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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence participation in faculty development at a multi-campus Florida state college. To improve Florida state college adjunct faculty participation in faculty development, it was necessary to examine their faculty development needs and the incentives and barriers that influence their participation in faculty development. This study extended the research on characteristics of adjunct faculty and their faculty development interests. This quantitative study addressed the gap in the literature related to the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of a Florida state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development.

A survey research design was used to explore faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty who had taught for a minimum of one semester. An online survey was used to collect the data via Qualtrics. Adjunct faculty who taught in fall 2018 from all academic areas, and all four campuses were included in the sample. The response rate for this survey was 20%.

A frequency distribution was constructed for the demographic data. Multiple regression was used to analyze the relationship between adjunct faculty participation in faculty development and background characteristics. Measures of central tendency were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation to identify faculty development needs, preferred conditions for faculty development, incentives that may encourage participation, and barriers that may hinder participation in faculty development opportunities, as perceived by respondents.
The results indicate that the adjunct faculty who responded to the survey need faculty development training related to the following topics: instructional technology, student engagement, and instructional strategies. They indicated weekday evenings was the preferred time for faculty development, one to two hours workshops was the most feasible format, and college-wide email was their preferred method of communication for faculty development. There was no consensus on the preferred location, online or campus. Professional growth and life-long learning were the two incentives identified, by the majority of the adjunct faculty, which significantly or moderately encourages their participation in faculty development. Most of the adjunct faculty identified time and full-time job as the barriers which significantly or moderately hinders their participation in faculty development.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Financial challenges have forced Florida state colleges to restructure fiscally and employ cost-saving measures (Liu & Zhang, 2013). Historically, the main revenue source for state colleges in Florida came from federal and state funding. Yet, over the last two decades, the state funding for public colleges has been significantly reduced. Between 2008 and 2013, “[R]evenues per full-time equivalent student from state and local sources decreased” by 18%, at 2-year public institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014, p. 3). The increase in new disciplines and student demand have also added to these fiscal challenges (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). One popular, cost-saving trend in higher education is hiring adjunct faculty. The Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014) found that more than half (58%) of U.S. community college courses are taught by part-time faculty.

In addition to reducing instructional costs, adjuncts expand the labor pool, allowing institutions to offer more courses to serve the increasing population of students (Liu & Zhang, 2013). The diversity and specialized talents of adjuncts increases an institution’s ability to offer courses in new and emerging disciplines (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). As a result, colleges are able to attract more students, which creates more revenues from tuition and fees (Liu & Zhang, 2013). Furthermore, the use of adjuncts helps to fulfill the college’s mission and increases their flexibility. Adjuncts are typically practitioners in their fields and serve as a college’s link to the community (Wallin, 2004). An adjunct’s real-world expertise and
specialized knowledge are relevant to students’ lives. By teaching multiple sections of courses, adjuncts help the colleges meet the student demand for more courses and alternative scheduling options (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014).

Historically, adjuncts were hired when enrollments increased and full-time faculty were unavailable (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Additionally, institutions often hire part-time faculty when colleges need faculty with expertise in a particular field or real-world experience (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Student demand and emerging disciplines have also led to the increased use of adjunct faculty (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). The shift in faculty hiring practices has impacted the instructional landscape of higher education. At post-secondary institutions, the number of part-time faculty has increased by 104% from fall 1993 to fall 2013 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). However, full-time faculty has only increased by 45% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). At two-year colleges, almost 70% of the instructional workforce are adjunct faculty (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

Adjunct faculty members have varied academic and employment experiences (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Most adjunct faculty (81%) report having a master’s degree (67%) or terminal degree (14%) as their highest degree earned (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Part-time faculty generally have less teaching experience than full-time faculty (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). The Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014) found that 37% of part-time faculty have less than five years teaching experience, compared to only 13% of full-time faculty.

Adjuncts teach for a variety of reasons. Gappa and Leslie (1993) developed a taxonomy of part-time faculty based on academic background, employment experience, and motivation.
Their typology consists of four loose categories that describe why adjuncts choose to teach (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The four categories include career-enders, experts, aspiring academics, and freelancers. Career-enders are retirees who want to stay connected to the field, while freelancers teach because they desire extra income (Wallin, 2004). Aspiring academics are eager to earn full-time, tenure track, faculty positions. However, most (38%) adjuncts are employed full-time outside of teaching (Pons, Burnett, Williams, & Paredes, 2017).

Job satisfaction among adjunct faculty at community colleges is moderately high. In fact, 68% of adjuncts at two-year colleges report that they are very or mainly satisfied with their overall teaching conditions (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). However, adjunct faculty still face a variety of challenges related to their teaching assignments. First, adjuncts generally have limited access to basic teaching resources (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Second, adjuncts are often excluded from participating in college-wide, departmental, and curricular decision-making (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). They are often paid 25-35% less than full-time faculty and denied healthcare and other benefits (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Additionally, many adjuncts report limited access to professional development and travel funds. Furthermore, job security is an additional concern for part-time faculty. Most adjuncts are hired per course and offered limited duration contracts (Liu & Zhang, 2013). The working conditions of adjuncts appear to be very different from the working conditions of full-time faculty.

The marginalization and diversity of adjunct faculty members create challenges as colleges work to ensure the college’s educational quality. The increased use of adjuncts “has raised concerns for constituents inside and outside of higher education” (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009, p. 168). Some fears related to the increased use of part-time faculty include grade inflation,
academic rigor, isolation, competency, lack of teaching experience, and lack of understanding of institutional philosophy (Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006). Jaeger and Eagan (2009) found that adjunct faculty are less accessible to their students, resulting in students becoming less integrated into the college community. Jacoby (2006) found that students decreased student engagement and integration has a negative impact on student persistence and attainment. Additionally, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2014) found that increased use of part-time faculty negatively affects retentions and graduation rates.

Jaeger and Eagan (2009) suggest the negative impacts on student outcomes is not exclusively the fault of adjunct faculty members. According to Jacoby (2006), different teaching strategies between part-time and full-time faculty members may be a result of unequal working conditions, rather than a lack of ability or expertise. While more than 50% of adjuncts are mainly satisfied with their overall teaching conditions, they still report feeling marginalized compared to their full-time counterparts (American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). They lack access to basic instructional resources and staff support. Other challenges adjuncts face include last-minute hiring decisions, inequitable compensation, and the denial of healthcare and retirement benefits (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). As the dependence on adjunct labor increases, colleges must support their needs to ensure educational quality. Recognizing that part-time faculty members are a diverse group, colleges must identify and be responsive to their needs as a means to maintain fidelity to the college’s mission.

Research findings indicate part-time faculty needs differ from their full-time counterparts. Concerns typically expressed by adjunct faculty include five major themes: orientation, training, a sense of belonging, initial and ongoing professional development, and
recognition. Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2014) found that adjuncts need a comprehensive orientation explaining the practices and policies of the institution. In order to feel more connected with the college, Dolan (2011) found that adjuncts need frequent communication and a variety of opportunities to network with colleagues. Furthermore, adjuncts could benefit from flexible faculty development offerings as most them have full-time jobs beyond their teaching position, limiting their ability to participate in face to face programming. Institutional leaders must provide the necessary institutional resources to integrate and empower all faculty members. In an effort to maximize student learning and success, Jaeger and Eagan (2010) suggest formalizing a college-wide system of adjunct faculty support and development.

Traditionally, faculty development was limited to providing support for sabbatical leaves, used by faculty to develop one’s disciplinary expertise. Over the last 50 years, higher education has faced a variety of academic and economic challenges. In response to these challenges, colleges began to use faculty development programs as a means to improve teaching and institutional success. Now, comprehensive faculty development programs exist to provide faculty with opportunities for growth in three main areas: instructional improvement, organizational development, and personal development (Lewis, 1996). Lewis (1996) describes faculty development as “systematic efforts to increase faculty effectiveness in all areas of their lives” (p. 26). While specific content of faculty development programming varies according to institutional type, most programs commonly address “the changing professoriate, the changing student body, and the changing nature of teaching and learning” (Sorcinelli, 2007, p. 4).

The complex mission and diverse populations present unique challenges for faculty developers at community colleges (Burnstad & Hoss, 2010). The primary mission of a community college is responding to the needs of the community. They are open-access
institutions, responsible for providing quality and affordable postsecondary education, serving nearly half (45%) of all United States undergraduates (American Association of Community Colleges, 2016). Thus, community colleges serve an extremely diverse student population which includes low-income, first-generation, minority, and underprepared students (Ma & Baum, 2016). The instructional staff is equally diverse since adjuncts teach 58% of the courses at U.S. community colleges (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Faculty developers at community colleges must recognize and respond to the unique needs of their diverse student population, complex mission, and disparate faculty groups.

Faculty developers at community colleges must work to support and develop all of their faculty groups. Community college faculty development programs are typically responsible for providing support to both full-time and part-time faculty (Tarr, 2010). Recognizing that adjunct account for almost 70% of the instructional workforce at community colleges, faculty development programs must be sensitive to the different needs of this population (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). In many circumstances, the strategies used to engage part-time faculty members in faculty development should differ from the methods used to engage full-time faculty. To improve instruction among all faculty groups, community college faculty development programs must identify and respond to the distinct needs of their adjunct faculty population.

Statement of the Problem

Community college part-time and full-time faculty are held equally accountable for student retention and completion rates (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). However, adjunct faculty often work under very different conditions compared to full-time faculty. Colleges must invest in, and embrace, adjunct faculty members by committing
institutional resources to ensure that they are recognized as valuable members of the academic community (Green, 2007). A strategy commonly used to support and engage part-time faculty, which also improves student learning and success, is the formation of a college-wide system of adjunct faculty support and development (Jaeger & Eagan, 2010). However, adjunct participation in faculty development is considerably lower than their full-time counterparts (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014).

Previous studies have examined a variety of topics related to adjunct faculty at four-year universities. Topics include adjunct faculty characteristics, the challenges they face, and job satisfaction. A small number of studies have investigated adjunct faculty perceptions of faculty development offerings and usefulness. Even fewer studies have focused on adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence participation in faculty development at community colleges. There have been no studies, to the knowledge of the researcher, examining adjunct faculty development preferences at a Florida state college. There are gaps in the research related to the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of Florida state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence participation in faculty development at a multi-campus Florida state college. To improve Florida state college adjunct faculty participation in faculty development, it was necessary to examine their faculty development needs and the incentives and barriers that influence their participation in faculty development. This study extended the research on characteristics of adjunct faculty and their faculty development interests. This quantitative study
addressed the gap in the literature related to the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of Florida state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development.

**Research Questions**

This study addressed five research questions:

1. What are the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality) and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college?

2. What are faculty development needs, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

3. What are the preferred conditions (times, locations, format, method of communication) for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

4. What incentives would encourage participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

5. What barriers hinder participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

**Significance of the Study**

With adjunct faculty teaching 58% of community college courses, there are concerns about quality of instruction (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). To ensure student achievement, community colleges have attempted to increase the supports and services offered to adjunct faculty. One method to improve student learning is faculty development (Jaeger & Eagan, 2010). Yet, faculty development participation among adjunct faculty is low.
Research that examines adjunct faculty development needs, and the factors that influence their participation in faculty development, can strengthen faculty development programs and increase adjunct faculty participation. When designing faculty development services for adjuncts, faculty developers need to know the preferred time to offer workshops, whether online or face-to-face formatting, and preferred methods of communication. When faculty developers offer services based on adjunct faculty preferences, adjunct faculty participation in faculty development may increase. This research helps faculty developers gain insight into the perceived needs of adjunct faculty and may inform faculty development services that developers offer.

Information related to adjunct faculty development preferences not only helps with program planning, it helps administrators and decision-makers with allocation of resources. When administrators understand the perspectives and needs of adjunct faculty, they are better prepared to invest in and embrace adjunct faculty members by committing institutional resources to ensure that they are recognized as valuable members of the academic community (Green, 2007). Institutional leaders and college administrations can further deepen the institution’s commitment to the support and development of adjunct faculty. This research can inform the development and implementation of college-wide practices that improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Research related to adjunct faculty development needs and preferences benefits adjunct faculty and students. Participation in faculty development contributes to the professional and personal growth of adjunct faculty (Tarr, 2010). When workshops are aligned to the needs of adjunct faculty members and are also delivered at times and locations or in formats most convenient to them, they are more likely to participate in faculty development. Increased
participation in faculty development, among adjuncts, positively impacts students. Faculty
development provides adjuncts with the support and training necessary to “provide students with
the best learning experience possible” (Tarr, 2010, p. 360). Supporting and investing in adjunct
faculty members increases their teaching effectiveness (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

**Delimitations and Limitations of the Study**

1. This research was limited to adjunct faculty teaching at a Florida state college in the fall
   of 2018.
2. This study was limited to adjunct faculty who agree to complete this survey online.
3. Results may not be generalizable to different populations of adjunct faculty at different
   institutions (liberal arts colleges, private colleges, research universities, and community
   colleges.)
4. Findings may not represent the perceptions of adjunct faculty in higher education
   institutions outside Florida.

**Definition of Terms**

*Adjunct faculty* are part-time, non-tenure-track faculty who are typically compensated per
course, or on an hourly basis (Lui, 2013). They are also known as contingent instructors or part-
time professors.

*Community colleges* are postsecondary educational institutions that “prepare students for
either transfer to four-year institutions or immediate labor market opportunities” (Baime &
Baum, 2016, p. 2). They are open access, and respond to the needs of their community (Baime
& Baum, 2016).

*Faculty development* is the process of providing faculty with opportunities for growth in
three main areas: instructional improvement, organizational development, and personal
development (Lewis, 1996). Lewis (1996) describes faculty development as “systematic efforts to increase faculty effectiveness in all areas of their lives” (p. 26). The terms faculty development, instructional development, organizational development, and professional development are often used interchangeably (Gravett, 2013; Ouellet, 2010).

The Florida College System is a network of 28 public community colleges that serves as Florida’s primary access point to post-secondary education (Florida College System, 2014). High-impact educational practices are “the practices that are most likely to engage students with faculty and staff, with other students, and with the subject matter they are studying” (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014, p. 8).

**Chapter Summary**

As the reliance on part-time faculty grows, colleges must systematically support their part-time faculty to ensure the college’s academic quality. It is incumbent upon institutions of higher education to provide the necessary opportunities that integrate and empower all faculty members. Jaeger and Eagan’s (2010) findings suggest that operationalizing a formal, college-wide system of part-time faculty support, development, and integration will positively impact student learning and success. However, part-time faculty members are a diverse group, who differ considerably from full-time faculty members (Tarr, 2010). Recognizing the imperative to support and develop adjunct faculty to improve student retention and completion rates, colleges must identify the diverse needs of adjunct faculty. To improve Florida state college adjunct participation in faculty development, this study examined adjunct faculty development needs, and the incentives and barriers which influence their participation in faculty development.
Chapter 2 presents a review of the relevant literature that addresses three main topics: the Florida College System, adjunct faculty, and faculty development. Chapter 3 outlines the research design and methods of the study.
This literature review addresses three main topics: the Florida College System, adjunct faculty, and faculty development. First, it outlines the history and unique features of the Florida College System. Next, adjunct faculty characteristics, their roles, and the challenges that they face are explored. The final topic outlines the purpose and status of faculty development in higher education.

**Florida College System**

The Florida College System, formerly the Florida Community College System, is a network of 28 public community colleges and state colleges serving the state of Florida (Florida College System, 2014). Enrolling nearly 65% of the state’s recent high school graduates from 2012-2013, the Florida College System serves as Florida’s primary access point to post-secondary education (Florida College System, 2014). Each institution within the Florida College System is governed by a local district board of trustees, under the jurisdiction of the Florida State Board of Education (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). The primary mission of Florida College System institutions is to respond to community and state needs for post-secondary education (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015).

**History of the Florida College System**

The establishment of the Florida College System can be traced back to the founding of St. Petersburg Junior College in 1927 (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013). St. Petersburg Junior
College began as a private, two-year college. In 1933, Palm Beach Junior College became Florida's first public, two-year college (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013). The Florida Legislature passed a law in 1939 allowing counties to “petition the State Board of Education for the establishment of a public junior college” (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013). In 1947, the passage of the Minimum Foundation Program Law helped to establish Florida’s Community College System, which included four publicly funded junior colleges (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013). The Florida Community College System was complete in 1972, with the establishment of Pasco-Hernando Community College (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013). In 2001, Florida community colleges received statutory approval to begin offering baccalaureate degrees (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013). The Florida Community College System was renamed the Florida College System in 2008. Additionally in 2008, the state legislature outlined the criteria for changing an institution’s name in accordance with their expanded missions (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013).

**Unique Features of the Florida College System**

Colleges within the Florida College System are comprehensive institutions which have multiple missions. Section 1004.65 of the Florida Statutes (2015) outlines the responsibilities of the Florida College System. The main responsibility of Florida College System institutions is to respond to the needs of the community (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). This obligation includes providing open access to high-quality, affordable postsecondary education programs and career training, and developing a globally competitive workforce (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). Institutions within the Florida College System are considered open access, requiring them to serve all individuals regardless of race, economic status, ethnicity, gender, or age (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). These institutions are responsible for offering lower level, undergraduate
courses and granting associate degrees (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). This might include offering workforce preparation, career certificates, associate in science degrees, and associate in applied science degrees (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). Additionally, they are responsible for offering student development services to include advisement, counseling, financial aid, tutoring, career development, and disability support services (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). Florida College System institutions are also expected to provide dual-enrollment courses and baccalaureate degrees which have been authorized by law (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). Offering adult education, community services and recreation and leisure activities is a secondary role for Florida College System institutions (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). Ultimately, the Florida College System institutions are expected to emphasize “the achievement of social and educational equity so that all can be prepared for full participation in society” (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015).

