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A Study of the Effects of Completing an Instructor Effectiveness Course on the Accountability Measures of Adjunct Community College Faculty

Ivan Franklin Harber, Jr.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of an Instructor Effectiveness Course designed specifically to retain adjunct faculty and improve their overall success in teaching. The study also investigated the “online” and “face-to-face” groups of the Instructor Effectiveness Course and compared faculty who take this course to those who do not in order to detect any significant differences. Differences were measured through students’ class grade point averages, (GPA’s), and course completion rates for the three groups of faculty, as well as through the faculty performance on student evaluations.

This mixed method, causal/comparative study looked at the adjunct faculty members who have taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course at a large southern community college compared to those who have not taken the course. This large southern community college employs approximately 1,400 adjunct faculty members. Four hundred of these adjunct faculty members have completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course offered at the college. For the past couple of years, the course has been offered both face-to-face and online. These adjunct faculty members teach both in the associate of arts (A.A.) programs, as well as the associate of science (A.S.) programs.
The adjunct faculty members were divided into four groups: by those with less than one year of teaching experience, those with one year of teaching experience, those with two years of teaching experience, and those with three years of teaching experience. The adjunct faculty members were also divided by those teaching A.S. courses and those teaching A.A. courses, and by those teaching night and day classes. The adjunct faculty members with prior teaching experience who have been exempted from taking the course were not included in the study.

The adjunct faculty members who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had significantly higher class GPA’s than those who had taken the course online or face-to-face. Student evaluations showed that adjunct faculty members who had completed the online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a higher weighted average for all questions than those who had not taken the course.

This study had three major objectives. The first was to investigate adjunct faculty members’ retention rates. The second was to investigate students’ success as measured by GPA and course completion. The third was to investigate adjunct faculty members’ success as measured by students’ evaluations. The research questions, hypotheses, participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis have been provided in this chapter. The participants have been identified, and the rationale for their selection was described. The community college used as the research institution has been identified.
Chapter One

Introduction

Adjunct faculty members are becoming an increasingly vital part of the higher education workforce. As of 1995, 75% of faculties at public community colleges were part-time (Wallin, 2005, p. 53). This percentage is increasing annually, both in Florida and throughout the rest of the country.

The need for adjunct faculty members is growing, and it is unlikely to change due to several constraints that are being placed on community colleges around the nation. Higher education institutions are being pressured by budgetary issues that have made it unfeasible for them to pay full-time faculty to do all of the teaching. Many tenured faculty members are choosing to teach higher level courses and not college entry or college preparatory classes. Many community college adjunct faculty members are also teaching at the high school level and contributing to the high school community college articulation agreements by increased communication and understanding of the needs of both institutions. In addition, the use of adjunct faculty members helps balance the full-timer’s teaching loads, and this enables the full-timers to teach the regular courses and not so-called “fad” courses or courses at peak enrollment times. Adjunct faculty members also add flexibility to the community college course offerings by allowing colleges to offer fad courses that may not be needed long-term.
Adjunct faculty members have a great deal of subject matter knowledge and often bring a freshness and enthusiasm to the classroom that full-timers may have lost. Studies conducted by John Roueche (Roueche, Roueche & Milliron 1995, p. 9) have shown that there is no difference in the quality of education provided to students by full-timers versus that provided by adjunct faculty members.

While the need for adjunct faculty members clearly is increasing annually, the support monetarily, logistically, and developmentally is not increasing. The institutions that employ them often do not provide level of support provided to full-time faculty. Part-timers are often viewed as a source of cheap labor rather than as a valuable resource because institutions are not required to provide fringe benefits or long-range financial commitments (McArthur, 1999, pp. 65-76). Most adjunct faculty members are hired on a semester-to-semester basis and are not given any benefits or contracts for continuing employment. Adjunct faculty members face a high turnover rate and low pay with an added uncertainty of employment.

Other problems adjunct faculty members face is their lack of initial classroom management skills and/or the lack of continuing education. If an adjunct faculty member is to function effectively, the university or community college department must provide both equipment and training for them. They must have access to computers, printers, and copiers and must know how to operate these resources (Moore, 1997, pp. 7-8). Adjuncts need to be offered professional development. In many institutions the adjunct faculty members are not given office space, computer access, or college email accounts.

Many institutions call on adjunct faculty members at the last minute and assign them a class that they may not be well prepared to teach. Once they are in the classroom,
they may not be offered the tools to improve their teaching. The quality of information being taught may be reduced, not because the individual teaching the class does not understand the material, but because the individual may need some training on learning styles, delivery methods, or simple classroom management skills training.

Faculty development for adjunct faculty members often is ignored or superficial (Thompson, 1995, p.19). Full-time instructors are offered continuing education opportunities to improve their skills, but in many institutions, adjunct faculty members are not. Many of them have never taken any education courses and know little about changes in learning or teaching styles. More and more research is being conducted to understand the learning styles of our students, but adjunct faculty members typically are not included in the research findings or provided training in the techniques to ensure their students’ styles are understood. Additionally, adjunct faculty members often are uninformed about changes that occur in the teaching field. Use of technology constantly is changing in the classroom, and many adjunct faculty members are not included in ongoing training on the use of new technology.

Adjunct faculty members also face the problem of disconnection with the institutions for which they are working. They may not have any ties to the institution other than going into a classroom and teaching a class. Also, they may not have served on any committees, such as curriculum development or governance. Finally and possibly most important, they may not have had anyone look over their syllabi or course outlines to make sure that the materials being taught are in line with the institution’s goals for the students.
Institutions typically use adjunct faculty members to teach introductory courses, which means that they get the largest classes and the least prepared students. These students need the increased support of instructors, but are often given the least support. It is essential that the students understand the support systems that are established on campus to help them succeed. Many adjunct faculty members have never been informed of the support services available to students, such as library services or tutoring labs. They know only the course material and may not know the culture of the institution or other information about the institution that could make the students’ educational experiences successful.

With tenuous job security and varying work schedules, adjunct faculty members typically remain outside the mainstream of campus life. They are excluded from orientation activities for new faculty, department meetings, or faculty development programs. Additionally, their teaching may not be as closely or frequently evaluated as that of full-time faculty. This significant and growing segment of the faculty is therefore unlikely to understand changing department or institutional priorities and in turn will not adopt them for their classrooms (Frakt & Castanera, 2000, p. 21).

Adjunct faculty members may be expected to do additional work outside the classroom for which they are not paid. Many of them are given a class to teach and are not fully aware of the other duties that are implicit in being an effective instructor. Preparing lessons, grading coursework, and conducting office hours take up an extraordinary amount of time, all of which are outside of classroom time. For example, adjunct faculty members need to be accessible to their students before and after class. Students need to be able to contact the instructor between class meetings to ask questions
or clarify areas of concern prior to the next class meeting. The use of technology also has impacted the delivery method of material and can take time to produce. Students expect to see technology used in the classroom, and many adjunct faculty members do not have the time to prepare lesson plans. Contact with the students via email or web mail is very important, and many adjunct faculty members do not have a method to handle these areas of concern. It is also very important for them to mentor and counsel their students, and this takes time.

Support services for adjunct faculty members may not be offered at institutions. Adjunct faculty members are a mobile workforce, many with full-time additional jobs. They may teach early or late classes when secretaries or work-study students are not available to duplicate materials or answer questions about equipment. Print shops are often closed, and access to services is not available. Adjunct faculty members may arrive just prior to class and leave as soon as class is over. They often provide little or no time for students to meet with them. With the lack of availability of office space, adjunct faculty members may have to work out of the trunks of their cars. Very few of them are given college email accounts that would allow students to contact them with any questions.

Because adjunct faculty members are becoming an integral part of the community college workforce, there has been a recent push for research on this growing segment of higher education faculty. The growing use of adjunct faculty members as a permanent part of the workforce has many ramifications for higher education. Everything from accreditation to labor issues has made their use an increasingly important topic in higher education today. Many states are dealing with labor issues that relate to the treatment of
adjunct faculty. “The state of Washington reached a tentative agreement on Friday to settle a longstanding class-action lawsuit with part-time instructors at community colleges, agreeing to pay them $11 million for wrongfully denying them healthcare benefits during the summer” (Selingo, 2004, p. A12).

The State Board of Community Colleges in Florida has very little information on the topic of adjunct faculty, other than the reporting of data, such as the numbers of adjunct faculty members per institution and some demographic information. State officials have just begun to collect samples such as adjunct faculty handbooks, development programs, and other methods of including adjunct faculty members into the overall culture of the institutions. Each of the 28 community colleges in Florida is trying to establish ways of using their adjunct faculty members in a positive manner.

Funding for higher education is under threat, and one area where colleges often cut expenses is that of faculty development. To stretch funding, colleges’ use of adjunct faculty members continues to increase. Literature indicates that in community colleges nationwide, part-time faculty members outnumber full-time faculty, and the numbers have risen consistently for almost 30 years. Between 1973 and 1991, there had been a 205.4% increase in the number of part-time faculty at community colleges (Burk, 2000, p. 3). Data assembled from several sources by Gappa and Leslie show that the share of regular full-time faculty employed in colleges and universities fell from 78% of total faculty employment in 1970-71, to 68% in 1982-83, and to 59% a decade later (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Rasell & Appelbaum, 1998, p. 29).

With the use of adjunct faculty members becoming more important to community colleges, institutions of higher learning have begun to investigate limited resources to
attract, recruit, and retain them. They may be offered services to help them feel a part of the culture of the institution. These services may include email accounts, employee development training, orientations, office space, computer access, and other services. Community colleges need to know what the best return on their investment is when it comes to monies appropriated for adjunct faculty members. Wyles (1998) found the following:

One-half of all current full-time community college faculties are expected to retire over the next five years. Coupled with decreased funding and the growing number of under prepared students, these projected retirements suggest that the demand for part-time faculty can only increase. This situation for part-time faculty is simply a microcosm of our national economy in which one in three workers is a contingent worker. Nationally, from 1969 to 1992 the number of part-time workers has increased by 88.9 percent and approximately 75 percent of new teaching jobs are filled by part-time faculty (p.90).

The overall success and inclusion of adjunct faculty members within the community college is vital to the overall mission of the college. Community colleges need to know how to encourage and motivate this major part of their overall teaching faculty. Many community colleges are trying to attract and retain good adjunct faculty members by providing email accounts, orientations, computer access, or other services, but these are things they may not really want or use. One central Florida community college has established email accounts for its entire 1,400 adjunct faculty, only to find that less than 20% of them actually use the accounts. Issues like viruses and “spam” mail have dissuaded many adjunct faculty members from using the accounts. At one community
college, an annual social is held to recognize the adjunct faculty, costing the college thousands of dollars. Over 1,000 adjunct faculty members are invited, but less than 25 showed up for the social.

One of the ways one Florida community college has chosen to make adjunct faculty members feel more connected is to require a mandatory “Instructor Effectiveness Course,” mentioned earlier. This course is taught to all adjunct faculty members prior to their entering the classroom. The Instructor Effectiveness Course is offered in several formats. The community college now offers it both live and as an Internet class for associate of arts teachers, associate of science teachers, and applied associate of science teachers. Each section covers the same basic information.

The course offers comprehensive guidance for the teaching experience. It begins with an overview of teaching and understanding the changing environment of higher education, and gives an orientation on human resource issues and general logistical information. It offers an understanding of today’s traditional and non-traditional students and learning styles, and addresses planning the course, identifying instructional resources, and developing the syllabus and course strategy. It reviews how to conduct an effective first class meeting, how to create a positive first impression, how to clarify class goals and expectations for the students, and how to reassure the students of the value of the course.

The course also suggests ways to manage the classroom environment, and how to organize the course materials and work the course plan. It emphasizes the value of interpersonal communication with students and time management skills. It gives instructor-directed learning methods, shows how to create a positive learning
environment, and reviews techniques for effective teaching presentations. It goes over student-directed learning methods, effective classroom discussions, and cooperative learning and experiential learning.

To assist in evaluation, the course covers developing, administering, and analyzing exams; understanding the qualities of an effective examination; and developing objective test items. It gives alternative assessment options and discusses how to bring the course to an effective conclusion, how to understand grades, and how to complete paperwork. It covers evaluating one’s teaching, conducting an informal self-evaluation, and conducting formal student/instructional leader ratings.

Last, but not least, it discusses how to effectively build one’s part-time teaching career, develop oneself as a teacher, and build a following with one’s students.

Statement of the Problem

Community Colleges are heavily reliant on part-time faculty. Many adjunct faculty members enter the classroom without a basic understanding of contemporary teaching/learning practices. Administrators thus feel the need to do something – but how much, and to what extent? Rather than throwing money at adjunct faculty development that may not be effective, such as the annual social mentioned earlier, we need to find out what works so that adjunct faculty members feel connected to the community college and teach effectively. Is the Instructor Effectiveness Course, such as the one described earlier, a good way for colleges to devote resources for adjunct faculty development?
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of an Instructor Effectiveness Course designed specifically to retain adjunct faculty and improve their overall success in teaching. The study also investigated the “online” and “face-to-face” groups of the Instructor Effectiveness Course and compared faculty who took this course to those who did not to see if any differences were noticeable. Differences were measured through students’ grade point average, (GPA) and course completion rates for the three groups of faculty, as well as through the faculty performance on student evaluations.

This mixed method, causal/comparative study looked at the adjunct faculty members who have taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course at a large suburban/rural community college compared to those who have not taken the course. This large southern community college employs approximately 1,400 adjunct faculty members. Four hundred of them have completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course that is offered at the college. For the past couple of years the course has been offered both face-to-face and online. These adjunct faculty members had taught both in the associate of arts (A.A.) programs, as well as the associate of science (A.S.) programs. They were divided into four groups: by those with less than one year of teaching experience, those with one year of teaching experience, those with two years of teaching experience, and those with three years teaching experience. They were also divided by those teaching A.A. courses and those teaching A.S. courses; and by those teaching night and day classes because some evidence exists suggesting that students who work during the day and take classes during the night are more critical of faculty. The adjunct faculty members with prior teaching
experience who have been exempted from taking the course were not included in the study.

*Research Questions*

This study investigated the following questions:

1. What is the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to up to three years, having completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

2. What is the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to up to three years, having completed the online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

3. What is the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to up to three years who have not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

4. What are the students’ success factors, as measured by class GPA and course completion rates, of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

5. What are the students’ success factors, as measured by class GPA and course completion rates, of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?

6. What are the students’ success factors as measured by class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have not completed the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?
7. What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

8. What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?

9. What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have not completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

10. Do adjunct faculty in the online training program and faculty in the face-to-face training program feel that the training helped them to be a better teacher?

11. Do these two groups of faculty feel their training program helped them to be connected to the college?

Definitions

Definitions for terms used throughout this study are as follows:

“Adjunct faculty” is defined as part-time, non-tenure seeking instructors. They are hired on a semester-to-semester basis with no benefits.

“Retention” is defined as part-time faculty who have taught for more than a year.

Limitations

Population validity:

Some adjunct faculty members may not be invited back to the college to teach after an initial semester; they were included in this study. If adjunct faculty members are
given bad evaluations during their first semester, they usually are not offered another class.

Questions exist about the appropriateness of linking student grades to adjunct faculty success, even though these are often used as measures of accountability by institutions and accrediting agencies.

The researcher is employed by the community college and was a former adjunct faculty member where the study was conducted and might have had a subconscious bias.

Another limitation was that the A.A. vice president requires all instructors to have an evaluation completed for every class they teach each semester. The A.S. vice president at that time did not require all sections to have evaluations.

A limitation to this study was that many of the A.S. adjunct faculty members had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course prior to the three-year time period and were therefore excluded from the study.

A.A. and A.S. adjunct faculty members did not complete the Instructor Effectiveness Course in equal numbers.

Ecological validity:

The last limitation was that there had not been any face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Courses offered within the year before this study. The reason for this was that the face-to-face course is typically offered at the beginning of the semester in late August and lasts for five Saturdays. The hurricane season had affected the course, and it was not offered.
Delimitations

This study is delimited by the fact that only adjunct faculty members at a large suburban/rural community college participated in the study.

This study used an existing student survey that had a total of 19 questions. The 10 questions were selected because they were related to the topics, goals, and objectives in the Instructor Effectiveness Course.

Summary

The need for adjunct faculty members is growing and is unlikely to change. Higher education institutions are being pressed by budgetary issues that have made it unfeasible for the institutions to pay full-timers to do all of the teaching. Many community colleges are trying to attract and retain good adjunct faculty members by providing different services to help them feel integrated into the culture of the institution. The need for adjunct faculty members is increasing, and the funding for these services is limited. Community colleges need to know what the best return on their investment is when it comes to monies appropriated for adjunct faculty members.

