part-timers teach about 30% to 40% of the full-time equivalent contact hours. However in 2003, part-time faculty accounted for 67% of all community college faculty (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005) growing from 65% in 1992 (Wyles, 1998); but as a result have grown to such an extent that they now are an integral part of community colleges’ effectiveness (Gappa, 1984). An example of the magnitude of part-time faculty growth is provided by Rouech, Rouech, and Milleron’s *Strangers in Their Own Land* (1998). This work cited that there was only 38% of part-time faculty employed in community colleges in 1966. This number increased in 1980 to between 50 to 65% and in 1992 part-time faculty represented 55% to 65% of all community college faculty. In fact, nine states reported percentages greater than 65%. Community Colleges will be most affected by the shortage of part-time faculty, since higher education has become structurally dependent on these faculty.

Throughout every employment sector in the overall economy, part-time employment is now a new trend (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998). There have always been part-time workers, even in post-secondary education institutions, however; attention to financial circumstances has required organizations to increase their use of part-time, temporary employees. For example, IBM had predicted that 80% of its workforce would be part-time by the year 2000 and Dow Chemical had only been hiring
individuals with specialized skills to accomplish specific tasks for specified time periods. The whole concept of “jobs as a way of organizing work” many need to be rethought (Roueche, Roueche, and Milleron, 1998, p. 19).

Mcardle (2002) suggests that we will never again have colleges and universities that provide instruction with only full-time faculty. For instance, New York University’s faculty composition was as high as 70% part-time faculty. The high percentages of adjunct faculty will change the entire character of higher education in the United States.

The potential shortage of community college faculty is attributed to several factors or trends. One factor is that full-time faculty are retiring or leaving for other careers and there doesn’t appear to be large numbers of qualified faculty to replace them (Murray, 2005; Engleberg, 1993). The number of tenure-track faculty positions will actually decline; however, the overall number of faculty positions will increase by 20 to 30% or more over the coming decade (Hough, 2003). The number of faculty members at two-year institutions grew by 210% compared with 69% at four-year institutions between 1970 and 1995 (Schneider, 1998). This means that part-time faculty will constitute the net growth in faculty members throughout the nation. As a result, we have been seeing changing patterns of instructional staffing (Benjamin, 2002). Adjunct faculty have become very critical to the financial and programmatic viability of community colleges (Ellison, 2002).

**Rural Community College Labor Market**

The availability of part-time faculty differs between urban and rural areas. Urban settings have many advantages related to the recruitment, hiring, and retention of
qualified part-time faculty due to the wide variety of occupations (Wyles, 1998). The urban labor market enjoys proximity to large universities and corporations, therefore; more faculty with graduate degrees are available for hire (Palmer, 1999). Essentially, there is a large pool of qualified candidates available to fill part-time positions (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

On the other hand, rural institutions face the greatest obstacles in finding qualified part-time faculty. These institutions “cannot offer potential faculty the financial, cultural, and social advantages of the urban institutions” (Murray, 2005, p. 218). Often rural community colleges are the only higher education institution located in a community that is often severely depressed both economically and educationally. Murray (2005) found that rural areas don’t seem to have a large pool of applicants that are anxious or qualified to become community college teachers.

In addition to having a smaller pool of available talent, the talent that is available is closely aligned with the local industry. Beyond the industry labor pool, faculty can be found from graduate students, part-time faculty at other nearby institutions, and spouses of full-time faculty. However this local labor pool in rural areas is thinner and more difficult to supply when compared to urban areas (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Rural community colleges have different faculty employment and professional development challenges than urban colleges. In particular, rural Appalachian regions normally have sparser populations overall and therefore smaller pools of qualified faculty available for employment. Studies of Appalachian areas indicate that only a very small percentage of individuals have advanced degrees (ARC, 2005). Competition for part-time faculty will
increase if the predicted shortfall of qualified community college instructors is realized. Since Conley & Leslie’s (2002) research indicated that the primary areas of dissatisfaction for part-time faculty is salary, benefits, and advancement opportunities, many part-time faculty could be attracted to the larger urban institutions that could more readily meet their employment needs; however, fewer faculty would be attracted to the rural areas due to lack of economic opportunities and cultural activities. This study will provide information which will assist our understanding of part-time faculty and their professional development.

In a survey conducted by AHA-OAN, part-time faculty reported that they stayed in a particular locality or region due to needs of family or the employment of a spouse or partner (Townsend & Hauss, 2002). This indicates a lack of geographical mobility in rural areas (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). On the other hand, Murray (2005) looked at what attracts faculty to rural community colleges and found that these institutions are not attracting a diverse faculty. In the past, rural community colleges somewhat like other colleges had a plentiful supply of candidates and a shortage of openings. However, now these institutions have a large demand for part-time faculty and must be concerned about meeting faculty needs, with retention becoming a major issue (Murray, 2005).

Research on part-time faculty is relatively new (Banachowski, 1996) and what is available is mostly national data. Little research is available that focuses specifically on rural Appalachian community college part-time faculty and their employment, professional development, and integration needs.
Characteristics of Part-time Faculty

Who are part-time faculty? There are numerous definitions for part-time faculty and these definitions vary from institution to institution (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998). Fulton (2000) defines part-time faculty as faculty who teach only one or two courses and who are employed for a specified or limited term. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1998) define part-time faculty as “those individuals an employing institution recognizes, legally and contractually, as less than full-time” (p. 24). Gappa and Leslie (1993) define part-time faculty as “individuals who are temporary, non-tenure track faculty employed less than full-time” (p.3).

Despite the fact that part-time faculty are now a significant component of community college post-secondary institutions, we still lack information about them which makes it difficult to address their needs or assign simple labels to describe them (Conley & Leslie, 2002). The most comprehensive studies of postsecondary faculty have been conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics with the most recent study conducted in 2003-04. NCES conducted three previous national studies: 1999, 1993, and 1988 (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005).

Samples for the surveys have been selected from two-year, four-year, doctorate-granting, and other colleges and universities. Both department chairpersons and instructional faculties were surveyed related to issues for full-and part-time faculty (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005).

The 2004 survey found that part-time faculty in two-year public institutions increased by 5% since the 1999 survey. Currently, part-time faculty comprises 44% of
the overall faculty at all institutions; although at public two-year institutions they total 67% of the faculty. Overall, with the exception of increasing numbers, the picture of part-time faculty has remained consistent throughout the studies. Part-time faculty at associate degree institutions are primarily white, male, and non-tenure track. Women are still a larger proportion of the faculty in these institutions at 48% compared to four-year institutions at 38% (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005). The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93) used for this study also revealed that 62% of the total faculty were part-time. The majority (88%) of part-time faculty was white, non-Hispanic, and 57% were male. Most part-time faculty (53%) held a master’s degree. Only 13% held a doctorate or first-professional degree and one-third (33%) held the baccalaureate or a lesser degree.

The 1988 study described part-timers as:

- “Younger than full-timers as a group, completing academic and professional training, beginning their families, and deciding upon mobility
- Representing racial and ethnic minorities in a slightly lower percentage than full-timers (9.2%)
- 58% men and 42% women (NSOPF `88); about equal representation in interviews; evidence of gender-related issues
- Married men and women in fairly equal numbers; family commitments leading to geographical immobility
- One-half of a dual-career academic couple in which one partner assumes part-time status to accompany a full-time spouse
• In community colleges, specifically, a large majority with at least one master’s degree, many with extensive work experience, in mid-career, who choose teaching over pursuit of higher degrees
• Serving at the college over widely varying lengths of time
• Choosing to teach for a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic reasons
• Somewhat (46%) or very (41%) satisfied with their jobs (NSOPF ’88); interviewees citing the excitement and challenge of teaching but dissatisfaction with many aspects of employment (Gappa and Leslie, 1993, pp. 17-44)"
(Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998, p. 6).

Using data from the National Center Education Statistics report, the United States Department of Education conducted a study of part-time instructional faculty and staff that provides a national snapshot of their characteristics and employment. Findings from the study support the fact that part-time faculty members are a large part of the workforce in higher education. “Forty-two percent of all instructional faculty and staff were employed part-time in the fall of 1992” (p.1). However, 62% of all public two-year instructional faculty and staff were teaching in community colleges (Conley & Leslie, 2002; Palmer, 1999).

Researchers acknowledge that very little is known about the characteristics of part-time faculty and what is known is based mostly on national data. Studies reveal that part-time faculty have a large age range. The average age of two-year community college part-time faculty was 46 years. The age of part-time faculty ranged from under 35 to 64 years of age. A majority of the part-time faculty were in the 35 to 44 age group (34%)
and the 45 to 54 age group (30%). Part-time faculty under the age of 35 (16%) were more likely to have only a baccalaureate degree and indicated they accepted part-time work because full-time work was not available. In contrast, the 55 to 64 age group held higher academic credentials and had more teaching experience. They also were more likely to hold other full-time employment (Conley & Leslie, 2002).

Of two-year faculty, 16% were under 35 years old and as the age of the population increases, retirees may be a good employment source for part-time faculty (Conley & Leslie, 2002). Palmer (1993) found two major differences in part-time faculty. Faculty under the age of 35 years are developing in their careers, contrasted with faculty between the ages of 55 and 64 who are transitioning into retirement. The majority (80%) of part-time faculty held their current teaching jobs for less than 10 years although 16% held their jobs between 10 and 19 years and another 4% held their jobs for 20 or more years indicating a strong commitment to their institutions.

Although studies show the diversity of part-time faculty, Gappa and Leslie (1993) point out that in most cases all part-time faculty are treated the same. Part-time faculty are treated as a homogeneous mass and afforded few options or alternatives. They are viewed as a means to keep the colleges fiscally viable and there to support the full-time faculty. Actually, part-time faculty are treated very similar to migrant workers in contrast to their professional standing in positions outside of higher education (Leslie & Gappa, 1993).

Female faculty members tend to be employed in part-time instructional positions rather than full-time positions. Males represent the majority of faculty in both full- and
part-time employment. Researchers found few differences in racial/ethnic distribution. Whether employed part- or full-time, the majority of faculty were white, non-Hispanic and U.S. citizens (Conley & Leslie, 2002).

The majority of two-year institutions do not distinguish between academic ranks labeling adjuncts as either instructor or lecturer. Many part-time faculty are employed on a temporary term-to-term basis which allows institutions staffing flexibility and the ability to meet financial constraints (Conley & Leslie, 2002).

Most part-time faculty chose to teach because they are attracted to being a part of an academic environment. Fifty-four percent prefer part-time employment and 70% who preferred part-time employment held another position that was full-time. Forty-seven percent reported that the lack of full-time employment was the reason they work part-time. Part-time faculty reported that 70% of their income came from outside sources (Conley & Leslie, 2002).

Of part-time faculty in two-year institutions, 96% reported that their principal activity is teaching. They teach an average of 1.6 undergraduate classes and spend less time with students out of the classroom than full-time faculty (Conley & Leslie, 2002).

The greatest dissatisfaction expressed by part-time faculty is about working conditions and benefits (Conley & Leslie, 2002; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Concerns expressed include the lack of availability of support services such as personal computers, access to networks, lack of office space, and no available secretarial support (Conley & Leslie, 2002).
Overall, part-time faculty expressed satisfaction with their jobs although they are dissatisfied with their job security, lack of opportunity for advancement in rank, and salary/benefits.

Palmer (1999) conducted a national survey through the U.S. Department of Education on Instructional Faculty and Staff in Public 2-year Colleges. This report provided the first national look at diversity with public 2-year colleges. In the analysis, a separate profile was created for part-time faculty comparing them to full-time faculty. It was found that teaching is the primary responsibility for both categories of faculty in community colleges.

Interestingly, 50% of part-time faculty prefer part-time work and 50% work part-time because full-time work is not available. Of part-time faculty, 79% held jobs outside their college with 67% indicating that this employment was full-time (Palmer, 1999).

Part-time faculty taught an average of 2.1 credit classes for a total of 5.8 credit hours. They devoted approximately 11 hours per week to college employment and 32 hours a week to outside employment (Palmer, 1999).

A look at primary teaching field shows that part-time faculty in the social sciences and education teach more students in credit classes than faculty in other fields. The distribution of part-time faculty by discipline was as follows: “business, law, and communication, 14%; health sciences, 7%; humanities, 18%; natural sciences and engineering, 26%; social sciences and education, 14%; vocational training, 8%; and all other programs, 13% (Palmer, 1999, p.16).
Part-time faculty prefer lecture as their main instructional method (66%) over essay exams. Student presentations were required by 55% of faculty. Few part-time faculty indicated that they publish or present their scholarly work (Palmer, 1999).

Conley and Leslie (2002) also conducted a study using NSOPF: 93 data, however; they viewed part-time faculty overall from a national perspective. This report provides a deeper look at program area employment. Three disciplines had a high percent of part-time faculty: vocational training, 52%; business, law, and communications, 50%; and humanities, 45%. The researchers suggest that supply and demand, gender composition of the workforce, and the “culture of work” in each field factor into the employment of part-time faculty. The report confirmed that “multiple career tracks and varied employment characteristics were the norm rather than the exception” (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Conley and Leslie (2002) point out that part-time faculty may be more diverse than full-time faculty and that there is danger in making generalizations about the differences between full- and part-time faculty. Also, faculty employment is different in each institutional sector. Part-time faculty are a very diverse group and very little is known about their characteristics (Conley & Leslie, 2002).

It is important to understand the motivations for part-time employment. Of part-time faculty in two- and four-year institutions, 70% stated that they wanted to be in academia. Fifty percent of two-year faculty preferred part-time employment and 70% of both full-and part-time faculty who preferred part-time employment held a full-time job elsewhere.
This report identified five major findings about part-time faculty:

• “A higher proportion of part-time faculty members than full-time faculty members were female.

• There were differences between part-time faculty members in the humanities compared with part-time faculty members in other program areas.

• Part-time faculty members perceived lower levels of support from their institution than full-time faculty.

• About one-half (49%) of part-time faculty members also held full-time employment.

• Part-time faculty members had different motivations for part-time employment. Many of those employed part-time wanted to be a part of an academic environment or preferred working part-time. Still others worked part-time because full-time work was unavailable or they were finishing degrees” (p. 16).

Conley and Leslie (2002) concluded that the academic labor market is rapidly changing and it is important to understand part-time faculty characteristics, work life, and attitudes.

A more recent report, “A Profile of Part-time Faculty,” was conducted using NSOPF: 99 data. This report indicated that part-time faculty still comprise a large portion of instructional staff in higher education, although the growth has leveled off, maintaining 62% as previously noted in NSOPF: 93 (Berger, Kirshstein, Zhang, & Carter, 2002). Overall the portrait of part-time faculty did not change much from NSOPF: 93 data. Part-time faculty still work on term-by-term contracts at their institutions and the
majority hold other primary employment. The majority (54%) holds a master’s degree and has worked an average of 11 years in higher education. Part-time faculty are more likely to be female.

Of both full-and part-time faculty, 85% reported they were satisfied with their jobs, however; 39% of part-time faculty would prefer full-time work (Berter, Kirshstein, Zhang, & Carter, 2002).

A significant point to consider is the fact that part-time faculty are more likely to be in their first higher education position. The majority of part-time faculty have other primary employment, and spend only a few hours per week on paid activities at their post-secondary institutions. Part-time faculty state that they feel the lack of economic security and experience little support from their institutions (Berger, Kirshstein, Zhang, & Carter, 2002).

Part-time faculty reported spending most of their time in classroom instruction and considerably less time in research, scholarship, administrative tasks, and service activities. They indicated that they hold only 2.0 scheduled office hours per week. The report did not address any amount of time spent interacting with colleagues. However in some cases part-time faculty, 31% taught as many classes as their full-time faculty counterparts. Even so, part-time faculty reported spending more of their time in work activities outside of the institution (Berger, Kirshstein, Zhang, & Carter, 2002).

The most recent NSOPF study was conducted in 2003-04. This report was expanded to gather information on issues of faculty composition, turnover, recruitment, retention, and tenure policies.
Invisible Faculty

Gappa and Leslie (1993) conducted a national survey to examine employment conditions of part-time faculty in which they interviewed Chief Academic Officers, Dean, Department Chairs, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and administrators. They concluded that part-time faculty are being blatantly exploited.

Higher education institutions have always used part-time instruction, but the actual increase in numbers began in the early seventies (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998). In the 1990’s the nation was experiencing a national economic recession and as a result colleges were experiencing large enrollment growth. In addition, large cohorts of senior faculty were retiring. As a result, the use of part-time faculty became very common. Even though this group of faculty has been around for many years, they still remain a largely unrecognized part of higher education. Leslie and Gappa (2002) point out that there are actually two faculties – tenured full time and the part-time faculty. The researchers stress that it is time for institutions to end this divided and unfair system.