**Governance of the Florida College System**

Florida College System institutions are governed by local district board of trustees. However, the institutions have legal accountability and funding connections to the state government (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). The Chancellor of the Florida College System oversees the administration of the entire Florida College System and reports to the Commissioner of Education (Wattenberger & Albertson, 2013). Additionally, the legislature gives first priority to post-secondary academic and career education, and adult education services when allocating funds (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). Funding from the legislature for other community services may be requested by Florida College System institutions, but a rationale must be provided, and the legislature may prioritize areas of funding (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015). While Florida College institutions are governed locally, they have statutory and fiscal connections to the government of Florida (Fla. Stat. § 1004.65, 2015).
Funding of the Florida College System

Historically, the primary revenue resources for colleges within the Florida State College System came from federal and state funding. However, over the last two decades, there has been a significant decrease in state funding for public colleges. The United States Government Accountability Office (2014) reported that state funding for public colleges decreased by 12% from 2003 to 2012. State funding for higher education decreased from $80 billion to $71 billion, in less than ten years (Government Accountability Office, 2014). In fact, state revenues, per full-time equivalent student at 2-year public institutions, were 16% lower in 2010-2011 than in 2005-2006 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). Thus, Florida College System institutions have had to develop innovative economic models in order to maintain open access and respond to environmental changes (Liu & Zhang, 2013). For example, colleges have increased their reliance on tuition and fee revenues (Liu & Zhang, 2013). From 2003 to 2012, public college tuition revenue increased from 17% to 25% (Government Accountability Office, 2014). As a result of the decline in public funding, institutions have been forced to adopt a profit making, corporate culture (Liu & Zhang, 2013).

A decrease in public funding is only one of the fiscal challenges currently impacting the colleges’ already limited resources. Florida State College System institutions are also confronted with rising costs. Student demand and new institutional types have added to college’s budgetary concerns (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Students are demanding additional course sections and increased scheduling options (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Additionally, colleges are struggling to keep up with the ever-growing career options in emerging disciplines (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Accordingly, Florida State College System institutions have responded by creating alternative
scheduling options, retrofitting current classrooms, updating technology resources and building new facilities (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). As a result of budgetary constraints, Florida State College System institutions are being forced to restructure the allocation of their resources (Liu & Zhang, 2013).

**Benefits of Using Adjunct Faculty**

Budget challenges have required Florida State Colleges to not only restructure fiscally, but also to employ cost-saving strategies (Liu & Zhang, 2013). Hiring part-time faculty is a popular, cost-saving trend in higher education. According to the Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014), 58% of U.S. community college courses are taught by part-time faculty. Hiring part-time faculty is part of a new economic model used by colleges to reduce instructional costs (Liu & Zhang, 2013). The commitment between the college and a part-time faculty member typically does not extend beyond a year, and in many instances, their contract is only for one term (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Colleges realize that using part-time faculty is a cost-efficient strategy to offer instruction because their pay is lower than full-time faculty and part-time faculty receive limited, if any, benefits (Liu & Zhang, 2013). According to Monk (2007), part-time, non-tenure-track faculty earn 80 to 85% less in institutional earnings than tenure-track faculty. At two-year colleges, 16% of part-time faculty report receiving health insurance from their teaching position (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Employing adjunct faculty helps keep overhead low (Liu & Zhang, 2013).

**Using Adjunct Faculty Increases Revenues**

In addition to reducing labor costs, hiring adjunct faculty can potentially increase revenues (Liu & Zhang, 2013). Hiring adjuncts not only expands the labor pool, but also increases the diversity of the faculty (Liu & Zhang, 2013). With an expanded workforce,
colleges are able to offer more classes in order to serve the growing population of students (Liu & Zhang, 2013). As the student population increases, the diversity among the student body also expands. Colleges accommodate diverse student interests by offering a broad range of courses (Liu & Zhang, 2013). The diversity and specialized talents among the adjunct faculty increases the college’s ability to offer courses in new and emerging disciplines (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Colleges that cater to student interests are able to attract more students, thereby generating increased revenues from tuition and fees (Liu & Zhang, 2013).

**Using Adjunct Faculty Increases Flexibility**

Adjuncts benefit colleges economically and increase their flexibility. Adjuncts teach multiple sections of courses and often cover for full-time faculty completing research (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Without adjunct faculty, most colleges could not meet the student demand for courses. Adjunct faculty offer colleges flexibility to offer a variety of vocational and technical programs, which are responsive to the diverse needs of the student body (Wallin, 2004). As a result, colleges have the ability to rapidly respond to the changing needs of the community (Wallin, 2004).

**Using Adjunct Faculty Fulfills Institutional Mission**

Adjunct faculty help fulfill the college’s mission because they bring a wealth of experiences and different backgrounds to the classroom (Wallin, 2007). In many instances, part-time faculty are the college’s link between the community and the college, bringing with them professional and personal experience from the real-world to the classroom (Wallin, 2004). For example, they are often practitioners in their field which serves to refresh the curriculum and create enthusiasm among the students (Wallin, 2004). According to Liu and Zhang (2013), adjuncts have real-world expertise which is unlikely developed at the university. Adjunct faculty
members possess practical skills and specialized knowledge which are relevant to students’ lives and future goals. As a result of their expertise and workplace experience, adjunct faculty add diversity to the institutional culture.

Traditionally, part-time faculty were hired when institutions of higher education needed faculty members with real-world experience or expertise in a particular field (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Additionally, colleges hired part-time faculty when enrollments increased and full-time faculty were unavailable (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Emerging disciplines and new institutional types have also led to the increased use of part-time faculty (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Ever-changing institutional missions and priorities have also influenced the shift in faculty hiring practices (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014).

The number of part-time faculty at post-secondary institutions has increased by 104%, from fall 1993 to fall 2013, while full-time faculty only increased by 45% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). According to the American Federation of Teachers (2010), almost 70% of the instructional workforce at two-year colleges are adjunct faculty.

**Characteristics of Adjunct Faculty**

Recognizing their ever-increasing reliance on part-time faculty, it is essential for colleges to understand the characteristics of their part-time faculty. While there is close to an equal number of male (52%) and female (48%) adjunct faculty among all post-secondary institutions, females account for 54% of the adjunct faculty members at two-year colleges (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). The majority of adjunct faculty (84%) identify as white, non-Hispanic (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Less than 15% of adjuncts identify as black (4%), Hispanic (3%), Asian (2%) or other (3%) (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). The
majority (81%) of part-time faculty report having a master’s degree (67 percent) or terminal degree (14%) as their highest degree earned (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Part-time faculty have less teaching experience when compared to full-time faculty (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). In fact, 37% of adjunct faculty have less than five years teaching experience, compared to 13% of full-time faculty (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). The majority (41%) of part-time faculty have been at the institutions where they work for 11 or more years (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). One in four (25%) have been teaching at their institution for 5 years or less, and roughly one third (32%) teaching 6 to 10 years (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

**Reasons for Teaching Part-time**

Investigating the reasons why adjunct faculty teach is another essential element in learning about adjunct faculty. Adjuncts teach for a variety of reasons. Some teach because they want or need extra money while others are hoping to become full-time, tenure-track, faculty members. According to the American Federation of Teachers (2010), 50% of adjuncts prefer teaching part-time, while 47% desire full-time teaching positions. Many are retirees who want to stay connected to the field (Wallin, 2004). Sixty percent of adjuncts under the age of 50 would prefer to teach full-time, and 62% 50 and over prefer teaching part-time (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). There are adjuncts with multiple part-time teaching jobs, in an attempt to equal full-time employment. The Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014) named these individuals full-time part-timers. Other adjuncts identify themselves as graduate students, college staff, or college administrators (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Most adjuncts are employed full-time, outside of teaching (Lyons & Burnstad, 2007). In
fact, 66% of adjuncts have two or more jobs, and 28% of them are another teaching job (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

**Adjunct Faculty Job Satisfaction**

Adjunct faculty attitudes vary according to their desire to teach full-time and institutional participation (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Job satisfaction is relatively high among adjunct faculty at two-year colleges, with 68% stating that they are very or mainly satisfied with their overall teaching conditions (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Overwhelmingly, the majority (75%) of faculty who prefer teaching part-time are more satisfied with their working conditions, whereas less than half (49%) of the adjunct faculty who want full-time teaching jobs are satisfied (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). More than half (57%) of adjunct faculty from two-year colleges are satisfied with jobs security (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Ultimately, the majority of part-time faculty are happy to have a teaching position, with 85% stating that they see themselves at their institutions for two or more years (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

**Adjunct Faculty Challenges**

Part-time faculty are less satisfied with compensation and benefits. In fact, fifty-seven percent report being dissatisfied with salaries (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Adjuncts are paid 25 to 35% less than full-time faculty, and most adjuncts do not receive an increase in pay for length of service (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Many part-time faculty members do not receive retirement benefits or health insurance from their teaching jobs. In particular, faculty from two-year institutions believe that retirement (60%) and health insurance (62%) benefits are falling short (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Fifty-seven percent of part-time faculty are motivated by their commitment to the teaching profession, and not the
money, while 26% teach primarily because of the income and benefits, and 15% are looking for full-time teaching positions (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Regardless, most adjunct faculty enjoy teaching and are eager to serve (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

**Adjunct Faculty Working Conditions**

Working conditions for adjunct faculty vary among, and even within, institutions (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Yet, part-time faculty experience very different working conditions than their full-time counterparts at most institutions. Part-timers often lack access to basic teaching resources. For example, they may not be given office space with a computer, printer, and phone (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Some adjuncts are not given college email accounts or campus mailboxes (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Limited access to faculty parking is another challenge facing many adjuncts (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Many of these resources are critical supports for effective and efficient teaching, and forcing adjuncts to work without them could potentially have a negative impact on student achievement (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014).

**Exclusion of Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct faculty are often excluded from critical campus dialogs (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). In many instances, they are not invited to participate on college-wide committees, or to attend department meetings (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). As a result, many adjuncts are given limited opportunities to interact with their peers, restricting their departmental integration (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Curriculum development is frequently completed without adjunct faculty input, effectively discounting their expertise (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). The adjunct faculty voice is often excluded from decision making related to college-wide governance (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). The experience and
skills that adjunct faculty members possess, which benefit the college and the students, are often unnoticed or disregarded.

**Lack of Access**

A lack of access to college-wide supports is another challenge faced by part-time faculty. (Jolley, Cross & Bryant, 2014). Teaching for a new institution can seem overwhelming for new-hires, but colleges can provide them with a variety of supports to ease their anxiety, such as an orientation and a mentor. Many adjuncts start teaching without being provided an orientation to the college or the department (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Denying part-time faculty the opportunity to become acquainted with the policies, procedures, and expectations of their employment can negatively impact their ability to fulfill their institutional and instructional responsibilities (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Often, adjuncts have limited access to technical and administrative support, leaving them feeling disadvantaged and disconnected. When issues arise, the part-time faculty frequently do not know who to turn to for assistance. Mentoring involves pairing an experienced, full-time faculty member with a part-time or new faculty member, to provide part-time faculty formal and informal occasions to learn about the institutional culture and methods for improving their teaching skills (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). However, opportunities for mentoring are typically limited for part-time faculty further reducing their chance to interact with and learn from their peers (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014).

**Limited Professional Development**

Adjunct faculty are often offered limited opportunities for professional development by their institutions. Professional development helps to communicate institutional values to adjunct faculty, and helps prepare them for their teaching responsibilities, resulting in improved
instructional quality (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Faculty professional development can be delivered formally or informally, and topics can be related to instructional practices or be discipline specific (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Many colleges offer on-campus professional development for their full-time faculty. However, part-time faculty are often overlooked and not invited to participate in professional development activities (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Unlike their full-time counterparts, part-timers are frequently denied or offered nominal funding to attend conferences or seminars off campus (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Similarly, adjunct faculty do not typically receive any incentives for advanced study (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014).

**Adjunct Job Stability**

Job stability is an additional concern for many part-time faculty. Most part-time faculty are offered limited duration contracts, which is temporary employment for a finite amount of time (Liu & Zhang, 2013). For example, most adjuncts are hired per course and are paid on an hourly basis (Liu & Zhang, 2013). Further compounding the issue, teaching schedules are often assigned to adjuncts with little, if any, notice (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Last minute hiring practices often impede preparation time, which can diminish the quality of instruction (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014).

**Impact of Adjunct Faculty**

The diversity and marginalization issues of adjunct faculty presents challenges, as institutions of higher education work to maintain their commitment to educational quality. In fact, adjunct faculty are often perceived as threats to the development of quality academic programs (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). For example, students often rely on the knowledge and expertise of faculty to help them navigate the institution. Particularly at community colleges,
faculty have an increased role in student academic advising and developmental education compared to four-year universities (Jacoby, 2006). Often, adjunct faculty are less accessible to students, which limits the students’ ability to develop key relationship (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). Unfortunately, students may have fewer meaningful interactions with part-time faculty, which results in students becoming less integrated into the college community (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). Unsuccessful student integration and engagement has a negative impact on student persistence and attainment (Jacoby, 2006).

**Limited Availability**

Full-time faculty are typically expected to be available to students outside of the classroom, by holding weekly office hours. However, most institutions do not have the same office hours expectations for part-time faculty, nor are they typically provided an office from which to meet with students. The different expectations for full-time versus part-time faculty, in regard to office hours, impacts the students ability to access and interact with the faculty member (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Moreover, adjunct faculty tend to be more transient, which further hinders their availability to students, decreasing the opportunity to connect with and mentor students (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). For this reason, the results of one study found that students perceived them as less stable and secure (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). Under those circumstances, students can become dissatisfied and leave (Schibik & Harrington, 2004).

**Less Teaching Experience**

The majority of adjunct faculty have less classroom teaching experience and education credentials than their full-time counterparts (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Fourteen percent of part-time faculty have terminal degrees, compared to
20% of full-time faculty (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Jaeger and Eagan (2009) conclude that part-time faculty “bring less scholarly authority” (p. 168). Sixty-five percent of full-time faculty have been teaching ten or more years. Conversely, only 39% of part-time faculty have more than 10 years of teaching experience (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Faculty that are less qualified often use less challenging instructional strategies (Jacoby, 2006). For example, part-time faculty frequently have lower writing expectations and are less likely to use authentic forms of assessment (Jacoby, 2006). Lack of teaching experience can impact the quality of instruction and academic rigor, potentially having a negative impact on student learning (Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006).

**Poor Institutional Integration**

Compared to full-time faculty, part-time faculty often lack comparable access to college resources and training, and they are less likely to be integrated into the campus culture (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). In fact, adjunct faculty members are frequently unable to establish networks of information (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). Consequently, adjuncts lack an understanding of institutional values and feel less empowered (Liu & Zhang, 2013). As a result, adjuncts often are less likely to use high impact educational practices such as suggesting students seek tutoring or academic advising services (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Poor institutional assimilation may negatively impacts students, including: a reduction in quality instruction, weak advising, and decreased curricular consistency (Jacoby, 2006).

**Grade Inflation**

Grade inflation is another concern related to adjunct faculty members. According to Jacoby (2006), grading patterns between full-time faculty and part-time faculty vary greatly. Part-time faculty grades are significantly higher than their full-time counterparts (Jacoby, 2006).
Some faculty believe that less rigorous content and expectations result in higher grades (Jacoby, 2006). Likewise, lower grades can negatively impact the feedback provided on course evaluations from students (Jacoby, 2006). If students are dissatisfied with their grades, they will address their concerns on their course evaluations. Part-time faculty understand the correlation between course evaluations and their employment status. Lack of job security may explain why part-time faculty provide students with “less demanding course work and higher grades” (Jacoby, 2006).

**Negatively Impacts Academic Goals**

Early exposure to part-time faculty may negatively impact student academic goals. In fact, a student’s educational experience can be related to faculty member employment status (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). For example, many part-time faculty do not spend as much time on high impact practices, the practices that engage students with each other, with other faculty, and with the content being studied, compared to full-time faculty (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Schibik and Harrington (2004) found that increased exposure to part-time faculty during the first semester is associated with lower second-semester retention rates and lower grade point averages.”

**Decreases Student Retention**

Eagan and Jaeger (2009) found that increased exposure to part-time faculty decreased student retention; it also adversely affected student transfer rates from community colleges to four-year universities. Eagan and Jaeger (2009) found that a student who has nearly half of their academic load with a part-time faculty member is less likely (8%) to transfer when compared to a student who has no exposure to part-time faculty. Similarly, Gross and Goldhaber’s (2009)
research revealed the number of tenured faculty at a two-year college is closely related to the number of students transferring to a four-year college.

Increased use of part-time faculty may negatively affect graduation and retention rates (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Jaeger and Eagan (2009) found that students with increased exposure to part-time faculty are less likely to complete their associate’s degree. Jacoby (2006) found that increased ratios of part-time faculty at community colleges significantly and negatively impacts graduation rates. Similarly, Ehrenberg and Zhang (2004) found that a 10% increase in exposure to part-time faculty is associated with a 2.65% decrease in graduation rates.

Unequal Working Conditions

According to Jacoby (2006), differing instructional practices between full-time and part-time faculty may be a result of unequal working conditions, versus a lack of skill or experience. In fact, part-time faculty are often hired because of their real-world expertise to enhance student learning experiences (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014). Moreover, many part-time faculty “contribute their own time and resources far beyond contractual requirements or compensation out of a sense of commitment or professional duty to support students” (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2014, p. 7).

Jaeger and Eagan (2009) suggest that negative student outcomes are not exclusively the fault of the part-time faculty member. Compared to full-time faculty, adjunct faculty members feel marginalized (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Adjuncts often lack access to basic teaching resources, and faculty support and development. Additionally, they face inequitable compensation, job security, and are often denied healthcare benefits and retirement plans (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Adjunct faculty
are often hired at the last minute which limits their preparation time. Therefore, negative student outcomes associated with overreliance on part-time faculty may be a consequence of the working conditions and inequitable treatment of adjuncts.

Part-time faculty, like their full-time counterparts, require support and development to enhance their teaching abilities and institutional knowledge. As the reliance on part-time faculty grows, colleges must systematically support their part-time faculty in order to maintain fidelity to the college’s mission. However, part-time faculty members are a diverse group, who have different needs from full-time faculty members (Tarr, 2010). Recognizing the imperative to recruit, support and develop adjunct faculty as a means to ensure educational quality, colleges must identify the diverse needs of adjunct faculty.

**Adjunct Faculty Needs**

The needs of part-time are often different from their full-time counterpart. Part-time faculty typically spend less time on campus, have weaker college connections, and teach for a variety of reasons (Tarr, 2010). Some adjuncts work part-time because they have a full-time job elsewhere, but they want supplemental income, or they just enjoy teaching. Other adjuncts are hoping to gain full-time teaching positions. As a result, faculty developers must consider the unique needs of adjunct faculty members when designing their programs and supports (Tarr, 2010).