This large suburban/rural community college faculty developed an Instructor Effectiveness Course that has become a required course for all adjunct faculty members to take prior to their being assigned a class to teach. The “face-to-face” group is taught over four weekends on Saturdays from 8:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. The course is divided up between lecture, discussion, role plays, and written assignments. The intention of the course is to help adjunct faculty members to feel more comfortable about the large suburban/rural community college and their role as adjunct professors. They have
knowledge of the subject matter they will be teaching, but may not have had any
background knowledge of the large suburban/rural community college, such as its
mission statement or culture. Often adjunct faculty members have not had any
formalized training in teaching, classroom management, or students’ learning styles. The
focus of this study will look at how effective this course is in the development of adjunct
faculty. The “online” version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course is taught by faculty
who are experienced in delivering this course online.

Organization of the Study

This study was a mixed methods, causal/comparative study. The literature review
is outlined in Chapter Two, with the methods that were utilized to evaluate the study
outlined in Chapter Three. This study had three major objectives: 1) to investigate
adjunct faculty members’ retention rates, 2) to investigate students’ success as measured
by GPA and course completion, and 3) to investigate adjunct faculty members’ success as
measured by students’ evaluations. This mixed methods, causal/comparative study
looked at adjunct faculty members that have taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course at
a large suburban/rural community college compared to those who have not taken the
course.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

*The Adjunct Professor’s Guide to Success* (Lyons, Kysilka, & Pawlas, 1999) sums up the adjunct faculty member’s role in higher education:

Increasingly in recent years, the discipline leaders in higher education, i.e., department chairs, deans, lead teachers, and persons with related titles who are responsible for making teaching assignments, have come to greatly value your potential contributions to their individual students and their program-building efforts. You enrich their curricula by providing up-to-date expertise, especially in highly specialized courses, which their full-time faculty members frequently lack. You provide contemporary real-world applications of the theories and practices described in textbooks, making courses come alive. You provide students a sense of current professional trends and a connection with the working environment that many students aspire to enter. You introduce students to resources that they might not otherwise encounter, through your guest speakers, field trips, and related activities. You build a stronger connection between the institution and the varied elements of its surrounding community. You provide scheduling flexibility, cost savings, and other efficiencies, enabling instructional leaders to offer more courses, at times and places convenient to their increasingly busy and knowledge-thirsty students. In short, you help create win-win situations,
enriching the education of students within the increasingly more market driven enrollment of higher education. (pp. 5-6)

This literature review will cover eleven topics on adjunct faculty. These areas are important to understand the adjunct faculty members and their role within the community college system. The following areas will be covered:

1. Composition of adjunct faculty
2. Reasons for teaching
3. The reasons community colleges employ them
4. The equality of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty members
5. The effectiveness of adjunct faculty members compared to full-time faculty
6. Participation in the academic community
7. Making the adjunct faculty member feel connected
8. Orientation and training of adjunct faculty members
9. Professional development of adjunct faculty members
10. Academic trends affecting adjunct faculty members
11. Problems facing adjunct faculty members

Composition of Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are a varied group. There are approximately 270,000 part-time faculty teaching in higher education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 20). In 1992, in all fifty states, the part-time faculty cohort equaled 55 to 65 percent of all community college faculties (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995, p. 3). Adjunct faculty members devote
13.4 hours per week, or 42 \% of their week, toward part-time teaching. There are seven different categories of part-time instructors (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46).

1. Semi-retired faculty make up 2.8\%. They are former full-timers who no longer want to work full-time.
2. Graduate students make up 21.2\%. This group of part-timers is teaching in institutions other than the ones they are attending for experience.
3. Hopeful full-timers make up 16.6\%. This group is hoping to gain full-time employment positions. They just want to keep their name in front of the institutions to make sure they are thought of when a full-time position opens.
4. Full mooners make up 27.6\%. This group likes to teach part-time and is not interested in a full-time position. Teaching is a side job, and that is the way they want to keep it.
5. Home workers make up 6.4\%. This group is working part-time because they have children at home or are taking care of some other family member.
6. Part-time mooners make up 13.6\%. This group works part-time somewhere and teaches part-time.
7. Part-time unknowners make up 11.8\%. This group is not sure exactly why they teach.

Minorities make up 9.2\% of the part-time faculty. The part-time faculty is not quite balanced in terms of gender, with 58\% male and 42\% female. Part-timers are educationally very qualified: 28.5\% have doctoral or professional degrees, 42.7\% have masters’ degrees, and 28.8\% have bachelors’ degrees (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, pp. 22-31).
Why Do They Teach?

Many reasons exist why part-timers want to teach. The biggest reason, by a large margin, is for professional growth (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 36). Economic motives, personal development, social interaction, and community or professional development are some other reasons why part-timers want to teach. Adjunct faculty members teach because they want to teach; they want to help contribute to their students’ education. Many adjunct faculty members like the satisfaction they receive from teaching because they are already employed elsewhere. This type of activity gives them something their full-time position may not give them. Others teach for the money, status, or as an entrée into a full-time academic position.

Why Do Community Colleges Employ Them?

There are a multitude of reasons why community colleges employ adjunct faculties. Economics is the foremost reason community colleges hire adjunct faculty members over full-timers. Budgets have shrunk, and it is essential for colleges to find ways to keep their costs in line. The average cost for an adjunct faculty member is about 1/3 the cost of a full-timer. Comparatively, though, adjunct faculty members earn on average 37 cents for every dollar earned by a full-time faculty member. There is a wide range of pay for adjunct faculty members, but nationally they are paid by the credit hours they teach. Colleges understand that the goal is to be able to save money by hiring them, but they also know that they are dealing with conflicting goals. They cannot just look at saving money; they need to balance the teaching load between full-timers and adjunct faculty members so that culture and stability remain (Birnbaum, 1998, p. 11).
Using adjunct faculty members also allows the full-timers to maintain a full teaching load each semester, by increasing or decreasing the adjunct faculty members’ load according to need. The use of adjunct faculty members also helps with articulation agreements by utilizing high school teachers as adjunct faculty members, thereby increasing in communication and understanding in regards to the needs of both institutions. Colleges also like having the flexibility to offer new courses, which some might call “fad courses,” and then being able to do away with the courses when they are not popular anymore.

Adjunct faculty members offer a greater flexibility to the institutions. They may have subject expertise in the areas that they teach the majority of the time, although this is not always true. Adjunct faculty members may be asked to teach a class that they are not comfortable teaching, but do so in an effort to please the department chair. An example from Dubson (2001) highlights this problem. An instructor was asked to teach a course by the director of a program at a community college. He knew that it would be a stretch, but felt the confidence the director had in him would lead to more substantial recognition, so he decided to teach the course. When a full-time position finally opened, the adjunct faculty member was not even considered for the full-time position because he was told that he didn’t have enough experience (Dubson, p. 85).

More often than many would like to admit, new adjunct professors are assigned to teach courses on very short notice for which they are not an appropriate fit or are not effectively prepared. Anxious to get their foot in the door, many new adjunct instructors have accepted teaching assignments without fully and accurately assessing the match between their backgrounds and the requirements of the assigned course, and without
sufficient knowledge of the classroom challenges they might face (Lyons, Kysilka, & Pawlas, 1999, p. 6). Additionally, adjunct faculty members may have excellent connections with the community that are very valuable to the college.

**Are Adjunct Faculty Members and Full-timers Equally Qualified?**

An important question arises concerning whether adjunct faculty are as effective as full-time faculty. For years, there has been an ongoing discussion about the quality of instruction that adjunct faculty members and full-timers deliver.

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) provide perspectives from both the institution and part-time faculty on the issue of instructional quality. When asked to provide an opinion on part-time faculty and the quality of instruction, department chairs, deans, and provosts suggested that they were either not as effective or at least as effective as full-time faculty. These findings led them to conclude “administrators and policy makers [should] be cautious in assuming that instructional practices of part-time faculty are inferior to those of full-time faculty in the same field” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 126).

Staffing at the last minute for a class is not the best way to instruct the students. Adjunct faculty members are hired all the time to teach a class even though they might not be the best instructor for the class. New adjunct professors have been assigned to teach courses, often with very short notice, for which they were not an appropriate fit or were not effectively prepared (Lyons, Kysilka, & Pawles, 1999, p. 6). A problem could arise if an individual is very knowledgeable about a subject, but does not have the teaching background or skills to insure that the students are learning that knowledge. While it is generally agreed that adjunct faculty members possess the subject expertise,
some may lack the pedagogical skills needed to be effective classroom teachers (Thompson, 1995, p. 9).

Adjunct faculty members may also have technical or professional degrees in subjects that they are teaching, but have never had the opportunity to take any education courses. They may be bankers, lawyers, doctors, or other professional business people who want to share their knowledge. Perhaps they did not go to college to become teachers, but they may have gone to college for the subject that is giving them the knowledge to teach. They may teach because they love to and are rejuvenated by their students (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 53).

The Florida Association of Community Colleges (FACC) is concerned with providing students a quality education. They feel that students need consistency and time to meet with their instructors outside of class. With the overuse of adjunct faculty members, there is the issue of program coherence, which may create a potential problem. A majority of the time, adjunct faculty members are not given offices or equipment to work with, faculty development, or other support that is offered to full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty members are removed from the curriculum development and other important areas of the college. Lack of control in hiring adjunct faculty can be expensive for the institution when something goes wrong, including actual cost and public relations problems.

Teaching semester to semester presents even more problems when adjunct faculty members must worry about next term’s reappointment. Stray from the syllabus, teach controversial works, or venture an excessive number of low grades, and next semester’s job might be in jeopardy (Hickman, 1998, p. 2).
There is also the thought that adjunct faculty members might not teach at the same pace or quality of instruction. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) provide perspectives from both the institution and part-time faculty on the issue of instructional quality. The authors felt the range of quality was probably broader among part-time faculty than full-time faculty. However, research provides a different picture. “Empirical studies to date have found no significant differences in student rating, class retention, or student achievement in subsequent classes between students taught by part-time faculty and those taught by full-time faculty” (Greive & Worden, 2000, p. 259; Roueche, Roueche & Milliron, p. 10).

*Are Adjunct Faculty Equally Effective?*

Another imperative question to be answered is whether part-time faculty are as effective at teaching as full-time faculty. The adjunct faculty member brings a freshness and enthusiasm to the class that the full-timers may have lost. Most adjunct faculty members are younger and have an extensive background in the subjects they teach. Overall, many have a full-time career in business, government, or a professional field which allows them to be closer to the trends in the areas they teach. Instructors who have taught for a long period of time may forget what it was like when they first began to teach.

In a recent national study of community college faculty, part-time faculty were observed to use the lecture plus discussion method of instruction, a method that has been severely criticized for its negative effects on instructional quality, less often than full-time faculty (Roueche, Roueche, & Milron 1995, p. 11). Nevertheless, technology
training for adjunct faculty members is still very important to ensure they are comfortable with the newer delivery methods. In some instances, adjunct faculty members may be better teachers because they worry less about writing curriculum, planning, and research. They have the technical expertise of the subject matter, are concerned exclusively with the teaching function of the job, and often teach the classes that the full-timers feel are below them or do not want to teach.

A 1993 report to the Florida State Board of Community Colleges documented that from 1987 to 1991 there had been a 63 percent increase in the use of part-time faculty to teach general education courses. The same report cited another study from the Illinois Community College Board that documented heavy staffing of general educational and remedial courses by part-timers (Roueche, Roueche & Milliron, p.17). Finally, Gappa and Leslie’s (1993) recent study found that part-timers are frequently used by colleges to teach the lower-level courses that full-time faculty find undesirable, and oftentimes developmental and general education courses are the only courses part-timers are allowed to teach (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, p. 17).

Participation in the Academic Community

This section of the literature review discusses participation in the academic community role in the institutions they serve. This section is divided into several parts: participation in general; interaction between the adjunct faculty member and the department, making the adjunct faculty member feel connected; orientation; additional training; professional development; trends in the profession; and what is at stake.
Many department chairs feel that adjunct faculty members should "sink or swim," while others try to link the adjunct faculty members with the college. There is a trend that is catching on nationwide to include them in the culture of the college. Adjunct faculty handbooks would be helpful if given to all adjunct faculty members, and the department chairs could take an active role in the hiring process. Department chairs are encouraged to oversee the syllabi, tests, and evaluations for the courses that they teach.

Some of the reasons individuals participate in the community college teaching experience are social, financial, ego-related, and a feeling of giving something back to the community or institutions that have helped them get where they are. Often, adjunct faculty members like to be connected to the community college in their professional lives. Some have established who they are by the fact that they teach at a community college.

Adjunct participation in the activities of a department depends on many things including the attitudes of the tenured faculty and the leadership of the department chair. The degree of participation the adjunct faculty member wants to experience is also a factor. Many either do not have the time or want the opportunity to get to know the campus or other faculty.

Interaction between the Adjunct Faculty Member and the Department

The interaction between the adjunct faculty member and the department is an important part of his participation in the college community. It is helpful for the adjunct faculty member to have a personal meeting with the department chair to discuss the
assigned course and what he has to deliver. Often, a small amount of time, if any at all, is spent on the delivery of the information. Once the adjunct faculty member begins the course, there is typically very little contact between him and the department chair. This can leave him working 16 to 18 weeks without any feedback as to what type of job he is doing in the classroom, while the full-time faculty may be evaluated in the middle of the semester and given feedback as to the positive and negative areas in their teaching. At the end of the semester, there is an evaluation that is completed by the student, and this is what will most likely determine if the adjunct faculty member is asked to return the next semester.

Making the Adjunct Faculty Member Feel Connected

Adjunct faculty members typically are on their own for self-development, while the institutions are focused on enrollment in the classes and the student evaluations. As long as enrollment and evaluations are the only two benchmarks for retention of adjunct faculty members, there is room for trouble. There needs to be some way for them to grow and be a part of the institution they work for, rather than being a workforce that is hidden from the public. This leads us to what the community college should consider when developing an orientation program. This is an area that each community college needs to spend considerable time developing. In the book Strangers in Their Own Land, the authors outline a detailed orientation checklist (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995 pp. 64-66). Some of the items they mention are provided below:
I. Introduction

State the philosophy and objectives of the institution and how they relate to the adjunct’s role.

II. Administrative Information

Clarify who will serve as administrative contact with the institution.

Clarify what the part-time faculty member is supposed to do when he cannot make a class.

Specify the kinds of administrative support (e.g., secretarial assistance, office space, parking, and materials duplication) the part-time faculty member can expect to receive.

Clarify who the part-time faculty member should see to get answers to questions.

Clarify the part-timer’s teaching responsibilities.

Specify procedures for turning in grades.

III. Academic Information

Include information about teaching evaluation procedures.

Provide hints about how to arrange for guest lectures and field trips.

Provide information about how to provide students with tutorial assistance.

Clarify procedures for the part-time faculty member to contact a student at home or work.

Ensure the part-time faculty member knows institutional policies about grading the system for turning in grades.

IV. Emergency Procedures

Provide information on how to reach campus security and campus medical facilities. Ensure that the part-time faculty member knows the procedures for obtaining emergency assistance.

Provide a list of emergency telephone numbers (Rouche, Rouche & Milliron, 1995, pp.64-66).
Orientation

Studies have shown that a “caring attitude of faculty and staff” was the most important retention factor for adjunct faculty members at an institution (Beal & Noel, 1980, p. 19; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995, p. 85). Orientation is an important step to insure that the adjunct faculty members and the institutions that they teach for are sharing common goals. This orientation should be mandatory and extensive. The orientations are very important to the adjunct faculty members, but Gappa and Leslie found that more is needed:

In our view, orientation programs are most successful when they are linked to more comprehensive professional development opportunities for part-time faculty. The initial induction sessions are valuable only when the expectations they establish are followed and reinforced by more substantial development activities in the ensuing weeks and months. (p. 272).

Additional Training

Training for adjunct faculty members is not on the list of priorities for most community colleges. As an exception, a large suburban/rural community college now requires all adjunct faculty members to attend a one credit hour course in Instructor Effectiveness. This course is delivered by a senior faculty member and covers many of the areas that the adjunct faculty member will encounter. Curriculum development, syllabus development, classroom management, political frames, and cultural issues, along with many other topics, are covered in the course.
The four frames that Bolman and Deal (1997) discuss are also studied in the class and discussed. These areas include the structural frame, the human resource frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. The structural frame includes getting organized, structuring and reengineering, and organizing groups and teams. The human resource frame includes people and organizations, improving human resource management, and interpersonal and group dynamics. The political frame includes power, conflict, and coalitions; the manager as politician; and organizations as political arenas and political agents. The symbolic frame includes organizational culture and symbols, organization as theater, and organizational culture in action. The course is offered for four Saturday mornings, and each adjunct faculty member plays an active role in the course. *The Adjunct Professor’s Guide to Success* is used as a textbook in the class. This class not only covers how to be an effective teacher, but also the cultural aspects and the politics of teaching at a community college.