Basically, there is very little that is known about part-time faculty. They can be defined as “individuals who are temporary, non-tenure track, and employed less than full-time (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

We also know that they are not a homogeneous group and that they are not used in the same ways at all institutions. Although studies have found that part-time faculty are conscientious, highly committed, and superbly qualified, issues of quality arise. The future of higher education will heavily depend on part-time faculty as institutions face tighter fiscal constraints, increasing enrollments, increased volatility in the market for
new programs, and shifting supply-demand factors in the faculty labor market. With the need for flexibility, institutions will face pressure to use more part-time faculty (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

The Appalachian Region

Appalachia extends over a 200,000 square-mile area that follows the spine of the Appalachian Mountains. The region includes the entire state of West Virginia and parts of twelve other states going as far north as New York State and as far south as Mississippi extending more than 1,000 miles. It is home to nearly 23 million people (ARC, 2005).

“Appalachia represents part of that “other America which has not shared in the national experience of success, affluence, progress, and modernization” (Eller, 1993, p. 6). Eller (1993) found that Appalachia can be characterized by five identifiable trends: “rural industrialization; low-wage, predominately unskilled labor; a primary industrial base; absentee generated capital investment which has produced large-scale absentee land ownership and little capital reinvestment back into the region; and a boom and bust economy” (p.7).

The Appalachian economy was once highly dependent on industry, agriculture, and mining. Although these jobs have been shifting to service, retail, and government jobs, Appalachians continue to live in poverty and some severely distressed areas still require basic infrastructure such as water and sewer systems. In northern and southern Appalachia poverty rates are slightly below the national average, however; in central rural Appalachia the poverty rate was nearly 27%. The regional per-capita income in
1999 was 81.9% of the U.S. average. Unemployment lowered from 5.3% in 1996-98 to 4.6% in 1998-2000 compared to the national rate of 4.2%. Estimates of underemployment stood at 10% compared to 8.6% for the nation (ARC, 2005).

Appalachia has stood apart from the rest of America in factors used to measure the quality of life in modern society such as per capita income, housing, health, population, unemployment, and poverty (Eller, 1993).

In 1965 the Appalachian Regional Development Act, created the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC). The commission is a federal-state partnership that works with the people of Appalachia to create opportunities for self-sustaining economic development and improved quality of life. The commission determined that generalizations about people within the region are difficult because it is such a large area with many cultures within (Couto, 2002).

We do know that Appalachians are closely tied to the place where they had ancestral roots and family heritage. Family ties are very important to the point that family and tradition are valued over social or economic progress. Appalachians are intent on staying in the region and tend not to leave to find employment (Denham, 2005). Appalachians are “oriented around place” making it difficult for them to leave the area and also accounts for the intense desire to go home whenever possible (Callahan, 2006).

“Teachers from the local community have typically been trained very close to home and often go to great lengths to stay teaching in the county, even if pay is substandard” (Obermiller & Maloney, 2002, p. 179). Most likely the pay is substantially less than the national average. Being near to family and home is the most important factor
in career choices. Schools are used as a bridge to either leave the area or to secure local employment that pays well (Obermiller & Maloney, 2002)

Baldwin (2006) states that “if Hollywood gave Oscars to institutions, community colleges would dominate the ‘Best Supporting Actor’ category at least in rural Appalachia” (p. 1). A community college presence is a common element throughout Appalachia which is important for economic and community development success. These colleges serve the local base of people and function in two roles; they respect and reflect the values of their communities and provide windows to the outside world.

Baldwin (2006) also found that the people from Appalachia are both economically bound and place bound. Students will go to a community college because it is in their backyard but couldn’t go somewhere else because they are married, have children and families, and work. They also will not leave their families or the place where they were raised.

Central Appalachia also has the lowest high school completion rate in the region with only 68.4% of adults aged 25 years or older who are high school graduates. The national average is 75.2%. 1990 data shows that the share of 18 to 24 year olds with 12 or more years of education in the overall Appalachian region was slightly higher (77%) than in the nation (76%) (ARC, 2005).

For example, Appalachia Ohio has a college going rate of 30% compared to 41% for the rest of the region and 62% for the United States (Ohio Appalachian Center for Higher Education [OACHE], 2005). In 2000, only 12.3% of Appalachian Ohio adults had a college degree compared to 24.4% nationally (ARC, 2005).
The 1992 study conducted by the Ohio Board of Regents and a consortium of two- and four-year colleges and universities in Appalachian Ohio found that the majority of high school seniors wanted to leave the Ohio Appalachian region and only 13.3% wanted to live in the area. Those seniors who wanted to remain are more likely to seek employment or attend a two-year college. Although 87% of graduates thought that training beyond high school was necessary, the study found that most students planned on entering occupations that are not present in rural communities (Spohn, & Crowther, 1992). This data indicates that not many of the high school graduates who plan to obtain a four-year degree expect to return to their hometown area, therefore; there will not be a large pool of qualified adjunct faculty in this age group to teach in the community colleges. This study indicates that college graduates do not plan to return to their Appalachian hometowns, but those who do stay do not attend college beyond the community college level. This also indicates that there may be a lack of qualified part-time faculty in the region (Spohn, & Crowther, 1992).

There are definite gaps in income, educational attainment, and health between urban and rural areas. It is a fact that “rural areas get fewer funds on a per capita basis than urban areas” (Baldwin, 2006, p. 5). Higher education plays an especially important role in rural areas since the lack of education is seen as affecting the attainment of employment (ARC, 2005). It is a fact that a region with an insufficiently educated and skilled labor force is therefore uncompetitive (Spohn & Crowther, 1992).

Currently, no central repository or network exists at any higher education institution in southeast Ohio that centralizes regional Appalachian information. Little has
been done regarding the identification of local expertise in education, community, and research areas pertinent to Appalachia. As a result, there is an extreme limit of scholarly information with the exception of historical data (Denhan, 2005).

Demographic Backgrounds of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia

All three states selected for the study are addressing Appalachian issues and concerns, although no one has yet addressed the issue of faculty employment, professional development, and integration in these rural Appalachian community colleges.

West Virginia is the only state that is entirely designated as Appalachian under ARC guidelines with a population of 1,808,344. The state’s population growth is estimated at 0.7% and the per capita income is $23,794. The 2003 unemployment rate was 6.1% and the 2000 poverty rate was 17.9%. Based on 2000 data, 75.2% of the adult population in West Virginia obtained a high school diploma compared to 80.4% of the nation. Only 14.8% received a college diploma.

Ohio has the second largest Appalachian region in the study with a population of 1,455,313. Ohio’s population growth estimate was 6.7%. The state’s per capita income is $22,127 with an unemployment rate of 6.3%. Slightly over 78% of Ohio’s adults obtained a high school diploma and only 12.3% obtained a college degree.

Kentucky’s Appalachian population is 1,141,511 with an estimated population change projected at 5.9%. The per capita income for 2002 is $19,467 with a 2003 unemployment rate of 7.4%. Of Kentuckian adults, 62.5% graduated with a high school diploma and only 10.5% obtained a college degree.
All three states are below the national average in all categories. The national per capita income is $30,413 and the unemployment rate is 5.8%. The U.S. poverty rate is 12.4%. Across the nation, 80.4% of adults graduated with a high school diploma and 24.4% obtained a college degree (ARC, 2005). For the purposes of this study, the selected states of Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky have similarly related economic conditions and educational attainment levels.

**National Perspective of Part-time Workers**

There is very little information available about part-time workers. What is known comes from national databases and therefore only provides an overview of part-time faculty. Data does not reflect information about specific institutional conditions (Sheeks & Hutcheson, 1998). Wyles (1998) reports that one in three workers in the national economy are part-time. Part-time work is defined as working less than 35 hours a week (Feldman, 1990) and many businesses across the United States are increasing the use of part-time workers (Thompson, 1995).

The United States has the highest percentage of part-time workers in the world with the exception of Sweden. Seventy-five% are employed in the service and retail trade industries. Since part-time workers are increasing in importance to the national labor market, it is extremely important to better understand the nature and consequences of their employment (Feldman, 1990). Feldman (1990) also found that part-time employment is especially important to three major groups: young workers ages 16 to 24, older workers ages 65 plus, and female workers who represent 66% of the total part-time workforce. In addition, part-time workers who have professional training and education...
may be more interested in full-time employment. Overall, part-time employment may lead to high turnover and lower job satisfaction based on many factors therefore employers will need to be more innovative to meet the needs of their part-time workforce (Feldman, 1990).

**Department Chairs**

Emphases should be placed on integrating part-time faculty into their institutions through integration, professional development, and employment. Key players in integration include chief academic officers and department chairs. Department chairs are the principle point of contact for part-time faculty. The primary interaction with part-time faculty occurs at the departmental level (Sheeks & Hutcheson, 1998). Thompson (1995) also found that the department chair is the first and on-going link for the adjunct faculty member.

How part-time faculty are treated and integrated into the institution depend upon many factors. Sheeks and Hutcheson (1998) found that department policies and the attitudes of departmental faculty go a long way in defining the work expectations of part-time faculty. However, there is a tremendous variation in these policies and attitudes. The department chair’s attitude about part-time faculty determines the degree to which adjuncts are integrated into the institution and affects their work climate (Thompson, 1995). If part-time faculty are accepted into their departments as colleagues and interact with full-time faculty they will feel more connected and integrated into the institution (Thompson, 1995). However, inconsistencies in the treatment of part-time faculty send the message that this group is less than a legitimate component of their college (Sheeks &
The guidance from the faculty chairperson is important and effective in integrating part-time faculty due in large part to the support and contact with full-time faculty (Cohen, 1992). Erwin and Andrews (1993) found that 56% of the administrators they studied expressed concerns about the effects of faculty shortages and 89% feared shortages in specific disciplines.

**Employment, Professional Development, and Integration of Part-time Faculty**

Since we know that community colleges employ significantly more part-time faculty than any other type of higher education institution and that rural institutions are often severely depressed both economically and educationally, it stands to reason that rural community colleges should place strong emphasis on part-time faculty in order to meet their mission. At this time, we do not know what employment, professional development, and integration practices that rural Appalachian community colleges employ.

Colleges have been encouraged to plan for the use of part-time faculty (AAUP, 1997). One reason that planning is important is the assurance of academic quality. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliran (1998) found that employment, professional development, and integration affected the quality of teaching as well as influenced part-time faculty satisfaction. Overall, part-time faculty are satisfied with their employment (Conley & Leslie, 2002), however; they do express dissatisfaction with numerous issues such as petty and thoughtless treatment, inequities, lack of commitment from their institutions, lack of appreciation of their efforts, and lack of involvement in decision making (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).
Integration is uneven among community colleges and is limited by time restraints and a reluctance to provide funds for employees who have loose ties to the institution and may be only temporary (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998). Yet, investment in part-time faculty will pay huge dividends. Faculty who are integrated into their institutions become more involved in college activities and as a result gain greater job satisfaction, have increased instructional effectiveness, and are retained at the institutions. Overall, the institution is strengthened (Howard & Hintz, 2002).

In contrast, faculty who are ignored by the institution are underprepared to meet the needs of students and are inadequately prepared for the job (Lyons & Kysilka, 2000). Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1998) found that institutional practices critically affect the quality of instruction and part-time faculty do not receive the same support offered to full-time faculty. These faculty have limited opportunities and incentives for professional growth and development.

Part-time faculty can be key assets to higher education if they are integrated into their institutions and receive professional development opportunities (McGuire, 1993). Parsons (1980) confirms that it is critical that these faculty are well integrated into the institution’s culture. Higher education is structurally dependent on part-time faculty and the demand will only escalate (Wyles, 1998). In fact part-time faculty will continue to increase due to declining resources, growing student enrollments, and retirement of current full-time community college faculty.

Even though it is well confirmed that the role of part-time faculty will expand in the future, Roueche and Roueche (1996) found that part-time faculty are still
“haphazardly selected, poorly socialized, and rarely supported” (p. 33). In addition, these faculty face the challenge of instructing under prepared and at-risk students. It is ironic that part-time faculty represent the largest faculty cohort in community colleges (Roueche & Roueche, 1996)

Since the use of part-time faculty will continue, several organizations have suggested limitations on their expansion. The Carnegie Foundation recommends hiring no more than 25% of the total faculty as part-time (Cain, 1988). The Foundation would also like to limit undergraduate instruction from part-time faculty to 20% (Bach, 1999). In addition, the Foundation would like the majority of credits awarded to be earned in classes taught by full-time faculty (McGuire, 1993). The American Association of University Professors urges institutions “to avoid excessive or inappropriate reliance on part-time faculty” (AAUP, 1997, p. 1). AAUP recommends that part-time faculty teach no more than 35% of undergraduate instruction and that the numbers of part-time faculty be limited. The Commission on the Future of Community College states that community colleges should avoid unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty and further declares that the practice is a disturbing trend (McGuire, 1993).

Some of the controversies concerning part-time faculty center around issues of instructional quality, lack of continuity for academic planning, outside classroom time devoted to students, and commitment to the institution (Bach, 1999). In addition to academic concerns, The American Association of University Professors expressed a concern about ensuring humane working conditions for part-time faculty. The Association developed a set of guidelines for how these faculty should be treated that
focuses on employment, professional development, and integration issues (AAUP, 1997). McGuire (1993) found that one of the biggest problems with part-time faculty is neglect. Part-time faculty have been treated as second class citizens by being excluded from their colleges when the better solution would be involvement.

In contrast to negative attitudes and concern about part-time faculty, Parsons (1980) recommends looking at standards developed by regional accrediting agencies. All six agencies refer to the value of part-time faculty. Parsons (1980) stated that part-time faculty are important in order for community colleges to meet their missions. Part-time faculty bring to the institution broad expertise, links to the community and a diversity that mirrors the student body. Parsons (1980) concluded that institutions should develop a strategic plan to address integration concerns and institute a series of support strategies.

**Employment**

Why do community colleges employ part-time faculty? Part-time faculty are used because they save institutions money and they offer flexibility in management decisions (Osborn, 1990). Lankard (1993) expands upon these two benefits by including up-to-date knowledge and skills, linkages to business and industry, willingness to teach off site classes and willingness to work unusual hours. Part-time faculty usually cost one-third of full-time faculty and they do not receive pension or sick leave benefits (Samuel, 1989; Thompson, 1995). Part-time faculty are good teachers and committed to their institutions (McGuire, 1993). These faculty are a good curriculum resource and provide links to both the workforce and the community. Part-time faculty will most likely continue to be a faculty of convenience because they are a risk free talent pool and as such community
colleges cannot afford to marginalize this very important segment of the faculty (Wyles, 1998). Wyles (1998) suggests that the employment practices of part-time faculty be examined especially pertaining to recruitment, selection, hiring, provisions, working conditions, and salary.

Recent studies have shown that job security, salary, benefits, and advancement opportunities are factors of dissatisfaction for most part-time faculty. Part-time faculty are not tenured and are considered as temporary employees working on term-by-term contracts. Opportunities for advancement are few, with 56% of part-time faculty indicating dissatisfaction in this category. Two-year colleges usually do not distinguish between academic ranks so part-time faculty are categorized as instructor or lecturer (Berger, Kirshstein, YuZhang, & Carter, 2002).

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted a set of 18 guidelines on the use of part-time faculty. The guidelines address a wide range of issues such as screening practices, supervision, evaluation, compensation, benefits, and proportion and is designed to reduce inappropriate employment of part-time faculty (Bach, 1999). Burnstad (2002) discusses a similar type of comprehensive plan used at Johnson County Community College. This plan begins with full-time faculty being involved in the interview process and provides a very detailed outline of how part-time faculty are brought into the College. Part-time faculty receive textbooks, syllabi, handbooks and a college catalog at the time of hire. To support their teaching and student learning they are provided office space along with the necessary support services, resource materials, and business cards. Johnson County Community College’s hiring process includes
professional development strategies as well as employment practices that help assure the successful recruitment and retention of part-time faculty (Burnstad, 2002).

Bach (1999) suggests that institutions employ a strategic planning process to help part-time faculty feel more connected and committed to their colleges. Strategic planning for the use of part-time faculty would lead to hiring based on availability, competency, and institutional needs. As a result, last minute haphazard hiring would be eliminated. Workload expectations should be clarified to define continual employment. This kind of effort requires centralized policies and procedures. Part-time workers are more likely to be productive when their work arrangements are permanent, year round, and a part of their main job (Feldman, 1990).

Charfauros and Tierney (1999) state that equity and fair treatment of part-time faculty does not generally require the same treatment that is provided for full-time faculty. Equity is governed by the employment policies and practices “of the institution that includes recruitment, selection, terms of employment, compensation, and evaluation.” Part-time faculty should be proactively recruited and provided as much advance notification as possible for class scheduling. As a result, the college can improve the performance of the rapidly growing cadre of instructors (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999).

Part-time faculty largely remain unrecognized and are treated as a homogeneous mass even though they are highly trained professionals in their full-time employment outside higher education institutions (Leslie & Gappa, 1998). When these professionals
become part-time faculty, they are excluded from the teaching-learning enterprise therefore they become a faculty of convenience (Wyles, 1998).