**Surveying Adjunct Faculty**

One method to identify the diverse needs of adjunct faculty is for the college to complete a comprehensive needs assessment. Fagan-Wilen et al. (2006) suggest that institutions survey the adjunct faculty members to gain a better understanding of their needs and the issues they are facing. The survey might include their availability to attend face to face meetings and the
methods of delivery they prefer. Additionally, Fagan-Wilen et al. (2006) recommend gathering demographic information about the adjuncts. The information gathered would be used to inform the creation of convenient and relevant professional development for the adjunct faculty.

**A Comprehensive Orientation**

A common concern expressed by adjunct faculty is the need for a comprehensive orientation acquainting them with the culture and practices of the institution (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). The primary goal of an orientation is for the hiring administrator to communicate the college’s policies and procedures (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). However, the onboarding process is often decentralized and varies by department. Furthermore, adjuncts are often hired at the last minute and begin teaching without a thorough understanding of their role within the institution (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). Ideally, all of the information that an adjunct faculty member would need to prepare for the first day of class would be included in the orientation.

**Networking Opportunities**

Many adjunct faculty members complain that they feel disconnected from their peers and institutional administrators (Green, 2007). When an issue arises, many adjuncts are not sure who to contact. Faculty who do not feel connected to their colleagues and administrators may not be as committed to the organization, resulting in decreased performance (Dolan, 2011). Introducing newly hired adjunct faculty to other adjuncts, full-time faculty, and staff members may make them feel welcome and valued. The use of mentors may increase adjunct involvement in the teaching community, creating opportunities for part-time faculty to network with peers, and enhances adjunct and student engagement (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014). As a result, adjuncts become familiar with their colleagues, thus feeling more connected to the college community.
(Green, 2007). Dolan (2011) states that faculty who “have a strong sense of belonging to the institution and feel connected” (p. 63) are more motivated to improve their skills in teaching.

**Frequent Communication**

Frequent and ample communication can help to combat the disconnection often experienced by part-time faculty. It is essential to keep adjuncts informed and provide them with feedback (Dolan, 2011). Adjuncts should be made aware of events offered by the college that affect faculty and students. This increases participation and promotes a sense of inclusion (Dolan, 2011). When adjuncts are better informed on institutional matters, their sense of isolation may decrease. Increased socialization with peers also gives them the opportunity to learn from one another and increase their skills, thus positively impacting student achievement (Dolan, 2011).

**Institutional Integration**

Part-time faculty need to feel connected to the institution. Providing adjuncts with specialized training during orientation serves to integrate them into the broader academic community. For example, the college could provide the adjunct faculty member with a workshop that teaches them how to use organizational software (Wallin, 2004). This early preparation would positively influence teaching effectiveness (Wallin, 2004). Thorough knowledge of institutional policies and academic expectations increases their confidence and enables them to offer a similar quality of instruction as their full-time counterparts (Wallin, 2004). Similarly, the workshops would also provide the adjuncts with the opportunity to socialize and connect with other new hires, staff members, and full-time faculty members, increasing their sense of belonging and dedication to the students and the institution (Wallin, 2004).
Institutional Support

Many adjuncts have full-time jobs elsewhere and may not be able to attend face to face events (Pons, Burnett, Williams, & Paredes, 2017). In some instances, adjunct faculty are excluded from faculty development programming and services. Offering online professional development is cost effective and does not require large amounts of institutional resources. McDaniel and Shaw (2010) assert that online professional development has numerous benefits. Namely, benefits include assurance of organizational effectiveness and reduced barriers of time and place study (McDaniel & Shaw, 2010). Furthermore, there are increased opportunities for networking across and within disciplines through the creation of various learning communities via online discussion boards and groups. Online communities within learning management systems can also help establish communications between mentors and adjunct faculty, and increase the frequency of exchange between full-time and adjunct faculty.

Recognition and Reward

Adjuncts want to be recognized as a source of valuable knowledge or as contributors to their academic discipline within the department (Green, 2007). Part-time faculty members possess experience and skills that can benefit not only their students, but also the institution and the academic community. But, many adjuncts report that they feel unappreciated by the institution. For example, their voices are often excluded from issues related to college governance and curriculum development. Often, adjuncts want to be included in critical campus dialogues. However, when they are not invited to attend department meetings, or to participate on college-wide committees, adjuncts feel devalued.

It seems reasonable that institutions of higher education need to systematically support their part-time faculty to ensure the college’s academic quality. Green (2007) asserts that
institutional leaders invest in and embrace adjunct faculty members by committing institutional resources to ensure that they are recognized as valuable members of the academic community. It is incumbent upon institutions of higher education to provide the necessary opportunities which integrate and empower all faculty members. There are a variety of strategies which colleges may employ to support and engage part-time faculty that enhance student outcomes. Jaeger and Eagan’s (2010) findings suggest that operationalizing a formal, college-wide system of part-time faculty support, development, and integration will positively impact student learning and success.

**History of Faculty Development**

Faculty development is a relatively new field in the United States. It has evolved from support for sabbatical leave to develop expertise in one’s field, to comprehensive faculty development programs providing faculty with opportunities to grow both personally and professionally (Lewis, 1996). In 1975, Francis described faculty development as “an institutional process which seeks to modify the attitudes, skills, and behavior of faculty members toward greater competence and effectiveness in meeting student needs, their own needs, and the needs of the institution” (p. 720). Two decades later, Lewis (1996) defined faculty development as an “umbrella term encompassing systematic efforts to increase the effectiveness of faculty in all areas of their lives” (p. 26). In her view, the term *faculty development* had evolved to include three main areas of focus: instructional improvement, organizational development, and personal development (Lewis, 1996). Diamond (2002) suggested that there is an “overall interaction” resulting from the combination of Lewis’s three approaches, which he refers to as educational development. Internationally, the most commonly used term to describe the initiatives taken on by faculty developers is educational development (Ouellett, 2010).
Today, faculty development, instructional development, organizational development, and professional development are terms used interchangeably to describe the work of faculty developers (Gravett, 2013; Ouellett, 2010). Tymitz-Wolf (1984) points out that while theorists may define faculty development differently, most agree that the purpose of the faculty development program is to create opportunities for faculty members to engage in activities that increase personal and professional growth.

Originally, professional development for faculty in higher education was related to developing disciplinary expertise (Ouellett, 2010). The earliest form of faculty development, the sabbatical leave, can be traced back to Harvard University in 1810 (Lewis, 1996). Sabbatical leaves provided faculty a means to complete research and keep current in their field (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Until the 1960s, most colleges and universities in the United States provided their faculty opportunities to develop in their academic disciplines by offering support for travel to professional meetings, completing advanced degrees, conducting research and sabbatical leave (Lewis, 1996). The first faculty development center was started in 1962, at the University of Michigan (Gravett, 2013).

The role of faculty development broadened in the 1960’s and 1970’s, shifting the focus from research, to include teaching. Traditionally, faculty success had been measured by research (Ouellett, 2010). Faculty began to advocate for a more holistic view of the nature of their work to include service and teaching excellence (Ouellett, 2010). As a result, institutional roles and career rewards reflected an increased emphasis on excellence in teaching (Ouellett, 2010).

A new approach to faculty development emerged in the 1970’s, emphasizing instructional development (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Societal and economic changes during the 1960’s and 1970’s contributed to the new focus on improving college instruction. During the 1970’s, the
OPEC-induced recession negatively impacted institutions of higher education. Colleges and universities were faced with a tremendous reduction in funding (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Simultaneously, higher education was confronted with rapid expansion as the baby-boomer generation reached college age (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

Higher education was also under student attack during the 1960’s and 1970’s. Students began to protest, demanding more rights and control (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Students were criticizing “irrelevant courses and uninspired teaching” (Gaff & Simpson, 1994, p. 168). Specifically, students wanted opportunities to provide faculty with feedback and to play a more critical role in selecting curricular content, resulting in what they felt would be more relevant to their experiences and aspirations (Ouellett, 2010). The protests began to disprove the assumption that if you had expertise in a particular field, you were equally equipped to teach it (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). An increase in nontraditional students further challenged the traditional methods of instruction used in higher education (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). In order to meet the needs of the growing diverse student population, faculty were required to expand their teaching repertoire. Concurrently, research was “demonstrating that effective teaching and learning are complex activities that can—and should—be learned” (Gaff & Simpson, 1994, p. 168).

During the 1970’s, colleges and universities started to institutionalize formal faculty development programs (Murray, 2002b). The newly established programs were supported by a variety of grants from private donors and public agencies (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). These foundations and federal agencies encouraged innovative approaches to teaching and learning.

The newly established programs shared a similar focus, the improvement of pedagogical skills. However, each program used a variety of approaches to achieve their goals. Gaff (1975)
suggested that there were three overarching themes related to faculty development: faculty development, instructional development and organization development. Some programs focused on the development of the individual faculty member, helping her/him to increase her/his knowledge related to her/his students, institution, and teaching behaviors (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Other programs concentrated on improving the instructional process by helping faculty to write learning objectives, design innovative learning opportunities, align assessments to objectives, and differentiate instruction (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Some other programs emphasized the need for teachers to collaborate and support one another by encouraging networking, setting group goals and improving relationships among faculty and administrators (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

While the focus of individual programs varied among colleges, most of the programs had similar features. Most faculty development programs were managed by a separate office. A respected faculty member, either given temporary leave or release time, typically directed the program. The director would report to the chief academic officer (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Most programs used faculty advisory boards to expand faculty support and ensure that faculty interests and needs were being addressed (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

During the early 1980s, faculty development was faced with responding to another academic challenge, related to the curriculum (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). The curricular changes included “increasing the quality and coherence in general education; strengthening and assessing academic majors; transforming the curriculum by attending to gender, race and ethnic traditions; incorporating global perspectives; and teaching skills, such as writing and critical thinking, across the curriculum” (Gaff & Simpson, 1994, p. 169). Curricular changes require faculty to work together in groups. Faculty have to “see their individual interests within the context of the
department or institution” (Gaff & Simpson, 1994, p. 169). Curricular initiatives were often the responsibility of the dean’s office. However, faculty development programs were often called upon to offer the workshops and retreats, designed to bring faculty together to make decisions and changes related to the curriculum (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

A new paradigm related to faculty development emerged during the 1980’s (Lewis, 1996). Faculty members were facing deteriorating working conditions triggered by the economic and societal changes of the 60’s and 70’s. Decreased clerical support, limited travel budgets, and delayed maintenance requests began to negatively impact faculty morale and often resulted in academic burnout (Lewis, 1996). In response, faculty development initiatives expanded their “scope to include the personal dimensions of faculty life” (Lewis, 1996, p. 29). Faculty development centers started to offer workshops and faculty support related to wellness, career counseling, employee assistance programs, and retirement planning (Lewis, 1996).

The instructional development centers that emerged in the 1980s “shared several principles of good practice” (Gaff & Simpson, 1994, p. 170). Typically, the newer faculty development centers were financed by permanent institutional funds rather than by external resources (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Offering a wide range of support and services was also a sound principle followed by newer instructional development centers. Another good practice associated with many of today’s successful centers is increased administrative support for teaching excellence (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Furthermore, effective faculty development centers reflect the changing needs of the faculty, rather than focusing on administrative needs (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Ideally, faculty development centers are guided by faculty and supported by key administrators (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).
During the 1990’s, higher education in the United States was impacted by demands for increased accountability. Parents and lawmakers needed reassurance that students attending colleges and universities were being offered the most effective academic learning conditions (Lewis, 1996). Faculty development centers were added to ensure faculty were receiving the necessary training and support to increase their instructional effectiveness. As a result, there was an upsurge in faculty development programs nationwide, up more than 20% from 1975 to 1995 (Lewis, 1996).

There was a renewed interest in faculty development programs in the 1990s, as well. Organizations associated with faculty and professional development, like the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education, the National Council of Staff, Program and Organizational Development (NCSPOD), and the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD), saw rapid growth in their memberships (Lewis, 1996). The growing body of research related to faculty and instructional development programs brought attention to the value and effectiveness of such programs (Lewis, 1996). Recognizing that faculty development programs not only improve teaching, but also benefits the institution overall, colleges and universities expanded the scope of faculty development offerings and initiated new priorities for these programs (Lewis, 1996).

**Current Status of Faculty Development**

Over the last fifty years, higher education has been faced with not only academic challenges, but also economic and social changes. In an effort to respond to these changes, colleges and universities started to use faculty development programs not only to improve teaching, but also to enhance institutional success. While the specific content of these faculty
development programs may differ depending on institutional type, most have common variations related to organizational structure and offer a combination of programs and services (Lee, 2010).

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) conceptualized a comprehensive and diverse approach to achieve an effective faculty development program. They proposed three levels required for significant change to occur: attitude, process, and structure (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975). Bergquist and Phillips’ (1975) faculty development model also included specific programmatic requirements for each of the three dimensions of faculty development. Now, the three dimensions are more commonly referred to as professional, instructional, and organizational development. Today, there are vestiges of Bergquist and Phillips’ faculty development model in every teaching and learning center (Lee, 2010).

Organizational structures of faculty development centers vary according to the size of the physical space, the budget, the number of employees, and type of institution. According to Lee (2010), faculty development centers typically fall into one of five basic organizational structures. Single, centralized teaching and learning centers are usually found in research and larger, comprehensive institutions (Lee, 2010). Characteristically, the center staff includes a director, associate or program directors, and other administrative support staff (Lee, 2010). The director, often a faculty member, typically reports to the Provost. Centralized centers frequently have faculty advisory committees to develop faculty support and guide programming and services (Lee, 2010). They offer a variety of programs, serve a broad range of populations, and support college-wide initiatives (Lee, 2010). An individual faculty member, with or without a physical center, is a common organizational structure popular in smaller colleges (Lee, 2010). A tenured faculty member is often given a part-time appointment as director, and no staff (Lee, 2010). They offer a limited number of programs and services. The other three types of organizational
structures include: committees that support faculty development, a clearinghouse for programs, and system wide offices (Lee, 2010). Organizational structures of faculty development centers are typically not static. They evolve over time as they respond to the challenges and changing needs of their institution.

The range and number of activities and services offered by individual faculty development centers depends on the mission of the institution and types of resources available (Lee, 2010). However, the type of activities most centers offer fall into similar categories (Lee, 2010). The most common activities include: workshops, individual consulting, and classroom observations (Lee, 2010). Often, these services are dependent on the expertise of the faculty development professional. Orientations, teaching circles, and faculty learning communities are also popular activities. However, within these categories, the faculty development professional assumes a different role, and serves more as a facilitator or change agent (Lee, 2010). Many faculty centers publish their own teaching and learning newsletters, maintain a center website, and assemble teaching resources (Lee, 2010). Other, less informal tasks associated with the function of the faculty center include: serving on committees, building partnerships with internal and external stakeholders, and assisting with accreditation (Lee, 2010).

**Purpose of Faculty Development**

There are a number of factors which influence the programs and services offered by faculty development programs in higher education. Sorcinelli (2007) identified three primary elements that faculty development programs commonly address: “the changing professoriate, the changing student body, and the changing nature of teaching and learning” (p. 4). While specific issues may vary by institution, faculty development professionals have a responsibility to
identify and address the most critical issues based on faculty and institutional needs (Ouellett, 2010).

**The Changing Professoriate**

The changes in higher education have transformed the traditional roles and responsibilities of faculty. Traditionally, faculty members focused on research and subject matter expertise. However, the new role of the professoriate has expanded to not only include teaching, but also designing online courses, interdisciplinary work, and the integration of technology (Sorcinelli, 2007). Other faculty roles may include advising students and grant writing. To mitigate the expanding role of the professoriate, faculty developers can offer programming that includes topics beyond the traditional scope of teaching and learning.

Faculty members vary by age, teaching experience, and workload. Junior faculty members often have different needs and values than senior faculty members. For example, new faculty often find it challenging to simultaneously balance their role as researcher and teacher, while fulfilling other professional commitments (Sorcinelli, 2007). Senior faculty often serve as mentors for new faculty, which requires a different type of development and support. The majority of faculty members, regardless of the stage of their career, are concerned with how to balance and find time to complete the demanding tasks associated with the role of the faculty, while simultaneously attending to their personal commitments (Sorcinelli, 2007). Faculty developers provide programming supports related to time management and work-life issues (Sorcinelli, 2007). Opportunities for mentoring can be facilitated through the faculty development programs to encourage and extend dialogues between junior and senior faculty (Ouellett, 2010). Faculty developers must identify and address the needs of their faculty depending on the stage of their career path (Ouellett, 2010).
Faculty development centers are often responsible for providing support and training of new faculty members (Sorcinelli, 2007). Newly-hired faculty members have unique needs. In addition to their faculty role, new faculty must also learn to navigate the tenure process, build networks and develop relationships (Sorcinelli, 2007). New faculty require an orientation to the college, mentoring and networking opportunities, and guidance related to tenure as well (Sorcinelli, 2007). A faculty induction program can be offered through the faculty center, offering a series of workshops based on the needs of newly hired faculty members.

As colleges increase their reliance on part-time and adjunct faculty members, faculty developers are faced with understanding and supporting this population’s diverse needs. Part-time and adjunct faculty members are an extremely diverse group of individuals. While most adjuncts have a master’s degree (67% ) as their highest degree earned, part-time faculty have on average less teaching experience when compared to full-time faculty (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). More importantly, adjunct faculty teach for reasons that often vary from their full-time counterparts. Some are retired and want to stay connected to the field, while others are working part-time in pursuit of a full-time teaching appointment. Other adjuncts are working part-time because they have a full-time job elsewhere. It is not uncommon for adjuncts to work two or more teaching jobs, to equal a full-time job. Adjuncts also identify themselves as graduate teaching assistants, college staff, or as an administrator. Regardless of their reasons for teaching part-time, faculty developers are responsible for supporting and developing them. Faculty development programs have to be flexible and creative to ensure that adjuncts receive the support that they need and feel included. Orientations and workshops can be offered online, in the evenings, or on the weekends. Mentoring and networking opportunities can also be scheduled during lunch hours or off campus. Workshop topics for adjunct faculty are
often similar to the topics offered to full-time faculty and new hires. Popular topics include teaching issues as well as departmental and institutional policies and practices (Sorcinelli, 2007).

**The Changing Student Body**

The changing nature of the student body in higher education has impacted faculty development programs. According to Sorcinelli (2007), “each year, the student body has become larger and more diverse across several variables – educational background, gender, race and ethnicity, class, age, and preparation” (p. 5). Students come to class with a variety of skill levels, motivations, goals and characteristics (Burnstad & Hoss, 2010). In order to meet the needs of all their students, faculty members need new and alternative approaches to teaching (Murray, 2002). The two major challenges associated with the changing nature of the student body, as identified by faculty developers, are multiculturalism and underprepared students (Sorcinelli, 2007).