The majority of institutions that do offer training or development do not have incentives tied to the training. One way of rewarding adjunct faculty members for completing training would be to set a ranking of seniority for adjunct instructors. This would make the instructors that do well have some sort of designation over the new adjunct faculty members, such as a mentor or senior adjunct. Several community colleges around the country are now listing their senior adjunct faculty members in the college catalog and making sure they are invited to graduation ceremonies in their caps and gowns. In some cases, this also equates to a pay differential. At many community colleges, there is no difference between the outstanding adjunct faculty member and the “so-so” adjunct faculty member. The seniority system would help to make this a more
rewarding experience for both the adjunct faculty members and the community college as a whole. A pay differential for adjunct faculty members may also need to be considered.

*Professional Development*

Research has shown that teaching skills are acquired best through personal development, observation and imitation, and shared experience (Eble, 1983, p. 63). There is a strong need for some sort of observation and evaluation other than the student evaluation. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) found:

The college should expect the same level of teaching performance of part-time faculty as of full-time, and part-time faculty should have the same advantages and opportunities to improve their teaching as do full-time. Part-timer faculty should be required to attend professional development activities that are scheduled conveniently for those with nontraditional teaching schedules, and they should be strongly encouraged to attend others that are available to all faculty. They should be required to engage in a mentor relationship within their own discipline area with a more experienced part-time faculty member or with a full-time faculty member for at least their first full teaching term at the college. Colleges that require participation in professional development activities and include compensations for professional development, compensate the part-timer for participation in various activities, or require participation for continued employment report improved relationships between part-time faculty and full-time and higher evaluations of the teaching performance of part-timers. (pp. 155-156).
At most institutions, part-timers have no time to develop themselves, and this hurts the student in the long run because the part-timer receives less institutional support; i.e., email, secretarial assistance, peer review, and computer services. They can be overworked with their full-time careers and part-time teaching.

The more colleges make adjunct faculty members feel good about the institution and an important part of the success of the institution, the better they will feel about teaching. They should be integrated into the college community and recognized as increasingly important players in the teaching and learning process in the interest of providing quality instruction to the growing number of full- and part-time students who will sit in their classrooms, in the interest of appreciating the investment value of the part-time faculty, and ultimately in the interest of establishing and maintaining the college’s reputation for teaching excellence (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995, p. 120).

*Trends in Academic Profession*

Community colleges are getting ready to experience a major change in the composition of instructors and administrators. There will continue to be a shortage of faculty in selected fields (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 219). Community colleges also face changing lifestyles of faculty, in that some instructors may want less than a full-time position for many reasons. The student population is changing, and the need for more diverse skills will increase. A middle ground is needed to keep salaries and institutions sound. The barriers to change must be eliminated.
**What is at Stake?**

“Part-time faculty are sleeping giants; their sheer numbers and their impact on college instruction cannot and should not be ignored. The issues that have divided full-time and part-time faculty, and the issues that have separated part-timers from the larger academic community will not go away. They will be addressed, or they will maim higher education” (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 157).

Ensuring the quality of the curriculum is one of the most important areas of concern. Another important area is the ability to find qualified faculty for the future. There will be increased assessment and accountability over time.

**Problems**

Adjunct faculty members face issues that arise with their teaching at the community college level. Some of the problems that part-timers experience are being overworked and being concerned over next term’s appointments. Many part-timers want to play it safe and take fewer chances in the classroom to ensure their return.

Student evaluations are one of the most important tools administration uses to assess the quality of an instructor. Most adjunct faculty members are hired on a semester–to-semester basis, knowing that if they do not have good student evaluations, they might not be asked to return. Many part-time faculty will play it safe to ensure they are given good evaluations. If a part-time instructor is not liked by the students, they will most likely not be asked to teach again, even if the problem lies with the students and not the instructor.
Training is very important to the overall success of the adjunct faculty member. If a student complains or questions something in the classroom, a part-timer’s contract may not be renewed. Sometimes it does not have anything to do with the quality of education, but with other issues. Often part-timers have done something that gets them into trouble, and they might not even know they have broken a rule or policy. Once this happens, the adjunct faculty member will most likely not be granted a renewal of contract.

In addition, the college’s facilities for adjunct faculty members can pose problems. Most community colleges do not offer any type of office space to them. They must work from their own offices or car trunks. This limits the access a student has to the adjunct faculty. Meeting with students to discuss sensitive issues or to counsel the student becomes difficult. Many times the classroom becomes their office prior to or after class. With many faculty using the same rooms, it becomes difficult to find a place to sit with a student and go over an exam or answer other concerns. Adjunct faculty members may not have the tools or materials that the students need when talking with them. Materials, such as review materials, that are on the adjunct faculty member’s home computer and not in the classroom are issues that affect the learning of the students. Additionally, without posted office hours, it is difficult for the student to know when and where to meet with the adjunct faculty member.

Many community colleges do not offer email accounts for their adjunct faculty. The adjunct faculty members are requested to use their own personal email. This becomes an issue for them because they might not want to have their students know their personal email address. Issues such as viruses or privacy are commonplace. Many
adjunct faculty members do not include an email address or personal phone number on their syllabus for this reason. This can limit the communication between students and adjunct faculty members.

Copy service for adjunct faculty members can be a problem area as well. Copy service is usually handled personally by them because of the limited secretarial help provided by the institution. Many print shops and rooms with copiers are closed at night, which limits the use of these services by adjunct faculty members, especially those who work their main jobs during the day and teach class at night. Even if they can make it to campus during the daytime, many are not comfortable with printing procedures or policies.

Summary

There are countless issues that face the part-timers. Mentioned in this chapter were the adjunct faculty members’ role in higher education, the composition of adjunct faculty, why community colleges employ adjunct faculty members, the effectiveness of adjunct faculty members, adjunct faculty members’ participation in the academic community, training of adjunct faculty members, orientation and professional development of adjunct faculty members, and the trends in the academic profession. As part of the review of adjunct faculty development discussed in this literature review chapter, the Instructor Effectiveness Course at a large suburban/rural community college was also reviewed. Adjunct faculty members play an increasingly important role in the delivery of instruction at the community colleges. Budgets continue to tighten, and the limited resources that are available need to be spent in the right areas for adjunct
effectiveness. Community colleges need to know where to spend their monies to maximize the return on their investment, and to decide whether instructor effectiveness courses, like the one employed by a large suburban/rural community college, are an effective way to devote resources to adjunct faculty development.

A widespread evaluation. This question has been explored in various and successive levels: question is, how much difference did an educational program make? Learner satisfaction, achievement, improved performance, benefits to others, and return on investment (Knox, 2002, p. 8).
Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of an Instructor Effectiveness Course designed specifically to retain adjunct faculty and improve their overall success in teaching. The study also investigated the “online” and “face-to-face” groups of the Instructor Effectiveness Course to see if any differences were noticeable. In addition, this study looked at perceptions of the adjunct faculty members who teach for a large suburban/rural community college, their feelings toward the institution, and their roles within the institution.

Research Questions

This study investigated the following questions:

1. What is the percentage of the retention rate, those who have taught less than one year up to three years, of adjunct faculty members having completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

2. What is the percentage of the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to three years, having completed the online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

3. What is the percentage of the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to three years, who have not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course?
4. What are the students’ success factors as measured by class grade point average (GPA) and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

5. What are the students’ success factors as measured by class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?

6. What are the students’ success factors as measured by class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have not completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

7. What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

8. What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?

9. What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have not completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

10. Do adjunct faculty in the online training program and faculty in the face-to-face training program feel that the training helped them to be a better teacher?

11. Do these two groups of faculty feel that their training program helped them to be connected to the college?
Participants

This mixed methods, causal/comparative study looked at the adjunct faculty members who have taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course at a large suburban/rural community college compared to those who have not taken the course. This large suburban/rural community college employs approximately 1,400 adjunct faculty members. Four hundred of these adjunct faculty members have completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course that is offered at the college. For the past couple of years, the course has been offered both face-to-face and online. These adjunct faculty members teach both in the associate of arts (A.A.) programs, as well as the associate of science (A.S.) programs. They were divided into four groups: those with less than one year of teaching experience, those with one year of teaching experience, those with two years of teaching experience, and those with three years of teaching experience. They were also divided by those teaching A.A. courses and those teaching A.S. courses, and by those teaching night and day classes because some evidence exists suggesting that students who work during the day and take classes during the night are more critical of faculty. The adjunct faculty members with prior teaching experience who have been exempted from taking the course were not included in the study.

Hypotheses

The first null hypothesis regarding Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 was that there would be no significant difference in the percentage of retention rates between adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, those who have completed the online version, and those who have not taken the course.
It was expected that the adjunct faculty members who had completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course would have a higher retention rate than those who had taken the course online or not had taken the course at all.

The second null hypothesis regarding Research Questions 4, 5, and 6 was that there would be a significant difference in the students’ grade point average between adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, those who have completed the online version, and those who have not taken the course. It was expected that the students’ grade point average would be higher in the adjunct faculty members’ classes who had completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course than in those adjunct faculty members’ classes who had taken the online Instructor Effectiveness Course or had not taken the course at all.

The third null hypothesis regarding Research Questions 4, 5, and 6 was that there would be a significant difference in the student course completion rates between adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, those who have completed the online version, and those who have not taken the course. It was expected that the completion rates would be higher with the students in the courses taught by adjunct faculty members who had completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course than for those taught by adjunct faculty members who had completed the online course or had not taken the course at all.

The fourth null hypothesis regarding Research Questions, 7, 8, and 9 was that there would be a significant difference in the adjunct success factors as measured by student evaluations between adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, those who have completed the online version, and
those who have not taken the course. It was expected that the student evaluations would be higher in the adjunct faculty members’ classes who had completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course than in those adjunct faculty members’ classes who had completed the course online or not taken the course at all.

Data Analysis Plan

The data was researched according to three “chunks.” Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 investigated adjunct retention rates. Research Questions 4, 5, and 6 investigated adjunct faculty members’ success as measured by students’ GPA and completion rates. Research Questions 7, 8, and 9 investigated adjunct faculty members’ success as measured by student evaluations.

For Research Questions 1, 2, and 3, summary descriptive statistics were calculated for retention rates of adjunct faculty members having completed the face-to-face and online versions of the Instructor Effectiveness Course, as well as those who did not take the course. An Chi-square, $\chi^2$ test of homogeneity was used to explore any difference in the rates. The sample for size for these questions was 1,400 total adjunct faculty members, with approximately 400 having taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course and 1,000 having never taken the course.

For Research Questions 4, 5, and 6, summary descriptive statistics were calculated for students’ success factors including GPA and course completion rates of adjunct faculty members having completed the face-to-face and online courses, and adjunct faculty members who have not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course. An Analysis of Variance, ANOVA, was used to compare class GPA’s, and an $\chi^2$ test of
homogeneity was used to compare course completion rates. The sample for size for these questions was 1,400 total adjunct faculty members, with approximately 400 having taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course and 1,000 having never taken the course. The data on retention rates of the adjunct faculty members’ students enrolled in their classes was used to measure the number of students enrolled compared to the number of students completing the course. Students’ GPA’s in the classes taught by the adjunct faculty members were also analyzed.

For Research Questions 7, 8, and 9, summary descriptive statistics were calculated for adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face and online Instructor Effectiveness Course and those who have not completed the course. An Analysis of Variance, ANOVA, was used to explore any differences in evaluation scores for the three groups of faculty. The sample for size for these questions was 1,400 total adjunct faculty members, with approximately 400 having taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course and 1,000 having never taken the course. The end of course student evaluation was used to evaluate the adjunct faculty members’ success factors. The student course evaluation form is a five-point Likert scale with the options ranging from definite strength, to neutral, to definite weakness. These ten success factors were used to create an overall measure of adjunct faculty member success factors, and are as follows:

1. Availability and willingness to assist students
2. Respect and concern for students
3. Pace of instruction
4. Enthusiasm for the subject
5. Organization of instruction
6. Use of various teaching methods and materials
7. Effective use of technology
8. Encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking
9. Maintenance of focus on lesson topic
10. Response to student questions

This evaluation tool is given out each semester to evaluate the overall rating of adjunct faculty. The evaluation instrument is included in the Appendix.

For Research Questions 10 and 11, focus groups were conducted. There were three adjunct faculty focus groups. The three groups of adjunct faculty were comprised of those who have taken the face-to-face version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course, those who have taken the course online, and those who have not taken the course at all. There were two guiding questions for the focus groups: Do adjunct faculty in the online training program and faculty in the face-to-face training program feel that the training helped them to be a better teacher? Do these two groups of faculty feel that their training program helped them to be connected to the college?

The adjunct faculty members were selected by emailing to the college email accounts of all of those who had completed the course either face-to-face or online. The adjunct faculty members were given a brief explanation of the research, and the date, time, and place of the meeting. This process gave equal opportunity to all adjunct faculty members of the college. There were a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 10 respondents accepted for each meeting. Ideally, verbatim transcription of recorded interviews provides the best database for analysis (Merriam, 1998, p.88). Both meetings were audio
taped and transcribed. An assistant was hired to do the transcription process. Once the transcription had been completed, the participants had the opportunity to review their responses so that they could clarify any statements that might have been inaudible on the tape. After any changes were made from the participants’ edits of the transcripts, the data was coded, and themes were identified from the focus groups.

Devising categories is largely an intuitive process, but it is also systematic and informed by the study’s purpose, the investigator’s orientation and knowledge, and the meanings made explicit by the participants themselves. Typically, guidelines for category construction found in the literature are very general (Merriam, 1998, p. 179).

For the purpose of this study, grade point average was described as students’ grades for the class that they were enrolled in that was taught by the adjunct faculty member.

For the purpose of this study, adjunct success factors as measured by the student evaluations included:

1. Availability and willingness to assist students
2. Respect and concern for students
3. Pace of instruction
4. Enthusiasm for the subject
5. Organization of instruction
6. Use of various teaching methods and materials
7. Effective use of technology
8. Encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking
9. Maintenance of focus on lesson topic
10. Response to student questions

Summary

This study had three major objectives. The first was to investigate adjunct faculty members’ retention rates. The second was to investigate students’ success as measured by GPA and course completion. The third was to investigate adjunct faculty members’ success as measured by students’ evaluations. The research questions, hypotheses, participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis have been provided in this chapter. The participants have been identified, and the rationale for their selection was described. The community college used as the research institution has been identified.
Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of an Instructor Effectiveness Course designed specifically to retain adjunct faculty members and improve their overall success in teaching. The study also investigated the “online” and “face-to-face” groups of the Instructor Effectiveness Course to see if any differences were noticeable. In addition, this study looked at perceptions of the adjunct faculty members who teach for a large suburban/rural community college, their feelings toward the institution, and their roles within the institution.

Summary of the Quantitative Portion of the Data Collection

The first step in the data collection process was to meet with the records and reports division of a large suburban/rural community college to find out the types of data that existed. It was determined that the current student evaluations and class grades were available on all adjunct faculty members, and the researcher decided to control for several variables. The research was categorized by the length of time adjunct faculty members had taught. They were divided into four groups: those with less than one year of teaching experience, those with one year of teaching experience, those with two years of teaching experience, and those with three years of teaching experience. They were also categorized by those teaching associate of arts (A.A.) courses and those teaching associate of science (A.S.) courses, and by those teaching night versus day classes.
Once these groups of adjunct faculty members were identified, the data were compiled from existing files. The data had to be sorted to meet the parameters of the categories and to delete the noncredit courses. Adjunct faculty members with over three years of teaching experience were not included in the study because of the possibility of having only the best adjunct faculty members still teaching after that period of time. The researcher felt that the adjunct faculty members who had been teaching for over three years would most likely be the better adjunct faculty members.

A limitation to this study was that many of the A.S. adjunct faculty members had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course prior to the three-year time period and were therefore excluded from the study. Dr. Richard Lyons, a professor at the college used for the study, developed the course as part of the research for his doctoral degree. For several years it was a recommended course for A.S. adjunct faculty members and then became a required course for all A.S. adjunct faculty members in 1996. The requirement for the A.A. adjunct faculty did not come until 2004. This created a larger number of A.A. adjunct faculty members than A.S. adjunct faculty members that were included in the study. The researcher did not have access to any names or other identifiable information on the adjunct faculty members.