Since there are more part-time faculty in the community college system, there are less full-time faculty to do the departmental work that supports the institutional operations necessary to maintain a strong academic climate. It is time for institutions to take a proactive stance to end the two separate faculty systems of full-time verses part-time. Colleges need to review their employment policies and practices that affect part-time faculty. (Leslie & Gappa, 1998)

Since two-year colleges have come to strongly depend on part-time faculty, these institutions can not afford to marginalize their importance. Gappa & Leslie (1993) supported this position by stating that part-time faculty have been exploited to the point that they are an invisible part of the academic profession. There has been a divided faculty system where the tenured faculty, who have long-term employment contracts with benefits and participate in college governance, can be contrasted to the temporary part-time faculty that only have term by term employment and receive no benefits or participation rights to participate in institutional governance (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Part-time faculty may be given assignments that exceed contractual limitations for full-time faculty but are the first to be let go when the institution faces enrollment declines. Even though these faculty may teach as much as full-time faculty they have no say in department, curriculum, or textbook decisions and very little is done to help them in improving their instruction (Lombardi, 1992).
Adjunct faculty also serve an “integral role in achieving the community college mission; therefore, their working conditions should mirror those of the full-time faculty” (Head, 2002, p. 37). Yet they remain largely a “unrecognized, under rewarded, and invisible part of the academic profession” (Leslie & Gappa, 2002, p. 1). Part-time faculty are usually treated very differently than full-time faculty and are actually a separate entity in many institutions. They have separate mailboxes, are left out of college publications and faculty meetings, and are not invited to college social events on campus (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Instead these faculty should be treated as valued colleagues and fellow educators receiving careful consideration since they represent the majority of community college faculty. Based on the sheer number of part-time faculty who are currently employed in these institutions requires that they be taken seriously (Gordon, 2002).

It is important to note that individual states are beginning to recognize how important part-time faculty are to the success of their institutions. In addition, colleges such as the University of Phoenix and the Community College of Vermont are following new trends in instruction and are actually operating without full-time faculty (Garman, 1999).

Seventy-seven percent of part-time faculty are working at other employment and 66% of their main jobs are full-time beyond their part-time teaching position (Conley & Leslie, 2002). These faculty are identified by Tucker as full-mooners and that they comprise over 27% of the part-time faculty (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998).
Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that part-time faculty were dissatisfied about their petty and thoughtless treatment, the lack of commitment from their institution, and the lack of appreciation for their work. They described themselves as migrant workers, expandable, and of second class status.

It is difficult to conceive how any major corporation could function using as high of a percentage of part-time professionals as are employed in higher education. Part-time faculty average 5.4 years at the same institution, so they are not short-term casual labor (Bach, 1999).

There are concerns that employing such a large number of part-time faculty will cause the quality of education to suffer. The division of part-time and full-time faculty perpetuates inequalities of student opportunity. Students receive different teaching services because part-time faculty do not hold office hours and usually arrive just before class and leave immediately after. Office hours are important for student social and intellectual development outside the classroom. With office hours, students have the opportunity to ask questions and the frequency and quality of contacts reinforces student persistence therefore cutting the high percentage dropout rate (Samuel, 1989).

Another concern was raised about part-time faculty who are transient. Transient faculty effect the consistent quality of courses and institutional development. Institutions need to develop hiring and promotion policies that will encourage a sustained relationship over time (Samuel, 1989).

The teaching performance of part-time faculty should be a matter of high concern because it affects the quality of higher education. Part-time faculty can be an asset to their
institutions but it depends on institutions having “clearly articulated, well understood, humane, and equitable policies based on good knowledge of differences among part-time” (Gappa, 1984, p. 3). The polarization between full- and part-time faculty could be avoided with the employment of part-time faculty a central institutional concern. Institutional policies and practices should enhance rather than diminish part-time faculty morale and teaching performance (Gappa, 1984).

Tuckman (1981) also expresses concern about the increase in part-time faculty and how this increase affects the quality of education. Part-time faculty provide attractive options but do have negative impacts related to their loose attachments to their institutions, the apparent decline in the number of full-time faculty positions, and the lack of effective evaluations. Tuckman (1981) suggests that part-time faculty can be used more effectively by incorporating the following:

- At the start of each term, institutions should determine their need for part-time faculty
- Establish criteria for the role part-time faculty will play
- Compile and update annually a list of eligible part-time faculty
- Evaluate part-time faculty on the same standards that apply to full-time faculty
- Base salary on criteria such as degree, experience, and productivity
- Integrate part-time faculty into the intellectual life of the academic department

Ellison (2002) recommends several strategies to improve part-time faculty satisfaction and retention: hire with a clear purpose and direction, define expectations, set a realistic number of faculty positions, manage enrollment, conduct mandatory
orientations, provide development activities, conduct performance evaluations, and create salary policies.

Leslie and Gappa (1993) point out that institutions need to plan for the use of part-time faculty and provide a socialization process that includes handbooks, orientations, and professional development activities. Additionally, it is important to review and adjust salaries, benefits, and length of appointment issues since these are factors of discontent.

**Professional Development**

Hoerner, Clowes, and Impara (1991) define professional development as “systemic and intentional effects delivered at the departmental level concerning such areas as general professional responsibilities, teaching and advising, discipline competency, and institutional development related to occupation programs” (p. 352). The most important reason for the existence of faculty development plans is the improvement of student learning and to train new faculty through pre-service programs (Pierce & Miller, 1980).

Lankard (1993) found that over 55% of colleges responding to a survey rarely have part-time faculty participate in professional development and 48% of colleges rarely make professional development available. Actually, only a few graduate programs or community colleges have even addressed the professional development needs of their faculty overall (Harmon, Rodriguez, & Haworth, 2002). Overall, faculty are not prepared in programs especially designed for community college teaching; therefore, it is left up to the institutions to devise faculty development programs. However, Harmon, et al. (2002)
found that there is a general lack of administrative support to do so. In order to ensure that part-time faculty are successful, valued, and supported, professional development should occur and institutional commitment is needed (Burnstad, 2002).

Haddad and Dickens conducted a survey which found that part-time faculty development was the top concern. It was found through the survey results that part-time faculty have less teaching experience, use less media to support instruction, require less reading from students, and are less involved in educational related activities (Parsons, 1980).

It is assumed that part-time faculty are similar to full-time faculty and as such their needs mirror full-time faculty (Osborn, 1990). However, part-time faculty are very diverse, extremely heterogeneous, and their reasons for teaching are equally varied. Part-time faculty can not be treated as a homogeneous mass because studies reveal that nationally as a group they differ greatly (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Much of the data on part-time faculty is old and institutions tend to operate on assumptions not fact when dealing with these faculty. Administrators’ perceptions of faculty development does not necessarily match the needs of part-time faculty; therefore, programs and initiatives have only minimal impact on part-time faculty development. Therefore, part-time faculty should be involved in the design of these evaluation and development activities (Osborn, 1990).

Osborn (1990) supports the need for professional development programs especially to improve teaching performance. Three perceived problems exist that need to be corrected:
1. Part-time faculty’s lack of information about their institutions

2. Part-time faculty’s marginal status and lack of contact with full-time faculty

3. Part-time faculty’s lack of feedback on teaching performance and limited access and involvement in staff development

Development programs are essential, but in practice often do not meet the needs of part-time faculty (Osborn, 1990). Bach (1999) found that part-time faculty feel more connected and loyal to their institutions if they feel at home within their departments and if they are included the quality of teaching is enhanced. A stronger sense of institutional identity is established when part-time faculty participate in department activities (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999). Evaluation of part-time faculty related to development is imperative due to the significant growth of these faculty. A key variable to the satisfaction of part-time faculty is departmental culture. A caring persona and a communicative interaction naturally draw part-time faculty into the institution (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999).

If the talents of part-time faculty are to be maximally utilized, each community college must develop a systematic program of pre-and in-service training. Part-time faculty training needs to be made into an integral part of the total educational process. Although, it will be a challenge for part-time faculty to participate because of their limited time due to outside employment commitments and conflicts with evening instructional hours (Pedras, 1985). Tuckman and Caldwell (1979) stated that professional
development is the first step to improve instructional quality in order to provide a new level of respectability and environment of productive exchange with full-time faculty.

There are four approaches to staff development: the curriculum development approach, staff development through peer support, personnel management, and adult education (Eric Digest, 1986; Wallen, 2001). Lankard (1993) found there are also four broad categories of training needs related to professional development. The four categories include an introduction to the educational setting, development of basic skills, refresher courses for experienced workers, and specialized courses. Orientation is the most critical phase when focusing on the improvement of instructional quality.

However, McGuire’s study (1993) found that only 31% of community colleges provided a formal orientation. Three additional components include education and training, evaluation, and administrative support. Bramlett and Rodriguez (1983) discovered that when part-time faculty do not understand or relate to the mission of the community college, are unfamiliar with support services, and do not understand what is expected of them they don’t feel they are important to the institution. Professional development programs help address these concerns; however, most programs are designed to fit the needs of colleges, not the part-time faculty (Bramlett & Rodriguez, 1983).

Training must be an on-going effort instead of a one-time shot. In order to be effective, training should follow the principles of adult learning. Adult learning includes the immediacy of application and is problem centered. A climate of mutuality, respect, and informality is needed and the part-time faculty should have a stake in their own
development (Bramlett & Rodriguez, 1983). If part-time faculty development is incorporated, there should be no differentiation in instruction between full-and part-time faculty. In addition, the quality of teaching will be improved (Wallin, 2001).

Lyons & Kysilka (2000) recommends a five-component comprehensive plan for faculty development:

1. A structured orientation
2. A teaching methods course
3. Mentoring with full-time faculty
4. Social interaction between full and part-time faculty
5. Creation and promotion of a materials resource center

Thompson (1995) sites the most commonly used development programs to include mentoring, orientation, in-service workshops, adjunct handbooks, newsletters, and adjunct committees. Northern Virginia Community College provides an orientation for new adjuncts in conjunction with full-time faculty orientation, end of the year recognition, representatives on campus council, part-time faculty names on the class schedule, and a faculty handbook (Wyles, 1998). Wyles (1998) stresses the importance of bringing part-time faculty into the culture of the organization in order not to marginalize this important segment of higher education.

In contrast, Osborn (1990) stated that part-time faculty can be informed through orientation programs and handbooks, but it is doubtful that either will improve instructional quality. Continuous evaluation beyond the typical student ratings is more effective to improve teaching performance.
Johnson County Community College has instituted comprehensive professional development initiatives which include orientation, in-service activities that open each semester, refresher orientations, department orientations, and department meetings. Part-time faculty must complete an individual development plan to participate in professional development programs at the college. The college also offers an adjunct certificate training program where part-time faculty develop a statement of intended learning outcomes (Burnstad, 2002).

Gappa (1984) indicates that professional development programs that give attention to part-time faculty needs is unusual. Part-time faculty appointments are typically informal, sometimes occurring right before classes begin. Appointments are tenuous in nature because they are enrollment driven. Support services are often non-existent and the sharing of information about teaching methods, materials, and student problems with other faculty rarely occurs. As a result of this lack of communication, Gappa (1984) found that part-time faculty feel devoid of status and apprehensive about future employment.

Integration

Gappa & Leslie (1993) issue the challenge that it is time for institutions that hire and use part-time faculty to end the divided system and focus on the need to integrate part-time faculty into the college environment. Literature reviews reveal that little attention has focused on how full-time faculty and administration integrate part-time faculty into their institutions (Sheeks & Hutcheson,
Burnstad (2002) found that part-time faculty feel strongly about whether or not they are integrated into their colleges and for the most part they feel like second class citizens which results in feelings of powerlessness, alienation, and invisibility. Integration could change these negative feelings so that part-time faculty would feel valued and supported.

Integration of part-time faculty is possible by weaving together the existing processes that connect them to the institution. Efforts must be supported at the top level of administration to have the greatest impact and these efforts must be on-going (Roueche & Roueche, 1996). The most successful integration programs have the commitment and participation of college administration and include full-time faculty with the intent to integrate part-time faculty into the mainstream of the institution (Thompson, 1995).

Parsons (1980) found that the integration of part-time faculty into the instructional design of the community college is critical if their potential is to be realized. Typically, part-time faculty have less teaching experience than full-time faculty, are less involved in educational related activities, and use less technology to support student learning. However, students should expect a single standard of quality from their classroom experience (Parsons, 1980).

Tobin (2002) points out that students benefit from being taught by the most competent, engaged, and committed faculty. Therefore, part-time faculty should be integrated. Integration can occur through student advising, contributions to department and faculty-wide curricula decisions, and engagement on professional achievement.
Integration can strengthen the educational experience for both faculty and students. Awareness of part-time faculty’s needs and strong communication are important components of effective integration (Johnson, MacGregor, & Watson, 2001). Institutional commitment is needed in order to implement a comprehensive program for inclusion (Burnstad, 2002).

Historically, institutions have isolated part-time faculty from the work of the college. As a result, part-time faculty feel disconnected from their institution and lack influence over the educational process (Wyles, 1998). Gorden (2002) found that institutions do a poor job of integrating part-time faculty and there are inconsistencies in practices. Good faculty are likely to be connected with other faculty while ineffective faculty are generally alienated from their peers (Schuetz, 2002). Part-time faculty usually have no interaction with their colleagues, spend little to no time on administrative duties, and are isolated from colleagues. As a result of this isolation, part-time faculty are also alienated from knowledge, innovative teaching methods, and campus services (Schuetz, 2002). The importance of integration is the ensurance that part-time faculty are successful, valued, and supported (Burnstad, 2002). Thus, integrating part-time faculty into the culture of the learning organization becomes a critical goal for higher education (Wyles, 1998).

Erwin and Andrews (1993) determined that support services offered to part-time faculty are often “sporadic, piecemeal, and ineffectual.” Their survey found that no systematic method exists for integrating part-time faculty into colleges. The conclusion is there is little excuse for the neglect of part-time faculty since they have been in college
and universities since these institutions began and have been a huge component during 
the large expansion of colleges that has occurred in the last three decades (Erwin & 

Essays written by full-time faculty who have previous part-time teaching 
experience recommend that improvements occur in program specific training, 
communications between adjuncts, communications between adjuncts and full-time 
faculty, and morale and working environment in order to implement effective integration 
(Bethke & Nelson, 1994). Erwin & Andrews (1993) stress the importance of part-time 
faculty’s involvement in curriculum development, program coordination, and academic 
advising.

Integration into department and institutional culture is the strongest predictor of 
part-time faculty motivation and commitment to student advising. The development of 
advising is a factor in student persistence and retention. Therefore, when integration 
occurs, there is a stronger sense of institutional identity for both part-time faculty and 
students (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999).

Part-time faculty complain about the lack of basic collegiality from full-time 
faculty and administration in the department. They state that being ignored by the 
department and the college is one of the most difficult issues faced by part-time faculty 
(Townsend & Hauss, 2002). When part-time faculty feels a disconnection from the 
institution this affects their emotional satisfaction level (Gordon, 2002).

Roueche and Roueche (1996) conducted a comprehensive study on part-time 
faculty integration. They found that part-time faculty are haphazardly selected, poorly
socialized, and rarely supported. The core theory of the study related that part-time faculty will identify with values, beliefs, and goals in the organizational culture to the extent that these individuals feel a sense of loyalty, membership, and similarity to the institution. “The process of identification is seen in the dynamic interaction between individuals and the organization during socialization, communication, and decision making” (p. 33). A direct relationship between a person’s assessment of his/her attachment to the organization and attitudinal commitment was found. Identified positive turning points in socialization included recognition, advancement in rank, and representing the institution to an outside group. In contrast, negative socialization is related to alienation from a group, loneliness, and disaffection which leads to high turnover. Therefore, integration through socialization, increased communication, involvement in decision making increased part-time faculty’s attachment to the organization (Roueche & Roueche, 1996).

Conceptive strategies are more effective than bureaucratic policies and procedures in developing higher levels of organizational identification. In addition, organizational culture has a strong effect on integration of employees. Few administrators aggressively and systemically direct their college’s efforts toward integrating part-time faculty. Evidence was only found in pockets of the organizations studied, not throughout (Roueche & Roueche, 1996).
CHAPTER THREE

Method

The purpose of the study was to determine and compare the perceptions of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs), the academic department heads in technical/career programs (DH-CTs), and the academic department heads in pre-baccalaureate/transfer programs (DH-PBs) about the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. In addition, the study concerned a description and analysis of participant descriptions of the importance of employing, and the perceived ability to employ, in specific disciplines as well as participants’ perceptions of the reasons why part-time faculty were employed at the institution.

Participants in the Study

The participants came from all 23 two-year, public community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia (Appendix B). The colleges were identified through the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC).