Within the classroom, a diverse student population creates interests and opportunities for expanded learning. However, it also presents challenges for faculty members because each student learns differently. In addition to staying current in their field, faculty now have to learn about the characteristics of their students and increase their repertoire of teaching strategies (Sorcinelli, 2007). Faculty developers can promote a variety of teaching approaches which increase multicultural awareness, communication skills, problem solving, critical thinking, and collaboration (Murray, 2002). Moreover, seminars or workshops offered through the faculty development center can provide strategies for engaging all learners when discussing sensitive topics such as religion, race, gender, and ethnicity (Sorcinelli, 2007). By increasing multicultural awareness, faculty developers create educators and students who “value diverse ideas, beliefs, and worldviews, and promote more inclusive student learning” (Sorcinelli, 2007).
More than half (53%) of the students entering college are academically underprepared (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002). Students who require remedial courses frequently lack effective study habits, self-confidence, and the skills necessary to navigate the college’s bureaucracy (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002). When students come to class lacking basic skills in reading, writing, or math, faculty members are forced to review, and in many instances adjust, their approaches to teaching and learning to meet the needs of all of their students. In many instances, faculty have to revise assignments, instruction, and timelines for students who need additional support with college-level academic skills. Additionally, there is often a disconnect between faculty expectations and student expectations, related to quality of work and time dedicated to coursework beyond class meetings (Sorcinelli, 2007). In order to scaffold the academic deficiencies of underprepared students, faculty developers can meet one-on-one with faculty members to help them revise their courses. Faculty development centers can remind faculty members to consistently outline the student resources available through the college, review their expectations for assignments, and emphasize the benefits of using effective teaching strategies (Sorcinelli, 2007).

The Changing Nature of Teaching and Learning

Pressures from parents, legislators, alum, and prospective students have had a considerable impact on higher education, resulting in a shift in the approach to teaching and learning. College constituents are demanding evidence that students are being exposed to the best teaching and learning practices (Ouellett, 2010). In response, faculty and administrators are using a variety of strategies to inform their constituents that students are indeed receiving a quality education. For example, institutions are focusing on student assessment and accountability efforts, as well as earning and maintaining their accreditation (Ouellett, 2010).
These newer areas of focus require support and development beyond the traditional teaching and learning topics offered by faculty development programs (Ouellett, 2010). Faculty developers can contribute to the success of these efforts by facilitating dialogues, offering research-based strategies related to assessment, and contributing to program reviews (Ouellett, 2010). Additionally, faculty development programs can introduce faculty to innovative curricular practices and assist them with embedding these strategies into their courses. The changing nature of teaching and learning has broadened the scope of faculty development programs and practices (Sorcinelli, 2007).

Further complicating matters, individuals teaching in higher education are often not required to have teaching credentials, other than earning a graduate degree in their academic discipline (Fink, 2013; Lewis, 1996; Murray, 2002). Subsequently, higher education faculty regularly rely on traditional teaching methods that are often ineffective (Fink, 2013). Traditional approaches to teaching include lecturing, listening and observing. Often, these methods do not require students to interact or participate, students are not able to apply the concepts, decreasing their ability to retain this knowledge for extended periods of time (Fink, 2013). Rather than relying on lecture and discussion to teach students, faculty members are being advised to use teaching strategies that are more student-centered (Sorcinelli, 2007). Students are expected to take a more active role in the learning process, encouraging more interaction with other students and the course content (Sorcinelli, 2007). Learner-centered teaching strategies require faculty members to have a different, more innovative skill set. A learner-centered teaching approach is often unfamiliar and intimidating for both newly hired and senior faculty members. In order to increase student engagement and improve student learning, faculty development programs create opportunities for faculty to learn innovative approaches to teaching which are more effective.
Faculty development programs can provide faculty with opportunities to learn about alternatives to lecturing, and time to discuss the innovative approaches to teaching and learning (Sorcinelli, 2007). As a result, faculty design alternative learning experiences that require students to think critically and apply what they are learning in class to the real-world, which improves learning (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

One of the greatest challenges currently facing higher education faculty is the successful “integration of technology into traditional teaching and learning” environments (Sorcinelli, 2007, p. 7). Students expect their instructors to use technology, not only to enrich learning, but also to facilitate interaction among students and keep up-to-date on course assignments and due dates. Using technology in the higher education classroom can facilitate a positive learning experience for students, but it also creates challenges for faculty. The successful integration of technology into teaching and learning is more than simply deciding the best tool to use to improve student learning (Sorcinelli, 2007). Effective technology integration is a complex task. It requires faculty to consider the learning goals, the capabilities of the technology, as well as “student access to and comfort with” the technology (Zhu & Kaplan, 2014, p. 263). Other issues associated with the use of instructional technology include expense, unpredictability, and copyright concerns (Ouellett, 2010). The increased role of distance education in higher education has also impacted how faculty approach teaching and learning. Faculty developers can help instructors by not only introducing them to new technologies, but also by demonstrating the best ways to use the technology to complement their teaching styles and accommodate different student learning styles (Ouellett, 2010). With the appropriate training and support, faculty developers can shift the focus from replacing instruction with technology, to enhancing instruction with technology (Ouellett, 2010).
The programs and support offered by faculty development centers are influenced by a variety of factors. Faculty roles and responsibilities are no longer limited to research and expertise in one’s field. Faculty members are now expected to have strong pedagogical skills, and participate in the college community. The increasing diversity of the student population is another element that faculty developers must respond to. Students come to college with a variety of goals, skill levels, and characteristics. Furthermore, the ever-changing nature of teaching and learning presents challenges for faculty members. As the demand for accountability, assessment, and quality in higher education increases, faculty developers can provide faculty members support and training to ensure their success. The factors that impact faculty development program goals are similar across most postsecondary institutions. However, the elements that each faculty development program chooses to focus on frequently depends on the institution type, and its mission.

**Faculty Development in Community Colleges**

Community colleges are unique postsecondary institutions which have multiple missions that differ from four-year institutions. Responding to the needs of the community is the primary mission of a community college. They are charged with offering quality and affordable postsecondary education and career training, while maintaining a policy of open access to nontraditional students. Among all United States undergraduates, almost half (45%) attend community college (American Association of Community Colleges, 2016). At U.S. community colleges, adjuncts teach 58% of the courses (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). The complex mission and diverse populations at community colleges create distinct challenges for faculty development programs in these institutions (Burnstad & Hoss, 2010).
Comprehensive Programming

Community college faculty development programs are primarily concerned with improving student learning (Burnstad & Hoss, 2010). However, their complex missions present faculty developers with challenges as they work to support and develop different faculty groups in an era of increased accountability and a decrease in resources (Murray, 2002). In addition to improving student success, community college faculty development programs are often expected to integrate different staffing groups, expand community relations, improve morale and institutional effectiveness, and respond to legislative and societal changes (Burnstad & Hoss, 2010). The demands of faculty development programs at community colleges are comprehensive and diverse.

Institutional Expectations

The institutional expectations placed on faculty at community colleges creates a challenge for faculty developers at community colleges. Faculty at community colleges are often expected to have a comprehensive set of skills and expertise, beyond being subject matter experts. It is also beneficial for the faculty to understand the comprehensive mission of the college. Faculty developers can help faculty gain a better understanding of the basic concepts of the community college by offering workshops that focus on topics like open access, nontraditional student populations, and the needs of their community. Once faculty members come to understand and accept the unique academic differences among their student population, it is generally expected that they continually hone and adapt their teaching skills (Murray, 2002). Faculty developers can help faculty develop a variety of instructional approaches that match the learning styles and needs of their students.
**Diverse Student Population**

Another challenge facing community college faculty developers is their extremely diverse student population. In fact, community colleges have seen an increase in nontraditional and underprepared students with their expansion of access (Murray, 2002). Students at community colleges have a variety of characteristics, motivations, and goals. Community colleges need faculty who are dedicated to reaching all learners (Murray, 2002). Faculty members can no longer solely rely on traditional teaching methods to improve student learning, when their classrooms are filled with nontraditional students such as women, students of color, part-time students, and first-generation college students. Instructors need new and different approaches to ensure the needs of all students are being met. As the focus on improving retention and graduation rates increases, faculty developers must provide faculty with opportunities to enhance their content and pedagogical knowledge and instructional skills.

**Increased Reliance on Part-time Faculty**

The increased reliance on part-time faculty at community colleges presents additional challenges for faculty developers. Most community college faculty development programs are overseen by a central unit which is responsible for providing support for both full-time and part-time faculty (Tarr, 2010). With nearly 70% of the instructional workforce at community colleges comprised of adjunct faculty, faculty development programs must be sensitive to their needs (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). When designing faculty development offerings for adjunct faculty, it is important to consider scheduling needs, reimbursement, marketing, and communication (Tarr, 2010). The specific faculty development needs of adjunct faculty members is another area of concern for faculty developers. While adjunct needs may differ according to academic discipline and teaching experience, most share basic common needs
which include: an orientation to the college, mentors, frequent communication, recognition, and integration into the college community (Tarr, 2010). While community colleges face unique faculty development challenges because of their complex mission, their faculty development programs remain focused on improving teaching and learning by offering workshops, mentors, observations, newsletters and orientations.

According to Murray (2002), faculty development offerings at community colleges have minimal long-term effects. Community colleges often rely on traditional approaches to faculty development (Murray, 2002). Murray (2002) identified three themes in the literature concerning faculty development in community colleges. First, program goals lack focus and are not tied to the institutional mission (Murray, 2002). When faculty development programs are expected to facilitate institutional change and improvement, it is necessary for them to have clear goals which focus on the mission of the college (Murray, 2002). Next, few community college faculty development programs evaluate their effectiveness (Murray, 2002). Program effectiveness is frequently measured by faculty satisfaction or number of participants, rather than measuring changes in teacher behavior or student learning (Murray, 2002). Third, only a small number of faculty actually participate in faculty development activities (Murray, 2002). Often faculty and administrators have different views on the purpose of faculty development. Faculty typically view faculty development as a means to further their disciplinary knowledge, while administrators think faculty development should focus on teaching and the mission of the institution (Murray, 2002).

**Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty at Community Colleges**

Previous studies have examined the needs of adjunct faculty at four-year universities. Topics include: adjunct faculty characteristics, the challenges they face, and the valuable role
they play within their institutions. Job satisfaction among adjunct faculty and the implications of their use have also been studied. A limited number of studies have investigated adjunct faculty perceptions of faculty development offerings and usefulness. Even fewer studies have identified adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence participation in professional development opportunities at community colleges.

Bourque (2016) investigated the impact of faculty development on the personal and professional growth of adjunct faculty at a rural community college. Five adjunct faculty members from a public two-year college participated in semi-structured interviews lasting from 40-60 minutes. The research findings revealed that adjuncts are passionate about teaching, appreciative for the opportunity to be included in faculty development activities, and value faculty development (Bourque, 2016).

Colwell (2011) surveyed part-time faculty and administrators at nine Oklahoma community colleges to determine if the two groups placed the same importance on various supports available to part-time faculty. The study results indicated that academic administrators placed a higher value on each support type overall when compared to the part-time faculty. But, both administrators and part-time faculty gave the highest ratings to the same three support types: orientation, technology support, and access to office supplies (Colwell, 2011).

Bowers (2013) examined adjunct faculty’s perception of professional development and support services at a multi-campus community college. The results of this study indicate that adjunct faculty members perceive that faculty development and support services improve their teaching and are important to their role and success (Bowers, 2013). Adjunct faculty members want professional development opportunities that meet their specific needs relating to effective instructional strategies (Bowers, 2013). But, adjuncts feel that their heterogeneous schedules
should be a consideration when determining when to offer faculty development trainings (Bowers, 2013).

Tomanek (2010) investigated the overall job satisfaction of adjunct faculty members at a community college. This study surveyed 700 adjuncts at one large Midwest community college (Tomanek, 2010). The survey included questions related to adjunct faculty demographics and their attitudes towards institutional support and professional development opportunities (Tomanek, 2010). The results of the study indicated that most adjunct faculty were aware of the supports available to them (Tomanek, 2010). The most frequently used support services included email, office space, and voicemail (Tomanek, 2010). Overall, the majority (77%) of adjunct faculty were satisfied with their jobs (Tomanek, 2010). Further investigation into the 24 variables associated with job satisfaction found that there were only four variables that scored a mean above 3.00 (Tomanek, 2010). These four variables included autonomy and independence, equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction, departmental leadership, and freedom to determine course content (Tomanek, 2010). Conditions with the lowest mean score could theoretically lead to job dissatisfaction (Tomanek, 2010). The four variables with the lowest mean score included benefits, funding for travel, interpersonal relationships, and career advancement (Tomanek, 2010). Working to improve the conditions with lowest mean scores, administrators could potentially increase adjunct faculty overall job satisfaction (Tomanek, 2010).

Bosley (2004) examined the influence of professional development on adjunct faculty’s level of job satisfaction at one Florida community college. The researcher investigated the reasons why adjunct faculty attended professional development activities, the level of job satisfaction of those adjuncts who attended professional development activities, and the effect of
attending professional development activities on teaching ability (Bosley, 2004). Seventy-nine percent of the adjunct faculty reported that they attended professional development for personal or professional growth (Bosley, 2004). While, forty-nine percent reported that they attended because a stipend was offered for attendance (Bosley, 2004). The two most popular reasons for adjunct faculty to attend professional development were personal or professional growth and the opportunity to increase their income (Bosley, 2004). The results of the study indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction levels among adjunct faculty who attended and those who did not attend professional development activities (Bosley, 2004). Most adjunct faculty perceived that their participation in professional development activities improved their teaching performance (Bosley, 2004).

Pedras (1982) investigated the staff development needs of part-time faculty at Clark County Community College in Las Vegas, Nevada. The researcher examined the perceived needs, and optimum desirable conditions for the staff development of part-time faculty, to develop a staff development model for part-time faculty (Pedras, 1982). The survey revealed four main categories for staff development: legal aspects of education, community college mission, classroom management, and instruction development and delivery (Pedras, 1982). The results also indicated that part-time staff prefer to attend on-campus, short-term workshops, offered on the weekends, or during college breaks (Pedras, 1982).

Chapter Summary

A limited number of studies have focused on adjunct faculty perceptions of professional development at community colleges. The research that exists is outdated or generally describes adjunct faculty perceptions of institutional support and professional development and the impact each has on adjunct faculty job satisfaction.
There have been no studies investigating adjunct faculty professional development preferences at a Florida State College. This study investigated the faculty development needs of adjunct faculty at a Florida State College, as well as the factors which influence their participation in faculty development. Specifically, this research examined the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of adjunct faculty, as they relate to faculty development.
CHAPTER 3:

METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 describes the research design and methods used in this study. This chapter includes: population and sample, instrumentation, variables, data collection, and data analysis. The purpose of this study was to examine the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a Florida state college. The researcher expected to identify the barriers and incentives that influence adjunct faculty participation in faculty development. Furthermore, the researcher examined the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of Florida state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development.

Research Questions

This study addressed five research questions:

1. What are the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality) and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college?

2. What are faculty development needs, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

3. What are preferred conditions (times, locations, format, and method of communication) for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

4. What incentives would encourage participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?
5. What barriers hinder participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

**Research Design**

A survey research design was used to explore faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a Florida state college. According to Creswell (2015), survey research provides a quantitative description of trends and attitudes of a population based on the sample data. The purpose of survey research is to allow the researcher to generalize the results of the study from the sample to the population (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). This method was selected because it enabled the researcher to collect data from a large sample of adjuncts at one Florida state college and to generalize the results to the population of adjunct faculty at other state colleges in Florida.

**Population and Sample**

A purposive sampling method was used to identify survey participants. Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling technique in which the researcher identifies the “characteristics of a population of interest and then tries to locate individuals who have those characteristics” (Johnson & Christensen, 2012, p. 231). The population of interest for this study was adjunct faculty members who taught at a multi-campus Florida state college for a minimum of one semester. The sample consisted of 634 adjunct faculty members who taught during fall 2018. To be eligible to participate, adjuncts must have had an active college email account, at the time of the survey. Adjuncts from all academic areas, and all four campuses were included in the sample.
Setting

The site for this research was a large, suburban Florida state college. This college has nearly 30,000 students enrolled annually and employs over 1,600 individuals, including 232 full-time faculty, 563 part-time faculty, 496 full-time non-faculty, 291 part-time non-faculty, and 30 administrators. Formerly a community college, this multi-campus four-year college now offers six bachelor’s degrees, two-year college-credit degrees, career certificates, and adult education. At this institution, faculty development activities and programming are primarily offered via the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. The Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning includes a director, who is a faculty member, and an administrative assistant. A faculty advisory committee assists in the decision-making related to the topics and type of activities to be offered, as well as how and when they will be offered. The director of the center typically communicates with faculty via email, print flyers, and the website.

The Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning offers a broad range of activities and supports for full-time and adjunct faculty. The primary mission of the Faculty Center is promoting and providing faculty development opportunities related to academic disciplines and instructional strategies to improve student learning. Recognizing the diverse needs of the full-time and adjunct faculty, the center provides workshops and training to faculty online, face to face, during the day, and in the evening. Programming offered by the Faculty Center is typically related to teaching and learning, and the diverse student population. Other services provided by the faculty center include book discussions, monthly newsletters, new faculty orientation, an adjunct academy, and full-time and adjunct faculty recognition. Full-time and adjunct faculty are notified of Faculty Center activities and services via college-wide email, newsletters, the Director of the Faculty Center, and CANVAS (the learning management system). The Center
offers a variety of formal and informal incentives to encourage participation in faculty development offerings which may include travel funds, books, technology tools, and certificates.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument that used to collect data for this study was a survey titled, “Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty Survey.” The questions for this survey were compiled from two existing instruments: “Full-time, Professional Academic Advisor Survey” (Sofranko, 2004) and “Staff Development Questionnaire” (Pedras, 1982). Permission to use both instruments was requested by, and granted to, the researcher from the authors of the two existing instruments (see Appendices A and B).