Another limitation was that the A.A. vice president requires all instructors to have an evaluation completed for every class they teach each semester. The A.S. vice president at that time did not require all sections to have evaluations. There were 5,754 A.A. evaluations and 1,749 A.S. evaluations.

The last limitation was that there had not been any face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Courses offered within the year before this study. The reason for this was
that the face-to-face course is typically offered at the beginning of the semester in late August and lasts for five Saturdays. The hurricane season had affected the course, and it was not offered.

Once the data were compiled and sorted, a Chi-square, $\chi^2$, test of homogeneity was conducted to answer Research Questions 1, 2, and 3. This looked at the retention rates of adjunct faculty members having completed the face-to-face and online versions of the Instructor Effectiveness Course, as well as those who did not take the course. For Research Questions 4, 5, and 6, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to compare class GPA’s and a Chi-square, $\chi^2$, test of homogeneity was used to compare course completion rates. An ANOVA was also conducted for Research Questions 7, 8, and 9 to calculate students’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who had completed the face-to-face and online Instructor Effectiveness Course and those who had not completed the course. Ten of the questions on the student evaluations were used to answer these questions.

Focus groups were formed to answer Research Questions 10 and 11. The adjunct faculty members were contacted using their adjunct faculty email accounts. The email requested their participation in three different focus groups. They were given a brief explanation of the research and the date, time, and place of the meeting. One focus group was for adjunct faculty members who had completed the online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The second focus group was for adjunct faculty members who had completed the face-to-face version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The third focus group was for adjunct faculty members who had not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course. These meetings were audio taped and transcribed verbatim by an
outside assistant. Ideally, verbatim transcription of recorded interviews provides the best database for analysis (Merriam, 1998, p.88). The adjunct faculty members signed the Independent Review Board forms and stated their names and courses that they had taught for the college. There were two guiding questions for the focus groups: Do adjunct faculty in the online training program and faculty in the face-to-face training program feel that the training helped them to be better teachers? Do these two groups of faculty feel that their training program helped them to be connected to the college?

Once the transcription had been completed, the participants had the opportunity to review their responses so that they could clarify any statements that might have been inaudible or incorrectly transcribed from the tape. There were no changes made from the participants’ transcripts; the data was coded and themes were identified from the focus groups. The themes came from making notes about the transcripts and then identifying reoccurring thoughts in those notes. The researcher read the transcripts in total over and over for a period of days to identify the themes.

Devising categories is largely an intuitive process, but it is also systematic and informed by the study’s purpose, the investigator’s orientation and knowledge, and the meanings made explicit by the participants themselves. Typically, guidelines for category construction found in the literature are very general (Merriam, 1998, p. 179).

The first three research questions have been grouped and are analyzed together. One of the limitations to Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 was that the adjunct faculty members could not be divided into the individual groups. The total number of A.A. and A.S. adjunct instructors was too small for sub-analysis. The number of students,
however, was large enough to allow for sub-analysis by A.A. and A.S. programs. Therefore, in these results when the analysis deals with the instructor there is no sub-analysis because the sub size is too small. The data could not be separated by A.A. and A.S. instructors, or by daytime and nighttime instructors, or by the method of taking the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The research showed that some adjunct faculty members taught both A.A. and A.S. courses during the same semester and that many adjunct faculty members taught day and nighttime sections. But when the analysis pertains to the students, the analyses are large enough to permit sub-analysis of the data.

For Research Questions 1, 2, and 3, there was not a significant difference between the groups of adjunct faculty. As shown in Table 1, the sample sizes were very small, \( n=171 \). The faculty retention percentages were higher, though not significantly higher, for those who had completed the face-to-face or online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course than for those who had never completed the course in all categories, except in the 2-year category.

Research Question 1: What is the percentage of the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to three years, having completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

Research Question 2: What is the percentage of the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to three years, having completed the online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

Research Question 3: What is the percentage of the retention rate of adjunct faculty members, those who have taught less than one year up to three years, who have not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course?
Table 1

Retention Rates of Adjunct Faculty Members (n=171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Retained</th>
<th># Not Retained</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Adjuncts Studied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face/Online</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjuncts - 0 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face/Online</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjuncts 1 Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face/Online</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjuncts - 2 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face/Online</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjuncts - 3 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face/Online</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as in Research Questions 1, 2, and 3, Research Questions 4, 5, and 6 form a group and are also analyzed together. As shown in Table 2, depicting the overall student grades for the three different methods of instructor effectiveness training, it was found that there was a significant difference in the students’ grades for instructors who took the online version compared to those who never took the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The students’ grades from adjunct faculty members who had taken the course online were significantly higher than from those who had not taken the course. Students’ grades were significantly higher from adjunct faculty members who had not taken the course over those adjunct faculty members who had taken the course. This was not expected; the
researcher felt that the grades would be higher in the group that had taken the course face-to-face over the other methods.

Research Question 4: What are the students’ success factors as measured by class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

Research Question 5: What are the students’ success factors as measured by class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?

Research Question 6: What are the students’ success factors as measured by class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have not completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

Table 2

Students’ Class Grades According to Method of Instructor Effectiveness Course

| Faculty Program Areas And Students Taught | Online | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                          | Mean   | SD             | N               | Mean           | SD             | N               | Mean           | SD             | N               |
| All Instructors                          | 2.5509 | 1.0901         | 8,275           | 2.6719         | 1.0538         | 1,314           | 2.4779         | 1.0952         | 26.10 **        |
| A.A. Instructors                         | 2.8324 | 1.1237         | 5,573           | 2.8786         | 1.0846         | 920             | 2.8516         | 1.1310         | 1.39            |
| A.S. Instructors                         | 3.1577 | 0.9756         | 2,702           | 3.2834         | 0.9726         | 394             | 3.1353         | 1.0011         | 5.51 **         |
| 0 - Years Instructors                    | 2.9206 | 1.1657         | 2,148           | 2.9562         | 1.0664         | 394             | 2.8516         | 1.0952         | 26.10 **        |
| 1 - Year Instructors                     | 2.8533 | 1.0434         | 2,567           | 2.8187         | 1.1033         | 0               | 0.0000         | 0.0000         | 0.28            |
| 2 - Year Instructors                     | 3.1094 | 1.0395         | 1,317           | 3.1109         | 1.1033         | 697             | 3.0918         | 0.9824         | 27.53 **        |
| 3 - Year Instructors                     | 3.1094 | 1.0395         | 1,317           | 3.1109         | 1.1033         | 697             | 3.0918         | 0.9824         | 27.53 **        |

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001
For class GPA the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 26.102, P = 0.000), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference. Those adjunct faculty members who never took the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher student average class GPA than those who took the course online or face-to-face.

The A.S. adjunct faculty members who never took the Instructor Effectiveness Course had significantly higher average student class grades than those who took the course face-to-face. For A.S. instructors, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 5.513, P = 0.004), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means of the A.S. adjunct faculty members between those who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course and those who took it face-to-face. The researcher had expected to find the student grades lower for those of faculty who had not taken the course.

The students in classes in which adjunct faculty members had taught for two years and never took the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher overall class GPA than did students in classes in which the instructors took the course online. Those who took the course face-to-face had a significantly higher class GPA than those who took the course online. For two-year instructors, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 27.534, P = 0.000), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.
The students in classes in which adjunct faculty members taught during the day and who took the Instructor Effectiveness Course face-to-face had significantly higher class GPA’s than those who had never taken the course. Those who had taught during the day who took the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course also had significantly higher grades than those who took the course online. For daytime instructors, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 3.902, P = 0.020), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

The students in classes in which adjunct faculty members taught at night and never took the Instructor Effectiveness Course had significantly higher grades than both those groups of instructors who took the course online or had taken the course face-to-face. Those who had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had significantly higher grades than those who had taken the course face-to-face. For nighttime instructors, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 39.915, P = 0.000), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

Course Completion Rates of Students in Adjunct Faculty Member Classes

As shown in Table 3 below, the course completion rates of all adjunct faculty members were significantly higher in the instructor group that had never taken the course. The “face-to-face” group had the lowest course completion rate of all three groups. A chi square, $\chi^2$, test of homogeneity indicated a significant difference between the proportion
of students retained ($\chi^2 = 20.66, p < .001$) for the three groups among all instructors. Furthermore, a Delucchi post-hoc test indicated that the course completion rate for teachers who had never taken the course was significantly higher than for those who had taken the face-to-face version ($p < .001$), and the course completion rate for the teachers who took the online version was significantly higher than for those who took the face-to-face version ($p < .05$). The adjunct faculty members who never took the course had a course completion rate of 81.40%, those who took the course online had a course completion rate of 79.79%, and those who took the course face-to-face had a course completion rate of 76.18%.

Table 3

Student Retention Rates of Adjunct Faculty Members According to Type of Instructor Effectiveness Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Inst. Effec. Trng. Course Taken by Faculty</th>
<th># of Students Retained</th>
<th># of Students Not Retained</th>
<th>% of Students Retained</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>79.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6736</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>81.40%</td>
<td>20.6587 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>76.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $< .01$. *** $< .001$

A Delucchi post-hoc test indicated that the course completion rate for adjunct faculty members who had never taken the course was significantly higher, as shown in Table 4, than for those who took the face-to-face version ($p < .01$), and the course completion rate for the teachers who took the online version was significantly higher than for those who took the face-to-face version ($p < .05$). An $\chi^2$ test of homogeneity indicated a significant difference between the proportions of students retained ($\chi^2 = 14.90, p < .001$) for the three groups among A.A. instructors.
Table 4

Student Retention Rates of Associate of Arts Adjunct Faculty Members According to Type of Instructor Effectiveness Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Instr. Effec. Trng. Course Taken by Faculty</th>
<th># Students Retained</th>
<th># Students Not Retained</th>
<th>% Students Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>78.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4438</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>79.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>74.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

course completion rates of daytime adjunct faculty, as shown in Table 5, were significantly higher in the group that had never taken the course. The “face-to-face” group had the lowest course completion rate of all three groups. An $\chi^2$ test of homogeneity indicated a significant difference between the proportions of students retained ($\chi^2 = 11.61, p < .001$) for the three groups among daytime instructors.

Furthermore, a Delucchi post-hoc test indicated that the course completion rate for teachers who had never taken the course was significantly higher than for those who took the face-to-face version (p < .05).

Table 5

Student Retention Rates of Daytime Adjunct Faculty Members According to Type of Instructor Effectiveness Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Instr. Effec. Trng. Course Taken by Faculty</th>
<th># of Students Retained</th>
<th># of Students Not Retained</th>
<th>% of Students Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>78.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>82.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>77.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001
A Delucchi post-hoc test indicated that the course completion rate for teachers who had never taken the course was significantly higher than for those who took the face-to-face version (p < .01), and the retention rate for the teachers who took the online version was significantly higher than for those who took the face-to-face version (p<.05). An χ² test of homogeneity indicated a significant difference between the proportions of students retained (χ² = 13.10, p < .001) for the three groups among nighttime instructors, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Student Retention Rates of Nighttime Adjunct Faculty Members According to Type of Instructor Effectiveness Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Instr. Effec. Course Taken by Fac</th>
<th># of Students Retained</th>
<th># of Students Not Retained</th>
<th>% of Students Retained</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>80.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4111</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>80.80%</td>
<td>13.0995 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>74.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001

The one-year adjunct faculty members indicated a significant difference between groups. An χ² test of homogeneity indicated a significant difference between the proportions of students retained (χ² = 51.35, p < .001) for the three groups among instructors who had course completion had taught for one year. Furthermore, a Delucchi post-hoc test indicated that the course completion rate for teachers who had never taken the course was significantly higher than for those who took the face-to-face version (p < .001), and the retention rate for the teachers who took the online version was significantly higher than for those who took the face-to-face version (p<.001), as shown in Table 7.
Table 7

Student Retention Rates of Adjunct Faculty Members with Less than One Year of Teaching Experience According to Type of Instructor Effectiveness Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Course</th>
<th># of Students Retained</th>
<th># of Students Not Retained</th>
<th>% of Students Retained</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>80.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>80.89%</td>
<td>51.353 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>68.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001

The \( \chi^2 \) test of homogeneity indicated a significant difference between the proportions of students retained (\( \chi^2 = 25.74, p < .001 \)) for the three groups among instructors who had taught for two years. Furthermore, a Delucchi post-hoc test indicated that the course completion rate for teachers who had never taken the course was significantly higher than for those who took the online version (\( p < .001 \)), and the course completion rate for the teachers who took the face-to-face version was significantly higher than for those who took the online version (\( p < .01 \)), as shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Student Retention Rates of Adjunct Faculty Members with Two-Years of Teaching Experience According to Type of Instructor Effectiveness Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Course</th>
<th># of Students Retained</th>
<th># of Students Not Retained</th>
<th>% of Students Retained</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>83.34%</td>
<td>25.736 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001
In all analyses for Research Questions 4, 5, and 6, the sample sizes of the “face-to-face” groups were much smaller for the groups that had never taken the course. Those instructors who taught for two years or more and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course face-to-face had the highest course completion rates.

The next section presents the results of the next grouping of Research Questions 7, 8, and 9. Only statistically significant questions are described in this section. The research questions were as follows:

Research Question 7: What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?

Research Question 8: What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?

Research Question 9: What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have not completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course?

The survey had a total of 19 questions and was distributed to students just prior to the end of the semester. See Appendix for the survey. There were 10 questions on the survey that were used in this study. The 10 questions included availability and willingness to assist students; respect and concern for students; pace of instruction; enthusiasm for the subject; organization of instruction; use of various teaching methods and materials; effective use of technology; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; maintenance of focus on lesson topic; and response to student questions.
The 10 questions were selected because they were related to topics, goals, and objectives in the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The other nine questions were not included because they were not pertinent to the study. The results were then analyzed by groups. The groups were all adjunct faculty members, A.A. and A.S. adjunct faculty members, day and nighttime adjunct faculty members, and adjunct faculty members who had taught less than one year, and also for one, two, and three years.

The section below presents the results on the student evaluations for adjunct faculty, first, by all adjunct faculty members, then length of time teaching, ten by degree program (A.A., A.S.), and finally by daytime and nighttime classes.

Looking at the largest category, all adjunct faculty members, the “face-to-face” group had a higher mean on student evaluations in only two categories. The questions about availability and willingness to assist students, and respect and concern for students, had a higher mean in the “face-to-face” group. The “online” group had the highest mean on the student evaluation questions about enthusiasm for the subject, organization of instruction, use of various teaching methods and materials, effective use of technology, and maintenance of focus on lesson topic. Those faculty who had never taken the course had a higher mean on the student evaluation questions about pace of instruction; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; and response to student questions.

The adjunct faculty members who had taught for one year had mixed results. The “online” group had the lowest mean of all groups. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean in questions addressing respect and concern for students, pace of instruction, enthusiasm for the subject, organization of instruction, use of various
teaching methods and materials, and effective use of technology for all three groups. The “never” group had the highest mean for all three groups in questions about availability and willingness to assist students; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; maintenance of focus on lesson topic; and response to student questions.

The adjunct faculty members who taught for three years had the highest means in the “online” group in all questions. The “face-to-face” group had the lowest mean in all groups.

Results on student evaluations were also analyzed by the program area in which the faculty taught either A.S. or A.S. The adjunct faculty members who taught A.A. courses had mixed results. The “online” group had the highest mean for questions about pace of instruction; enthusiasm for the subject; organization of instruction; use of various teaching methods and materials; effective use of technology; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; and maintenance of focus on lesson topic. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean for questions about availability and willingness to assist students, and respect and concern for students. The “never” group had the highest mean for questions about response to student questions. The “online” had the highest mean for the majority of the questions.

The adjunct faculty members who taught A.S. courses had mixed results. The “online” group had the highest mean for questions about maintenance of focus on lesson topic, and response to student questions. The “never” group had the highest mean for questions about pace of instruction; organization of instruction; use of various teaching methods and materials; effective use of technology; and encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean for
questions about communication of ideas and information, availability and willingness to assist students, and pace of instruction. The “never” had the highest mean for most of the groups. The sample sizes were small for the “online” and “face-to-face” groups.

All Adjunct Faculty Members

Looking at the “all” category, the “face-to-face” group had a higher mean in only two categories. The questions about availability and willingness to assist students, and respect and concern for students, had a higher mean in the “face-to-face” group. The “online” group had the highest means in the questions about enthusiasm for the subject, organization of instruction, use of various teaching methods and materials, effective use of technology, and maintenance of focus on lesson topic. Those who had never taken the course had a higher mean on the questions about pace of instruction; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; and response to student questions.