The entire Appalachian region encompasses 200,000 square miles including parts of 12 states and the entire state of West Virginia (ARC, 2005). While this study includes the entire population of community colleges in the Appalachian parts of three states central in the region, the colleges comprise a nonprobability sample of all Appalachian community colleges, and generalizations of the results to other parts of Appalachia must not be assumed.
Nonprobability sampling is based on the researcher’s judgement about the availability or appropriateness of subjects for a study (Dillman, 2007). This study involves selecting individuals that are available rather than selecting from the entire population (Galloway, 2007). But even though this study did not involve a random sample of institutions in Appalachia, the results still might be representative of the entire population of community colleges throughout the region. As shown in Chapter Two, the economics, demographics, and culture of the three states selected for this study are homogeneous and similar to other states in Appalachia. A nonprobability sample can deliver accurate results under such conditions (Statistics Canada, 2007).

The specific participants were the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs who work in the identified colleges. CAOs are responsible for the entire academic functions of the institution. They set policies and procedures that affect part-time faculty; they control the budget that determines employment; and they influence faculty professional development and integration opportunities. The academic department heads were included in the study because they are most responsible for recruiting, hiring, and orienting part-time faculty in particular discipline clusters and have direct on-going contacts with part-time faculty.

**Research Questions**

This study had four major research questions:

1. How do chief academic officers and academic department heads perceive the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices in Appalachian community colleges in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia, and are there any significant differences among these perceptions?
2. How do chief academic officers and academic department heads perceive the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific pre-baccalaureate/transfer studies and technical career disciplines in their institutions, and are there any significant differences among these perceptions?

3. How do chief academic officers and academic department heads rank the reasons for employing part-time faculty at their institutions, and are there any significant differences in these rankings?

4. What additional perceptions and information can chief academic officers and academic department heads provide about the employment, professional development, and integration needs and practices for part-time faculty in Appalachian community colleges?

**Null Hypotheses**

The first null hypothesis was: Ho 1: There are no significant differences or relationships among the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance and presence of selected part-time employment, professional development, and integration practices on their campuses. This hypothesis was divided into two sub hypotheses which, in turn, had their own sub hypotheses.

Ho 1a: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected part-time employment, professional development, and integration practices on their campuses.
Ho 1a1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected part-time employment practices on their campuses.

Ho 1a2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected professional development practices for part-time faculty on their campus.

Ho 1a3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected integration practices for part-time faculty on their campuses.

Ho 1b: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected part-time employment, professional development, and integration practices on their campuses.

Ho 1b1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected part-time employment practices on their campuses.

Ho 1b2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected professional development practices for part-time faculty on their campuses.

Ho 1b3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected integration practices for part-time faculty on their campuses.
The second null hypothesis and its sub hypothesis were: Ho 2: There are no significant differences or relationships among the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.

    Ho 2a: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.

    Ho 2b: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.

The third null hypothesis was:

    Ho 3: There are no significant differences in the rankings of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the reasons for employing part-time faculty at their institutions.

**Design of the Questionnaire**

There were no existing questionnaires available to assess the perceptions of CAOs and academic department heads about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration issues. Therefore, the questionnaire for this study (Appendix A) was developed by: modifying an existing questionnaire, incorporating the results of a focus group of part-time faculty, and interviews with a college committee of administrators and faculty by including characteristics that were suggested by a review of the research about the topic of this study.
The researcher modified a questionnaire designed by Leslie and Gappa (1998) for the study of part-time faculty. The original questionnaire had three sets of questions that were used in campus interviews with selected part-time faculty, chief faculty personnel officers, and administrators including chairpersons. The first set of questions was not applicable to this survey because it was intended for part-time faculty. The second set of questions was directed to the chief faculty personnel officer. It included a total of fourteen questions, and the third set of questions was directed to all administrators including chairpersons. It included twelve questions.

This research included items from the second and third sets of questions that related to employment, professional development, and integration of part-time faculty, but excluded items related to salary and benefits. Portions of the remaining questions were modified and used in the final questionnaire for example Question 9 in Leslie and Gappa’s (1998) third set of questions comprises Part III of the current questionnaire.

A college committee consisting of administrators and faculty reviewed draft questions to be included in the questionnaire and provided input on the questionnaire design. In addition to these questions, a focus group of faculty provided input about the questionnaire, and a pilot questionnaire was developed. The result of this pilot was reviewed by a college committee of faculty and administrators.

Thus, a modified questionnaire was constructed by the researcher that incorporated information from Leslie and Gappa’s questionnaire (1998), the pilot survey, the committee interview, Dillman’s (2007) guidelines, and the review of literature. The
The final questionnaire was pilot tested by potential respondents and reviewed by college presidents and modified accordingly.

The Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire consisted of four parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to identify their position at the institution. Positions defined for this study included CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs. These positions are defined in Chapter One of this dissertation, as they were worded on the questionnaire.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of three categories of practices: (a) employment, (b) professional development, and (c) integration of part-time faculty at the institution. Each category had ten questions. Recipients were asked to rate the perceived importance of each practice “at your institution” on a five point Likert scale. The scale ranged from “very unimportant” to “very important”. They were asked as well to answer “yes” or “no” to whether each of ten listed employment, professional, or integration practices was “in place at your institution.”

The first set of questions in this part of the questionnaire focused on the perceived importance and presence of employment practices for part-time faculty at the institution. The importance was identified through a five point Likert scale from, “5” which equaled “very important to “1”, “very unimportant.” Questions pertained to the following practices: (a) institutional policies affecting the employment of part-time faculty; (b) intake orientation process; (c) established salary policy; (d) an institutional benefits package; (e) office space on campus; (f) technical equipment to enhance classroom instruction; (g) incentives to attract part-time faculty; (h) personal e-mail accounts
established; (i) clerical support services; and (j) guidelines to monitor the use of part-time faculty.

The second set of questions concerned the perceived importance and presence of professional development practices for part-time faculty at the institution. The importance was identified through a five point Likert scale from “5” “very important” to “1” “very unimportant.” Questions pertained to the following practices: (a) instructional enrichment activities that focus on improving teaching skills; (b) programs to help develop skills for relating to students; (c) recognition of contributions to the institution; (d) travel funds for conferences and training; (e) departmental evaluation to provide feedback; (f) training to enhance skill competencies; (g) opportunities to learn about higher education issues; (h) tuition remission for themselves; (i) opportunities for mutual sharing with other faculty; and (j) paid membership in state and/or regional organizations.

The third set of questions concerned the perceived importance and presence of practices to integrate part-time faculty into the institution. The importance was identified through a five-point Likert type scale that ranged from “5” “very important” to “1” which equaled “very unimportant.” Questions pertained to the following: (a) help part-time faculty gain knowledge and appreciation of the history, philosophy, and goals of the institution; (b) furnish information about the types of students who attend the institution; (c) provide a job description; (d) equip part-time faculty with a syllabus for assigned courses; (e) provide opportunities to participate in social activities; (f) supply a handbook specifically for part-time use; (g) participate on academic senate; (h) included in regular
institutional communications; (i) match new part-time faculty hires with a full-time faculty mentor; and (j) involvement with curricular decisions.

The third part of the questionnaire consisted of two components. In the first component, the respondents were asked about the importance of employing part-time faculty in pre-baccalaureate studies and in technical career studies, agricultural and natural resource technologies, business, computer technologies, education, engineering/industrial technologies, health technologies (except nursing), nursing (ADN and PN), and public service technologies. The pre-baccalaureate studies included English, natural and physical sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences. In the second component of this part of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked about their ability to employ part-time faculty in these same disciplines.

In Part IV, participants were asked to indicate their reasons for employing part-time faculty. Seven reasons were provided on the questionnaire and participants had the option of identifying an eighth reason. The listed reasons were: financial savings, access to scarce expertise, access to current knowledge and practice, links with employers and professionals, visibility/credibility, flexibility in meeting student demand, and extended use of retired faculty. Participants ranked their responses in order of importance with “1” being the “most important” and “8” being the “least important.”
Operational Definitions of Variables

Independent Variables

The independent variable for this study was the position that the respondent held. The study involved participants who held three different employment positions: CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were identified in Parts II, III, and IV of the questionnaire. In Part II of this study, the dependent variables were the perceived importance and the existence of selected employment, professional development, and integration practices. The variables in Part III included the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty, and the variables in Part IV were the reasons for employment. These variables were defined in the first chapter.

Data Collection Procedures

“The questionnaire is only one element of a well-done survey” (Dillman, 2007, p 149). A high response rate is needed for a successful study. Dillman (2007) wrote about five elements that were needed to achieve good results: “(1) a respondent-friendly questionnaire, (2) up to five contacts with the questionnaire recipient, (3) inclusion of stamped return envelopes, (4) personalized correspondence, and (5) a token financial incentive that is sent with the survey request” (p. 150). Surveys using these elements can obtain response rates ranging from 58 to 92% (Dillman, 2007).

The researcher sent a packet of information to the president of each of the 23 identified institutions. The packet included a copy of the questionnaire (Appendix A), an
introduction letter (Appendix C), and a contact information form (Appendix D). The letter was from the researcher who introduced the study, described the research in general, and sought the president’s support for the participation of their CAO and academic department heads in the study. The presidents were asked to provide the names and contact information for the chief academic officer and academic department heads who should participate in the survey. The letter confirmed the importance of the research to the region and sought institutional participation.

After receiving the presidents’ support for participation, the questionnaire was sent by U.S. Mail to the identified CAOs and academic department heads at each college. They also received an introduction letter requesting voluntary participation including a brief overview of the study. (Appendix E). Two weeks after the original mailing, a second questionnaire was mailed to CAOs and academic department heads in order to increase the response rate. Follow-up telephone calls were made three weeks after the original questionnaire was sent to the potential participants.

Each questionnaire was coded to avoid duplication of data and to protect the identities of the participants. The request for individual participation included a clear statement that participation in the study was voluntary and that responses to the survey would remain confidential.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive Statistics and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to analyze the data collected from the questionnaire mailing.
Guiding these analyses were the four research questions that were mentioned previously in this chapter. The analyses concerned the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about: (1) the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices, (2) the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific pre-baccalaureate/transfer studies and technical career disciplines at their institutions, (3) the reasons for employing part-time faculty, and (4) additional perceptions and information about employment, professional development, and integration needs and practices.

Descriptive statistics involving the percentages and rank order were gathered to describe the results for Research Questions One and Two. Research Question Three was answered by examining means and order of rank and Research Question Four was answered by reviewing the responses provided by the respondent groups.

ANOVA was the appropriate statistical procedure to measure the variation among the respondents on the perceived importance and presence of different employment, professional development, and integration practices; the perceived importance and the ability to employ in different disciplines and the reasons for employing part-time faculty. ANOVA was appropriate for null hypotheses Ho 1 and Ho 2 and sub hypotheses Ho 1a, Ho 1a1, Ho 1a2, Ho 1a3, Ho 1b, Ho 1b1, Ho 1b2, Ho 1b3, Ho 2a and Ho 2b to compare the scores of discrete groups on continuous measurements of variables. It was premised on a null hypothesis that the mean scores of the groups will be the same, and designed to measure the mean variance among the scores of the groups (Aron, Aron, & Coups, 2005). The data in a major portion of this study were the reported perceptions of three discrete
groups of administrators along a continuous Likert Scale. Therefore, Analysis of Variance was the appropriate test of these perceptions.

Since ANOVA is a parametric test, the analyses were guided by four assumptions that must be met for the results to be accurate. First, it was assumed that the data are from normally distributed populations. If the data were not normally distributed, the results were likely to be inaccurate (Field, 2005). To test for normality, a histogram of the collected data was produced through SPSS. A normal curve was imposed upon the histogram to visualize if the data are normally distributed.

The second assumption is “that the variances should be the same throughout the data” (Field, 2005, p. 64). To test homogeneity of variance, Levene’s test was used. If the significance was greater than .05, equal variances were assumed. The significance level for this study was set at the 95% confidence level.

The third assumption is that the data should be measured in intervals that were equal at all parts on the scale, and the final assumption is that the data from the different participants were independent, meaning that they did not influence the behavior of another. These last two assumptions can only be tested by common sense (Field, 2005).

A Bonferroni correction was applied to the results of statistical significance to control for Type I error. Bonferroni corrects the “level of significance for each test such that the overall Type I error rate across all comparisons remains at .05. There is a trade-off for controlling the familywise error rate and that is loss of statistical power. This means that the probability of rejecting an effect that does actually exist is increased (a Type II error)” (Field, 2005, p 339-340). The Bonferroni inequality test was used as an
overall test. This test was applied to make sure the true null hypotheses were not rejected since the study involved a large number of ANOVAs. There were 92 ANOVAs in the study with the study-wide alpha was set at .05. As a result of the Bonferroni inequality analysis, .0005 was used to decide to reject or fail to reject each ANOVA.

The study concerned a population and for the purposes of this study was treated as a convenience sample in order to conduct statistical analyses. Therefore power was not an issue.

**Summary**

This chapter provided a description of the (a) participants in the study, (b) research questions, (c) null hypotheses, (d) the questionnaire, (e) operational definitions of variables, (f) data collection procedures, and (g) data analysis methods.

Four research questions were answered through descriptive statistics and ANOVA comparing the mean differences, frequencies, and rankings among the respondents.

All of the questions were answered using data collected from the questionnaire that was mailed to the CAOs and academic department heads from the 23 community colleges in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia.
CHAPTER 4
Results

The purpose of this study was to make a comparison of the perceptions among CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. This chapter contains the findings of this research. This chapter has four sections corresponding to the four research questions presented for the study as well as a summary.

The data for this study were collected from a questionnaire mailed to the chief academic officers and academic department heads employed at the 23 two-year, public community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. The presidents of the 23 colleges were asked to identify the names and addresses of their chief academic officers (CAOs) and academic department heads who would be invited to participate in the study. All 23 college presidents (100%) responded to either the initial mailing requests or the follow up telephone contact. Questionnaires were then mailed to the identified CAOs and department heads to begin data collection. Eighty-two questionnaires were returned from the 126 questionnaires mailed, obtaining a 65% response rate. The results of the data analysis are presented in the order of the research questions.

The questionnaire used in the study had four parts. They were developed by modifying an existing questionnaire, and incorporating results from: a focus group of part-time faculty, interviews with a college committee including administrators and
faculty, and characteristics that were suggested by a review of the research about the topic of this study.

In Part I of the questionnaire, participants were asked to indicate their position within the institution. Positions selected for the study were chief academic officer (CAO), academic department head – career/technical programs (DH-CT), and academic department head-pre-baccalaureate/transfer (DH-PB). The CAO was defined as the highest ranked administrator over academic affairs. The DH-CT was defined as the administrator or faculty member who has direct responsibility for hiring part-time faculty in career/technical programs, and DH-PB was defined as the administrator or faculty member who has direct responsibility for hiring part-time faculty in pre-baccalaureate/transfer education. Position titles for both department head categories could include dean, division coordinator, department head, or director. There were 82 respondents: 16 CAOs (19.5%), 36 DH-CTs (43.9%) and 30 DH-PBs (36.5%).

Part II of the questionnaire addressed the employment, professional development, and integration of part-time faculty. It included three sections. Section A addressed employment practices. Section B focused on professional development, and Section C addressed integration. Participants were asked to rank their opinion in response to ten items under each section on a five-point Likert scale, and to indicate whether the practice referenced in the item was in place at their institution.

The third part of the questionnaire concerned the importance of employing part-time faculty and the ability to hire them in twelve different disciplines. A five-point Likert scale was used for each response along with an option for selecting not applicable.
Participants were asked to rank the reasons for hiring part-time faculty in the last part of the questionnaire. Seven possible reasons were provided in the section, and a space was provided to insert an additional reason that the respondent believed was important.

The items on the survey represented four research questions, three null hypotheses, and 10 sub hypotheses. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the employment, professional development, and integration issues perceived by the study participants, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to measure the mean variance in responses from the CAOs, the DH-CTs, and the DH/PBs. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical testing.

This chapter contains the results of the analyses of the data collected from the questionnaire. The independent variables were the positions of the respondents (a) CAOs, (b) DH-CTs, and (c) DH-PBs and the dependent variables were the 80 employment, professional development, and integration items provided in the questionnaire. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

**Findings**

**Research Question One**

Research Question One was: How do chief academic officers and academic department heads perceive the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices in Appalachian community colleges in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia, and are there any significant differences among these perceptions? Part II of the questionnaire contained three sections that addressed this
research question. Section A addressed employment issues, Section B addressed professional development issues, and Section C addressed integration issues. Each section contained ten items that were rated on a five-point Likert scale, along with an option to provide additional comments if desired. Responders were asked to rate their perceptions about each of these practices using “1” as “very unimportant,” “2” as “unimportant,” “3” as “neither important nor unimportant,” “4” as “somewhat important,” and “5” as “very important”. In addition to rating the importance of the practices, participants were asked to indicate whether the practice was in place at the institution by circling “yes” or “no.” Responses for research Question One were analyzed using descriptive statistics and Analysis of Variance. The results follow with the descriptive data provided first and then the results of the hypotheses testing:

**Descriptive analyses for employment.** Eighty-two responses were received in response to the questionnaire mailing and subsequent telephone contacts. The CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs from the 23 identified community and community/technical colleges were the respondents. In all, a 65% response rate was achieved for the study.