**Sofranko survey.** According to Roberts (2010, p. 151), “[V]alidity is the degree to which your instrument truly measures what it purports to measure.” The “Full-time, Professional Academic Advisor Survey” (Sofranko, 2004) was used to research what motivates academic advisors to participate in professional development activities. This instrument examined the incentives that encourage, and the barriers that hinder, participation in professional development activities (Sofranko, 2004). Two closed-ended questions were taken from this survey instrument. The first question was, “Which of the following incentives encourages your participation in professional development activities?” (Sofranko, 2004, p. 156). The second question was, “Which of the following hinder your participation in professional development activities?” (Sofranko, 2004, p. 158). Lian (2014) used a similar survey question to investigate the factors that motivate adjunct faculty to participate in faculty professional development activities at nine universities in California.

Creswell (2012) states that “to use an existing instrument” a researcher should describe efforts taken by the author to establish validity. Sofranko (2004) conducted a pilot study to
increase the validity of the survey. Before the survey instrument was sent to the pilot study respondents, a panel of experts reviewed the survey questions (Sofranko, 2004). This would be considered an effort to establish content validity. Based on their recommendations, edits were made to the instrument (Sofranko, 2004). The pilot study participants were representative of the target population. Twenty advisors responded to the pilot survey. The survey instrument was revised based on their suggestions (Sofranko, 2004).

**Pedras survey.** The “Staff Development Questionnaire” (Pedras, 1982) was created to provide data to be used to establish a faculty development program for community college adjunct faculty. The survey instrument examined the specific professional development needs for part-time faculty (Pedras, 1982). The first part that will be used is a five-point Likert scale, in which survey participants “were asked to respond regarding their perception as to the need for training” within four major categories: instructional development and delivery, legal aspects of education, mission of the community college, and classroom management (Pedras, 1982). The second part that will be used includes four closed-ended questions designed to solicit perceived best conditions for professional development training (Pedras, 1982). Participants were asked to identify the most desirable locations, times, and formats for staff development activities (Pedras, 1982). Davidson (2015) used two sections from the Pedras (1982) survey instrument to examine the professional development interests and scheduling needs of adjunct faculty in three liberal arts colleges.

In addition to a complete literature review, Pedras (1982) reviewed several questionnaires related to part-time faculty and staff development to develop the “Staff Development Questionnaire.” Pedras (1982) found that most instruments related to staff development had three parts: demographic data, specific professional development needs, and perceived best
conditions for training. This would be considered an effort to establish content validity. The first draft of the survey was submitted to an advisory committee of three administrators, three full-time faculty, and three part-time faculty (Pedras, 1982). After minor revisions were made, a second draft was pilot-tested with a sample of the target population which included two administrators, five full-time faculty, and eight part-time faculty members (Pedras, 1982). A final draft of the survey instrument was prepared based on the recommendations from the second pilot test (Pedras, 1982). This would be considered an effort to establish face validity.

**Study survey.** Two questions from the “Full-time, Professional Academic Advisor Survey” (Sofranko, 2004) survey were compiled with two parts from the “Staff Development Questionnaire” (Pedras, 1982) to create the “Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty Survey.” Two questions were added to better examine the variables for this study. One question was added to capture the number of faculty development activities that each participant had attended. Another question was added to investigate the preferred methods to communicate with adjunct faculty.

The questions and survey instrument were modified in various stages based on feedback from 19 individuals. This was done to establish face validity. Original survey questions and the cover letter were modified based on informal feedback from two Higher Education faculty members, two faculty development professionals, a web developer, and ten peers enrolled in a doctoral capstone course during the spring of 2016. Based on their feedback (see Appendix C), there were a few modifications made to the questions and cover letter. First, a description of faculty development was added to the survey cover letter. Second, three design-related changes were made, resulting in changing the order of three questions. Survey instructions were added to the Qualtrics survey, including: the estimated time to complete the survey and additional
informed consent. Next, examples of faculty development were also added to question ten. Lastly, there were a few wording changes to enhance question clarity.

According to Roberts (2010), you must field test an instrument that has been modified from an existing instrument. Roberts (2010, p. 154) suggests you “select from 5 to 10 people to test the instrument” and give feedback on its validity. The updated survey instrument (see Appendix D) was emailed with a cover letter (see Appendix E) to five adjuncts to obtain their feedback (see Appendix F). Based on the field test survey results there were no changes made to the survey instrument.

The “Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty Survey” (see Appendix G) survey consisted of 17 questions and is divided into 5 sections. Section I included multiple choice questions to collect demographic and background information. It also included one question about the number of faculty development activities that participants had attended during the last two years.

Section II asked participants to identify their professional development needs. For each faculty development topic, adjuncts were asked to indicate their level of need. The goal of this section was to identify the common faculty development needs among adjunct faculty.

Section III asked participants questions about their perceived preferred conditions for faculty development. It also asked participants to identify the preferred methods of communication. These questions helped identify the preferred communication methods, locations, formats, and times for faculty development activities.

Section IV investigated the incentives that would encourage adjunct faculty participation in faculty development opportunities. Participants used Likert scale ratings from “does not encourage” to “significantly encourages” to identify the degree to which each incentive
encourages their participation. The purpose of this question was to identify ways to increase adjunct faculty participation in faculty development, by offering them incentives that are meaningful to them.

Section V examined the barriers that hinder adjunct faculty from participating in faculty development opportunities. Adjuncts used Likert scale ratings from “does not hinder” to “significantly hinders” to indicate the degree to which each barrier hinders their participation in faculty development opportunities. This question helped determine the most common barriers that impact adjuncts’ ability to participate in faculty development.

**Variables**

The dependent variables in this study included:

1. Number of faculty development opportunities in which individuals have participated
2. Faculty development needs
3. Preferred conditions for faculty development
4. Incentives that would encourage participation in faculty development
5. Barriers that hinder participation in faculty development

The independent variables in this study included:

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Number of years at this institution
4. Educator preparation
5. Primary teaching modality
6. Primary campus
According to Creswell (2014, p. 161), research questions must be related to specific questions within the survey instrument “so that a reader can easily determine how the data collection connects to the variables and questions.” As shown in Table 1, each research question was directly aligned with one or more questions on the survey instrument.

**Data Collection**

An online survey was used to collect the data. This collection method is a cost-effective strategy to gather large amounts of data (Nardi, 2013). Online surveys are convenient and automated, for the participant as well as the researcher (Nardi, 2013). The data will be cross-sectional because it will be collected at one point in time (Creswell, 2015). The researcher was granted permission from the Vice President of Academic Affairs to survey adjunct faculty at a Florida state college (see Appendix H). The researcher received Institutional Review Board approval from the University of South Florida prior to collecting the data.

The data was collected during the fall of 2018. The survey was administered via Qualtrics. The Vice President of Academic Affairs sent an email to adjunct faculty explaining the research. The researcher will send an ‘Informed Consent’ email (see Appendix I) that provided each participant with a description of the research procedures, potential benefits and risks, and the measures taken to ensure confidentiality. The content of the Informed Consent was aligned with IRB requirements for informed consent. In addition to the informed consent, the email included a request for participation and a link to the survey. One week after the initial request was emailed, a follow up email was sent to remind individuals who had not completed it to please do so. The second week, another reminder was sent to all participants. A third and final reminder was emailed to all survey participants.
Table 1 Research Question Alignment to Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question:</th>
<th>Question on Survey Instrument:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality) and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college?</td>
<td>1. How long have you been an adjunct faculty member at this institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How long have you been an adjunct faculty member at any institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What is the highest post-secondary degree that you hold?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Please indicate the post-secondary institution(s) that you have attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Please indicate your level of educator preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Please indicate the primary modality in which you teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Please indicate the primary campus from which you work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. What is your age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. What is your gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Please indicate the number of faculty development opportunities in which you have participated during the last two year, Fall 2016-Summer 2018, offered by this institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are the faculty development needs, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?</td>
<td>11. For each topic, please indicate the level of need you have for your own professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the preferred conditions for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college? (times, locations, format, and method of communication)</td>
<td>12. What is the preferred location for faculty development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. When is the preferred time to offer faculty development trainings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. What is the most feasible way to learn new skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. What is the preferred method of communication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What incentives would encourage participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?</td>
<td>16. To what degree do the following incentives encourage your participation in faculty development opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What barriers hinder participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?</td>
<td>17. To what degree do the following barriers hinder your participation in faculty development opportunities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

The data from the research questions was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to examine the data for this study. A frequency distribution was constructed for the demographic data. Measures of
central tendency were also used to report the adjunct faculty development needs, and the incentives and barriers that influence adjunct participation in faculty development activities. To determine the preferred conditions for adjunct faculty development, descriptive statistics were used to identify the means and standard deviations of the times, locations, format, method of communication. A simultaneous multiple regression was used to examine the relationships between adjunct faculty demographics and adjunct participation in faculty development.

**Research Question 1**

What are the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality) and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college?

Descriptive and inferential statistics was used to evaluate this question. A frequency distribution was used to identify the mean age, gender distribution, highest post-secondary degree, educational background, educator preparation, years taught, primary campus, and teaching modality. The frequency distribution was used to represent the demographics of adjunct faculty at a Florida state college.

Multiple regression was used to analyze the relationship between adjunct faculty participation in faculty development by background characteristics. Multiple regression helped the researcher to determine how adjunct faculty participation in faculty development differs based on age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality.

**Research Question 2**

What are faculty development needs, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?
Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data for this question. Measures of central tendency were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for each question. A frequency table was constructed showing the raw score, percentage, mean and standard deviation. The researcher presented the results for each professional development topic listed in Question 11, Part 2 to identify the level of need perceived by respondents for each topic.

**Research Question 3**

What are the preferred conditions (times, locations, format, and method of communication) for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze this question. Measures of central tendency were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for each question. The researcher compared the results for each question and identified the preferred conditions for faculty development as perceived by respondents. The purpose of this analysis was to determine the preferred time, locations, format, and method of communication for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty.

**Research Question 4**

What incentives would encourage participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data for this question. Measures of central tendency were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for each item in the question. A frequency table was constructed showing the raw score, percentage, mean and standard deviation for each item. The researcher presented the results for each incentive listed in
Question 16, Part 4. The goal was to determine the incentives that respondents perceive may encourage adjunct faculty participation in faculty development.

**Research Question 5**

What barriers hinder participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data for this question. Measures of central tendency were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for each item in the question. A frequency table was constructed showing the raw score, percentage, mean and standard deviation for each item. The researcher presented the results for each barrier listed in Question 17, Part 5. The goal was to determine the barriers that respondents perceive may hinder adjunct faculty participation in faculty development.

**Ethical Considerations**

A variety of strategies were used to protect and inform research participants of the procedures and risks associated with this study. Before surveys were emailed, the research study was approved by the University of South Florida Institutional Review Board. The first email sent by the researcher included a description of the purpose of the research and research procedures. The email also ensured the participants that the survey was voluntary and anonymous. The survey included an informed consent statement (see Appendix I) before they began the survey. The survey did not ask participants to provide their names or identification numbers. The data was collected and stored on a server that is password protected. The researcher and an employee of the College’s Institutional Research department were the only people with access to the data. All data was maintained as confidential.
CHAPTER 4:
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a multi-campus Florida State College. This chapter summarizes the data that were collected, outlines the statistical analysis, and reports the findings. The results of the data analysis are organized by the research questions that guided the study:

1. What are the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality) and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college?

2. What are faculty development needs, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

3. What are preferred conditions (times, locations, format, and method of communication) for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

4. What incentives would encourage participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

5. What barriers hinder participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

Sample Summary

The population of interest for this study was adjunct faculty members who taught at a multi-campus Florida State college for a minimum of one semester. To be able to participate,
adjuncts had to have an active college email account. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs sent an introduction email to 634 adjunct faculty members who taught during fall 2018. The researcher followed up with an email describing the upcoming survey and alerting the adjuncts to the fact that the survey would be from a Qualtrics email address. Three reminder emails were sent to adjuncts who had not already completed the survey. The survey was open to participants from November 12, 2018 to January 23, 2019.

The response rate for the survey was 20% (130 participants). Adjuncts from all academic areas, and all four campuses were represented in the sample. Participants were not required to answer every question. As a result, sample sizes vary.

**Research Question 1**

What are the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality) and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college?

**Adjunct Faculty Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 Adjunct Faculty Demographics (N=130)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant demographics are outlined in Table 2. The mean age was 53; more than 80% of the respondents were over the age of 40. The majority of participants were female (58%).

**Educational Background**

Survey participants were asked questions related to their educational background. The majority of adjuncts (76.2%) participating in this survey held a master’s degree, while 20% held a doctorate. Responses indicated that 73% had attended a public college or university, half had attended a private college or university, 40% had attended a community college, and 35% had attended a state college. Table 3 displays the educational background of the participating adjunct faculty.

Table 3 Educational Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Type of Colleges Attended**   |    |         |
| N = 130                         |    |         |
| Community College               | 52 | 40.0    |
| State College                   | 45 | 35.4    |
| Public College/University       | 95 | 73.1    |
| Private College/University      | 66 | 50.8    |

Based on these percentages, it is evident that some participants had attended more than one type of college. The findings associated with the highest degree earned were reflective of the College’s credentialing requirements for adjunct faculty, at the time of this study. The College’s credentialing guidelines require a doctorate or master’s degree in the teaching
discipline or a master’s degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline for faculty to teach general education courses designed for transfer to a baccalaureate degree.

Perceived Preparation for Teaching

Participants were asked to indicate the type of educator preparation they had experienced. Table 4 shows the frequency of self-identified experiences respondents considered as preparation for their adjunct faculty teaching experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educator Preparation (N = 130)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related experience</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-credit teaching and learning courses</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal research and practice</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate of college of education</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-credit instructional design courses</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal educator preparation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Taught (N = 128)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only seven (5.4%) participants stated that they had no formal educator preparation. Nearly three-quarters (73.1%) of the adjuncts cited work-related experiences as one type of their educator preparation. More than 50% of the participants reported taking college-credit teaching
and learning courses, with close to half (47.7%) being graduates of a college of education. The majority (71.6%) of adjuncts had taught for less than eleven years, and almost a quarter (23.9%) had taught for less than four years. The average years taught was 9. These results suggest that the majority of adjuncts are experienced educators with a variety of educator preparation experiences.

**Primary Teaching Location and Modality**

The adjunct faculty were asked to identify the primary campus from which they taught, and their primary teaching modality (on campus only, online and on campus, or online only). Table 5 displays the data related to the primary campus on which the adjuncts taught, and the primary teaching modality they reported using. The data are listed in descending order.

**Table 5 Primary Teaching Location and Modality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Campus (N = 129)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus A</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Modality (N=130)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus only</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online and on campus (includes hybrids)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most (71.0%) respondents cited Campus A as their primary campus, and 9.2% identified Campus D as the primary location from which they taught. More than half (52.3%) of the survey participants taught on campus only, while 13.8% taught online only. These findings are
proportional to the number of students at each of the four College campuses, and primary
teaching modality at each (on campus versus online).

**Number of Faculty Development Opportunities Attended**

Adjunct faculty participants were asked to enter the number of faculty development
opportunities in which they participated at this institution (see Table 6). The majority (28.4%, N
= 37) of the adjuncts reported attending one or two faculty development opportunities, 8.5% (N
= 11) reported never attending a faculty development opportunity, and 19.2% (N = 25) had
attended more than 11. The average number of faculty development opportunities attended by
the study participants was 10.58.

Table 6 Number of Faculty Development Opportunities Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Faculty Development Attended</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intercorrelations between Predictor Variables

#### Table 7 Intercorrelations between Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years Taught</th>
<th>Teaching Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Taught</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Modality</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep COE</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep TL</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep ID</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep Informal</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep Work</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prep None</strong></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n**

130

128

130

128

130

128

130

128

130

128

130

128

130

130

128

130

128

130
Table 7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Prep COE</th>
<th>Prep TL</th>
<th>Prep ID</th>
<th>Prep Informal</th>
<th>Prep Work</th>
<th>Prep None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Taught</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Modality</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep COE</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep TL</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep ID</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep Informal</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep Work</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep None</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 shows the Pearson correlation coefficient and sample size for predictor variables. Before conducting a simultaneous multiple regression to analyze the relationship between adjunct participation in faculty development and background characteristics, the researcher analyzed the bivariate correlations between the independent variables.

A zero-order correlation matrix was created to determine the level of correlation between the five predictor variables (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality), in order to avoid multicollinearity. The intercorrelations among the independent variables are considerably lower than .80. In fact, the highest intercorrelation, among different independent variables is .459, between work related educator preparation (Prep Work) and informal educator preparation (Prep Informal). As a result, multicollinearity is most likely not an issue.

**Relationships between Adjunct Characteristics and Faculty Development Participation**

The researcher conducted a simultaneous multiple regression to analyze the relationship between adjunct participation in faculty development and background characteristics. Table 8 outlines the multiple correlation (R) between the independent and dependent variables, and explanation of the amount of variance in the dependent variable, by the combination of the predictor variables.

Table 8 Multiple Correlation Between Number of Trainings and the Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.371&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>20.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (constant), age, gender, years taught, teaching modality, Prep COE, Prep TL, Prep ID, Prep Informal, Prep Work, Prep None
The purpose of using the multiple regression was to determine how adjunct faculty participation in faculty development differs based on age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality. The dependent variable was the number of faculty development opportunities attended (number of trainings). The independent variables were age, gender, years taught, teaching modality (on campus only, online and on campus, or online only), and level of preparation which included: graduate of a college of education (Prep COE), teaching and learning coursework (Prep TL), instructional design coursework (Prep ID), informal teacher preparation (Prep Informal), work-related teacher preparation (Prep Work), or no teacher preparation (Prep None). All independent variables were entered into the regression model simultaneously. The multiple correlation (R) between number of faculty development trainings attended and the predictor variables is relatively weak (R = .371). The independent variables account for 13.8% (R square = .138) of the variation in number of trainings attended.

Table 9 shows the analysis of variance. The result of the regression analysis not statistically significant $F(10, 115) = 1.84, p > .05$. The large p-value (.061) suggests that the relationship between number of faculty development trainings attended and the independent variables is not significant.

Table 9 Significance of the Relationship between Number of Trainings and Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>7733.472</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>773.347</td>
<td>1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>48335.457</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>420.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56068.929</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (constant), age, gender, years taught, teaching modality, Prep COE, Prep TL, Prep ID, Prep Informal, Prep Work, Prep None
Table 10 shows the regression weight (Beta), t test, and significance results for each predictor variable.