Table 9
Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for All Adjunct Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Never Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.3735</td>
<td>1.0171</td>
<td>4.4595</td>
<td>0.8618</td>
<td>4.4766</td>
<td>0.8526</td>
<td>6.2063 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.3699</td>
<td>1.0389</td>
<td>4.4852</td>
<td>0.8341</td>
<td>4.4915</td>
<td>0.8109</td>
<td>10.9486 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.1361</td>
<td>1.0656</td>
<td>4.1699</td>
<td>1.0311</td>
<td>4.0757</td>
<td>1.0185</td>
<td>3.1446 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.5600</td>
<td>0.7645</td>
<td>4.5381</td>
<td>0.8018</td>
<td>4.5144</td>
<td>0.8166</td>
<td>0.9370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.2905</td>
<td>1.0362</td>
<td>4.2697</td>
<td>0.9663</td>
<td>4.2258</td>
<td>1.0264</td>
<td>1.1516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>4.1214</td>
<td>1.0463</td>
<td>4.1188</td>
<td>1.0390</td>
<td>4.0866</td>
<td>1.0804</td>
<td>0.3605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.1148</td>
<td>1.0110</td>
<td>4.0966</td>
<td>1.0552</td>
<td>4.0806</td>
<td>1.0446</td>
<td>0.3202 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.2991</td>
<td>0.9643</td>
<td>4.3509</td>
<td>0.9146</td>
<td>4.2673</td>
<td>0.9510</td>
<td>4.0143 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.3686</td>
<td>0.9433</td>
<td>4.3528</td>
<td>0.9212</td>
<td>4.2990</td>
<td>0.9945</td>
<td>1.5491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.3541</td>
<td>1.0953</td>
<td>4.4476</td>
<td>0.9106</td>
<td>4.3543</td>
<td>0.9996</td>
<td>7.6984 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 1588 5103 812

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001
For Questions 2 and 3 on the Student Survey, availability and willingness to assist students ($F = 6.206, P = 0.002$), and respect and concern for students ($F = 10.949, P = 0.000$), all the adjunct faculty members who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had taken the online course. The adjunct faculty members who took the course face-to-face had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the $F$ statistic and $p$ value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test ($\alpha = .05$) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

For Questions 4, 9, and 11 on the Student Survey, pace of instruction ($F = 3.145, P = 0.043$), encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking ($F = 4.014, P = 0.018$), and response to student questions ($F = 7.6984, P = 0.000$), all the adjunct faculty members who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had taken the course face-to-face. Those who never took the course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the $F$ statistic and $p$ value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test ($\alpha = .05$) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

Adjunct Faculty Members Who Had Taught for Less than One Year

Table 9 presents the results for adjunct faculty members with less than one year of experience. There were no face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Courses taught within the first year of this group. The “online” group of the course was taught. The “online”
group had mixed results, with the “online” group having a higher weighted average than those who had not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course for all the questions, with all of these differences being statistically significant except for Question 3 on the student evaluation.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for Adjunct Faculty Members with Less than One Year of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online Mean</th>
<th>Online SD</th>
<th>Never Mean</th>
<th>Never SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Mean</th>
<th>Face-to-Face SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.5122</td>
<td>0.8609</td>
<td>4.4150</td>
<td>0.9165</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.1353 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.4959</td>
<td>0.9027</td>
<td>4.4492</td>
<td>0.8565</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.0268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.2520</td>
<td>0.9698</td>
<td>4.1161</td>
<td>1.0274</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.4156 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.6497</td>
<td>0.6697</td>
<td>4.4339</td>
<td>0.8840</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23.9903 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.4265</td>
<td>0.8673</td>
<td>4.1615</td>
<td>1.0228</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25.8583 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>4.3113</td>
<td>0.9426</td>
<td>3.9938</td>
<td>1.1008</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>31.9194 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.1875</td>
<td>0.9822</td>
<td>4.0109</td>
<td>1.0791</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.9885 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.5010</td>
<td>0.8060</td>
<td>4.2659</td>
<td>0.9358</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24.1420 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.4086</td>
<td>0.9315</td>
<td>4.2672</td>
<td>0.9358</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8.1342 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.5370</td>
<td>0.8209</td>
<td>4.4107</td>
<td>0.9369</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.9009 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 490 1294 0

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001

Adjunct Faculty Members Who Had Taught for One Year

The adjunct faculty members who had taught for one year had mixed results on the overall, combined results of all 10 questions on the student evaluations included in this study. The group who took the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had the lowest mean on results for all the questions on student’s evaluations of all the groups. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean in questions about respect and concern for students, pace of instruction, enthusiasm for the subject, use of various teaching methods and materials, and effective use of technology for all three groups. The group who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had the highest mean for all three groups
on student evaluations for questions about availability and willingness to assist students; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; maintenance of focus on lesson topic; and response to student questions. Table 10 presents the means and standard deviations for adjunct faculty members who had taught for one year.

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for Adjunct Faculty Members with One Year of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Never Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.1762</td>
<td>4.4539</td>
<td>0.8615</td>
<td>4.4444</td>
<td>0.8875</td>
<td>18.6916 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.1812</td>
<td>4.4276</td>
<td>0.8698</td>
<td>4.4383</td>
<td>0.8368</td>
<td>16.4950 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.1597</td>
<td>4.0943</td>
<td>1.1018</td>
<td>4.1109</td>
<td>1.0123</td>
<td>5.5290 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>0.8570</td>
<td>4.5176</td>
<td>0.7983</td>
<td>4.5269</td>
<td>0.8173</td>
<td>3.1489 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.1841</td>
<td>4.2744</td>
<td>0.9478</td>
<td>4.3045</td>
<td>0.9958</td>
<td>12.5058 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.1286</td>
<td>4.0968</td>
<td>1.0386</td>
<td>4.1485</td>
<td>1.0575</td>
<td>10.1773 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.0584</td>
<td>4.0775</td>
<td>1.0513</td>
<td>4.1599</td>
<td>1.0340</td>
<td>4.3289 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.0713</td>
<td>4.3270</td>
<td>0.9282</td>
<td>4.2097</td>
<td>0.9820</td>
<td>10.5330 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.0141</td>
<td>4.3853</td>
<td>0.8668</td>
<td>4.1911</td>
<td>0.9262</td>
<td>9.4205 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.1713</td>
<td>1.3111</td>
<td>4.4242</td>
<td>0.8963</td>
<td>4.2671</td>
<td>1.0784</td>
<td>17.4950 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 689 912 486

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001

The next several paragraphs will discuss results for the individual questions on the student evaluations.

For Questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 on the Student Survey, availability and willingness to assist students (F = 18.6916, P = 0.000), respect and concern for students (F = 16.495, P = 0.000, pace on instruction(F = 5.528, P = 0.004), organization of instruction (F = 12.506, P = 0.000), use of various teaching methods and materials (F = 10.177, P = 0.000), and effective use of technology (F = 4.329, P = 0.013), the adjunct faculty members who had taught for one year and had never taken the Instructor
Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score on the student survey than those who had taken the course online. Those who had taken the course face-to-face also had a significantly higher score on the student survey than those who had taken the course online. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means. Faculty who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had the highest means on student evaluations on each of the instructional variables above.

For Question 5 on the Student Survey, enthusiasm for the subject, the original test of Analysis of Variance indicated a significant difference. However, the post-hoc test did not indicate a significant difference for any of the pairs, rejecting the null hypothesis.

For Questions 9 and 10 on the Student Survey, encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking (F = 10.533, P = 0.000); and maintenance of focus on lesson topic (F = 9.420, P = 0.000), the adjunct faculty members who had taught for one year and had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score than those who had taken the course online. The adjunct faculty members who never took the course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

For Question 11 on the Student Survey, response to student questions, the adjunct faculty members who had taught for one year and had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score than those who had taken the
course online. Those who never took the course had a significantly higher score than
those who had taken the course face-to-face. Those who had taken the face-to-face
course had a significantly higher score than those who took the course online. Those who
never took the course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null
hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 17.495, P = 0.000), indicating
differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha =
.05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

*Adjunct Faculty Members Who Had Taught for Two Years*

The adjunct faculty members who had taught for two years had mixed results.
The “never” group had the lowest mean of all groups. The “face-to-face” group had the
higher mean for all questions except Question 6. The “online” group had the highest for
Question 6. This would indicate that the course was valuable for faculty who had taught
at least 2 years of teaching experience, and those instructors who took the course had
higher success ratings than those who had not taken the course.
Table 12

Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for Adjunct Faculty Members with Two Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Never Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.3083</td>
<td>0.9684</td>
<td>4.3894</td>
<td>0.8915</td>
<td>4.7273</td>
<td>0.5990</td>
<td>6.0003 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.2458</td>
<td>1.0697</td>
<td>4.4157</td>
<td>0.8718</td>
<td>4.7922</td>
<td>0.4684</td>
<td>9.4009 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.1167</td>
<td>0.9543</td>
<td>4.1232</td>
<td>1.0276</td>
<td>4.2857</td>
<td>0.8864</td>
<td>0.9479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.4417</td>
<td>0.8579</td>
<td>4.5313</td>
<td>0.8131</td>
<td>4.6753</td>
<td>0.6165</td>
<td>1.9576 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.4000</td>
<td>0.8925</td>
<td>4.1871</td>
<td>1.0131</td>
<td>4.3377</td>
<td>0.9405</td>
<td>3.1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>3.9583</td>
<td>1.0800</td>
<td>4.0473</td>
<td>1.0473</td>
<td>4.3026</td>
<td>0.8947</td>
<td>2.7204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.9623</td>
<td>4.0080</td>
<td>1.0809</td>
<td>4.1765</td>
<td>1.0066</td>
<td>0.9226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.1197</td>
<td>1.0185</td>
<td>4.3396</td>
<td>0.9348</td>
<td>4.4416</td>
<td>0.8958</td>
<td>3.6382 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.3729</td>
<td>0.8351</td>
<td>4.2833</td>
<td>0.9600</td>
<td>4.4805</td>
<td>0.7541</td>
<td>2.0096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.1849</td>
<td>1.0412</td>
<td>4.3634</td>
<td>0.9695</td>
<td>4.7013</td>
<td>0.5864</td>
<td>6.8180 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N | 120 | 1610 | 77

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001

The next several paragraphs will discuss results for the individual questions on the student evaluations for adjunct faculty member who had taught for two years.

For Questions 2, 3, and 11 on the Student Survey, availability and willingness to assist students (F = 6.000, P = 0.003), respect and concern for students (F = 9.400, P = 0.000), and response to student questions (F = 6.818, P = 0.001), the adjunct faculty members who had taught for two years and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course face-to-face had a significantly higher score on the questions on the student evaluations than those who had taken the course online. Those who had taken the course face-to-face had a significantly higher score than those who had not taken the course. Those who took the face-to-face course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value, indicating differences in the
means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

For Question 9 on the Student Survey, encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking, the adjunct faculty members who had taught for two years and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score on the questions on the student evaluations than those who had never taken the course. Those who had taken the course face-to-face had a significantly higher score than those who had taken the course online. Those who took the face-to-face course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 3.638, P = 0.026), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

Adjunct Faculty Members Who Had Taught for Three Years

As shown in Table 12 below the adjunct faculty members who taught for three years had the highest means in the “online” group in all questions. The three-year group had 10 questions that were statistically significant. Those who took the course online scored significantly higher than those who never took the course in all 10 questions. However, those who took the course online scored higher than those who took the course online in nine questions. Those who never took the class scored significantly higher than those who took the class in the face-to-face format in six of the questions.
For Questions 2 and 3 on the Student Survey, availability and willingness to assist students ($F = 8.583, P = 0.000$), and respect and concern for students ($F = 10.375, P = 0.000$), the adjunct faculty members who had taught for three years and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score on the questions concerning availability and willingness to assist students, and respect and concern for students on the student evaluations than those who had never taken the course. Those who had taken the course online had a significantly higher score than those who had taken the face-to-face course. Those who took the online course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the $F$ statistic and $p$ value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, for Question 2, the Tukey test ($\alpha = .05$) indicated a significant difference in the group means.
For Question 4 on the Student Survey, pace of instruction, the adjunct faculty members who had taught for three years and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score than those who had never taken the course. Those who took the course face-to-face had a significantly higher score than those who had never taken the course. Those who had taken the course online had a significantly higher score than those who had taken the face-to-face course. Those who took the online course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 18.863, P = 0.000), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

For Questions 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 on the Student Survey, enthusiasm for the subject (F = 16.756, P = 0.000), organization of instruction (F = 27.384, P = 0.000), use of various teaching methods and materials (F = 23.146, P = 0.000), effective use of technology (F = 23.146, P = 0.000), and maintenance of focus on lesson topic (F = 23.146, P = 0.000), the adjunct faculty members who had taught for three years and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score on the student evaluations than those who had never taken the course. Those who never took the course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who took the face-to-face course. Those who had taken the course online had a significantly higher score on students' evaluations than those who had taken the face-to-face course. Those who took the online course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value, indicating differences in the means
among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

For Question 9 on the Student Survey, encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking, the adjunct faculty members who had taught for three years and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had never taken the course. Those who had taken the course online had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had taken the face-to-face course. Those who took the online course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 4.976, P = 0.006), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

For Question 11 on the Student Survey, response to student questions, the adjunct faculty members who had taught for three years and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had never taken the course. Those who had taken the course online had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had taken the face-to-face course. Those who took the online course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 4.976, P = 0.006), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means of the adjunct faculty members who had taught for three years between those who took the
online Instructor Effectiveness Course and those who never took the course, and those who took it face-to-face and those instructors who took the online version.

Associate of Arts Teachers

This next section describes the results on the student evaluations by the program are in which adjunct faculty taught, A.A. or A.S., with results for A.A. program faculty presented first.

The adjunct faculty members that taught A.A. courses had mixed results. The “online” group had the highest mean for questions about pace of instruction; enthusiasm for subject; organization of instruction; use of various teaching methods and materials; effective use of technology; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; and maintenance of focus on lesson topic. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean for questions about availability and willingness to assist students, and respect and concern for students. The “never” group had the highest mean for question about response to student questions.
Table 14
Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for Associate of Arts Adjunct Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.3648</td>
<td>1.0251</td>
<td>4.3679</td>
<td>0.9172</td>
<td>4.4113</td>
<td>0.8922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.3581</td>
<td>1.0501</td>
<td>4.3978</td>
<td>0.8932</td>
<td>4.4182</td>
<td>0.8537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.1251</td>
<td>1.0743</td>
<td>4.0615</td>
<td>1.0764</td>
<td>4.0220</td>
<td>1.0400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.5583</td>
<td>0.7636</td>
<td>4.4876</td>
<td>0.8383</td>
<td>4.4724</td>
<td>0.8529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.2795</td>
<td>1.0466</td>
<td>4.1575</td>
<td>1.0166</td>
<td>4.1874</td>
<td>1.0377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>4.1201</td>
<td>1.0519</td>
<td>4.0101</td>
<td>1.0716</td>
<td>4.0490</td>
<td>1.1077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.1353</td>
<td>1.0123</td>
<td>3.9634</td>
<td>1.0989</td>
<td>4.0537</td>
<td>1.0614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.2938</td>
<td>0.9690</td>
<td>4.2649</td>
<td>0.9581</td>
<td>4.2247</td>
<td>0.9711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.3595</td>
<td>0.9545</td>
<td>4.2741</td>
<td>0.9621</td>
<td>4.2520</td>
<td>1.0293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.3394</td>
<td>1.1090</td>
<td>4.3460</td>
<td>0.9778</td>
<td>4.2853</td>
<td>1.0470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 1442

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001

For Questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 on the Student Survey, enthusiasm for the subject (F = 4.354, P = 0.013), organization of instruction (F = 7.311, P = 0.000), use of various teaching methods and materials (F = 5.478, P = 0.004), and effective use of technology (F = 13.700, P = 0.000), the adjunct faculty members who had taught A.A. courses and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had never taken the course. Those who took the online course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.
Associate of Science Teachers

The next several paragraphs will discuss results for the individual questions on the student evaluations for A.S. adjunct faculty members.

The adjunct faculty members who taught A.S. courses had mixed results. The “online” group had the highest mean for questions about maintenance of focus on lesson topic, and response to student questions. The “never” group had the highest mean for questions about pace of instruction; organization of instruction; use of various teaching methods and materials; effective use of technology; and encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean for questions about communication of ideas and information, and availability and willingness to assist students.