Descriptive statistics for Part II-Section A, Employment Importance are found in Table 1. This table contains the means and ranks from the questionnaire Likert scales for each position category and employment practice. A review of the means in Table 1 reveals that CAOs ranked the most important employment practices as, in order: institutional policies, established salary policy, personal e-mail account, technical equipment, and guidelines to monitor. DH-CTs practices were, in order:
Table 1

*Mean Distribution for Importance of Employment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of employment</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Career/Technical Education</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional policies</td>
<td>4.81 1</td>
<td>4.61 1</td>
<td>4.66 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake orientation program</td>
<td>4.38 7</td>
<td>4.39 5</td>
<td>4.55 3.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established salary policy</td>
<td>4.75 2</td>
<td>4.50 2</td>
<td>4.69 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional benefits package</td>
<td>3.67 10</td>
<td>3.89 10</td>
<td>3.79 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space on campus</td>
<td>3.88 9</td>
<td>4.06 9</td>
<td>4.10 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical equipment</td>
<td>4.63 4</td>
<td>4.50 2</td>
<td>4.36 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to attract</td>
<td>3.94 8</td>
<td>4.08 8</td>
<td>3.97 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal e-mail accounts</td>
<td>4.67 3</td>
<td>4.47 4</td>
<td>4.41 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical support services</td>
<td>4.50 6</td>
<td>4.25 7</td>
<td>4.10 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines to monitor</td>
<td>4.56 5</td>
<td>4.28 6</td>
<td>4.34 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on the mean score with the highest score as number 1 and the lowest score as number 10.
policies, established salary policy, technical equipment, personal e-mail account and intake orientation program. The most important practices for DH-PBs were, in order: established salary policy, institutional policies, intake orientation program, personal e-mail account, and technical equipment.

The CAOs and DH-CTs rated five practices in the same order of importance. The most important employment practice was “institutional policies,” second was “established salary policy,” eight was “incentives to attract,” ninth was “office space on campus,” and last was “institutional benefits package.” The CAOs and DH-BPs agreed that “personal e-mail accounts” ranked fourth, and “guidelines to monitor” ranked sixth and “clerical support services” ranked seventh. “Institutional benefits package” ranked as the least important employment practice.

Descriptive statistics for Part II-Section A, Employment In Place are found in Table 2. This table contains percentages and ranks from the questionnaire responses on whether each identified employment practice was in place at the institution. Respondents were asked to select either “yes,” the practice was in place, or “no,” the practice did not exist at their institution.

A review of the percentages in Table 2 reveals that all three respondent groups place importance on “established salary policy” and “personal e-mail accounts” as the most common employment practices at their institution. The least common employment practices among the institutions were “incentives to attract” and “institutional benefits package” for part-time faculty.
Table 2

*Percentage and Rank Distribution for Employment Practices in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment in Place</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake orientation program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established salary policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional benefits package</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage and Rank Distribution for Employment Practices in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment in Place</th>
<th>Office space on campus</th>
<th>Technical equipment</th>
<th>Incentives to attract</th>
<th>Personal e-mail accounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Academic Officers</td>
<td>Department Heads Career/Technical</td>
<td>Pre Baccalaureate Transfer Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>66.7 7</td>
<td>57.6 8</td>
<td>53.3 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>86.7 5</td>
<td>90.9 2</td>
<td>79.3 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>13.3 10</td>
<td>9.1 10</td>
<td>13.3 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>100 1</td>
<td>90.9 2</td>
<td>100 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: continued

*Percentage and Rank Distribution for Employment Practices in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment in Place</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerical Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines to monitor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on practice percentage that is in place with the highest percentage ranked as number one and the lowest percentage in place as the lowest percentage. Not in place percentages were not ranked.
CAOs perceive “established salary policy,” “personal e-mail accounts,” “clerical support services,” and “institutional policies” to be the most common employment practices at their institutions. DH-CTs most common practices were: “established salary policy,” “institutional policies,” “technical equipment,” and “personal e-mail accounts.” DH-PBs selected “personal e-mail accounts,” “established salary policy,” “institutional policies,” and “intake orientation program.”

Table 2 provides the complete list of employment practices and percentages with rankings from the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs responses of whether the employment practices exist at the institution. Analyses of differences appear in the next section.

**Descriptive analyses for professional development.** Descriptive statistics for Part II-Section B, Professional Development Importance are found in Table 3. This table contains the mean responses and ranks for each respondent category in regard to the professional development practices. The top practices are rank ordered, beginning with the most important. The top five professional development practices for CAOs are, in order: departmental evaluation, instructional enrichment, recognition of contributions, programs to develop skills, and mutual sharing. DH-CTs ranked, in order: departmental evaluation, instructional enrichment, training, mutual sharing, and programs to develop skills. The most important practices for DH-PBs were: departmental evaluation, instructional enrichment, programs to develop skills, mutual sharing, and recognition of contributions.

“Departmental Evaluation” was rated as the most important practice by all three respondent groups and “higher education issues” was rated seventh by all respondent
Table 3

*Mean Distribution for Importance of Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of professional development</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate Transfer Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional enrichment</td>
<td>4.63  2</td>
<td>4.50  1</td>
<td>4.33  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to develop skills</td>
<td>4.25  3</td>
<td>4.14  5</td>
<td>4.23  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of contributions</td>
<td>4.25  3</td>
<td>4.06  6</td>
<td>4.17  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds</td>
<td>3.69  8</td>
<td>3.83  8</td>
<td>3.57  8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental evaluation</td>
<td>4.88  1</td>
<td>4.50  1</td>
<td>4.43  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>4.13  6</td>
<td>4.17  3</td>
<td>3.97  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education issues</td>
<td>3.88  7</td>
<td>3.92  7</td>
<td>3.70  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition remission</td>
<td>3.50  9</td>
<td>3.61  9</td>
<td>3.57  8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual sharing</td>
<td>4.25  3</td>
<td>4.17  3</td>
<td>4.21  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid membership</td>
<td>2.88  10</td>
<td>3.19  10</td>
<td>3.10  10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on the mean score with the highest score as number 1 and the lowest score as number 10.
groups. “Paid membership” was perceived to be the least important professional development practice.

Descriptive statistics for Part II, Section B, Professional Development in Place are found in Table 4. This table contains the percentages and ranks for the respondents’ perceptions of professional development activities that are in place at the respondents’ institutions. Respondents were asked to select either “yes” or “no” to indicate whether the professional development practice existed at their institution.

A review of the percentages in Table 4 reveals that the most common professional development practices in place at institutions are perceived to be “departmental evaluation,” “mutual sharing,” and “instructional enrichment.” The least common practice for all three respondent groups is “paid membership.”

CAOs perceive “departmental evaluation,” “mutual sharing,” “instructional enrichment,” and “training” to be the most common practices in place at their institutions. “Departmental evaluation,” “instructional enrichment,” “mutual sharing,” and “training” were selected by the DH-CTs. DH-PBs perceive “departmental evaluation,” “mutual sharing,” “instructional enrichment,” “recognition of contributions,” and “travel funds” as practices in place at their institutions.

Descriptive analyses for integration. Descriptive statistics for Part II-Section C, Integration Importance are found in Table 5. This table contains means and ranks from each respondent group in regard to integration practices in rank order of importance. A review of the means in Table 5 reveals that CAO’s most important integration practices were, in order: equip with a syllabus, supply a handbook, curricular decisions, mentor,
### Table 4

**Percentage and Rank Distribution for Professional Development in Place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Professional Development</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate Career/Technical</th>
<th>Transfer Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>73.3 3</td>
<td>78.8 2</td>
<td>50 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>26.7 21.2</td>
<td>21.2 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to develop skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>42.9 7</td>
<td>24.2 8</td>
<td>30 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>57.1 75.8</td>
<td>75.8 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>57.1 5</td>
<td>21.2 9</td>
<td>43.3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>42.9 78.8</td>
<td>78.8 56.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>57.1 5</td>
<td>33.3 6</td>
<td>43.3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>42.9 66.7</td>
<td>66.7 56.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: continued

*Percentage and Rank Distribution for Professional Development in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Professional Development</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Academic Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental evaluation</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition remission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: continued

*Percentage and Rank Distribution for Professional Development in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Professional Development</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on practice percentage that is in place with the highest percentage ranked as number one and the lowest percentage in place as the lowest percentage. Not in place percentages were not ranked.
### Table 5

*Mean Distribution for Importance of Integration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Integration</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain knowledge/appreciation</td>
<td>Mean 4.07 Rank 7</td>
<td>Mean 4.17 Rank 6</td>
<td>Mean 3.93 Rank 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about students</td>
<td>Mean 4.06 Rank 8</td>
<td>Mean 4.22 Rank 4</td>
<td>Mean 4.17 Rank 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a job description</td>
<td>Mean 4.31 Rank 5</td>
<td>Mean 4.44 Rank 2</td>
<td>Mean 4.37 Rank 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip with a syllabus</td>
<td>Mean 4.75 Rank 1</td>
<td>Mean 4.67 Rank 1</td>
<td>Mean 4.59 Rank 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in social activities</td>
<td>Mean 4.06 Rank 8</td>
<td>Mean 3.75 Rank 9</td>
<td>Mean 4.14 Rank 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply a handbook</td>
<td>Mean 4.63 Rank 2</td>
<td>Mean 4.42 Rank 3</td>
<td>Mean 4.38 Rank 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in academic senate</td>
<td>Mean 2.81 Rank 10</td>
<td>Mean 3.11 Rank 10</td>
<td>Mean 3.13 Rank 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional communications</td>
<td>Mean 4.31 Rank 5</td>
<td>Mean 4.14 Rank 7</td>
<td>Mean 4.33 Rank 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Mean 4.38 Rank 4</td>
<td>Mean 4.19 Rank 5</td>
<td>Mean 4.20 Rank 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular decisions</td>
<td>Mean 4.56 Rank 3</td>
<td>Mean 3.83 Rank 8</td>
<td>Mean 3.53 Rank 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on the mean score with the highest score as number 1 and the lowest score as number 10.
and institutional communications. DH-CTs valued, in order: equip with a syllabus, supply a handbook, provide a job description, institutional communications, and mentor. The most important practices for DH-PBs were, in order: equip with a syllabus, supply a handbook, provide a job description, institutional communications, and mentor.

Comparing the top five practices among the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs reveals that all three respondent groups rate “equip with a syllabus” as the most important integration practice at their institutions and the “participation in academic senate” as the least important practice at their institutions. CAOs and DH-PBs placed “supply a handbook” as second in importance, while DH-CTs placed this item as third on the list. “Providing a job description” was important to both DH-CTs and DH-PBs, but was rated fifth by the CAOs.

Table 5 provides the complete list of integration practices that were rated in importance by the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs. The mean scores and ranks seem to indicate differences in the perceived importance of integration practices. These are analyzed in the next section of this chapter.

Descriptive statistics for Part II-Section C, Integration in Place are found in Table 6. This table contains percentages and rankings from the questionnaire responses. Respondents were asked to indicate the presence of the integration practices at their institutions by either marking “yes” or “no” on the questionnaire.

A review of the percentages in Table 6 reveals that all three respondent groups perceive that “equip with a syllabus” is in place more than any other practice and “participate in academic senate” is the least available practice. Responses varied among
Table 6

*Percentage and Rank Distribution for Integration Practices in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration in Place</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain knowledge/appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a job description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip with a syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in social activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: continued

**Percentage and Rank Distribution for Integration Practices in Place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration in Place</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Academic Officers</td>
<td>Career/Technical</td>
<td>Transfer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply a handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>71.4 4</td>
<td>66.7 4</td>
<td>76.7 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in academic senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>6.7 10</td>
<td>15.6 10</td>
<td>23.3 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>93.3 84.4</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>80 3</td>
<td>75 3</td>
<td>86.7 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>60 6</td>
<td>51.5 8</td>
<td>63.6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: continued

*Percentage and Rank Distribution for Integration Practices in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration in Place</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Academic</td>
<td>Department Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Career/Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Place</td>
<td>26.7 9</td>
<td>40.6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Place</td>
<td>73.3 59.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on practice percentage that is in place with the highest percentage ranked as number one and the lowest percentage in place as the lowest percentage. Not in place percentages were not ranked.
the respondents for the remaining integration practices, but “equip with a syllabus,” “provide a job description,” “participate in social activities,” “supply a handbook,” and “institutional communications,” were more available practices in place at their institutions.

**Results of the analyses of variance.** The results of the analysis of variance are presented below for null hypothesis 1 and its sub hypotheses: 1a, (including Hos1a1, 1a2, 1a3), and 1b (including Hos 1b1, 1b2, and 1b3).

Ho 1: There are no significant differences among the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance and presence of selected part-time employment, professional development, and integration practices on their campuses.

The data displayed in Tables 7 through 12 indicate the significance levels of differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance and presence of selected part-time employment, professional development, and integration practices on their campuses. Some significant differences were found, thus, null hypothesis 1 was rejected.

Ho 1a: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected part-time employment, professional development, and integration practices on their campuses.

The data displayed in Tables 7, 8, and 9 indicate that there are no significant differences in the respondents’ perceptions of the importance of selected employment, professional development, or integration practices. Thus, null hypothesis 1a, failed to be rejected.
Table 7

*Analysis of Variance for Importance of Employment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional policies</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake orientation program</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established salary policy</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional benefits package</td>
<td>2,77</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space on campus</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical equipment</td>
<td>2,77</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to attract</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal e-mail accounts</td>
<td>2,77</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical support services</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines to monitor</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

*Analysis of Variance for Importance of Professional Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional enrichment</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to develop skills</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of contributions</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental evaluation</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education issues</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition remission</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual sharing</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid membership</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

*Analysis of Variance for Importance of Integration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain knowledge/appreciation</td>
<td>2,77</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about students</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a job description</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip with a syllabus</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in social activities</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply a handbook</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in academic senate</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional communications</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular decisions</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ho 1a1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected part-time employment practices on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 7 indicate that there are no significant differences in the importance of selected part-time employment practices on their campuses. Thus, this null hypothesis about the perceived importance of employment practices could not be rejected.

Ho 1a2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected professional development practices for part-time faculty on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 8 indicate that there are no significant differences in the importance of selected professional development practices for part-time faculty on their campuses. Thus, null hypothesis 1a2 failed to be rejected.

Ho 1a3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected integration practices for part-time faculty on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 9 indicate that there are no significant differences in the importance of selected integration practices for part-time faculty on their campuses. Thus, this null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Ho 1b: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected part-time employment, professional development, and integration practices on their campuses.
Following are the tests of the sub hypotheses that led to the rejection of null hypothesis 1b:

Ho 1b1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected part-time employment practices on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 10 indicate that there are significant differences in the perceptions of the presence of employment practices for “clerical support services,” (p=.032). Thus, null hypothesis 1b1, was rejected.

A post hoc test was incorporated using the Bonferroni technique to analyze the differences between respondent groups included in the study about their perceptions on “clerical support” for part-time faculty. More CAOs, 100%, believed that “clerical support services” was in place than DH-CTs and DH-PBs, even though 66.7% of the DH-CTs and 76.7% of the DH-PBs believed that this practice was in place at their institution. An alpha level of .05 was used for this test.

Ho 1b2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected professional development practices for part-time faculty on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 11 indicate that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence “instructional enrichment activities that focus on improving and assessing teaching performance,” (p=.044) and “recognition of contributions to the institution,” (p=.038). Thus, null Ho 1b2, was rejected.
Table 10

*Analysis of Variance for Employment in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional policies</td>
<td>2,76</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake orientation program</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established salary policy</td>
<td>2,76</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional benefits package</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space on campus</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical equipment</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to attract</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal e-mail accounts</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>2.163</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical support services</td>
<td>2,76</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines to monitor</td>
<td>2,76</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05.
Table 11

*Analysis of Variance for Professional Development in Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional enrichment</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to develop skills</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of contributions</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>3.420</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental evaluation</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>2.268</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education issues</td>
<td>2,73</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition remission</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual sharing</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid membership</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .05 \).*
Post hoc tests incorporating the Bonferroni technique were used to analyze the differences between respondent groups in the study about the presence of “instructional enrichment activities that focus on improving and assessing teaching performance” and “recognition of contributions to the institution”. More CAOs, 73.3%, and DH-CTs, 78.8% believed that “instructional enrichment activities that focus on improving and assessing teaching performance” was in place than DH-PBs, even though 50% of the DH-PBs believed that this practice was in place at their institution. An alpha level of .05 was used for these tests.