Table 10 Regression Weights of Each Predictor Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-32.364</td>
<td>24.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Taught</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Modality</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>2.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep COE</td>
<td>-.889</td>
<td>3.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep TL</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>4.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep ID</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>4.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep Informal</td>
<td>-1.384</td>
<td>4.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep Work</td>
<td>5.606</td>
<td>5.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep None</td>
<td>10.623</td>
<td>8.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age was the only predictor that had a significant standardized regression weight, indicating that age is positively associated with number of trainings attended (i.e., as one becomes a year older, one is likely to attend .478 more workshops/trainings). The association is statistically significant (Beta = .313, t = 3.385, p = .001).
Research Question 2

What are faculty development needs, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college? In part 2 of the survey, study participants were asked to identify their professional development needs. Table 11 lists the topics provided on the survey.

Table 11 Faculty Development Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Low Need</th>
<th>No need</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Need</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Retention</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Online</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Mission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each faculty development topic, adjuncts were asked to indicate their level of need by responding with one of the following statements: high need, moderate need, no opinion, low need, or no need. Instructional technology faculty development was identified as the greatest need among participants (N=130), with 82 (63%) participants labeling it as a high need (N=22) or moderate need (N=60). Fifty-five percent of the adjunct faculty (N=129) indicated a high need (N=18) or moderate need (N=53) for faculty development related to student engagement. Overall faculty development need (52% with N=129) and instructional strategies (48% with N=130) were also identified as high-need topics. The lowest faculty development need was related to copyright (2%), with only 3 adjuncts (N=129) identifying it as a high need. College mission (2% with N=129) and classroom management (3% with N=130) were also identified as being low need topics. With nearly one-half (48%; N = 62) of the adjunct faculty identifying as teaching online or a combination of online and campus, it would make sense that their greatest faculty development need is related to instructional technology.

**Research Question 3**

What are the preferred conditions (times, locations, format, and method of communication) for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college? For part 3 of the survey, respondents were asked to identify their preferred conditions for faculty development trainings. The preferred conditions included preferred times, locations, format, and method of communication for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty.

**Preferred Time for Faculty Development**

Table 12 displays the preferred time for faculty in descending order, most popular time to least popular time. There were four choices related to preferred time: summers, weekends,
Table 12 Preferred Time for Faculty Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday evenings</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

weekdays, and weekday evenings. Respondents were allowed to select all that applied. Nearly 45% of the participants (N = 58) chose weekday evenings, with weekdays being the least popular (35% with N = 45). There was little (10%) variation between the four choices. As a result, faculty developers should consider varying the times of faculty development opportunities to accommodate the disparate needs of adjunct faculty.

**Preferred Location for Faculty Development**

The study participants had two choices to identify their preferred location for faculty development: on campus or online. Table 13 shows the preferred locations.

Table 13 Preferred Location for Faculty Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Half of the adjuncts (50%) preferred on campus faculty development trainings, while the other half of the adjuncts (49%) preferred online faculty development trainings. There was no consensus on preferred location; participants’ responses were split almost equally.

**Preferred Format for Faculty Development**

Participants were asked to choose the most feasible way to learn new skills. The three choices were one to two hour workshops, self-paced materials, and online training. Participants could choose all that apply. Table 14 lists the preferred format for faculty development in descending order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One to two hour workshops</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online training</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-paced instructional materials</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there was little variation (less than 10%) between the three choices, one to two-hour workshops was the most popular format (66% with N = 86), and self-paced instructional materials was the least popular format (57% with N = 74). Since the adjuncts have such different needs, it would be beneficial to offer faculty trainings in a variety of formats.

**Preferred Method of Communication for Faculty Development**

The adjunct faculty were asked to choose their preferred method of communication. Table 15 outlines the preferred method of communication in descending order of popularity.
Table 15 Preferred Method of Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College-wide email</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANVAS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Center</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the seven possible choices, an overwhelming 92% (N = 120) of adjuncts chose college-wide email as their preferred method of communication. The second (42% with N = 55) most popular method of communication was CANVAS, the College’s learning management system. The least popular method of communication (13% with N= 17) was publication (publication via flyer and/or newsletter). The best method to communicate with adjunct faculty is college-wide.

**Research Question 4**

What incentives would encourage participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

In part 4 of the survey, adjuncts were asked to identify incentives that encourage their participation in faculty development. The participants were given a list of eleven incentives and were asked to choose from the following statements for each of those incentives: significantly encourages, moderately encourages, no opinion, mildly encourages, or does not encourage.
Table 16 displays the incentives that encourage participation in faculty development with the most popular incentive at the top of the table, and the least popular incentive at the bottom of the table.

Table 16 Incentives that Encourage Participation in Faculty Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significant Encourage</th>
<th>Moderate Encourage</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Mildly Encourages</th>
<th>Does Not Encourage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-long learning</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist students</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career opportunities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor encouragement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants (N = 66) identified professional growth M = 4.22 as the incentive that most encourages their participation in faculty development, followed by life-long learning M = 3.85 (N = 47) and self-esteem 3.83 (N = 45). The incentives least likely to encourage adjunct faculty participation in faculty development were supervisor encouragement.
M = 2.69 (N = 16) and personal growth M = 2.47 (N = 9). Professional growth is the incentive that encourages the majority of adjunct faculty to participate in faculty development opportunities.

**Research Question 5**

What barriers hinder participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

For part 5 of the survey, study participants were asked to identify barriers that hinder their participation in faculty development. Respondents were given a list of eleven barriers and were asked to choose from the following statements for each of those barriers: significantly hinders, moderately hinders, no opinion, mildly hinders, or does not hinder. Table 17 lists the barriers that were most likely to hinder adjunct participation in faculty development in descending order.

Time M = 3.48 (N = 42) was the barrier that most significantly hindered adjunct participation in faculty development. Full-time job M = 2.97 (N = 40) and lack of monetary incentive M = 2.95 (N = 29) were the other two barriers that significantly hindered their participation in faculty development. Lack of encouragement M = 1.94 (N = 7) and not part of evaluation M = 1.92 (N = 6) were least likely to hinder their participation in faculty development. Time is the barrier that most hinders adjunct participation in faculty development.

**Chapter Summary**

Chapter 4 presented the data collected via an online survey addressing the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a Florida state college. The results of the data
Table 17 Barriers that Hinder Participation in Faculty Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significantly Hinders</th>
<th>Moderately Hinders</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Mildly Hinders</th>
<th>Does Not Hinder</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time job</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of monetary incentive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninteresting topics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of career opportunities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of offerings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of prestige</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of encouragement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not part of evaluation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis were outlined, in both table and narrative format, according to each research question. Although the number of respondents was modest (N = 130, 20%), this study adds to the literature related to faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty. Chapter 5 discusses the findings, outlines the implications and limitations of the study, and proposes areas for further research.
CHAPTER 5:
CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a multi-campus Florida state college. A survey research design was used to explore faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty who had taught for a minimum of one semester. An online survey was used to collect the data via Qualtrics. Adjuncts who taught in fall 2018 from all academic areas and all four campuses were included in the sample (n=634). The response rate for this survey was 20% (130 participants.) A frequency distribution was used to identify the mean age, gender distribution, highest post-secondary degree, educational background, educator preparation, years taught, primary campus, and teaching modality. Multiple regression was used to analyze the relationship between adjunct faculty participation in faculty development and background characteristics. Measures of central tendency were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation to identify faculty development needs, preferred conditions for faculty development, incentives that may encourage participation, and barriers that may hinder participation in faculty development opportunities, as perceived by respondents.

This chapter provides a discussion of the key findings associated with each research question in relation to prior research, outlines implications for practice and limitations of the research. The chapter concludes with suggestions for further research and general conclusions.

Discussion of Findings

Findings of the study are discussed in relation to each of the five research questions.
Research Question 1

What are the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics (age, gender, educator preparation, years taught, and teaching modality) and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college?

The first part of the survey asked participants to provide demographic information. Results from the survey showed the average age of the adjunct faculty at the Florida state college was 53. Slightly more than half of the adjunct faculty (54.5%) were over the age of 50. The findings of this research are consistent with previous research. The American Federation of Teachers (2010), for example, found that nearly half (46%) of the part-time faculty are under the age 50.

More than half (58%) of the participants identified their gender as female. According to the American Federation of Teachers (2010), 54% of the adjunct faculty members at two-year colleges are female. While there is a 4% difference, the findings of this study were fairly consistent with previous research.

The participants were asked to identify their highest post-secondary degree. Over 75% (76.2%) of the adjunct faculty possessed a master’s degree. These findings are somewhat consistent (5% difference) with research by the Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014) which reported the majority (81%) of part-time faculty have a master’s degree. Twenty percent (20.8%) of the adjunct faculty at the Florida state college had a doctorate degree. This is slightly higher (7%) than the national average of 14% (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014).

Study participants were asked to indicate the types of post-secondary institutions they had attended. The institutions listed as choices were community college (not a state college), state
college, public college or university, or private college or university. Nearly three-quarters (73.1%) of the participants had attended a public college or university. More than half (50.8%) had attended a private college or university. More than three-quarters (75.4%) of the adjunct faculty attended a community college or a state college. It has been the researcher’s experience that individuals who teach at the state college have often attended more than one type of post-secondary education. It is interesting that a large percentage of the survey participants have attended and are now teaching in a community or state college.

The adjunct faculty were asked to identify the types of educator preparation in which they had participated. Work-related experience (i.e., on-the-job training) was the most common (73.1%) type of educator preparation cited by adjunct faculty at the Florida state college, while only 5.4% stated they had no formal educator preparation. Close to half (47.7%) of the study participants were graduates of a college of education. Based on the researcher’s experiences, many adjunct faculty tend to be in-service or retired public school teachers. Many public school teachers are graduates of a college of education.

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had been an adjunct at any institution. The average years taught at any institution is nine, with the majority of adjunct faculty (71.6%) stating they had been an adjunct for less than eleven years. More than a third (37.7%) of the respondents had less than five years at any institution. This finding is consistent with previous research. According to the Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014), thirty-seven percent of part-time faculty have fewer than five years teaching experience.

Research participants were asked to identify the primary campus from which they taught, and their primary teaching modality (on campus only, online and on campus, or online only). The majority (71%) of respondents identified Campus A as their primary campus, followed by
Campus B (23%), Campus C (12%), and Campus D (9.2%). These findings are reflective of the percentage of students enrolled at each campus. The majority (46%) of the students were enrolled at Campus A, followed by Campus B (23%), Campus C (17%), and 5% at Campus D. Based on student enrollment, it is expected that the majority of adjunct faculty would be needed at Campus A.

When asked to identify their primary teaching modality, the majority (52.3%) of respondents chose “on campus only,” followed by “online and on campus (33.8%),” and the least (13.8%) chose “online only.” The researcher has observed that it is more common for full-time faculty to be assigned online courses than adjunct faculty. As a result, it is not surprising that respondents identified primary teaching modality as on campus only.

As part the first research question, survey participants were asked to “indicate the number of faculty development opportunities in which they had participated at this institution.” The responses ranged from zero to one hundred faculty development opportunities attended. The majority (28.4%) of the respondents reported attending one or two faculty development trainings while 8.5% reported never attending a faculty development opportunity, and 19.2% had attended more than eleven. The average faculty development opportunities attended was 10.58. These findings are not surprising because adjunct faculty have identified time as a barrier that hinders their participation in faculty development. Furthermore, many adjunct faculty work a full-time job in addition to their adjunct teaching.

To analyze the relationship between adjunct faculty participation in faculty development and background characteristics, the researcher conducted a simultaneous multiple regression. The correlation between number of faculty development trainings attended and the predictor variables was relatively weak (R = .371). The independent variables account for 13.8% (R
square = .138) of the variation in number of trainings attended. The regression equation was not statistically significant F (10, 115) = 1.84, p > .05. The large p-value (.061) suggests that the relationship between number of faculty development trainings attended and the independent variables is not significant.

Age was the only predictor that had a significant standardized regression weight. Age is positively associated with number of trainings attended. This association is statistically significant (Beta = .313, t = 3.385, p = .001). Age is significantly associated with number of faculty development trainings attended. The other variables in the model do not appear to be significantly associated with number of trainings attended.

**Research Question 2**

What are faculty development needs, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

In the second section of the survey, adjunct faculty were asked to identify their professional development needs. For each faculty development topic, adjuncts were asked to indicate their level of need by responding with one of the following statements: high need, moderate need, no opinion, low need, or no need. Instructional technology was the topic identified as the greatest need among participants (63%). Since nearly one-half (48%) of the adjunct faculty identified as teaching online or a combination of online and campus, it would make sense that the greatest faculty development need was related to instructional technology.

This finding is consistent with Sorcinelli’s (2007) research on faculty development. According to Sorcinelli (2007), one of the greatest challenges facing higher education is the integration of technology. Students expect their instructors to use technology, not only to enrich learning, but also to facilitate interaction among students and keep up-to-date on course
assignments and due dates. These findings suggest adjunct faculty recognize that faculty
development related to instructional technology may help them better serve their students.

Faculty development related to student engagement (55%), overall faculty development
(52%), and instructional strategies (48%) were also identified as high-need topics. These results
were reflective of the challenges associated with the changing student body (Sorcinelli, 2007).
Each year, the student body has become more diverse “across several variables – educational
background, gender, race and ethnicity, class, age, and preparation” (Sorcinelli, 2007, p. 5).
According to Burnstad and Hoss (2010), students come to class with a variety of characteristics,
skill levels, motivations, and goals. In order to increase student engagement and improve student
learning, adjunct faculty must learn about the characteristics of their students and increase their
repertoire of teaching strategies (Sorcinelli, 2007). Faculty development programs provide
adjunct faculty opportunities to learn innovative approaches to teaching and learning (Sorcinelli,
2007). The findings show that adjunct faculty recognize faculty development as a means to learn
new approaches to teaching, in an effort to engage and meet the needs of all their students
(Murray, 2002).

The lowest faculty development need was related to copyright (2%), with only 3
respondents (N=129) identifying it as a high need. It has been the researcher’s observation that
copyright is a topic that is commonly taught to students. While the library offers resources
related to copyright, it is not a topic generally presented to faculty. As a result, adjunct faculty
may not recognize the importance of knowing copyright laws. This finding may also suggest
that adjunct faculty are comfortable with their knowledge related to copyright, and/or, they
perceive other topics as more important.
Only 2% of the respondents identified college mission as a high need topic. This finding is not surprising, since 75.4% of the adjunct faculty reported having attended a community college or a state college. This comparison suggests that adjunct faculty who had attended a community college or state college may have felt confident in their understanding of the college mission.

Classroom management (3%) was also identified as a low need topic. This finding is consistent with the small percentage (5.4%) of respondents who indicated they had no formal educator preparation. An overwhelming majority of the adjunct faculty had a variety of educator preparation experiences: 73.1% of the respondents had work-related educator preparation, more than 50% had college-credit teaching and learning courses, and close to half (47.7%) were graduates of a college of education. Classroom management is a common topic within educator preparation courses. Therefore, it would be expected that a large population of adjunct faculty have completed coursework related to classroom management. However, educator preparation programs are typically preparing individuals to teach the K-12 population, not adult learners.

**Research Question 3**

What are the preferred conditions (times, locations, format, and method of communication) for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

Part 3 of the survey asked participants to identify their preferred conditions for faculty development trainings. The preferred conditions listed were preferred time, locations, format, and method of communication for faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty.

**Preferred time for faculty development.** The four choices related to preferred time were summers, weekends, weekdays, and weekday evenings. The majority (45%) of
respondents chose weekday evenings. The least (35%) popular time was weekdays. According to the American Federation of Teachers (2010), the majority of (66%) of adjunct faculty have two or more jobs. In fact, Lyons and Burnstad (2007) found that most adjunct faculty were employed full-time outside of teaching. This comparison suggests that the least popular time to offer faculty development opportunities is during the weekdays as adjunct faculty may be working at another job during that time. Therefore, the most popular time to offer faculty development is weekday evenings, after adjunct faculty are finished with their full-time job or other responsibilities for the day.

There was little (10%) variation among the four preferred times. Since the percentages are closely related, there is no best time to offer faculty development trainings to ensure the greatest attendance. This finding reveals the disparate needs among adjunct faculty. The findings are consistent with research by both Tarr (2010) and Bowers (2013). Tarr (2010) recommended that faculty developers should consider the unique needs of adjunct faculty members when designing their programs and supports. Bowers (2013) indicated that adjunct faculty felt their heterogeneous schedule should be a consideration when determining the best time to offer faculty development opportunities.

**Preferred location for faculty development.** Respondents had two choices to identify their preferred location for faculty development: on campus or online. Half (50%) preferred on campus faculty development, while the other half (49%) preferred online faculty development opportunities. There is no consensus on the best location for faculty development opportunities among adjunct faculty members responding to the survey. These findings are consistent with research by both Tomanek (2010) and Davidson (2015). According to Tomanek (2010, p. 90), “adjunct faculty are a very complex group of educators” with distinct needs. Davidson’s (2015)
research emphasized the need to separate the adjunct population according to an adjunct typology framework, similar to Gappa and Leslie (1993). This indicates that choosing one location over the other to offer faculty for development opportunities could be a barrier for nearly half of the college’s adjunct faculty.

This finding could also be a reflection of the percentage of adjunct faculty who taught on campus only (52.3%) versus the percentage (47.6%) who teach “online only” and “online and campus.” As a result, perhaps the percentage of adjunct faculty that taught on campus (52.3%) preferred to attend faculty development training on campus (50%). Conversely, the percentage of adjunct faculty that taught “online only” and “online and campus” (47.6%) preferred faculty development delivered online (49%).

**Preferred format for faculty development.** Participants were asked to choose the most feasible way to learn new skills. The three choices were: one to two hour workshops, self-paced materials, and online training. Participants could choose all that apply. The most feasible format was one to two hours workshops (66.2%), followed by online training (61.5%), and self-paced instructional materials (56.9%). While the variation between the most-popular and least-popular format was less than 10%, if faculty development opportunities are delivered using only one format, a large population of the adjunct faculty may not be able to participate. As a result, it would be beneficial to offer faculty development trainings across all three formats.

**Preferred method of communication for faculty development.** Survey participants were asked to choose their preferred method of communication. The choices were college-wide email, CANVAS, supervisor, colleague, faculty center director, website, and publication. An overwhelming majority (92%) of respondents chose college-wide email as their preferred method of communication, with CANVAS being the second most popular (42%).
findings may be indicative of the time that adjunct faculty spend on campus outside of teaching. According to Jaegar and Eagan (2009), adjunct faculty tend to be more transient than full-time faculty. Equally important to mention is the fact that most institutions do not have the same office hours expectations for part-time faculty. These circumstances could hinder adjunct faculty interaction with colleagues, supervisors, and the faculty center director. As a result, the most reliable method of communication would be via college email.