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for Associate of Science Adjunct Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online Mean</th>
<th>Online SD</th>
<th>Never Mean</th>
<th>Never SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Mean</th>
<th>Face-to-Face SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.7055</td>
<td>0.6661</td>
<td>4.7052</td>
<td>0.6236</td>
<td>4.8171</td>
<td>0.4804</td>
<td>2.6125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.7260</td>
<td>0.6272</td>
<td>4.6963</td>
<td>0.6185</td>
<td>4.8057</td>
<td>0.4636</td>
<td>2.6029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.4207</td>
<td>0.8051</td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>0.8211</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.8373</td>
<td>0.5530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.6712</td>
<td>0.7057</td>
<td>4.6965</td>
<td>0.6470</td>
<td>4.7600</td>
<td>0.5356</td>
<td>0.9309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.5342</td>
<td>0.7626</td>
<td>4.5693</td>
<td>0.7460</td>
<td>4.5200</td>
<td>0.8633</td>
<td>0.4307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>4.3448</td>
<td>0.8691</td>
<td>4.4133</td>
<td>0.8756</td>
<td>4.3699</td>
<td>0.8570</td>
<td>0.5487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.2199</td>
<td>0.9031</td>
<td>4.4462</td>
<td>0.8351</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>0.9301</td>
<td>8.0226**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.5586</td>
<td>0.7535</td>
<td>4.5885</td>
<td>0.7317</td>
<td>4.5233</td>
<td>0.7907</td>
<td>0.6696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.5890</td>
<td>0.7208</td>
<td>4.5619</td>
<td>0.7650</td>
<td>4.5429</td>
<td>0.7483</td>
<td>0.1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.7260</td>
<td>0.6272</td>
<td>4.6994</td>
<td>0.6501</td>
<td>4.7029</td>
<td>0.6091</td>
<td>0.1130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 146 1428 175

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001
For Question 8 on the Student Survey, effective use of technology, the adjunct faculty members who had taught A.S. courses and had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a significantly higher score than those who had never taken the course. Those who never took the course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who took the course face-to-face. Those who took the online course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 13.700, P = 0.000), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

*Daytime Classes*

The daytime adjunct faculty members had mixed results. The “online” group had the highest mean for questions about pace of instruction, enthusiasm for the subject, organization of instruction, use of various teaching methods and materials, and effective use of technology. The “never” group had the highest mean for questions about availability and willingness to assist students; encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking; maintenance of focus on lesson topic; and response to student questions. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean for questions about respect and concern for students. Table 16 presents the means and standard deviations for daytime adjunct faculty members.
Table 16

Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for Daytime Adjunct Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online Mean</th>
<th>Online SD</th>
<th>Never Mean</th>
<th>Never SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Mean</th>
<th>Face-to-Face SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.2000</td>
<td>1.1727</td>
<td>4.4038</td>
<td>0.9235</td>
<td>4.3774</td>
<td>0.9206</td>
<td>8.5340 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.1591</td>
<td>1.2417</td>
<td>4.4354</td>
<td>0.8813</td>
<td>4.4096</td>
<td>0.8489</td>
<td>16.5069 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.2233</td>
<td>1.0143</td>
<td>4.1825</td>
<td>1.0164</td>
<td>4.1364</td>
<td>1.0063</td>
<td>0.8223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.5434</td>
<td>0.8090</td>
<td>4.4901</td>
<td>0.8691</td>
<td>4.4600</td>
<td>0.8485</td>
<td>1.1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.3553</td>
<td>0.9678</td>
<td>4.3165</td>
<td>0.9325</td>
<td>4.3551</td>
<td>0.9587</td>
<td>0.5137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>4.1178</td>
<td>1.0576</td>
<td>4.0736</td>
<td>1.0771</td>
<td>3.9513</td>
<td>1.1781</td>
<td>2.8863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.1113</td>
<td>0.9938</td>
<td>3.9960</td>
<td>1.1296</td>
<td>3.9540</td>
<td>1.1404</td>
<td>2.7070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.1917</td>
<td>1.0542</td>
<td>4.2911</td>
<td>0.9626</td>
<td>4.2088</td>
<td>0.9892</td>
<td>2.6723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.2695</td>
<td>0.9799</td>
<td>4.3098</td>
<td>0.9465</td>
<td>4.1763</td>
<td>1.0805</td>
<td>3.2563 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.1470</td>
<td>1.2774</td>
<td>4.4265</td>
<td>0.9387</td>
<td>4.2238</td>
<td>1.1190</td>
<td>17.5992 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 485 1877 416

P < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001

For Questions 2 and 3 on the Student Survey, availability and willingness to assist students (F = 8.534, P = 0.000), and respect and concern for students (F = 16.507, P = 0.000), the daytime adjunct faculty members who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had taken the course online. Those who took the course face-to-face had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who took it online. Those who never took the course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.
For Questions 10 and 11 on the Student Survey, maintenance of focus on lesson topics (F = 3.256, P = 0.039), and response to student questions (F = 17.599, P = 0.000), the daytime adjunct faculty members who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had taken the course online. Those who never took the course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who took it face-to-face. Those who never took the course had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value, indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.

**Nighttime Classes**

The nighttime adjunct faculty members had mixed results. The “face-to-face” group had the highest mean for questions about availability and willingness to assist students, respect and concern for students, enthusiasm for the subject, use of various teaching methods and materials, effective use of technology, maintenance of focus on lesson topic, and response to student questions. The “online” group had the highest mean for questions about pace of instruction and organization of instruction. The “never” group had the highest mean for questions about encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking. Overall the “face-to-face” group had the highest mean for the most questions. Table 17 presents the means and standard deviations for nighttime adjunct faculty members.
### Table 17

Means and Standard Deviation of Student Evaluation Responses for Nighttime Adjunct Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Online Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Never Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting</td>
<td>4.4550</td>
<td>0.9246</td>
<td>4.4933</td>
<td>0.8202</td>
<td>4.5938</td>
<td>0.7490</td>
<td>3.5864 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.4689</td>
<td>0.9123</td>
<td>4.5154</td>
<td>0.8027</td>
<td>4.5881</td>
<td>0.7535</td>
<td>2.9164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>4.2233</td>
<td>1.0143</td>
<td>4.1825</td>
<td>1.0164</td>
<td>4.1364</td>
<td>1.0063</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>4.5678</td>
<td>0.7431</td>
<td>4.5673</td>
<td>0.7567</td>
<td>4.5783</td>
<td>0.7739</td>
<td>0.0341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4.3553</td>
<td>0.9678</td>
<td>4.3165</td>
<td>0.9325</td>
<td>4.3551</td>
<td>0.9587</td>
<td>0.8074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>4.1232</td>
<td>1.0415</td>
<td>4.1463</td>
<td>1.0143</td>
<td>4.2450</td>
<td>0.9303</td>
<td>1.9229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.1165</td>
<td>1.0198</td>
<td>4.1576</td>
<td>1.0026</td>
<td>4.2373</td>
<td>0.8894</td>
<td>1.9764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4.3497</td>
<td>0.9151</td>
<td>4.3872</td>
<td>0.8824</td>
<td>4.3362</td>
<td>0.9006</td>
<td>1.0402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Topic</td>
<td>4.4154</td>
<td>0.9223</td>
<td>4.3790</td>
<td>0.9046</td>
<td>4.4432</td>
<td>0.8621</td>
<td>1.2245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions</td>
<td>4.4514</td>
<td>0.9841</td>
<td>4.4605</td>
<td>0.8929</td>
<td>4.5071</td>
<td>0.8137</td>
<td>0.5088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1033, 3081, 352

P < .05. ** < .01. *** < .001

For Question 2 on the Student Survey, availability and willingness to assist students, the nighttime adjunct faculty members who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who had taken the course online. Those who took the course face-to-face had a significantly higher score on student evaluations than those who took it online. Those who took the course face-to-face had the highest weighted average. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the F statistic and p value (F = 3.586, P = 0.0278), indicating differences in the means among the three groups. Furthermore, the Tukey test (alpha = .05) indicated a significant difference in the group means.
Summary of the Qualitative Portion of the Study

The following questions all deal with the qualitative portion of the dissertation, and study the overall feelings of the adjunct faculty members and how they feel about the effectiveness of the Instructor Effectiveness Course and what they gained from taking the course. Listed below are the pseudonyms for all the adjunct faculty members along with their years of teaching and the method of Instructor Effectiveness Course.

Table 18
Focus Group Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Type of Focus Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>On-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>On-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>On-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>On-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>On-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 10. Do adjunct faculty members in the online training program and those in the face-to-face training program feel that the training helped them to be better teachers?

Three focus groups were convened using three groups of adjunct faculty members: those who had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course face-to-face, those who had taken the course online, and those who had never taken the course. The adjunct faculty members were identified by using their email accounts at the community college.
The researcher wrote a letter that was emailed to all adjunct faculty members’ email accounts by the dean that oversees the adjunct faculty members. This was done to ensure that the adjunct faculty members would open and read the email. The letter from the researcher was included in the body of the email sent as an attachment. This was done so that the adjunct faculty members would not have the fear of opening an attachment from someone they did not know. The adjunct faculty members were asked to contact the researcher, either by phone or email, to volunteer for one of the focus groups. The research questions that would be asked were developed prior to the focus group meetings.

The first focus group was made up of six adjunct faculty members who had taken the face-to-face version of the course. The group consisted of four males and two females. The person conducting the focus groups had previously conducted focus groups on many occasions. The meeting was recorded, and a complete transcription of the meeting was provided to the researcher. The names of the participants were coded to protect their identity. The data was transcribed and then read by the researcher. Most qualitative researchers begin their data analysis by reading and rereading in its entirety all the information they have collected, including interview transcripts and field notes, to get a feel for the whole (Rudestam & Newton, p. 156). Once the data had been read and reread, the researcher looked for themes that emerged from the data. The data was coded and then divided into themes.

The online focus group had the same questions. This group consisted of five participants, four females and one male. The focus group was conducted by the same individual who conducted the “face-to-face” focus group. The meeting was recorded, and a complete transcript of the meeting was provided to the researcher. The names of
the participants have been coded to protect their identity. The data was transcribed and then read by the researcher. The same themes were identified for the “online” group. The themes that emerged were:

The classroom
   Getting the class started right
   Policies and procedures and resources
   Legal and ethical issues
   Resources

Instructor confidence
   Dealings with students
   Dealings with the institution

Methodology- new concepts
   Trying new things

The overall feelings of the “face-to-face” focus group were that they felt the course was very valuable to them as adjunct faculty members. The time they spent taking the course made their overall teaching experience more rewarding. The comments from the individual members of the “face-to-face” group are below.

Three major themes emerged from all focus group sessions. The theme of getting the class off to a successful start was mentioned by most of the participants. Some had never taught before, while others had taught in public school or Sunday School. One of the participants had taught college classes and thought that she was knowledgeable in her classroom skills. They all felt that they had learned how to launch a successful class after taking the Instructor Effectiveness Course. Several of the participants shared how one
might be very knowledgeable in the subject matter that they are going to teach, but might not have the classroom management skills to be successful in the classroom.

Participants noted that the syllabus is a very important part of the overall success of the class. They stated that it is important to understand the ramifications of having a “contract” with the students, and make sure the instructor and students understand what the concepts, outcomes, and grading policies are going to be. They shared that they were not aware of the importance of a well thought out syllabus.

Ron, a mid 30’s male, said:

“This course has had a significant impact on my teaching career. When I took the course, I had not yet taught a college class before, so I was clearly nervous. The course taught me a number of valuable lessons, including never letting the students know you were assigned to the class at the last minute. The syllabus is a contract with the students. It must be taken seriously, and you should always try to adhere to it, while at the same time allowing for some flexibility to meet the students’ needs.”

Jim, an early 40’s male, said:

“Yes, I absolutely agree that this course was extremely beneficial. Some of the specific issues, concepts, and behaviors that were taught in the class that have had a positive impact on my teaching are as follows: first - conduct an effective first class meeting which includes creating a positive first impression, whet the students’ appetites for the course material, and use an icebreaker activity.”

Keith, a late 40’s male, also affirmed the importance of learning to prepare a syllabus:
“I had no experience before in teaching other than Sunday School. So, I didn’t know what to expect. Coming to the class, and learning how to do a syllabus and how to do the basics was very key to my success.”

Jan, an early 30’s female instructor, noted that, even though she had experience in education, she still learned new tips for syllabus preparations:

“As an early childhood educator I was aware of lesson plans, classroom management, and meeting individual needs. I took away from this class ideas for syllabus preparation, and being consistent and timely and fair.”

Cathy, a late 40’s female, was in the “online” focus group and shared her thoughts:

“I am not an educator by education, so the course helped me structure, think through how to plan the course, how to set up an understandable and clear syllabus, and how to organize the class to accomplish what we needed to accomplish. And then, some things that I had let go by the wayside, like an introduction of myself in the beginning, thinking perhaps it was too egotistical. I would stand up there telling them all these degrees that I had, and how wonderful I was. I found out in the course that they really do need to hear that stuff because it kind of sets the standard. Why are you qualified to stand before us?”

Sally from the “online” focus group, a late 50’s female, also agreed with Cathy: “I had also let the introductions go, and after taking the course I picked those up.”

Andrew, an early 20’s male from the “online” focus group, felt that his age was issue in the classroom:
“It made things much clearer for me on how the classes would be set up, and how I should deal with students. And I felt that this class helped me just to understand the basics of how maybe I approach teaching students that were somewhat close to my age.”

The next theme that was mentioned by most of the participants dealt with policies, procedures, and resources. The focus group felt that the course helped them to better understand the college and what was important to the institution. The culture of the college, as well as an informal organization chart showing who is responsible for what, were important to the adjunct faculty members. The college has five campuses and many teaching sites, and it was important to the adjunct faculty members that they learned their roles in the overall makeup of the institution. Issues such as grades, classroom management skills, resources such as libraries, centers for personalized instruction, print shop, and student services were very important to the adjunct faculty members. Many of them had never used the services on campus because they were unaware of what was available to them as adjunct faculty members.

Keith said:

“Being able to learn about some of the resources that were available and being able to pass that information on to the students was tremendous; being able to utilize some of those resources myself for preparation was great also.”

Mary, a 50’s female, shared the following comment:

“This course helped me to figure out where I needed to go for faculty information and for teaching information, the resources available, and just being able to navigate the campuses. I think it did help as far as getting connected. And not only with the college
itself, but seeing other adjuncts there and being able to talk with them, and interact with them, and hear some of the ways that perhaps they had found resources in addition to the course being able to provide the resources, or telling us where to go for resources. This course helped me to figure out where I needed to go for faculty information and for teaching information, and so that, as Keith mentioned, the resources available through the full-time-faculty helped in that, and just being able to navigate the campuses.”

Jan said:

“I was sick one Saturday class meeting, and didn’t know who to call or how to get in touch with someone. I was also teaching at another campus, and it was an awful feeling letting the students down. The list of provosts, security, and phone numbers for each campus would have been great. Now I have that information.”

Alice, a mid 50’s female from the “online” focus group, shared her thoughts on procedures:

“I’d been teaching for a year before I took this course. I didn’t know how to do that, and I didn’t know how to do the withdrawals, a bunch of technical things that I really wasn’t familiar with, and that was good.”

The third theme that centered around the classroom management skills involved legal and ethical issues. There was quite a bit of discussion dealing with these issues. Many of the adjunct faculty members shared how they had never considered these issues. They had thought about the material that was to be covered, but had never thought about what was legal and illegal. One part of the Instructor Effectiveness Course deals with ethical and legal issues such as Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), and
the college’s position on what is permissible to do, and what could get the adjunct faculty members into trouble. This was an area that produced a lively discussion.

Ron started the discussion by saying:

“The ethics component has stuck with me. In fact, recently, I graciously turned down a gift-basket that was offered to me as an end of class “Thank you.” The mini-case problems were very beneficial at bringing forth some obvious and not-so-obvious ethical scenarios that may present themselves. It served as a ‘what to do and what not to do’ manual.”

Jim agreed with Ron’s statement by saying:

“The subject of ethics is not a ‘one and done’ type of exercise. It is an ongoing developmental process that must be examined and reexamined; and the course taught me that when in doubt, always seek the counsel from the department chair or another faculty member in the absence of the chair.”

The next major theme dealt with adjunct instructor confidence. There was a lot of discussion about how the adjunct faculty members knew the subject material, but lacked the classroom skills to be successful in the classroom. The overall feeling was that the course had done a great job preparing them for the classroom and to be pro-active in entering the classroom. The adjunct faculty members felt that, because the course is set up in a discussion-based learning environment, listening to each other as well as the instructor discuss issues of classroom management helped them to see how others might have handled a situation. That helped them to feel comfortable coming to class prepared
with questions and share their thoughts with each other. They said it made them feel like they were all in it together, and that others had the same kind of questions and doubts.

Bill, an early 60’s instructor, shared his thoughts on how the course identified some areas where he could improve, even though he had taught for many years:

“I come from a background of many years of teaching. Because of that, this course was even more interesting in light of the mistakes that I had made in the past. It was beneficial because it led me to a more in-depth study on my part on how to teach, especially the area where we placed ourselves into the situation of being a student, and how we would like to have been taught. It was a tremendous boost in instructor knowledge on how to teach.”