Ho 1b3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the presence of selected integration practices for part-time faculty on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 12 indicate that there are significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about “provide opportunities to participate in social activities,” (p=.045). Thus, null hypothesis 1b3, was rejected.

A post hoc test incorporating the Bonferroni technique was used to analyze the differences between respondent groups in the study for “provide opportunities to participate in social activities”. More CAOs, 86.7%, and DH-PBs, 83.3%, believed that “provide opportunities to participate in social activities” practice was in place than DH-CTs, even though 59.4% of DH-CTs believed the practice was in place at their institutions.
Table 12

*Analysis of Variance for Integration In Place*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain knowledge/appreciation</td>
<td>2,73</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about students</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a job description</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip with a syllabus</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in social activities</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>3.223</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply a handbook</td>
<td>2,73</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in academic senate</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional communications</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular decisions</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05.*
Research Question Two

Research Question Two was: How do chief academic officers and academic department heads perceive the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific pre-baccalaureate/transfer studies and technical career disciplines in their institutions, and are there any significant differences among these perceptions?

Responses on Part III of the questionnaire provided the data that addressed this research question. The first section concerned the importance of employing part-time faculty in these areas, and the second section concerned the ability to employ them. The first section of Part III of the questionnaire concerned the importance of employing part-time faculty in General Studies and Technical Career Programs. General Studies disciplines included English, natural and physical sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences. Technical Career Programs included agriculture and natural resources, business, computer technology, education, engineering/industrial technology, health, nursing, and public service technology. A five-point Likert scale was used for ranking the responses along with a not applicable option. The Likert scale used “1” as “important,” “2” as “somewhat important,” “3” as “neither important nor unimportant,” “4” as “unimportant,” and “5” as “very unimportant.” The categories of “important” and “somewhat important” were combined into one scale named “important” and the categories of “unimportant” and “very unimportant” were combined into one scale called “important” for clarity in the table.

Descriptive analyses for importance of employing. Descriptive statistics for Part III, Importance of Employing in this Discipline are found in Table 13. This table
Table 13

*Mean Distribution for Importance of Employing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Employing in this Discipline</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate Transfer Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.13 1</td>
<td>2.03 9</td>
<td>1.79 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and physical sciences</td>
<td>1.19 2</td>
<td>2.00 8</td>
<td>1.96 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; humanities</td>
<td>1.31 5</td>
<td>2.09 10</td>
<td>2.14 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>1.25 3</td>
<td>1.97 7</td>
<td>2.00 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; natural resource</td>
<td>1.27 4</td>
<td>1.23 1</td>
<td>1.63 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1.81 12</td>
<td>2.33 12</td>
<td>1.89 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer technologies</td>
<td>1.33 6</td>
<td>2.14 11</td>
<td>1.96 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.50 8</td>
<td>1.89 5</td>
<td>1.82 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/industrial</td>
<td>1.44 7</td>
<td>1.68 3</td>
<td>1.60 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health technologies</td>
<td>1.56 11</td>
<td>1.90 6</td>
<td>1.89 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (ADN &amp; PN)</td>
<td>1.50 8</td>
<td>1.67 2</td>
<td>1.93 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service technologies</td>
<td>1.50 8</td>
<td>1.75 4</td>
<td>1.38 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on the mean score with the highest score as number 1 and the lowest score as number 12.
contains the mean responses and ranks for each position category and academic discipline. The most important employment disciplines for CAOs, in order: English, natural and physical sciences, social sciences, agricultural and natural resource, and arts and humanities. DH-CTs ranked, in order: agriculture and natural resource, nursing, engineering/industrial, public service technologies, and education. The most important for DH-PBs were: public service technologies, engineering/industrial, agriculture and natural resource, English, and education. There was no agreement among the groups on either the most important or the least important discipline. CAOs and DH-CTs rated “business” as twelfth and CAOs and DH-PBs rated “nursing” as eight. DH-CTs and DH-PBs rated “education” as fifth and “health technologies” as sixth. The rankings from all three groups varied on importance but overall each discipline had a mean score above a number 3 indicating each of the disciplines was important to the respondents.

The second section of Part III of the questionnaire concerned the ability to employ part-time faculty in General Studies and Technical Career Program. General Studies disciplines included English, natural and physical sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences. Technical Career Programs included agriculture and natural resources, business, computer technology, education, engineering/industrial technology, health, nursing, and public service technology. A five-point Likert scale was used for ranking the responses along with a not applicable option. The Likert scale used “1” as “easy,” “2” as “somewhat easy,” “3” as “neither easy nor difficult,” “4” as “difficult,” and “5” as “very difficult.” The “easy” and “somewhat easy” scales were combined into one scale; “easy”
and the “difficult” and “very difficult” scales were combined into one scale; “difficult” for clarity for the reader.

**Descriptive analyses for ability to employ.** Table 14 is a display of the descriptive statistics about the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines. CAOs find it easy to employ part-time faculty in “agricultural and natural resources,” public service technologies,” and “education” but find it difficult to employ part-time faculty in “natural and physical sciences,” “health technologies,” and “nursing.” DH-CTs find it easy to employ part-time faculty in “agricultural and natural resource,” “public service technologies,” and “business” but find it difficult to employ part-time faculty in “nursing,” “natural and physical sciences,” and “health technologies.” DH-PBs find it easier to employ part-time faculty in “public service technologies,” “agricultural and natural resources,” and “business” than any other discipline. “Natural and physical sciences,” “nursing, and “arts and humanities” are perceived to be the most difficult disciplines for employing part-time faculty by this group. Natural and physical sciences was the only discipline with a mean score of “4” which indicated it was difficult to hire in this discipline and no discipline has a score of “1” indicating that it was “easy” to hire part-time faculty in the discipline.

**Results of analysis of variance.** The second research hypothesis stated:

Ho 2: There are no significant differences among the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.
### Table 14

**Mean Distribution for Ability to Employ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to Employ</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate Transfer Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in this Discipline</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and physical sciences</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; humanities</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; natural resource</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer technologies</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/industrial</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health technologies</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (ADN &amp; PN)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service technologies</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on the mean score with the highest score as number 1 and the lowest score as number 12.
The data displayed in Tables 15 and 16 indicate that there were no significant differences among the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses. Thus, null hypothesis could not be rejected. Following are the results of the tests of the sub-hypotheses of Ho2:

Ho 2a: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 15 indicate that there were no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses. Thus, the null hypothesis, Ho 2a, was not rejected.

Ho 2b: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.

The data displayed in Table 16 indicate that there were no significant differences in the ability to employ part-time faculty in the specific disciplines by administrative function. Thus, this null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Research Question Three**

Research Question Three was: How do chief academic officers and academic department heads rank the reasons for employing part-time faculty at their institutions, and are there any significant differences in these rankings?
Table 15

*Analysis of Variance for Importance of Employing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>1.752</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and physical sciences</td>
<td>2,71</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; humanities</td>
<td>2,73</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>2,72</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; natural resource</td>
<td>2,65</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2,70</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer technologies</td>
<td>2,68</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,68</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/industrial</td>
<td>2,66</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health technologies</td>
<td>2,70</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (ADN &amp; PN)</td>
<td>2,70</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service technologies</td>
<td>2,67</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16

*Analysis of Variance for Ability to Employ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2,70</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and physical sciences</td>
<td>2,65</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; humanities</td>
<td>2,68</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>2,69</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; natural resource</td>
<td>2,55</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2,67</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer technologies</td>
<td>2,66</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,62</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/industrial</td>
<td>2,59</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health technologies</td>
<td>2,67</td>
<td>1.968</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (ADN &amp; PN)</td>
<td>2,65</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service technologies</td>
<td>2,61</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Three concerned the respondents’ views about the reasons for hiring part-time faculty, and the responses were entered on Part IV of the questionnaire. The CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs ranked seven possible reasons for part-time employment at their institutions. A space was provided for an additional reason that was not listed. The results are presented in this section.

**Descriptive analysis for reasons for employment.** Descriptive statistics for the “Reasons for Employment” of part-time faculty are shown in Table 17. A review of the means reveals that CAOs and DH-CTs rated the reasons for employment the same while DH-PBs differed slightly on some practices. The top five reasons for employing part-time faculty are: meet student demand, current knowledge/practice, scarce expertise, financial savings, and links with employers and professionals. All responder groups rated the “other” option as the last reason.

Ten respondents did not prioritize the reasons for employing part-time faculty as requested but did check mark their top reasons. These data could not be part of the numerical rankings so the number of respondents and frequency of their choices can only be noted here. “Financial savings” and “flexibility in meeting student demand” ranked first followed by both “access to current knowledge and practice” and “links with employers and professionals” which both ranked third.

Part IV of the questionnaire included an optional space where participants could add and rank an additional reason for hiring part-time faculty. All of the additions were ranked eighth in priority. They included the following: responses including coverage of certain class times; need beyond full-time faculty capabilities; distance learning; ability to
Table 17

*Mean Distribution for Reasons for Employment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for part-time faculty employment</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Pre Baccalaureate Transfer Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial savings</td>
<td>3.62 4</td>
<td>3.61 4</td>
<td>3.26 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarce expertise</td>
<td>3.38 3</td>
<td>3.45 3</td>
<td>3.30 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current knowledge/practice</td>
<td>3.31 2</td>
<td>3.35 2</td>
<td>3.23 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers and professionals</td>
<td>4.08 5</td>
<td>3.77 5</td>
<td>4.23 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility/credibility</td>
<td>5.69 6</td>
<td>5.40 6</td>
<td>6.04 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting student demand</td>
<td>2.69 1</td>
<td>2.61 1</td>
<td>2.56 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of retired faculty</td>
<td>5.77 7</td>
<td>5.90 7</td>
<td>5.54 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.83 8</td>
<td>7.55 8</td>
<td>7.30 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Rank is based on the mean score with the highest score as number 1 and the lowest score as number 8.
offer programs at off-campus sites; friends of friends; community involvement; no funds for full-time faculty; free full-time faculty for release time duties such as assessment; enrollment demand of creating additional course sections; short term solutions; financial savings due to limited budget for hiring full-time faculty; flexibility of schedule including nights/weekends; and ability to quickly meet student demand.

Three respondents offered general comments about their reasons for hiring part-time faculty. The first comment was “We believe our part-time faculty are valued and well-integrated.” The second statement provided insight into the value of part-time faculty: “If small groups in a technology make hiring a full-time person impossible, use of adjunct is vital.” The final comment provides the view that part-time faculty may be a cost saving component of an institution: “The use of part-time faculty is an exploitation of labor – hiring without having to pay benefits.”

**Analyses of variance.** Ho 3: There are no significant differences among CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about how they rank the reasons for employing part-time faculty at their institutions.

The data displayed in Table 18 indicate that there were no significant differences in the perceptions of the ranking of reasons for employing part-time faculty at their institutions. Thus, the null hypothesis for Ho 3 was not rejected.

**Research Question Four**

Research Question Four was: What additional perceptions and information can chief academic officers and academic department heads provide about the employment,
professional development, and integration needs and practices for part-time faculty in Appalachian community colleges?

The questionnaire contained spaces for optional comments under each section of Part II.
Table 18

*Analysis of Variance for Reasons for Employing Part-time Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial savings</td>
<td>2,68</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarce expertise</td>
<td>2,68</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current knowledge/practice</td>
<td>2,67</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers and professionals</td>
<td>2,67</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility/credibility</td>
<td>2,66</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting student demand</td>
<td>2,68</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of retired faculty</td>
<td>2,67</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,24</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment Optional Comments

The following concern the optional comments provided by the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about employment practices. The responses were taken from Part II-Section A of the questionnaire:

Chief Academic Officers

1. “Adjuncts/division are assigned only one room/office area.”

2. “We have practices – not written.”

Department Heads- Career/Technical Programs

1. “We have an institutional policy that provides benefits to our on-going part-time faculty who work at 50% or greater.”

2. “Faculty who have contracts for less than 50% or who are temporary adjuncts do not receive benefits.”

3. “Less than 10% of faculty are part time.”

4. “Although guidelines to monitor the use of part-time faculty are in place they are not always followed.”

Academic Department Heads – Pre-baccalaureate/Transfer Education

1. “Our college pays into the State Teachers Retirement fund on behalf of part-time faculty—the single real benefit we offer. Beyond that, our department makes a positive effort to maintain contact with part-time staff, evaluate their work and encourage professional growth. Guidelines for use of part-time staff are largely governed by state requirements for specific qualifications and similar requirements from accreditation agencies.”
2. “Academic Dean monitors hours taught. There is a limit of 10 hours per semester.”

3. “Our adjuncts are so badly treated that I wonder why they keep working for us.”

4. “Benefits and incentives are very limited.”

**Professional Development Optional Comments**

The following concern the optional comments provided by the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about professional development practices. The responses were taken from Part II-Section B of the questionnaire.

**Chief Academic Officers**

1. “Adjunct faculty are mentored by full-time faculty and division dean. Most adjuncts are invited to monthly all-faculty meetings.”

2. “Recognition of contributions and travel funds are very limited.”

**Department Heads- Career/Technical Programs**

1. “Answers would differ if related to full-time faculty.”

**Academic Department Heads – Pre-baccalaureate/Transfer Education**

1. “Part-time faculty are always welcome at our professional development days and events. We have funds available to bring part-time faculty in for meetings and special training.”

2. “Institution conducts a national teaching and learning conference.”

3. “We do host an annual adjunct faculty orientation which is always well done.”

4. “We do not provide much in professional development for part-time faculty.”
5. “Instructional enrichment activities are limited and evaluations are completed by students.”

**Integration Optional Comments**

**Chief Academic Officers**

1. “There is a scheduled annual adjunct faculty orientation, but the agenda covers a lot of items, not specific, a lot of generalities.”
2. “Web page site for adjuncts.”
3. “In progress of developing a handbook and mentor program.”
4. “We do not have a faculty senate.”

**Department Heads- Career/Technical Programs**

1. “We believe our part-time faculty are valued and well integrated.”
2. “Sometimes adjuncts are involved in curriculum matters and decisions.”
3. “This really takes place on a department by department basis and is often driven by the interest/collegiately level of the adjunct(s).”
4. “For items marked yes, there is a difference in degree of implementation.”

**Academic Department Heads– Pre-baccalaureate/Transfer Education**

The following concern the optional comments provided by the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about integration practices. The responses were taken from Part II-Section C of the questionnaire.

1. “The liberal arts department is developing a Web site for full- and part-time faculty to communicate and show ideas. The college publishes a biweekly electronic newsletter available to part timers. We have a handbook for part timers. The syllabi at the
college are standardized, and the part times are also given course outlines and course information sheets, which they can tailor to their own needs so long as course objectives are met.”

2. “No concentrated effort to socialize.”

3. “One day seminar to cover a variety of information. Schedules a day for observation and completes an official document from three administrators several times a year.”

4. “Our adjuncts are second class citizens within the institution. Our division tries to reach out to them, however. Some are loyal and dedicated.”

5. “Sometimes part-time faculty are matched with a full-time faculty mentor.”

**Summary and Conclusion**

This chapter provided the findings from the data analysis as introduced in Chapter Three. The research questions and null hypotheses guided this examination of the comparisons of the perceptions among CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia.

Chapter Five includes a discussion of these findings and conclusions based on the results presented in this chapter. Recommendations for future research are presented.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This study was designed to determine and compare the perceptions of Chief Academic Officers (CAOs), department heads in technical/career programs (DH-CTs), and department heads in pre-baccalaureate transfer programs (DH-PBs) about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community colleges located in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. College presidents of the 23 community colleges included in the survey were contacted to identify their CAOs and department heads and provide support for the study. All 23 presidents responded to the request (100%). The study used a questionnaire developed specifically for the research to collect data from the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs. This information then could guide community college academic affairs administrators in the use of part-time faculty at their institutions. Descriptive statistics, including means, frequencies, and ranks; and Analysis of Variance were used to analyze the data provided from the questionnaire.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a summary of the study, including a review of the research questions and methodology utilized in the study, to provide a summary of findings within the context of the literature, to provide conclusions, and to support implications for practice. Recommendations for further research complete this chapter.
Summary of the Study

Part-time faculty is considered as the invisible faculty by many (Gappa & Leslie, 1993) and as strangers to others within their own higher education organizations (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998). This is problematic because over 67% of the faculty in community colleges is part-time and this faculty has a large impact on academic quality and student learning (NCES, 2005). Community colleges are extremely reliant upon the use of part-time faculty due in part to decreased state funding, increases in student enrollment, and the need for diverse technical expertise (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998).