**Research Question 4**

What incentives would encourage participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

The fourth part of the survey asked respondents to identify incentives that encourage their participation in faculty development. The participants were given a list of eleven incentives and were asked to choose from the following statements for each incentive: significantly encourages, moderately encourages, no opinion, mildly encourages, or does not encourage participation in faculty development. Most participants (86.2%) chose professional growth as the incentive that significantly or moderately encourages their participation in faculty development. When compared with previous research, the results are somewhat consistent. Bosley (2004) found that the majority (79%) of the adjunct faculty reported that they attended professional development for personal and professional growth (one choice on the Bosley survey). In this study professional and personal growth were two different choices, and survey results in this study indicated personal growth as an incentive was least likely (6.9%) to encourage adjunct participation in faculty development opportunities.

This study found life-long learning to be the second most popular incentive (73.1%) to encourage participation in faculty development. This finding is inconsistent with previous
According to Bosley (2004), the second most popular reason for adjunct faculty to attend professional development was the opportunity to increase their income. In contrast, this study found that monetary incentives ranked seventh out of the ten possible incentives that encourage adjunct faculty participation in faculty development. These results are not surprising. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2014) found part-time faculty often contribute personal time and resources, beyond what is required by the institution, because they feel it is their duty to assist their students. Therefore, they are more likely to attend a faculty development opportunity to learn and better themselves, in an effort to better serve their students.

**Research Question 5**

What barriers hinder participation in faculty development, as perceived by adjunct faculty at a Florida state college?

The final part of the survey asked respondents to identify barriers that hinder their participation in faculty development. Respondents were given a list of eleven barriers and were asked to choose from the following statements for each: significantly hinders, moderately hinders, no opinion, mildly hinders, or does not hinder. Most respondents identified time as the barrier that significantly or moderately (62.3%) hindered their participation in faculty development, followed by full-time job (46.2%). These findings are consistent with other research. Lyons and Burnstad (2007) found that most adjunct faculty work full-time, outside of teaching, and 66% have two or more jobs (American Federation of Teachers, 2010).

Lack of monetary incentive was another barrier that respondents identified as significantly or moderately hindering (46.1% combined) their participation in faculty development. This finding is inconsistent with research by the American Federation of Teachers (2010). According to the American Federation of Teachers (2010), 57% of part-time faculty are
motivated by their commitment to the teaching profession, and not the money, while 26% teach primarily because of the income. However, the findings of this study are consistent with research by Bosley (2010) who found that stipends were the second most popular incentive that encourages adjunct faculty development participation. Of particular interest to the researcher is the fact that monetary incentive was a very low encouragement in question four but was a very high hindrance in question five.

**Implications for Adjunct Faculty Development**

Adjunct faculty account for nearly 70% of the instructional workforce at community colleges (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). Previous studies have examined topics related to adjunct faculty at four-year universities, including adjunct faculty characteristics, job satisfaction, and the challenges they face. Few studies have investigated adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence participation in faculty development at community colleges. There have been no studies, to the knowledge of the researcher, examining adjunct faculty development preferences at a Florida state college. This study addressed the gap in the literature related to the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of Florida state college adjunct faculty. The findings from this study can be used to strengthen faculty development programs, inform decision makers, and benefit adjunct faculty members and students.

**Faculty Development Programs**

The research findings indicate that examining adjunct faculty development needs, and the factors that influence their participation in faculty development, could strengthen faculty development programs and increase adjunct faculty participation. First, it is important to recognize that the needs of adjunct faculty differ from those of full-time faculty members (Tarr, 2010). Perhaps more importantly, adjunct faculty should not be viewed as a homogeneous group
with the same needs (Davidson, 2015). It is important for faculty developers to consider the unique needs of adjunct faculty members when planning faculty development opportunities. If their differences are not taken into consideration when planning programs, various adjunct populations may be excluded (Davidson, 2015).

Asking adjunct faculty to complete a comprehensive needs assessment is one method to gain a better understanding of their needs (Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006). A needs assessment survey might include the times they are available to attend face-to-face workshops, and whether they prefer online or on-campus workshops. Additionally, adjunct faculty could be asked to indicate faculty development topics that might benefit them. This survey could also be used to gather demographic information to further assist in program planning. Faculty developers could then customize faculty development programming based on adjunct faculty responses. Faculty development topics, locations, and times would be scheduled based on the results of the survey. Recognizing that new adjunct faculty are hired every semester, it would be essential to distribute the needs assessment survey, developed for this study, to adjunct faculty every year.

Ultimately, survey respondents placed a high value on topics related to instructional technology, student engagement, and instructional strategies. Including topics perceived as important to adjunct faculty, demonstrates their opinions are valued, which may strengthen their commitment to the students and institution.

Respondents indicated weekday evenings was the preferred time for faculty development, one to two hours workshops was the most feasible format, and college-wide email was their preferred method of communication for faculty development. There was no consensus on the preferred location, online or campus. Based on the findings of this research, it would be most
beneficial to offer faculty development trainings at different times, both online and on campus, via different formats.

**Decision Makers**

Research related to the characteristics and needs of adjunct faculty assists College administrators with budget and policy decisions (Tomanek, 2010). When college leaders understand and recognize the perspectives and needs of adjunct faculty, they are more likely to invest in and embrace adjunct faculty by committing institutional resources to ensure they are recognized as valuable members of the college community (Green, 2007). It is necessary to collect and review data on adjunct faculty needs and perspectives annually to determine what efforts are working and what changes need to be implemented (Tomanek, 2010). When institutional leaders track and review yearly data on adjunct faculty, they are more likely to further deepen the college’s commitment to the support and development of adjunct faculty (Tomanek, 2010). Supporting and engaging part-time faculty improves student learning and success (Green, 2007). This results of this research can be used to inform college administrators in the development and implementation of college-wide practices to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Results from this research could also be used to educate decision and policy makers at the federal and state level (Tomanek, 2010) on state college issues. Since more than half (58%) of U.S. community college courses are taught by part-time faculty, it is important to keep policy makers informed on the characteristics of state college adjunct faculty and the challenges they face (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). College leaders could provide policy makers with annual reports on adjunct demographics, perspectives, and needs. Since federal and state funding is one of the main revenue sources for state colleges in Florida, it is
important for our constituents to understand some issues that state colleges face. These reports would inform and guide state and federal leaders when making decisions related to state college funding and resource allocations.

**Adjunct Faculty and Students**

Research related to adjunct development needs and preferences benefits adjunct faculty members and students. Participation in faculty development enhances teaching abilities and institutional knowledge. Faculty development engages and supports adjunct faculty, which also improves student learning and success (Jaeger & Eagan, 2010). Results from this study highlighted development interests and scheduling preferences of the adjunct faculty who responded to the survey. Such information can help faculty developers create convenient and relevant faculty development programs that meet the needs of adjunct faculty. When workshops and trainings are offered at times convenient to adjunct faculty, participation among adjunct faculty is likely to increase.

Increased participation in faculty development not only enhances adjunct teaching effectiveness, it also increases their sense of belonging and connection to the institution (Dolan, 2011). Workshops provide adjunct faculty the opportunity to socialize with their peers and other staff members (Wallin, 2004). Dolan (2011) found that increased socialization with peers provides an opportunity to learn from each other and improve their teaching skills, thus positively impacting student learning and success. Eagan’s (2010) findings suggest that networking with peers enhances adjunct and student engagement.

By using the survey developed for this study, institutions may collect data on adjunct faculty development needs and preferences that can help faculty developers customize faculty development programming (Jaeger & Eagan, 2010). Including adjunct faculty voices in faculty
development planning, not only increases faculty development participation and ensures their needs are being met, but it also makes them feel valued (Green, 2007). Adjunct faculty want to be recognized as valuable members of the academic community (Green, 2007). They possess skills and experiences that benefit the students, the institution at which they teach, and the academic community as a whole. Recognizing adjunct faculty as sources of valuable knowledge increases their sense of belonging and dedication to the students and the institution (Wallin, 2004).

**Limitations**

The purpose of this study was to explore adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influenced participation in faculty development at a multi-campus Florida state college. There are several potential limitations to this study.

1. This research is limited to adjunct faculty teaching at one Florida state college in the fall of 2018. Each semester, adjunct faculty are hired or rehired based on the needs of the department. Some adjunct faculty may not teach during the fall, but they may teach during the spring and summer. This research may not capture the needs and preferences of adjunct faculty that only teach during the spring or summer.

2. This study is limited to adjunct faculty who agreed to complete this survey online. Some adjunct faculty may not have checked their college email, and therefore were unaware of the survey. Since the survey was distributed online, participants were unable to ask questions related to the survey, which might have influenced their ability to complete the survey.

3. The sample for this research study was adjunct faculty members who taught at a large (roughly 30,000 students enrolled annually), suburban Florida state college. Results of
this study may not be generalizable to populations of adjunct faculty at different institutions types (liberal arts colleges, private colleges, research universities, and community colleges).

4. The population for this study was adjunct faculty members who taught at a state college in Florida. Findings of this study may not represent the perceptions of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions outside Florida.

5. The survey did not ask open-ended questions and collected no qualitative data. Respondents were not given the opportunity to make comments.

6. The survey was distributed on November 12, 2018 and closed on January 23, 2019. This timeframe consisted of two major, college-observed holidays. Many adjunct faculty likely did not check their college email during the holidays. Therefore, the dates of the survey may have limited the number of survey responses.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The intent of this research was to explore the relationships between adjunct faculty characteristics and participation in faculty development at a Florida state college. This study also examined adjunct faculty development needs and preferred conditions to learn new skills, as perceived by adjunct faculty. This study also investigated the incentives that encouraged, as well as the barriers that hindered, participation in faculty development. Based on the findings of this exploratory study, there are some suggestions for future research:

1. This study used an online survey to collect quantitative data related to adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence their participation in faculty development opportunities. The survey did not include open-ended questions. Respondents were not given the opportunity to elaborate on their responses. It is recommended that a
qualitative study could expand this research to gain a deeper understanding of the factors that influence adjunct participation in faculty development.

2. It is recommended that this research be expanded to include multiple Florida state colleges. Extending this research to more than one state college in Florida would help the generalizability of the results.

3. This study should be replicated in other states. This study only investigated perceptions of adjunct faculty in the state of Florida. It would be useful to research adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence faculty development in other states.

4. It is recommended that this study be expanded to include the perceptions of faculty developers. It would be useful to understand how faculty developers choose programming, scheduling, and format for faculty development opportunities, and what perceptions about adjunct faculty the developers use to make those choices. It would be valuable to ask how faculty developers are communicating support and services to adjunct faculty and to ask adjunct faculty how information is communicated to them. Further research could compare faculty developer perceptions with the perceptions of adjunct faculty members, related to the faculty development opportunities that are offered and when they are offered.

5. Further research should include the collection of data on the perceived effectiveness of each faculty development activity. Guskey (2000) and Killion (2018), for example, provide practical guidelines for assessing participant reactions, learning, use of new knowledge and skills, learning outcomes, and perceptions of organization supports. Faculty developers or faculty development centers could collect these data. Participants could be asked to sign in if it is an on-campus workshop. Online participation could be
It would be useful to include an evaluation at the end of every faculty development opportunity offered. Data could be compiled and tracked by the college’s institutional research department.

6. It is recommended that the survey be expanded to include more demographic characteristics and to analyze their relationships with the number of faculty development trainings in which adjunct faculty participated. State colleges offer a variety of degrees and certifications. It would be beneficial to ask adjunct faculty to identify the program in which they teach. Perhaps asking them to identify with one of the adjunct typologies would also offer a deeper understanding of their faculty development participation habits. Another demographic characteristic of interest would be whether the adjunct is employed in another capacity at the institution in which they adjunct. There are a number of college employees who are employed by the college, outside of being faculty, who are hired as adjunct faculty for a variety of programs. It would also be interesting to ask if adjunct faculty are also teaching at another state college or university as adjunct faculty sometimes work concurrently for more than one institution.

**Conclusion**

This study revealed that adjunct faculty members are a diverse faculty population with unique needs. Findings from this study highlighted faculty development interests and needs of part-time faculty.

This study addressed the gap in the literature related to scheduling, format, and communications preferences of Florida state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development. The findings of this study may be useful for faculty developers to consider to customize faculty development programming to meet the needs of adjunct faculty. Offering
adjunct faculty professional development opportunities that are well communicated and convenient, and that eliminate participation barriers and provide relevant participation incentives, may increase participation. Information related to the characteristics and needs of adjunct faculty may help college leaders and policy makers with decision-making and allocation of resources. Research related to adjunct faculty development needs and preferences may also benefit adjunct faculty and students. Faculty development offers adjunct faculty opportunities to enhance their teaching effectiveness (Tarr, 2010). Offering workshops at times and locations most convenient to adjunct faculty is likely to increase their participation. Participation in faculty development enhances the professional growth of educators (Tarr, 2010).

Part-time and full-time faculty members are held equally accountable for student retention and completion rates (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). Faculty development is often used as a means to improve student learning and success (Jaeger & Eagan, 2010). Yet, according to the Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014), adjunct participation in faculty development is considerably lower than their full-time counterparts. Research that examines adjunct faculty development needs and preferences can inform faculty development programs and possibly increase adjunct faculty participation. For colleges whose goals include improving instruction among all faculty groups as a means to increase student learning and success, those colleges must invest in, and embrace, adjunct faculty members. A college that institutionalizes the yearly collection of data about their adjunct faculty, and employs that data for the betterment of faculty development programs, demonstrates its commitment to not only enhance the lives and educational success of its students, but also the lives and professional success of the adjunct faculty members.
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Appendix A: Permission to Use Survey: Sofranko

Ashley Navarro
615 Main Drive, White Springs, FL 32096 | 407-231-6556 | navarram2005@gmail.com

February 2, 2018

Dr. Karen B. Sofranko
Academic Advisor/Manager
Penn State Harrisburg
71 University Drive
Harrisburg, PA 17205

Dear Dr. Karen B. Sofranko,

My name is Ashley Navarro, and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of South Florida. I am pursuing my PhD in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in Higher Education Administration. For my dissertation, I am investigating the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a state college. I am particularly interested in examining the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development. Furthermore, I want to research the incentives that encourage, and the barriers that hinder, their participation in faculty development.

I read your dissertation on Factors Motivating Full-time, Non-faculty Professional Academic Advisors to Participate in Professional Development Activities. I think that some of your survey questions, or a modified version of them, would be useful to inform my research. I am writing to request your permission to use some of your survey questions, or a modified version of them, in my survey instrument. I will cite your research within my methods chapter as part of my references. If you agree to allowing me to use some of your survey questions, or a modified version of them, please respond to this email request.

Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Ashley Navarro
Doctoral Candidate
University of South Florida

Request to Use Survey Instrument

KAREN B SOFRANKO <kbs11@psu.edu>

To: Ashley Navarro <navarram2005@gmail.com>

Fri, Feb 23, 2018 at 4:25 PM

Hello Ashley,

Thank you for reaching out to me. It sounds like my instrument will be very helpful to you in your survey. I am happy to have you use it or modify it as you need.

Good luck in your research! I will be interested to read your results.

Take care,
Karen

From: "Ashley Navarro" <navarram2005@gmail.com>
To: "KAREN B SOFRANKO" <kbs11@psu.edu>
Cc: "Ashley Navarro" <navarram2005@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2018 10:42:01 AM
Subject: Request to Use Survey Instrument
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Request to Use Survey Instrument

Ashley Navarro

March 30, 2010

De Velasquez, Pedras

As a doctoral candidate at the University of South Florida, I am pursuing my Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in Higher Education Administration. My dissertation involves investigating the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a small college. I am particularly interested in examining the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of college faculty, related to faculty development. Furthermore, I want to research faculty retention and the barriers that hinder faculty participation in faculty development.

I used your dissertation on The Conceptualization and Development of a Staff Development Model for Community College Part-Time Faculty. I thought that some of your survey questions, or a modified version of them, would be useful in my research. I am writing to request your permission to use some of your survey questions, or a modified version of them, in my survey instrument. I will cite your research within my methods chapter and as part of my references. If you agree to allowing me to use some of your survey questions, or a modified version of them, please respond to this email.

Sincerely,

Ashley Navarro

Request to Use Survey Instrument

Pedras, Melvin (mpedras@uah.edu) <mpedras@uah.edu>

To: Ashley Navarro <anavarro2@usf.edu>

Ms. Navarro:

Thank you for inquiring and it was a pleasure to talk with you on the phone yesterday. You are most welcome to use any of my dissertation information including survey questions helpful to your research. If I can be further assistance please email or call.

Best regards,

Melvin Pedras

Melvin J. Pedras, Ed.D.