Ron shared that the confidence in the classroom also carried over into his personal life:

“The class taught me to always be prepared and ready, and your confidence will impact the students. When I took the class, I was in the beginning stages of my MBA degree. The course gave me a shot of energy and reaffirmed my decision to continue my education. The course afforded me the freedom to ask questions that I was always curious about. The environment was relaxed, and I felt comfortable to be able to explore the subject matter.”

Mary shared how the course had helped her to experiment and have the confidence to try new things, not just teach the way she had been taught. She talked about how, when she was in school, the method of instructional delivery was lecture, and that was the way she had been teaching up until taking the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The course gave her confidence to take some risks.
“Going to this class, and going through the curriculum, and realizing that I can bring some of the things into the classroom that I’m comfortable with, as far as experiential-type activities and really hands-on, was enlightening to me. I think we tend to gravitate toward those things that we think are the norm because that’s how we were taught. And, even though we might not be comfortable with it, we may continue doing that way unless we go through an experience, go through a class, that says you can do this. It’s ok, and it’s cool. I think the climate of the classroom was such that nobody felt intimidated to speak their mind; there wasn’t a feeling that there were any restrictions. We were free to examine what the instructor said, what other people said, as long as it was respectful. We were able to share ideas, get engaged in the curriculum, and get engaged in the topics. You did meet people that maybe were having some of the same concerns for frustrations in their classes as you were, and you could get ideas, you could bounce things off them. There was time for a lot of interaction and a lot of sharing about things, so you built a bond with people that were encountering the same things as you.”

Alice also reported that the Instructor Effectiveness Course increased her confidence as an instructor.

“I think completing the course gave me more confidence because, though I had taught at the college level before, and I’m really not even sure if I can say specifically what information gave me the confidence to do it, but I think it just rounded me out a little bit better and enabled me to feel more comfortable with my teaching style because I
found it to be aligned and supported and maybe even beefed up a little bit from having taken the course.”

Cherry, a late 40’s female from the “online” focus group, felt the course helped, adding:

“I think what this class and the book does is allow people to feel more confident in the classroom. And I know what those students want is somebody up front who can lead that class, and they feel comfortable when the professor is competent in front of that room and has the resources they need to be able to teach well. I found that part very helpful.”

Another theme that surfaced was “methodology and new concepts.” There was a lot of discussion on how the adjunct faculty members teach and ways to understand the students. Student learning styles were covered in the class so that the adjunct faculty members would understand that everyone doesn’t process information in the same way. The adjunct faculty members felt that it was important to understand the different needs of the students in their classrooms. Discussions on methods of teaching, and not just the subject matter, were very beneficial to the adjunct faculty members. The classroom makeup at the community college level can be very interesting. The instructor may, and often does, have a class made up of traditional students, 30- and 40-year-old students, and students that are retirement age. Each of these groups processes information differently, and it is important to understand that.

Ron shared his thoughts on the methodology portion of the Instructor Effectiveness course:
“The course content that most directly influenced my teaching style was the concept of engaging the students’ level of participation and involvement through group activities, and by being able to move them out of their known comfort zone. Additionally, the course was designed in a way that the principles were experienced firsthand, as in the role of a student. Finally, the Denzel Washington movie quote, “Tell me like I was 6 years old,” is in my mind’s ear from the course; the point is, don’t assume the students’ level of knowledge, but assume their perspective (and consider their individual and generational learning styles), and remember back to when I first learned the material.”

Jim talked about how he looked at the teaching style from the students’ perspective, not just what was the easiest way for him to cover the lesson:

“One thing that had a positive impact on my teaching was to utilize the teacher’s “tool belt” by picking the proper tool for the particular learning task. The course taught me to look at my teaching style from the students’ perspective and always endeavor to try new things. Another aspect that I recall is the importance of students’ active participation in classroom activities. My experience as a student was to sit, listen to lecture, take notes, and leave. The course taught me that it is important to actively engage the students’ minds through small group activities, discussions, hands-on activities, etc. I would have to say that I fed off of the other instructors’ inputs, insights, suggestions, and feedback.”

Kevin, a late 40’s male, felt that the fact that he does not have children made him unaware of the generational difference between groups. He shared the following comment:
“One thing that opened my eyes in the class, that I really hadn’t thought of, was that it was the first time I really heard about the diversity issue in terms of generations -- the generational differences between Gen-X’s, the boomers. It was very interesting, and it opened my eyes.”

Cathy, a late 40’s female from the “online” group, also noted how the Instructor Effectiveness Course made her aware of different teaching styles:

“Being a new teacher, I didn’t have a teaching style. My personal style was to be fairly organized, and matter-of-fact about things and making presentations. But the book and the course helped me think about other ways of delivering information, and trying to diversify more my approach; and in that regard it was very beneficial, and I am still developing my teaching style.”

Alice shared her thoughts concerning student characteristics:

“I thought that the diversity issue was most helpful and most interesting to me as a teacher because I really don’t understand the demographics of a community college. I really wasn’t aware of it. And I think it made me much more aware, and I did also, with the information and sort of just, based on demographics, keep my eyes out for more instruction or helping those students who might fall behind more easily statistically.”

Sally added:

“My favorite part in the class was the difference in today’s students compared to when we were students, and how you more or less have to entertain them; you can’t stand up and just lecture to them”
Research Question 10. Do adjunct faculty members in the online training program and those in the face-to-face training program feel that the training helped them to be better teachers?

All of the participants of the focus group felt that the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a very positive impact on their teaching. It was also felt that the course had enabled them to become more effective adjunct faculty members. The focus group shared their many positive comments about the value of the course and what they learned from taking the time out of their Saturday mornings for four weeks. The adjunct faculty members are not paid to take the course, and they have to give up four Saturdays to take the course. While conducting the focus groups, the researcher had expected some negative comments on the time the course was offered or other aspects of the class. It was very interesting to see that everyone had extremely positive comments.

Research Question 11. Do these two groups of faculty feel that their training program helped them to be connected to the college?

The researcher expected to find that the adjunct faculty members who had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course would feel more connected to the college. One of the underlying themes in the course is how to make the adjunct faculty members feel that they are appreciated by the college, as well as to make sure they are integrated into the overall college culture. It is important for the adjunct faculty members to know what is happening at the college and to feel a part of that.

The overall feeling of both focus groups was that the Instructor Effectiveness Course was very effective in making them feel part of the college. Some of the adjunct
faculty members’ thoughts that took place in the “face-to-face” group of the course are noted below.

Ron had the following comments on the course and how it made him feel connected to the college:

“Teaching at night and on the weekends I think inherently brings a certain level of disconnectedness. However, the course taught me to actively seek out connections with college faculty and staff. Simple things like trying to come by the office and visit a couple of times a semester, getting to know the people in the print shop, and when possible get involved in committees. The course taught me the importance of making connections with the department’s full-time faculty.”

Jim agreed with Ron:

“Regarding the before and after comparison of feeling connected to the college, the course was beneficial in that it served as sort of an orientation to the college philosophy of teaching, in that the ultimate goal is student success through quality education, and also we see the student as a customer. Campus resources and the level of commitment to student successes by the faculty and administration serve as examples of the dynamics brought forth in the course, which contributed to a better understanding of the college organizational culture. Additionally, it was a pleasure to meet the other instructors in the class from various departments, and it added to the overall feeling of being connected to the college culture.”

Keith shared his thoughts on how effective the course was in making him feel connected to the college:
“Definitely, the matter of being able to learn some of the resources that were available and being able to pass that information on to the students was tremendous, being able to utilize some of those resources myself for preparation.”

The second focus group, who had taken the online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course, shared their thoughts on how effective the course was in making them feel connected to the college.

Cathy shared a comment on how the online version might be improved from a connection standpoint:

“The nature of being an adjunct lends itself for us working primarily in isolation. I do think it would be advantageous for all of us to have a way of meeting face-to-face other adjuncts in our school and particularly in our discipline. I don’t personally know anyone else who teaches psychology at my campus. I’ve never had the opportunity to meet them.”

Alice had the following thoughts:

“I think taking the course, I certainly felt more connected because it provided a dialogue with other instructors and with the professor. I agree with the fact that we are kind of isolated because we are only on campus for small periods of time. Sometimes I think, just teaching in general, it’s kind of an isolated activity, at least isolated from your peers because you do not teach with a bunch of people. You are the instructor, and they are your students. So I like the fact that I could have a rapport, and that the class provided a quorum for that rapport, and I kind of miss it, too, because I don’t have that anymore.”
Summary

The focus group sessions were quite beneficial in uncovering richer information about faculty’s perceptions of the effectiveness of the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The quantitative portion of the study had mixed results. But, the results of the qualitative portion were not at all mixed. The overall feeling of the “face-to-face” and “online” adjunct faculty members who took the Instructor Effectiveness Course was very positive about the course. For Research Questions 10 and 11, the responses were unanimous in that they felt the course had a positive impact on their teaching and helped them to feel that they were an integral part of the culture of the college.

For Research Questions 1, 2, and 3: What is the percentage of the retention rate, those who have taught between one and three years, of adjunct faculty members having completed the face-to-face, online, or never completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course? There was not a significant difference between these groups. The retention percentages were higher, although not significantly higher, for those who had completed the face-to-face or online version of the course in all categories except in the two-year category.

For Research Questions 4, 5, and 6: What are the students’ success factors as measured by class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face, online or never completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course? Surprisingly, results for all adjunct faculty members combined, as well as sub-analyses for faculty who teach in the A.S. program, faculty who had taught for two years, and faculty who taught at night all showed that students’ GPA’s were higher for faculty who had not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course than for faculty who took either
the online or face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course. The daytime adjunct faculty members who took the Instructor Effectiveness Course had significantly higher class GPA’s than those who had never taken the course.

In the “all category” the adjunct faculty members who never took the course had a higher retention rate than those adjunct faculty who took the course online, while those adjunct faculty who took the course online had a higher retention rate than those who took the course in the face-to-face format. This was surprising to the researcher. The only category where this was not true was in the “adjunct faculty who had taught for two years” category.

Overall, for Research Questions 4, 5, and 6, there were six categories that were significant for the students’ retention rates. The face-to-face method had a significantly higher retention rate in only one category, while those who never took the course had a significantly higher retention rate than those who took the course online in only one category.

For Research Questions 7, 8, and 9: What are the adjunct faculty members’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face, online, or never took the course?

All adjunct faculty members had five statistically significant questions. Three out of the five questions showed that the group that never took the course had a significantly higher score than those who took the course online, while two out of the five questions showed that the group who never took the course had a statistically significant higher score than those who took the course face-to-face.
There were several significant findings for the adjunct faculty members who had taught for less than one year. There were no face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Courses taught within the first year of this group due to hurricanes in the area of the study. The “online” group had the higher weighted average over those who had not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course for all questions, with all of these differences being statistically significant except for Research Question 3.

In the group of adjunct faculty that had taught for one year, the researcher found that the means for the adjunct faculty members who had never taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course were higher than for those who took the class online on nine of the ten questions in the student evaluations. The adjunct faculty members who took the Instructor Effectiveness Course face-to-face had a significantly higher mean than the adjunct faculty members who took the course online on seven of the questions. However, those who never took the class had a higher score than those who took the class face-to-face only on one of the questions.

Findings for adjunct faculty members who had taught for two years were mixed. There were four statistically significant questions. Those adjunct faculty members who had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course face-to-face scored significantly higher than those who had taken the course online in four questions, while those who had taken the course face-to-face scored significantly higher than those who had never taken the course in only three of the questions.

For the adjunct faculty group that had taught for three years, the “online” group was significant over the group that had never taken the course on all questions. The
“online” group was statistically significant over the “face-to-face” group for all questions except one.

The A.A. adjunct faculty members had four questions that were statistically significant. The “online” group was significantly higher than the “never” group for all questions. The A.S. adjunct faculty members had only one question that was statistically significant. The “online” group scored significantly higher than those who had never taken the course.

Daytime adjunct faculty members had four questions that were statistically significant. For all four questions, the “never” group was statistically significant over the “online” group. Two questions showed that the “never” group was significant over the “face-to-face” group, while two more questions showed that the “face-to-face” group was significantly higher than the “online” group. On the other hand, the nighttime adjunct faculty members had only one question that was statistically significant. The group that never took the course had a significantly higher score than those who took the course online, and those who took the course face-to-face had a significantly higher score than those who took it online.

The quantitative section of the research had mixed results, with no clear cut findings. However, the qualitative portion showed that all the adjunct instructors who participated in the focus groups felt that the class was worthwhile, and that it had helped them to become better instructors. They shared their thoughts on how the course had made them better prepared in the classroom and how it had increased their confidence. They also shared that they were more willing to try new things in the classroom and that they felt more connected to the college.
Chapter Five

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Implications for Practice and Research

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of an Instructor Effectiveness Course designed specifically to retain adjunct faculty members and improve their overall success in teaching. The study also investigated the “online” and “face-to-face” groups of the Instructor Effectiveness Course to see if any differences were noticeable. In addition, this study looked at perceptions of the adjunct faculty members who teach for a large suburban/rural community college, their feelings toward the institution, and their roles within the institution.

For the purpose of this study, adjunct faculty members are defined as part-time, non-tenure seeking instructors. They are hired on a semester-to-semester basis with no benefits. The Instructor Effectiveness Course is defined as a course that is taught in both online and face-to-face versions at a large suburban/rural community college. The course was developed to help retain adjunct faculty members and improve their overall success in teaching. Retention is defined as part-time faculty who have taught for more than one year.

Method Summary

This mixed method, causal/comparative study looked at the adjunct faculty members who have taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course at a large suburban/rural community college compared to those who have not taken the course. This large
suburban/rural community college employs approximately 1,400 adjunct faculty members. Four hundred of these adjunct faculty members have completed the Instructor Effectiveness Course that is offered at the college. For the past couple of years, the course has been offered both face-to-face and as an online version. These adjunct faculty members teach both in the associate of arts, A.A. program, as well as the associate of science, A.S. programs. The adjunct faculty members were divided into four groups by length of teaching experience: less than one year, one year, two years, and three years. The adjunct faculty members were also divided by those teaching A.S. courses and A.A. courses, as well as by faculty teaching night and day classes. The adjunct faculty members with prior teaching experience who have been exempted from taking the course were not included in the study.

The data was researched according to three “chunks.” Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 investigate adjunct faculty member retention rates. Research Questions 4, 5, and 6 investigate adjunct faculty member success as measured by students’ class grade point average (GPA), and completion rates. Research Questions 7, 8, and 9 investigate adjunct faculty member success as measured by student evaluations.

Summary of Findings

Using a mixture of qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques, this study explored 11 research questions, each of which is presented below with a summary of findings for each question that came back with a significant result. It is important to note that not all breakdowns will be included in the discussion of each question; this is because each division may not have been statistically significant.
Research Questions 1, 2, and 3

Of the adjunct faculty members who have taught less than one year, one year, two years, and three years, what is the retention rate for those who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, for those who have completed the course online, and for those who have never taken the course?

Overall, those adjunct faculty members who completed the face-to-face or online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course had a slightly higher retention rate than those who had never completed the course, 68.18% vs. 66.93%. This finding held true for all sub-analysis by length of time the faculty had taught (less than one year, one year and three years), except for those with only two years of teaching experience. The overall finding was that for Research Questions 1, 2 and 3 there was no significant difference between the groups. The retention percentages were higher, although not significantly, for those who had completed the face-to-face or online version of the Instructor Effectiveness Course than for those who had never completed the course in all categories, except in the two-year category. The existing data for Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 was not able to be subdivided into day or night, or A.A. or A.S., because many of the adjunct faculty members teach both A.A. and A.S. courses, and teach day and night sections.

Research Questions 4, 5, and 6

What are the students’ success factors as measured by the class GPA and course completion rates of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, for those who have completed the course online, and for those who have never taken the course?
In looking at the overall grades, the researcher found that while those adjunct faculty members who had taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course online had a higher class student GPA than those who had not taken the course at all, the same was not true for those who had taken the course in the face-to-face format. The research showed that those adjunct faculty members who had taken the course in the face-to-face format actually had a lower class GPA than those adjunct faculty members who had not taken the course at all.

This result was wholly unexpected. The researcher felt that the student grades would be higher in the adjunct faculty group who had taken the course face-to-face over the other methods. One possible reason for this may be that instructors who have not taken the class may give higher grades because they think that by giving higher grades students will be happy and they will be asked to return. It should be noted that the adjunct faculty members who took the class were taught about grade distribution, how to write a test, and how to deliver the class so that it is challenging.