As a current community college president and a former CAO, I appreciate and value the part-time faculty who has served my institution. I recognize the need to know more about the institutional practices and policies that affect part-time faculty who account for over half of the institution’s academic offerings. I also know that practices and policies will be more important to this institution as new part-time faculty join our ranks. The majority of the part-time faculty within my institution has over a decade of service and will most likely be retiring in the near future. It will be difficult to replace these valued employees and a large investment of time and finances will be required to find their successors. The success of the institution and students depends on a successful transition of recruitment, retention, and integration of part-time faculty.

Community colleges in Appalachia face unique faculty staffing challenges. Even though they already rely on part-time faculty for a majority of their instruction, they will be forced to hire more of these faculty to serve an undereducated population in an
economically disadvantaged region. It is predicted that higher education will see a serious shortfall of qualified community college instructors (Freeland, 1998) and overall it is expected that community colleges enrollments will continue to increase. For instance, the Chancellor of Ohio released his strategic plan for higher education which specifies the expectation of 233,000 new students over the next ten years with most of the enrollment growth targeted for the state’s community colleges (OBR, 2008). In order to respond to the Governor’s plan, community colleges will need to hire additional faculty, most likely many will come from the part-time ranks. In addition, the rural areas served by these community colleges are facing economic challenges with the downsizing or closing of business/industry which requires quick action for the development of new training programs creating an additional need for part-time faculty. Community colleges will be most affected by a shortage of part-time faculty, since this segment of higher education has become structurally dependent on these faculty and as a result part-time faculty have grown to such an extent that their numbers now exceed 67% of the total faculty at two-year institutions (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005). Part-time faculty has become the norm for community colleges in particular due to decreased state financial support, the need to meet growing student enrollment, the addition of new academic programs, and the need for diverse technical expertise (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995).

Purposeful and effective strategies are necessary to retain quality part-time faculty already employed in community colleges and to attract new hires into the institutions (Pearch & Marutz, 2005).
Addressing part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration issues in a proactive stance will help these institutions not only to address part-time faculty retention, but help them achieve their overall mission now and in the future (Leslie & Gappa, 1993). Strong administrative support is necessary for change to occur in policies affecting part-time faculty (Levinson, 2005). CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs are the most likely points of contact with part-time faculty and also have the responsibility to recommend policies that affect part-time faculty; therefore, they were selected to participate in the study.

This demand for part-time faculty is a real issue for rural community colleges which face greater challenges than their urban peers in employing part-time faculty due to sparse populations overall and the small labor pool of people with advanced qualifying degrees. Higher Learning Commissions, which oversee institutional accreditation, require a masters degree with a specified number of hours in the discipline in order to be eligible to teach at the collegiate level and in many rural areas less than 10% of the population has the required credentials (HLC,1997). Therefore, due to the increased demand, the shortage of qualified individuals, and the competition for these positions; rural institutions need to be aware of employment practices, professional development, and integration practices that will assist with recruiting, retaining, and developing part-time faculty at their institutions.

Studies have been conducted to learn more about part-time faculty characteristics and usage on a national level; however little is known about faculty in specific rural regions and institutions. The National Center for Education Statistics has conducted
several studies related to part-time faculty which has provided insight into their diversity and complexity (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005). Leslie and Gappa (2002) completed an extensive survey of both administrators and part-time faculty that was one of the first studies to look extensively at part-time faculty issues. In addition, Conley and Leslie (2002) and Palmer (1999) conducted extensive research, supported by the U.S. Department of Education, about part-time faculty. These studies provide a snapshot of part-time faculty characteristics and employment on a national level but do not provide details about the administrative perceptions and actual practices that affect part-time faculty in community colleges located in rural Appalachian regions.

The Appalachian region is very large and most wouldn’t think so diverse; therefore, a smaller study has the potential to provide a more realistic picture of what actually occurs in a particular region that has similar demographics and cultural identities. The states of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia were chosen because they have very similar demographics and cultural identity.

“Currently, little has been done regarding the identification of local expertise in education, community, and research areas, as well as curricula or program areas pertinent to Appalachia” (Denham, 2005, p. 2). Since community colleges are the most locally based of all higher education institutions, it is important to understand how they identify individuals who will serve as part-time faculty and how they meet the needs of those people and students in doing so. From my institutional studies, I found that a large portion of part time faculty at the college have been employed for over a decade. From an employment perspective these faculty will most likely be retiring close to the same time
as the full-time faculty who have been employed at the college since its inception in 1975. It will be difficult to replace these valued employees because the college is located in a rural, sparsely populated region with low educational attainment. As previously mentioned, part-time faculty is expected to meet the credential standards of Higher Learning Commissions, who oversee accreditation standards. Usually the standards require a block number of hours in the specific disciplines for the master’s degree. The most likely pool of potential part-time faculty would come from secondary educators, but these individuals usually have a master’s degree in education not in their academic discipline. This is becoming an important discussion as dual enrollment programs are becoming an enrollment option for high school students and high school faculty could be considered as the faculty for instruction. Another likely source of part-time faculty would include the business sector, but this pool is limited in a region with a declining economic base. Therefore, it is extremely important to rural community colleges to employ, retain, and develop the best possible candidates.

Descriptive statistics and Analysis of Variance were utilized to determine and compare the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community and community/technical colleges in the Appalachian regions of Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. Means and rankings were used to examine the differences among each respondent group related to the importance of specific practices and the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines. Percentages and rankings for used to analyze the presence of the specific practices that were examined.
for importance. ANOVA incorporating the Bonferroni technique was used to examine differences in group means about the same issues analyzed using descriptive statistics and in addition to examine the reasons for hiring part-time faculty. A questionnaire developed by the researcher was used to gather the data for the study which was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

**Summary of the Findings**

**Research Question One**

Research Question One concerned the perceptions of the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices.

**Employment importance.** CAOs ranked the most important employment practices as, in order: institutional policies, established salary policy, personal e-mail account, technical equipment, and guidelines to monitor. DH-CTs priorities were, in order: institutional policies, technical equipment, established salary policy, personal e-mail account, and intake orientation programs. The most important practices for DH-PBs were, in order: established salary policy, institutional policies, intake orientation program, personal e-mail account, and technical equipment.

DH-PBs placed more importance on “intake orientation programs” than CAOs or DH-CTs. DH-CTs placed more importance on “technical equipment” than CAOs or DH-PBs. Overall, the means were different among the groups, although DH-CTs had the same means for “established salary policy” and “technical equipment” within their group, and DH-PBs had the same means for “office space on campus” and “clerical support
services” within their group. For the most part, the rankings of practices did not differ much on employment practices. Responses indicated that basic employment practices such as institutional policies, salary scales, e-mail accounts, and technical equipment for instructional purposes are considered essential practices. Less importance was placed on “institutional benefits,” “office space,” and “incentives to attract,” though these practices still had a strong mean score indicating that the practice was not unimportant. Decreasing college budgets may limit the implementation of these practices.

There were no significant differences in the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of selected employment practices on their campuses.

**Employment in place.** Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the same employment practices they ranked in importance were present at their institutions. All three respondent groups placed “established salary policy” (CAOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 93.9%; and DH-BPs, 96.7%) and “personal e-mail accounts” (CAOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 90.9%; and DH-PBs, 100%) as the most common employment practices at their institution. The least common employment practices among the institutions were “incentives to attract” (CAOs, 13.3%; DH-CTs, 9.1%; and DH-PBs, 13.3% in place) and “institutional benefits package” (CAOs, 20%; DH-CTS, 28.1%; and DH-PBs, 13.3% in place) for part-time faculty.

CAOs perceive “established salary policy”, 100%; “personal e-mail accounts”, 100%; “clerical support services”, 100%; “institutional policies”, 93.8%; and “technical equipment”, 86.7%; to be the most common employment practices at their institutions. DH-CTs most common practices were: “established salary policy,” 93.9%; “institutional
policies,” 90.9%; “technical equipment,” 90.9%; “personal e-mail accounts,” 90.9%; and “intake orientation program,” 72.7%. DH-PBs selected “personal e-mail accounts,” 100%; “established salary policy,” 96.7%; “institutional policies,” 86.7% and “intake orientation program,” 82.8% and “technical equipment,” 79.3%.

Analysis of Variance results indicated that there were significant differences in the perceptions of the presence of employment practices for “clerical support services,” (p=.032). CAOs perceived that “clerical support services” was available at their institutions, 100% response, compared to only 66.7% of the DH-CTs, and 76.7% of the DH-PBs.

**Professional development importance.** The most important professional development practices for CAOs were, in order: departmental evaluation; instructional enrichment, programs to develop skills, recognition of contributions, and mutual sharing. DH-CTs ranked, in order: departmental evaluation, instructional enrichment, training, mutual sharing, and programs to develop skills. The most important practices for DH-PBs were: departmental evaluation, instructional enrichment, programs to develop skills, mutual sharing, and recognition of contributions.

“Departmental Evaluation” was ranked as the most important practice by all three respondent groups and “higher education issues” was ranked seventh by all respondent groups. The least important professional development practice was “Paid membership.”

CAOs had three practices with a 4.25 mean score: programs to develop skills, recognition of contributions, and mutual sharing which tied these practices for third
DH-CTs ranked “instructional enrichment,” 4.50, and “departmental evaluation,” 4.50, as first; and both “training,” 4.17, and “mutual sharing,” 4.17, as third.

The Analysis of Variance results revealed that there were no significant differences in the importance of selected professional development practices among the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs.

**Professional development in place.** Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the same professional development practices they ranked in importance were present at their institutions. All three respondent groups placed “departmental evaluation” (CAOs, 93.3%; DH-CTs, 87.9%; and DH-PBs, 83.3%) as the most common professional development practice at their institution. The least common professional development practice in place at institutions was “paid membership” (CAOs, 100% not in place; DH-CTs, 97% not in place, and DH-PBs, 96.6% not in place).

CAOs perceive “departmental evaluation”, 93.3%; “mutual sharing”, 80%, “instructional enrichment”, 73.3%; “training”, 73.3%; “recognition of contributions”, 57.1%; and “travel funds”, 57.1%; as the most common practices in place at their institutions. “Departmental evaluation”, 87.9%; “instructional enrichment”, 78.8%; “mutual sharing”, 66.7%; and “training”, 51.5%; were selected by the DH-CTs. DH-PBs perceived “departmental evaluation”, 83.3%; “mutual sharing”, 55.2%; and “instructional enrichment”, 50%; as practices in place at their institutions.

**Integration importance.** CAO’s most important integration practices were, in order: equip with a syllabus, supply a handbook, curricular decisions, mentor, provide a job description, and institutional communications. DH-CTs valued, in order: equip with a
syllabus, provide a job description, supply a handbook, information about students, and mentor. The most important practices for DH-PBs were, in order: equip with a syllabus, supply a handbook, provide a job description, institutional communications, and mentor.

Comparing the top five practices among the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs reveals that all three respondent groups selected “equip with a syllabus” as the most important integration practice at their institutions and agreed that “participation in academic senate” was the least important practice.

Integration in place. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the same integration practices they selected in importance were present at their institutions. All three respondent groups perceive that “equip with a syllabus” (CAOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 90.9%; and DH-PBs, 90%) is in place more than any other practice and “participate in academic senate” (CAOs, 93.3% not in place; DH-CTs, 84.4% not in place; and DH-PBs, 76.7% not in place) as the least available practice.

CAOs perceive the most common practices in place to be, in rank order: equip with a syllabus, 100%; participate in social activities, 86.7%; institutional communications, 80%; supply a handbook, 71.4%; and provide a job description, 66.7%. DH-CTs selected, in rank order: equip with a syllabus, 90.9%; provide a job description, 81.8%; institutional communications, 75%; supply a handbook, 66.7%; gain knowledge and appreciation, 59.4%; and participation in social activities, 59.4%. The most common practices for DH-PBs include, in rank order: equip with a syllabus, 90%; institutional communications, 86.7%; participation in social activities, 83.3%; supply a handbook, 76.7%; and provide a job description, 73.3%. 
Research Question Two

Research Question Two concerned the differences among the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing and the ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.

Importance of employing. CAOs ranked the most important disciplines as, in order: English; natural and physical sciences; social sciences; agricultural and natural resource; and arts and humanities. DH-CTs indicated agricultural and natural resource; nursing; engineering/industrial; public service technologies; and education were most important to them. Means for DH-PBs placed public service technologies; engineering/industrial; agricultural and natural resource; English; and education as the top five disciplines for importance of employing.

All disciplines had a mean score above 3 indicating all respondents considered the disciplines “important” or “somewhat important.”

Ability to employ. CAOs find it easier to employ part-time faculty in “agricultural and natural resources,” “public service technologies,” and “education” but find it more difficult to employ part-time faculty in “natural and physical sciences,” “health technologies,” and “nursing”. DH-CTs find it easier to employ part-time faculty in “agricultural and natural resource,” “public serve technologies” and “business,” but find it more difficult to employ part-time faculty in “nursing,” “natural and physical sciences,” and “arts and humanities.” DH-PBs find it easier to employ part-time faculty in “public service technologies,” “agricultural and natural resource,” and “business.” “Natural and
physical sciences,” “nursing,” and “arts and humanities” are perceived to be the most
difficult disciplines for employing part-time faculty by this group.

Based on the mean scores most disciplines fall into the “somewhat easy” to
“neither easy nor difficult” scale for ability to employ. Natural and physical sciences,
engineering/industrial, health technologies, and nursing mean scores indicate that they are
the most difficult disciplines to employ part-time faculty.

Analysis of Variance results indicated that no significant differences among the
perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance of employing and the
ability to employ part-time faculty in specific disciplines on their campuses.

**Research Question Three**

Research Question Three concerned the reasons for employing part-time faculty.
CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs ranked the reasons for employing part-time faculty the
same for the following: number 1) “flexibility in meeting student demand,” 2) “access to
current knowledge/practice,” 5) “employers and professional,” and 8) “other”. CAOs and
DH-CTs ranked, in order: “meeting student demand,” “current knowledge/practice,” and
“scarce expertise” as the top three reasons for employing part-time faculty. While DH-
PBs agreed with CAOs and DH-CTs on the top two rankings, they selected “financial
savings” as their third ranking for hiring part-time faculty. CAOs and DH-CTs ranked all
the reasons provided in the same order.

Ten respondents did not prioritize the reasons for employing part-time faculty but
did check mark their top reasons. “Financial savings” and “flexibility in meeting student
demand” ranked first followed by both “access to current knowledge and practice” and
“links with employers and professionals”. The responses, from these ten respondents, matched the top three ranking responses from the DH-PBs.

**Research Question Four.**

Research Question Four concerned additional perceptions and information that CAOs and department heads provided about employment, professional development, and integration needs and practices. Fourteen participants responded to the optional comments. Most comments expanded upon the statement provided in the questionnaire. No predominant theme appeared in the feedback from respondents although several responses suggest that institutions are in the process of developing web sites or some type of electronic system of communications to stay in touch with their part-time faculty.

**Conclusions**

As a community college president and former CAO, I know that part-time faculty is essential to our community colleges. The percentage of part-time faculty employed in two year colleges is increasing as student enrollments continue to climb. Student enrollments are expected to continue to escalate as the value of education becomes more important, especially when education is seen as the economic driver to a better future.

Many part-time faculty employed by my institution have over a decade of service to the college and could be retiring from service at the same rate as the full-time faculty. This is a concern because the college is located in a rural, sparsely populated region where there is a small pool of individuals with the necessary credentials to qualify as a part-time instructor. This means that efforts to recruit, retain, and develop part-time faculty are extremely important and attempts to grow our own faculty may be necessary.
Many question the increasing use of part-time faculty and have valid concerns. The point of this research is not to debate these issues but to recognize that part-time faculty play an important role in community college education and we need to understand more about their employment, professional development, and integration in order to recruit, retain, and develop these valuable faculty.

The purpose of this study was to determine and compare the perceptions of CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about the importance and presence of part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community colleges. This study incorporated a questionnaire to collect the data and as a result a number of conclusions were drawn regarding the administrative perceptions about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration.

Data from the questionnaire results about employment, professional development, and integration practices indicate that academic leaders place more importance on essential or basic services while practices that go beyond the essentials were perceived as less important. It should be noted that mean scores fell mostly between the “neither important nor unimportant” or “important” scale ranges. No scores fell into the “very unimportant” or “unimportant” scales. This would suggest that academic leaders place value on these practices even though they may not be in place at their institutions.

Responses could be interrupted in light of the limited financial resources available to most institutions. Expansion of practices that would benefit part-time faculty is expensive and requires additional administrative responsibility. Although administrators might wish to expand their practices they could be limited by the availability of financial resources.
The following are conclusions drawn from the results of the questionnaire:

1. CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs placed all practices presented in the study in the “important” to “somewhat important” range, indicating a positive approach towards the utilization of part-time faculty by these groups. Mean scores for employment ranged from a high of 4.81 to a low of 3.67 for CAOs. DH-CTs mean scores ranged from a high of 4.61 to a low of 3.89 and scores for DH-PBs ranged from a high of 4.69 to a low of 3.79.

2. CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs have different mean scores and rankings for most employment, professional development, and integration practices indicating different perceptions about how these groups perceive the importance of the practices.

3. CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs agree that the most important practice for employment is “institutional policies” and that the least important practice is “institutional benefits package.”

4. CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs agree that the most important practice for professional development is “departmental evaluation” and the least important practice is “paid membership.”

5. CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs agree that the most important practice for integration is “equip with a syllabus” and the least important practice is “participate in academic senate.”

6. Even though all three respondent groups selected “institutional policies” as their most important practice, this policy is not the most common practice. It is preceded by “established salary policy” (CEOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 93.9%; and DH-PBs,
96.7%), “personal e-mail accounts” (CEOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 90.9%; and DH-PBs, 100%), and “clerical support services” (CEOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 66.7%; and DH-PBs, 76.7%)

7. CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs agreed that “departmental evaluation” was both the most important practice and the most common practice in place at their institutions (CAOs, 93.3%; DH-CTs, 87.9%; and DH-PBs, 83.3%).

8. CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs agreed that “equip with a syllabus was both the most important and the most common practice in place at their institutions (CAOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 90.9%; and DH-PBS, 90%).

9. Employment practices that have mean scores above “3” for importance may not be a common practice at institutions. “Not in place” percentages indicate that “institutional benefits package” (CAOs, 80%; DH-CTs, 71.9%; and DH-PBs, 86.7%), and “incentives to attract” (CAO, 86.7%; DH-CTs, 90.9%; and DH-PBs, 86.7%) are not common practices. It is not surprising that most part-time faculty do not receive an institutional benefits package or incentives to attract. These practices may become more important as competition for part-time faculty increases.

10. Professional development practices that have mean scores above “3” for importance may not exist at institutions. “Not in place” percentages indicate that “paid membership” (CAOs, 100%; DH-CTs, 97%; and DH-PBs, 96.6%) and “tuition remission” (CAOs, 73.3%; DH-CTs, 69.7%; and DH-PBs, 75.9%) were not common practices at institutions. This suggests that part-time faculty do not receive any support for professional development outside the institution.
11. Integration practices that have mean scores above “3” for importance may not be common practices at institutions. “Not in place” percentages indicate that “participate in academic senate” (CAOs, 93.3%; DH-CTS, 84.4%; and DH-PBs, 76.7%) and “curricular decisions” (CAOs, 73.3%; DH-CTs, 59.4%, and DH-PBS, 66.7%) were uncommon practices at institutions. This indicates that most part-time faculty is not involved with academic issues or course management decisions.

12. Disciplines that are ranked as important to the institutions vary by respondent groups and have no correlation to the ability to employ in these same disciplines.

13. Mean scores for academic disciplines in the Importance of Employing section of the questionnaire suggests that all disciplines fall in the “important” to “somewhat important” category for all respondent groups.

14. The ability to hire part-time faculty is easier in agricultural and natural resource, public service technologies, and business.

15. The ability to hire part-time faculty is more difficult in natural and physical sciences, nursing, health technologies, engineering/industrial, and arts and humanities.

16. The most selected reason for employing part-time faculty included “meeting student demand”. “Financial savings” surprisingly was not the first choice.

**Implications for Practice**

When one considers academic instruction within higher education, full-time faculty comes to mind. Full-time faculty has been the backbone of colleges since the formation of our institutions. But the picture of higher education is changing particularly
for community colleges. Community colleges are being asked to do more with less, increase enrollment and course offerings but with fewer resources.

Part-time faculty provide the means to meet student demand, bring in specialized skills not in existence with the full-time faculty, access current knowledge and practice, and provides financial savings to the institution. According to the literature, the percentage of part-time faculty is increasing significantly. The most recent report from NCES (Cataldi, Fahimi, & Bradburn, 2005) points out that part-time faculty comprises 67% of all two-year college faculty. This is an alarming percentage for faculty who are considered invisible within their own institutions (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

When one considers the implications that over half of the academic instruction is provided by faculty who have little to no interaction with anyone in the institution, do not attend academic senate meetings or sit on committees, have little knowledge about the students who attend the institution, and may not be aware of the philosophy of the institution it should be a cause for concern and a prompt for action. It is especially important to have part-time faculty involved with curriculum development to insure successful student learning outcomes. Institutions need to make every effort to integrate part-time faculty into the culture and work of the college, but at the same time be mindful that most of the faculty are full-time professionals in their own careers. So what works for full-time faculty may not be effective for part-time faculty.

Academic leadership needs to be cognizant of the fact that a large number of faculty within their institution may be part-time faculty and should make sure resources
and policies exist to ensure their success. Approximately half of the institutions have established guidelines to monitor the use of part-time faculty.

Regional collaborations might be established to address professional development and training. Partnerships have the potential to pull together expertise from many sources and provide financial savings to the colleges. Partnerships with secondary education can be beneficial as well. This would bring together faculty from both segments of education to create a learning environment for high school student transition into college success and build a mentoring situation which hopefully could lead to building a pipeline for part-time faculty employment.

The research for this study revealed that an annual teaching and learning conference is available to part-time faculty every fall. The conference is within the three state region and is reasonably priced. The allocation of funds to support part-time attendance is reasonable to consider.

State policy makers should be informed of growing numbers of part-time faculty within the community college system and how part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices are perceived by college administration. The important role that part-time faculty play within these institutions needs to be realized and at the same time point out the limitations of their role due in part to limited financial resources. This study identifies the importance and existence of employment, profession development, and integration practices that can be used to retain part-time faculty.
The presence of part-time faculty in our institutions is not a new phenomenon. We have however seen a “silent explosion” of part-time faculty within our colleges and we can’t afford to ignore this important group of our instructional faculty (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1998). Even though there are concerns about their role in higher education, they are necessary to the success of community colleges. Since part-time faculty are here to stay, colleges must seriously consider strategies to recruit, retain, and develop these faculty. Proactive strategies could avoid a future crisis with regards to part-time faculty instruction. An investment in part-time faculty is an investment in the institution and student learning.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Within the context of this study, including the review of the literature, the limitation and delimitations, and the methodology utilized, several recommendations for further research are offered.

First, this study utilized a questionnaire to make a comparison of the perceptions among CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration practices at community colleges. A similar study of part-time faculty employed at these institutions could provide a more in depth view from the faculty perspective comparing their perceptions to the perceptions of the CAOs, DH-CTs, and DH-PBs.

Second, a qualitative study including CAOs, DH-CTs, DH-PBs and part-time faculty examining each of the employment, professional development, and integration practices may prove insightful.
Third, specific comparisons of rural Appalachian community colleges to other rural community colleges in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia are encouraged.

Fourth, the study utilized data provided from the questionnaire for current practices. Further research comparing a historical view of how employment, professional development, and integration practices evolved within the institutions comparing the ratios of part-time faculty to full-time faculty specific disciplines is encouraged.
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Appendix A: Questionnaire

Part-Time Faculty Employment, Professional Development, and Integration

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the perceptions and actual practices of key personnel about employment conditions, professional development, and integration issues of part-time faculty in rural Appalachian community colleges. Part-time faculty for this study is defined as faculty that usually work with contracts for one academic term and who hold the rank of instructor or lecturer. It is estimated that it will take 10 minutes to complete this form. Complete confidentiality of response is guaranteed. Thank you for taking your time to give the needed information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate your position within the institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Department Head – Career/Technical Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Department Head - Pre-baccalaureate/Transfer Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part II - Section A

**Employment**

Following are items related to part-time faculty **Employment**. Please indicate your opinion about the importance of employment items by circling the appropriate response. Key: 1 equals very unimportant, 2 equals unimportant, 3 equals neither important nor unimportant, 4 equals somewhat important, and 5 equals very important. Next, indicate whether the item is in place at your institution by circling yes or no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance at Your institution</th>
<th>In Place at Your Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unimportant</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Institutional policies affecting the employment of part-time faculty  
2. Intake orientation program  
3. Established salary policy  
4. An institutional benefits package  
5. Office space on campus  
6. Technical equipment to enhance classroom instruction  
7. Incentives to attract part-time faculty  
8. Personal e-mail accounts established  
9. Clerical support services  
10. Guidelines to monitor the use of part-time faculty

(Optional) Please provide additional comments if desired.
Part II - Section B and C

Following are items related to part-time faculty Professional development (Section B) and Integration (Section C). Please indicate your opinion about the importance of employment items by circling the appropriate response.
Key: 1 equals very unimportant, 2 equals unimportant, 3 equals neither important nor unimportant, 4 equals somewhat important, and 5 equals very important. Next, indicate whether the item is in place at your institution by circling yes or no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance at Your institution</th>
<th>In Place at Your Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II - Section B

Professional Development

1. Instructional enrichment activities that focus on improving and assessing teaching performance
2. Programs to help develop skills for relating with students
3. Recognition of contributions to the institution
4. Travel funds for conferences and training
5. Departmental evaluation to provide feedback
6. Training to enhance skill competencies
7. Opportunities to learn about higher education issues
8. Tuition remission for themselves
9. Opportunities for mutual sharing with other faculty
10. Paid membership in state and/or regional organizations

(Optional) Please provide additional comments to illustrate findings.
**Part II - Section C**

*Integration*

1. Help part-time faculty gain knowledge and appreciation of the history, philosophy, and goals of the institution
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
2. Furnish information about the types of students who attend the institution
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
3. Provide a job description
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
4. Equip part-time faculty with a syllabus for assigned courses
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
5. Provide opportunities to participate in social activities
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
6. Supply a handbook specifically for their use
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
7. Participate in academic senate
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
8. Included in regular institutional communications
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
9. Match new part-time faculty hires with a full-time faculty mentor
   - 1 2 3 4 5
   - Yes  No
10. Involvement with curricular decisions
    - 1 2 3 4 5
    - Yes  No

(Optional) Please provide additional comments if desired.
Part III

Part Time Faculty Staffing Concerns by Academic Department

Part III has two parts. First, please rate the **Importance of Employing in this Discipline** by circling the best response. Second, rate the **Ability to Employ in this Discipline** by circling the best response. Use the following scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Employing in this Discipline</th>
<th>Ability to Employ in this Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Studies**

- English
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Natural & Physical Sciences
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Arts & Humanities
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Social Sciences
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

**Technical Career Programs**

- Agricultural & Natural Resource Technologies
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Business
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Computer Technologies
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Education
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Engineering/ Industrial Technologies
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Health Technologies (except Nursing)
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Nursing (ADN & PN)
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5

- Public Service Technologies
  - Importance of Employing in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
  - Ability to Employ in this Discipline: 0 1 2 3 4 5
Part IV
Reasons for Part-Time Faculty Employment

Below is a list of eight possible reasons for employing part-time faculty. Place a 1 beside the item to which you would give top priority. Put a 2 beside the topic that you would give second priority. Continue with a 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, with 8 for the topic to which you would give least priority.

What does the institution gain by employing part-time faculty?

_____ financial savings
_____ access to scarce expertise
_____ access to current knowledge and practice
_____ links with employers and professionals
_____ visibility/credibility
_____ flexibility in meeting student demand
_____ extended use of retired faculty
_____ other (please identify any reasons that are not on this list___________________________

Thank you very much for your time.

Please place the completed form in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided and mail to:

Sherry Stout, President
Southern State Community College
100 Hobart Drive
Hillsboro, OH 45133
Appendix B: List of College Participants

List of Colleges

Ashland Community and Technical College
Belmont Technical College
Big Sandy Community and Technical College
Blue Ridge Community and Technical College
Community and Technical College at West Virginia University Institute of Technology
Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College
Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College
Hazard Community and Technical College
Hocking Technical College
Jefferson Community College
Marshall Community and Technical College
Maysville Community College
New River Community and Technical College
Pierpont Community and Technical College
Potomac State College of West Virginia University
Rio Grande Community College
Somerset Community College
Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College
Southern State Community College
Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College
Washington State Community College
West Virginia Northern Community College
West Virginia University at Parkersburg
Appendix C: Introduction Letter to Presidents

July 2, 2007

«Title» «FirstName» «LastName»
«College»
«Address»
«City», «State» «Zip»

Dear «Title» «LastName»:

I am writing you as a current president about one of the most important issues facing the rural community college: our increasing reliance on part-time faculty. Part-time faculty constitute 67% of the total faculty at two-year institutions, and we need to employ more and more of them in order to respond to tightening resources and the need for flexibility. Rural community colleges such as ours will be hard pressed to meet their missions if qualified part-time faculty are not available to teach, are not integrated into our culture, and are not developed to teach at high levels of skill. This is especially important because of our strong need to increase college-going rates and improve the economic conditions in rural communities.

In addition to my role as a first-time president at a rural community college, I am completing my doctoral studies in the higher education program at Ohio University. My dissertation research is about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration in rural community colleges. I want to compare and contrast the perceptions held by current chief academic officers and academic department heads about part-time faculty issues.

In order to get results that can benefit leaders in rural community colleges, I am seeking your assistance in gaining the names and contact information for your chief academic officer and academic department heads on the attached form. The identified individuals will receive a copy of the enclosed questionnaire and a letter inviting them to participate in the study. All information will be kept confidential with responses anonymously coded. No individual responses will be reported to anyone because the data will be reported only in aggregate form.

Thank you for taking time from your demanding schedule to help me with this important study. If you have any questions or concerns about my request you may contact me at 937-393-3431 extension 2670 or stout@sscc.edu. If you are interested in obtaining a summary of the study results, please send me an e-mail.

Sincerely,

Sherry Stout, President
Southern State Community College
Appendix D: Contact Information Form

Contact Information

Please provide contact information for the Chief Academic Officer and Academic Department Heads and return the completed form in the enclosed addressed, stamped envelope. Note: the form is two-sided.

Institution _______________________________________________________________

Chief Academic Officer
The chief academic officer is the highest ranked administrator over academic affairs.

Name __________________________________________________________________
Address ________________________________________________________________
Email Address ___________________________________________________________

Academic Department Heads – Career/Technical Programs
This is an administrator or faculty member who has direct responsibility for hiring part-time faculty in career/technical programs. Position titles may include dean, division coordinator, department head, or director.

Name __________________________________________________________________
Address ________________________________________________________________
Email Address ___________________________________________________________
Academic Discipline ______________________________________________________

Name _________________________________________________________________
Address ________________________________________________________________
Email Address ___________________________________________________________
Academic Discipline ______________________________________________________
Name ________________________________________________________________

Address __________________________________________________________________

Email Address __________________________________________________________________

Academic Discipline __________________________________________________________

**Academic Department Head - Pre-baccalaureate/Transfer Education**

This is an administrator or faculty member who has direct responsibility for hiring part-time faculty in pre-baccalaureate/transfer education. Position titles may include dean, division coordinator, department head, or director.

Name ________________________________________________________________

Address __________________________________________________________________

Email Address __________________________________________________________________

Academic Discipline __________________________________________________________

Name ________________________________________________________________

Address __________________________________________________________________

Email Address __________________________________________________________________

Academic Discipline __________________________________________________________

Name ________________________________________________________________

Address __________________________________________________________________

Email Address __________________________________________________________________

Academic Discipline __________________________________________________________
Name ________________________________________________________________
Address  ___________________________________________________________________
Email Address _____________________________
Academic Discipline ___________________________________________________________________
Name ___________________________________________________________________
Address  ___________________________________________________________________
Email Address _____________________________
Academic Discipline ___________________________________________________________________
Appendix E: Introduction Letter to Chief Academic Officers and Department Heads

October 23, 2007

Dear «Title» «LastName»:

I am writing you as a current president and former vice president of academic affairs about one of the most important issues facing the rural community college: our increasing reliance on part-time faculty. Part-time faculty constitute 67% of the total faculty at two-year institutions, and we need to employ more and more of them in order to respond to tightening resources and the need for flexibility. Rural community colleges such as ours will be hard pressed to meet their missions if qualified part-time faculty are not available to teach, are not integrated into our culture, and are not developed to teach at high levels of skill. This is especially important because of our strong need to increase college-going rates and improve the economic conditions in rural communities.

In addition to my current duties as a first-time community college president, I am completing my doctoral studies in the higher education program at Ohio University. My dissertation research is about part-time faculty employment, professional development, and integration in rural community colleges. I want to compare and contrast the perceptions held by current chief academic officers and academic department heads about part-time faculty issues.

I would be very grateful if you could take about ten minutes to participate in the research, by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the envelope provided. Your participation is completely voluntary, and all responses will be held in complete confidence. Individual responses will be anonymously coded, and data will be reported only in aggregate form.

Thank you for taking time from your demanding schedule to help me with this important study. If you have any questions or concerns about my request, you may contact me at 937-393-3431 extension 2670 or sstout@sscc.edu. If you are interested in obtaining a summary of the study results, please send me an e-mail.

Sincerely,

Sherry Stout, President
Southern State Community College

Enclosures: Questionnaire and Return Envelope

*All materials used in this study are paid for by the researcher.*