Professor Emeritus of Education

University of Idaho

Home Address:

4651 Bend Drive NE

Lacey, WA 98516

Ham Radio Operator W8HST
## Appendix C: Informal Survey Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Feedback:</th>
<th>Changes made to instrument because of this feedback:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Survey Directions** | - General note - do you want to add a shot intro paragraph - this could briefly restate what the survey is so that they are sure they landed on the right page. Also may want to consider adding reminder that all answers are confidential. Also may want to add that the whole thing should take about 10 minutes (or whatever) so that if they start to feel overwhelmed or think it going to go on forever, they got a note first thing letting them know or reminding them what to expect for a time commitment.  
- Add estimated time to completion  
- Add “no opinion” or “neutral” to the Likert-scale ratings | - Added a statement to the directions “It should take less than 10 minutes to complete this survey.”  
- Added “no opinion” as a Likert-scale choice.                                                                                                 |
| 1               | - Perhaps "at your current institution" since there isn't a previous reference to define "this institution" on the survey. (Its understood to be the respondents institution, but still just a thought).  
- if they choose the last option should they stop and not complete the rest of the survey? Or, if respondents could be former adjuncts should you offer that option as well, or reword the last option to include former adjuncts? | - No change was made because the adjuncts will be sent an email via their College email account.  
- No change was made because if they choose “I am not an adjunct faculty member,” the survey will end.                                  |
<p>| 2               | - How long have you been an adjunct faculty member at any institution? - I think you want all years total being an adjunct across all institutions, if so you should reword this, because if they were adjunct at A for 7 yrs and B for 2 yrs and at C for 3 yrs, they could technically answer 7 years and be correct. | - No change was made because the previous question asked, “How many years have you been an adjunct at this institution?” As a result, the next question asking, “How long have you been an adjunct at any institution?” would be a naturally progression to determine total number of years. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>• work related MAY need a hyphen</th>
<th>• Added a hyphen to “work-related.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8 | • Move question 8 to the end of the first section  
• not sure - do you maybe need to list a few examples of what "faculty development opportunities" are? | • Moved question 8 to the end of the first section.  
As a result, the last question of section 1 is now, “Please indicate the number of faculty development opportunities in which you have participated during the last two years, Fall 2016-Summer 2018, offered by this institution.  
• Added examples of faculty development opportunities to question 8. |
| 9 | • Add the answers: prefer not to disclose and transgender | • No change was made because they may select the gender that they identify with, or they may skip the question. |
| 11 | • The numbers aren't used within the list anywhere, so I don't think you need to show this as the top: 1 = no need, 2 = low need, 3 = no opinion, 4 = moderate need, 5 = high need.  
• To consider: Maybe the topics need to have each word in capitals rather than only the first word since they are topics they are more like titles?  
• the last item reads a little clunky - I had to read it a couple of times, maybe something like Overall Need of (or "for") Faculty Development Training? | • Removed numbers from Likert-scale ratings  
• Capitalized the first letter of each category  
• Changed the wording of the last item to read “Overall need for faculty development training” |
| 15 | • Add mailers to the “publication” choice | • Added mailers to the “publication” choice, to clarify the options. |
Appendix D: Field Test Survey

Welcome!

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the survey titled "Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty", and providing feedback on the survey instrument.

- There are five parts to this survey, followed by a feedback section.
- There is a progress bar at the bottom of each section that displays the percentage of the survey that you have completed.
- There are forward and back arrows allowing you to go back to a previous page.
- Once you complete the survey, you will be asked 4 questions seeking your feedback on the survey instrument.

Your input is valued, and will be used to enhance the survey instrument.

Part 1: Background Information

How long have you been an adjunct faculty member at this institution?

- [ ] 0-3 years
- [ ] 4-6 years
- [ ] 7-9 years
- [ ] Greater than 10 years
- [ ] I am not an adjunct faculty member
How long have you been an adjunct faculty member at any institution?

- ○ 0-3 years
- ○ 4-6 years
- ○ 7-9 years
- ○ Greater than 10 years

What is the highest post-secondary degree that you hold?

- ○ None
- ○ Associates
- ○ Bachelors
- ○ Masters
- ○ Doctorate

Please indicate the post-secondary institution(s) that you have attended. Select all that apply.

- □ Community College, not a State College
- □ State College
- □ Public College or University
- □ Private College or University
Please indicate your level of educator preparation. Select all that apply.

- Graduate of a college of education
- College-credit courses related to teaching and learning
- College-credit courses related to instructional design
- Informal personal research and practice
- Work related experience
- Have not participated in any formal type of educator preparation

Please indicate the primary modality in which you teach.

- On campus only
- Online only
- Online and on campus (including hybrid/blended)

Please indicate the primary campus from which you work.

- Altamonte
- Heathrow
- Sanford/Lake Mary
- Oviedo
Please indicate the number of faculty development opportunities in which you have participated during the last two years, Fall 2016–Summer 2018, offered by this institution.

Examples may include activities or trainings offered, face to face or online, by the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, your department, Human Resources, eLearning/CANVAS, CTS, etc.

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
What is your age?

- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60-69
- 70 or more
- Prefer not to say
# Part 2: Faculty Development Needs

For each topic, please indicate the level of need you have for your own professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct faculty meetings</th>
<th>no need</th>
<th>low need</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
<th>moderate need</th>
<th>high need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving student retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing student engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional (instructional strategies and assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-hire orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State college mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no need</td>
<td>low need</td>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td>moderate need</td>
<td>high need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject matter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(academic discipline or professional specialty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching online</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall need for faculty development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3: Best Conditions for Faculty Development

What is the best location for faculty development trainings?

☐ On campus
☐ Online

When is the best time to offer faculty development trainings? Select all that apply.

☐ Summers
☐ Weekends
☐ Weekdays
☐ Weekday evenings

What is the most feasible way to learn new skills? Select all that apply.

☐ One to two hour workshops
☐ Self-paced instructional materials
☐ Online training
What is the best method of communication? Select all that apply.

☐ College-wide email
☐ College website
☐ Publication (Flyer, newsletter)
☐ Supervisor
☐ Colleague
☐ Director, Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning
☐ Learning Management System (CANVAS)
Part 4: Incentives that Encourage Participation in Faculty Development

To what degree do the following incentives encourage your participation in faculty development opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>does not encourage</th>
<th>mildly encourages</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
<th>moderately encourages</th>
<th>significantly encourages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist students better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career opportunities (promotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component of performance evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-long learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth (becoming better at your job)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 5: Barriers that Hinder Participation in Faculty Development

To what degree do the following barriers hinder your participation in faculty development opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>does not hinder</th>
<th>mildly hinders</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
<th>moderately hinders</th>
<th>significantly hinders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time job in addition to adjunct faculty position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of career opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of encouragement from supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of monetary incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of prestige and recognition for attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a component of performance evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninteresting topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot Survey Feedback

How long did it take you to complete this survey?

- Less than 10 minutes
- 10-15 minutes
- 16-20 minutes
- more than 20 minutes

How did you feel about the length of this survey?

- Too long?
- Appropriate length?
- Too short?

What changes do you recommend?

What is your overall impression of this survey instrument?
Appendix E: Field Test Survey Cover Letter

April 29, 2018

Dear Survey Reviewer,

My name is Ashley Navarro, and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of South Florida. For my dissertation, I am investigating the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a state college. I am particularly interested in examining the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development. Furthermore, I want to research the incentives that would encourage, and the barriers that hinder, their participation in faculty development.

I am reaching out to you because of your experience and expertise. I am requesting your participation in a research study via a short online survey regarding your faculty development preferences. At the end of the survey, you will also have the option to provide any feedback on the survey instrument.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated, but entirely voluntary. If you choose not to participate in this research study there will be no consequences. This survey is anonymous. No names or identifying information will be collected. Results of this research may be published by the researcher; however, this survey is completely anonymous and no names or specific identifying information will be collected or recorded.

The potential benefits of this research include strengthening faculty development programs and increasing adjunct faculty participation in faculty development, which may improve adjunct faculty teaching effectiveness. There are no known risks associated with participating in this research study. The researcher has been given permission by [the College] to send out this request.

This survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete, and is accessed simply via click of the Survey Link below. The survey includes a progress bar that indicates the percentage of the survey you have completed. By clicking on the survey link, you are consenting to participate in this study. You must be 18 or older to participate. You may withdraw from the study at any time, and you are not obligated to answer all survey questions.

For the purposes of this research, faculty development refers to the opportunities provided to faculty to increase their effectiveness in three main areas: instructional improvement, organizational development, and personal development (Lewis, 1996).

I value your input, and feel that your critique and recommendations will strengthen the survey instrument. If you have any questions about this survey or my research please contact me at amnavar2@mail.usf.edu.

Survey link:

Sincerely,

Ashley Navarro
### Appendix F: Field Test Survey Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How long did it take you to complete this survey?                       | • Less than 10 minutes  
• Less than 10 minutes  
• Less than 10 minutes  
• Less than 10 minutes  
• Less than 10 minutes |
| How did you feel about the length of this survey?                       | • Appropriate length  
• Appropriate length  
• Appropriate length  
• Appropriate length  
• Appropriate length |
| What changes do you recommend?                                           | • None  
• None.  
• Blank  
• Blank  
• I think this is was a great survey. Short enough that the length didn't deter me, but long enough that I felt like it was of good value. |
| What is your overall impression of this survey instrument?              | • It was well organized and comprehensive. All questions had an appropriate selection of varied responses.  
• It was well written  
• Blank  
• Blank  
• I liked this survey instrument. The clean and simple interface was a pleasure to use. |

---
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Appendix G: Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty Survey

Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty Survey

Start of Block: Background Information

Welcome!

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the survey titled "Faculty Development Preferences of Adjunct Faculty".

There are five parts to this survey. It should take less than 10 minutes to complete. There is a progress bar at the bottom of each section that displays the percentage of the survey that you have completed. There are forward and back arrows allowing you to go back to a previous page. You must be 18 or older to complete this survey. By completing this survey, you are consenting to participate in this study.

Part 1: Background Information  How many years have you been an adjunct faculty member at this institution? Please enter the number of years.

How many years have you been an adjunct faculty member at any institution? Please enter the number of years.
What is the highest post-secondary degree that you hold?

- None
- Associates
- Bachelors
- Masters
- Doctorate

Please indicate the post-secondary institution(s) that you have attended. Select all that apply.

- Community College, not a State College
- State College
- Public College or University
- Private College or University

Please indicate your level of educator preparation. Select all that apply.

- Graduate of a college of education
- College-credit courses related to teaching and learning
- College-credit courses related to instructional design
- Informal personal research and practice
- Work related experience
- Have not participated in any formal type of educator preparation
Please indicate the primary modality in which you teach.

○ On campus only

○ Online only

○ Online and on campus (including hybrid/blended)

Please indicate the primary campus from which you work.

○ Altamonte

○ Heathrow

○ Sanford/Lake Mary

○ Oviedo

What is your age? Please enter a number.

________________________________________

What is your gender?

○ Female

○ Male

Please enter the number of faculty development opportunities in which you have participated at this institution. Examples may include activities or trainings offered, face to face or online, by the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, your department, Human Resources, eLearning/CANVAS, CTS, etc.

________________________________________
### Part 2: Faculty Development Needs

For each topic, please indicate the level of need you have for your own professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>no need</th>
<th>low need</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
<th>moderate need</th>
<th>high need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving student retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing student engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional (instructional strategies and assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-hire orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State college mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter (academic discipline or professional specialty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall need for faculty development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3: Preferred Conditions for Faculty Development
What is your preferred location for faculty development trainings?

☐ On campus

☐ Online

When is your preferred time to offer faculty development trainings? Select all that apply.

☐ Summers

☐ Weekends

☐ Weekdays

☐ Weekday evenings

What is the most feasible way to learn new skills? Select all that apply.

☐ One to two hour workshops

☐ Self-paced instructional materials

☐ Online training

What is your preferred method of communication? Select all that apply.

☐ College-wide email

☐ College website

☐ Publication (Flyer, newsletter)

☐ Supervisor

☐ Colleague

☐ Director, Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning

☐ Learning Management System (CANVAS)
### Part 4: Incentives that Encourage Participation in Faculty Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>To what degree do the following incentives encourage your participation in faculty development opportunities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does not encourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assst students better</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career opportunities (promotion)</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component of performance evaluation</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from supervisor</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve self-esteem</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-long learner</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary incentives</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and recognition</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth (becoming better at your job)</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5: Barriers that Hinder Participation in Faculty Development</td>
<td>To what degree do the following barriers hinder your participation in faculty development opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does not hinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligations</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time job in addition to adjunct faculty position</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of career opportunities</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of encouragement from supervisor</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of monetary incentives</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of prestige and recognition for attendance</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a component of performance evaluation</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of offerings</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninteresting topics</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Letter of Support

Permission for Research
Ashley Navarro <amnavar2@mail.ucf.edu>

To: Ashley Navarro <amnavar2@mail.ucf.edu>
Cc: Ashley Navarro <amnavar2@mail.ucf.edu>, amnavar2930@gmail.com

Mon, Apr 16, 2018 at 5:21 PM

Greetings, Dr. Ross. I hope this email finds you well. About a year ago, we discussed the research that I am doing, related to my dissertation. I am examining faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a Florida state college. The purpose of this study is to investigate adjunct faculty perceptions of factors that influence participation in faculty development at a multi-campus Florida state college. To improve Florida state college adjunct faculty participation in faculty development, it is necessary to examine their faculty development needs, and the incentives and barriers that influence their participation in faculty development. This study will address the research on characteristics of adjunct faculty, and their faculty development interests. This quantitative study will address the gap in the literature related to the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of Florida state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development.

Before I begin my research, I will gain IRB approval from the University of South Florida. Additionally, I will work with Seminole State’s Institutional Research department, and follow their guidelines as well. I was hoping to send electronic surveys to adjunct faculty via their Seminole State email addresses. I plan to ensure participation is voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. I am planning to send out the surveys at the beginning of Fall 2018.

During our previous discussion, I asked if you would be able to complete my research at Seminole State. At that time, you said that it would be fine for me to research Seminole State’s adjunct faculty. I am writing now, to gain formal permission to complete my research, swarming faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a Florida state college, at Seminole State College.

Please let me know if you need any other information. I appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Ashley Navarro
PHD Candidate
University of South Florida

Permissions for Research
Laura Ross <rossl@semicolinstate.edu>

To: Ashley Navarro <amnavar2@mail.ucf.edu>
Cc: amNavar2930@gmail.com, amNavar2930@gmail.com, Ashley Navarro <amNavar2@mail.ucf.edu>

Tue, Apr 17, 2018 at 4:35 AM

Hi Ashley,

I support your research project and the fact that the completion of research will be at Seminole State College. I look forward to seeing the results. Please work with Dr. Morgan and the Seminole State College IRB for approval and direction.

Wishing you the best on your data collection,
Laura

Dr. Laura Ross
Vice President
Academic Affairs
Seminole State College of Florida
700 Weldon Blvd | Sanford, FL 32773
P: 407-708-3252
www.seminolestate.edu

GO STATE. GO FAR.
Appendix I: Survey Cover Letter

Survey: Faculty Development Preferences

Dear Survey Participant,

My name is Ashley Navarro, and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of South Florida. For my dissertation, I am investigating the faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a state college. I am particularly interested in examining the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development. Furthermore, I want to research the incentives that would encourage, and the barriers that hinder, their participation in faculty development.

I am reaching out to you because of your experience and expertise. I am requesting your participation in a research study via a short online survey regarding your faculty development preferences.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated, but entirely voluntary. If you choose not to participate in this research study there will be no consequences. This survey is anonymous. No names or identifying information will be collected. Results of this research may be published by the researcher; however, this survey is completely anonymous and no names or specific identifying information will be collected or recorded.

The potential benefits of this research include strengthening faculty development programs and increasing adjunct faculty participation in faculty development, which may improve adjunct faculty teaching effectiveness. There are no known risks associated with participating in this research study. The researcher has been given permission by Dr. Ross to send out this request.

This survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete and is accessed simply via click of the survey link at the end of this email. The survey includes a progress bar that indicates the percentage of the survey you have completed. By clicking on the survey link, you are consenting to participate in this study. You must be 18 or older to participate. You may withdraw from the study at any time, and you are not obligated to answer all survey questions.

For the purposes of this research, faculty development refers to the opportunities provided to faculty to increase their effectiveness in three main areas: instructional improvement, organizational development, and personal development (Lewis, 1996).

I value your input and feel that your participation in this study will help strengthen faculty development programming for adjunct faculty members. If you have any questions about this survey or my research, please contact me at amnavar2@mail.usf.edu.

The link to the survey is below the Informed Consent.
Appendix J: Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Informed Consent to Participate in Research
Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study

Pro # 00037352

Researchers at the University of South Florida (USF) study many topics. To do this, we need the help of people who agree to take part in a research study. This form tells you about this research study. We are asking you to take part in a research study that is called: An Exploration of Adjunct Faculty Preferences for Faculty Development Opportunities at a Florida State College. The person who is in charge of this research study is Ashley Navarro. This person is called the Principal Investigator.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to explore faculty development preferences of adjunct faculty at a state college. I am particularly interested in examining the scheduling, format, and communication preferences of state college adjunct faculty, related to faculty development. Furthermore, I want to research the incentives that would encourage, and the barriers that hinder, their participation in faculty development.

Why are you being asked to take part? We are asking you to take part in this research study of your experience and expertise as an adjunct faculty member.

Study Procedures: If you take part in this study, you will be asked to participate in a research study via a short online survey regarding your faculty development preferences. This survey is anonymous. No names or identifying information will be collected. This survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete and is accessed simply via click of the survey link below. The survey includes a progress bar that indicates the percentage of the survey you have completed.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal: Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated, but entirely voluntary. If you choose not to participate in this research study there will be no consequences. You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer; you are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this study. Your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect your job status, employment record, employee evaluations, or advancement opportunities. You are not obligated to answer all survey questions.

Benefits and Risks: The potential benefits of this research include strengthening faculty development programs and increasing adjunct faculty participation in faculty development, which may improve adjunct faculty teaching effectiveness. There are no known risks associated with participating in this research study. The researcher has been given permission by Dr. Ross to send out this request. This research is considered to be minimal risk.

Compensation: We will not pay you for the time you volunteer while being in this study.

Privacy and Confidentiality: We will do our best to keep your records private and confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. It is possible, although unlikely, that unauthorized individuals could gain access to your responses because you are responding online. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the
technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet. However, your participation in this online survey involves risks similar to a person’s everyday use of the Internet. If you complete and submit an anonymous survey and later request your data be withdrawn, this may or may not be possible as the researcher may be unable to extract anonymous data from the database.

Certain people may need to see your study records. The only people who will be allowed to see these records are:

- The Principal Investigator: Ashley Navarro
- The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The information collected for this research will be kept as long as it is needed to conduct this research. Once your participation in the research is over, your information will be stored in accordance with applicable policies and regulations. Your permission to use your personal data will not expire unless you withdraw it in writing. You may withdraw or take away your permission to use and disclose your information at any time. You do this by sending written notice to the Principal Investigator at the following address: 615 Marni Dr. Winter Springs, FL 32708

While we are conducting the research study, we cannot let you see or copy the research information we have about you. After the research is completed, you have a right to see the information about you, as allowed by USF policies. If you have concerns about the use or storage of your personal information, you have a right to lodge a complaint with the data supervisory authority in your country.

Contact Information: If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638 or contact by email at RSCH-IRB@usf.edu. If you have questions regarding the research, please contact the Principal Investigator at amnavar2@mail.usf.edu

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not let anyone know your name. We will not publish anything else that would let people know who you are. You can print a copy of this consent form for your records.

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that by proceeding with this survey that I am agreeing to take part in research and I am 18 years of age or older.
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