The results from the comparison between the student GPAs from the adjunct faculty members who took the course online as opposed to the adjunct faculty members who did not take the course at all were also surprising. One explanation for this might be that the online courses that are being taught by adjunct faculty members are being developed by the adjunct faculty members themselves, and they may have designed the grading to be easier because of the newness of the delivery method.
Overall, for Research Questions 4, 5, and 6, there were six categories that were significant for the students’ retention rates. Faculty who took the Instructor Effectiveness Course via the online method had a significantly higher course completion rate than the faculty in the face-to-face course in four of the categories, while the adjunct faculty members who had never taken the course had a significantly higher retention rate over the face-to-face method in five of the six categories. In fact, the face-to-face method had a significantly higher retention rate in only one category, while those who never took the course had a significantly higher retention rate than those who took the course online in only one category.

While it appears that the group who never took the course did better than the others in terms of student success characteristics. The community college in this study has offered this course for the past 10 years. The course was originally offered to A.S. instructors, and then became a mandatory course for all adjunct faculty members in the A.S. degree programs about eight years ago. This made the A.S. sample much smaller than the A.A. sample and may have skewed the research. Another factor that may have skewed the course completion rate data was the fact that the community college that was the subject of the study had suffered three major hurricanes over the course of three years. This could have had a detrimental effect on the course completion rate, regardless of what type of Instructor Effectiveness Course the adjunct faculty had.
Research Questions 7, 8, and 9

What are the students’ success factors as measured by student evaluations of the adjunct faculty members who have completed the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, for those who have completed the course online, and for those who never have taken the course?

Overall, for Research Questions 7, 8, and 9, the adjunct faculty members who had never taken the course scored significantly higher than both those who had taken the course online and those who had taken the course face-to-face on most of the questions.

Again, this result was wholly unexpected. Those who never took the course are scoring higher on student evaluations than those who took the course in either of its two formats. As discussed previously, the researcher feels that this result might be partially due to the fact that the adjunct faculty members who never took the course were not taught about grade distribution, how to make the class challenging, and how to write a test. All of this might lead those adjunct faculty members who had never taken the class to over inflate their grades, and this in turn might skew the graders’ (students’) analysis of the instructor’s effectiveness, even in categories that were not grade-dependent.

Research Question 10

Do adjunct faculty members in the online training program and faculty in the face-to-face program feel that the training helped them to be a better teacher?

The “online” and “face-to-face” groups felt that the Instructor Effectiveness Course was very beneficial to their overall success in the classroom. The quantitative statistics varied in the overall success measures as to the effectiveness of the course, but the qualitative results were unanimous in that every one of the focus group members felt
the training was invaluable. Many of them wanted to have a follow-up course to go over things that had come up since completing the course.

Research Question 11

Do these two groups of adjunct faculty members feel that their training program helped them to be connected to the college?

The “online” and “face-to-face” groups felt that the Instructor Effectiveness Course was very beneficial in making them feel closer to the college. They developed relationships and contacts that have helped them feel a stronger connection with the college. There were no negative comments on the use of the course to make the adjunct faculty members feel like a part of the culture and overall institution.

The adjunct faculty members shared that they felt the college had invested in them by offering the Instructor Effectiveness Course and how it made them feel valued to the institution.

Implications

The findings of this study support the need for the Instructor Effectiveness Course. The quantitative portion showed that the course had mixed results on the overall teaching effectiveness of the adjunct faculty members. The qualitative portion showed that the course was very much appreciated and that the adjunct faculty members felt that the course had better prepared them to be effective in the classroom, as well as making them feel more connected to the college.

The results of this study provide qualitative data that shows the adjunct faculty members who have taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course benefited from the course.
The focus groups show that the overall feelings of those who took the course were that it gave them the tools to be better prepared in the classroom. The themes that emerged from the focus groups along with the comments that were shared by the participants validated the adjunct faculty members’ feelings on the course.

These major themes emerged from all focus group sessions. The theme of getting the class off to a successful start was mentioned by a majority of the participants. The focus group participants felt that they had learned how to launch a successful class after taking the Instructor Effectiveness Course. Several of the participants shared how they felt they knew the subject matter prior to taking the course, but did not have the classroom management skills to be successful in the classroom.

The next theme that was discussed was dealing with policies, procedures, and resources. The focus group participants felt that the Instructor Effectiveness Course helped them to better understand the college and what was important to the institution. The culture of the college, along with an informal organization chart, emerged as important components of the course.

The third theme was centered on classroom management skills involving legal and ethical issues. Many of the adjunct faculty members shared how they had never considered these issues prior to taking the course.

The next major theme dealt with adjunct instructor confidence. There was a great deal of discussion about how the adjunct faculty members knew the subject matter, but lacked the classroom skills to be successful in the classroom. The overall feeling was that the course had done a great job preparing the adjunct faculty members for the
classroom, as well as teaching the adjunct faculty members to be proactive in entering the classroom.

Another theme that emerged was method and new concepts. The adjunct faculty members discussed both ways to teach and ways to understand the students. Student learning styles were covered in the class so that the adjunct faculty members would understand that each student does not process information in the same way. The adjunct faculty members felt that it was important to understand the different needs of each student in their classroom. The focus groups also illuminated the value of the course to the adjunct faculty members, revealing their overall belief that the course had a tremendous impact on their teaching.

With the increase in accountability measures at the higher education level, it is important that community colleges find ways to improve their faculty’s teaching effectiveness—both full- and part-time. The use of adjunct faculty members has increased over the past 20 years, and it appears as if the trend will continue into the future. Every community college needs to find ways of insuring that its adjunct faculty members are prepared to enter the classroom. While this research showed mixed results on the quantitative section, the qualitative section showed that the adjunct faculty members highly valued the course. Although the online versus face-to-face delivery methods of the course had mixed results, this researcher feels that both remain valuable to the adjunct faculty members and to the community college as a whole.
Limitations

Population validity:

This study had several limitations. The first was that there were no “face-to-face” adjunct faculty members in the first year of the study. The second is that not all adjunct faculty members were required to submit evaluations. The third was that the A.S. instructors had been taking the course for more than five years while the A.A. instructors had only be required to complete the course in the past three years. This eliminated many excellent adjunct faculty members who had completed the course more than three years ago from the results.

Ecological validity:

There were three major hurricanes during the time of this study that could have had an effect on the results.

The quantitative section of the research had mixed results. The qualitative portion showed that all the adjunct instructors who participated in the focus groups felt that the class was worthwhile and that it had helped them to become better instructors. They shared their thoughts on how the course had made them better prepared in the classroom and how it had increased their confidence. They also shared that they were more willing to try new things in the classroom and that they felt more connected to the college.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

1. This researcher feels that the community college should determine which method of instruction would be optimal their adjunct faculty members. A blended method, combining face-to-face and online delivery, might be the most effective. For
adjunct faculty with teaching as their second job, the online method of delivery might be better integrated into the adjunct faculty member’s orientation.

2. Community colleges across the nation should look for ways to improve the overall quality of their adjunct faculty members. The adjunct faculty members should be given the opportunity to increase their classroom management skills -- helping them to begin each class with knowledge, confidence, and support from the institution, thereby creating a successful semester. The Instructor Effectiveness Course has the needed information built into the curriculum to give adjunct faculty members a solid foundation for their teaching careers. This course, or a group of it, should be made a requirement at all community colleges to ensure the adjunct faculty members have been given all the tools necessary for success in the classroom.

3. It would be beneficial to add to the course a section on technology in the classroom. With the constant progression of technological innovations for the classroom, it is imperative that adjunct faculty members keep abreast of the latest learning tools. Learning styles are also changing, and students expect instructors to be competent in current technological trends.

4. Community colleges should offer a version of the Instructor Effectiveness course for new full-time faculty.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. Similar studies of Instructor Effectiveness Courses should be duplicated in another community college to see if there are any differences between the institutions. Community colleges are distinctive, depending upon the community in which the college
is located. Every community has a culturally different makeup, and that makeup might change the results. A more metropolitan area might be different than a rural setting as to what is important to students and adjunct faculty members.

2. Another study should be conducted with more controlled data. This study used existing data. The limitations of student surveys, no face-to-face adjunct faculty members in the less-than-year category, and the fact that the A.S. adjunct faculty members had been taking the course for years could be controlled for with a study that is completed using data that would be collected over a period of years instead of historically. A new survey tool could be developed to measure the exact questions with which the researcher is concerned.

3. Another study could be conducted examining the benefits that accrue to the individual as a result of taking professional development courses like the Instructor Effectiveness Course, such as prompting an adjunct faculty member to consider going to graduate school.

4. Another study could be conducted examining whether there are differences in faculty 1) by discipline area (not just A.A. and A.S. degree), 2) by time of day that the adjunct faculty member teaches (day vs. night), and 3) by adjunct faculty member degree qualifications and experience in teaching, and 4) whether differences might exist based upon the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the adjunct faculty members.

**Summary Statement**

While this researcher understands that the quantitative results of this study may lead college administrators to feel that the Instructor Effectiveness Course was not
worthwhile, this researcher feels that the qualitative results indicate just the opposite. While the student GPAs and student evaluations of instructors may have yielded mixed results regarding the effectiveness of the course in helping adjunct faculty members to become better teachers, this researcher cautions any administrator that may use this study. There are far-reaching and long-term effects of the Instructor Effectiveness Course that may not be quantitatively measurable in the short term. Even in the long term, perhaps calculations and means alone can not sum up the worth of the Instructor Effectiveness Course. This researcher feels that, at least in this study, the qualitative effect of the course outweighs any short-term quantitative gains made by those who did not take the course.

On the whole, while the quantitative data on the results of the Instructor Effectiveness Course was mixed, the qualitative data was incredibly clear. The focus group participants felt that the benefits of the course were immeasurable. That alone supports the need for the course. Adjunct faculty have become a staple to both community colleges and universities across the country; now, more than ever, it is imperative that these adjunct faculty members be given all the tools necessary to help them succeed in the classroom.
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### Appendix A:

**Student Course Evaluation Form**

**STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Reference #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTOR'S NAME:**

**COURSE NUMBER:**

**DATE:**

This evaluation is anonymous. Instructors will receive a printout with summary data but will not see your written comments (on back) until after the term ends. Your honest appraisal will assist in assuring quality instruction at Indian River Community College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Style</th>
<th>Definite Strength</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Definite Weakness</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication of Ideas &amp; Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Availability &amp; Willingness to Assist Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Respect &amp; Concern for Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pace of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enthusiasm for the Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organization of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use of Various Teaching Methods &amp; Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Effective Use of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Encouragement of Independent, Creative, &amp; Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Maintenance of Focus on Lesson Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Response to Student Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Use of CPI, Library, &amp; Other College Resources Encouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Policies &amp; Materials</th>
<th>Definite Strength</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Definite Weakness</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Description of Course Objectives &amp; Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Explanation of Attendance Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Description of Grade Determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Examinations Related to Assignments &amp; Class Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Tests &amp; Written Assignments Graded &amp; Returned in a Timely Manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Usefulness of Textbook &amp; Assigned Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Assignments Appropriate for Course Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please turn this evaluation over to complete the "Comments" section on the back.*
Appendix B:

Instructor Effectiveness Course Syllabus

Instructor Effectiveness Training
MNA 1330
Spring 2004

Class: Saturday mornings, 8:30 - 12 noon
B building, room 111, Fort Pierce Campus
One credit course, satisfies portion of recertification requirement

Textbook: The Adjunct Professor’s Guide to Success (new adjuncts), Success Strategies for Adjunct Faculty (veterans), or Teaching College in an Age of Accountability (full-timers), available at the IRCC Bookstore, or at Amazon.com or BN.com. A 3 ring notebook is recommended for organizing handout materials that will be provided. Additional complimentary resources are available at www.developfaculty.com.

Instructor: Dr. Richard Lyons, Chair of the Adjunct Faculty Committee, received his B.S. in Business Administration and M.A. in Marketing Education from Western Kentucky University, and his Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Central Florida. He began teaching college courses as an adjunct instructor at WKU, following work as a supermarket manager and in sales. He has been at IRCC since 1987, as adjunct then full-time instructor, then later as department chair and instructional dean.

Office: Dr. Lyons will be available following the end of each class meeting in B 117. He may be reached at school, 462-4715 or from Martin & Indian River counties at 1-866-866-4715, or (best) by e-mail, at rlyons@ircc.edu.

Teaching Methods: A wide variety of instructional methods will be used to provide you with meaningful learning experiences, and to provide a model for you to adapt for your classes. These include group problem-solving, and self-analysis instruments, as well as more traditional methods.

Objectives: Upon completion of this course, each participant will be able to:
1. Explain the function of the department chair;
2. Develop an effective course syllabus;
3. Describe the factors impacting the success of community college students;
4. Conduct an effective first class meeting;
5. Explain prudent classroom organizational skills;
6. Demonstrate a variety of instructional methodologies;
7. Plan, conduct and follow up field trips and guest presentations;
Appendix B (continued)

---

8. Identify the factors impacting professionalism in the classroom;
9. Demonstrate transactional analysis techniques;
10. Compare and contrast test formats;
11. Analyze test results, take corrective actions;
12. Conduct formal and informal student evaluations;
13. Explain frequently misunderstood college policies and procedures.

**Attendance Policy:**
Although the instructor is providing opportunities for each participant's achievement of course objectives, please recognize the value that your experiences and insights offer others as well. Therefore, it is critical that you attend and participate actively in each session. An "S" will not be awarded to any student missing more than one class.

**Grading Criteria:**
Attendance, participation

Journal (standard provided), minimum of 6 entries

---

**Schedule**

**January 3**
**Planning the Course**  
*APG 4 & 5, SSAF/TCAA 3 & 4*
- The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Instructors
- Utilizing your most critical resource: the department chair
- Resources for planning: textbook, ancillaries, media, course outlines
- Today's community college student
- Developing an effective syllabus -- your contract with students
- Preparing for the first class meeting

**January 10**
**Managing Your Course Effectively**  
*APG 6 & 7, SSAF/TCAA 5 & 6*
- Introducing yourself effectively to the class
- Using "icebreakers" and "student profiles" effectively
- Establishing an appropriate atmosphere, professionalism
- Effective communications techniques, "Transactional Analysis"
- Managing class time effectively
- Dealing with common teaching challenges

**January 17**
**Martin Luther King Holiday (no class)**

**January 24**
**Maximizing Teaching Effectiveness**  
*APG 8 & 9, SSAF/TCAA 7 & 8*
- Dovetailing instruction and evaluation
- Asking questions, lecturing effectively
- Using field trips, guest speakers and other activities effectively
- Cooperative and experiential learning
- Using audio-visual materials and equipment effectively
- Infusing technology into your instruction
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January 31  Evaluating Success

*Journals due
Comparing and contrasting test formats
Exam construction, de-bugging
Scoring exams, using Scantron system, analyzing test results
Students’ and peers’ assessments of teaching: informal and formal
Questions, discussion

APG, SSAF, TCAA 10, 11 & 13
Appendix C:

Focus Group Questions

There will be 3 different focus groups: adjuncts that have taken the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course, adjuncts that have taken the online Instructor Effectiveness Course, and adjuncts that have not taken the Instructor Effectiveness Course.

The questions for the adjuncts that have taken the face-to-face course are:

1. Please provide your first name and courses that you have taught, and number of times each, since starting at IRCC.
2. When did you complete the face-to-face Instructor Effectiveness Course?
3. Our survey data shows that X % of those who completed that course believe it had a positive impact on their teaching performance. Do you agree or disagree? Why?
4. Do you feel that having taken this course you are more connected to the college? If so how?
5. What content within the course do you believe had a positive influence on the teaching style you have since developed?
6. Besides the content itself, what other factors inherent in the course, do you believe had a positive influence on the teaching approach you have since adopted?
7. Did the course fail to address any issues that would have proven valuable?
8. Do you have any other recommendations for improving the course?

The questions for the adjuncts that have taken the online course are:

1. Please provide your first name and courses that you have taught, and number of times each, since starting at the college.
2. When did you complete the online Instructor Effectiveness Course?
3. Our survey data show that Y % of those who have completed that course believes it had a positive impact on their teaching performance. Do you agree or disagree? Why?
4. Do you feel that having taken this course you are more connected to the college? If so how?
5. What content within the course do you believe had a positive influence on the teaching style you have since developed?
6. Besides the content itself, what other factors inherent in the course, do you believe had a positive influence on the teaching approach you have since adopted?
7. Did the course fail to address any issues that would have proven valuable?
8. Do you have any other recommendations for improving the course?
The questions for the adjuncts that have not taken the course are:

1. Please provide your first name and courses that you have taught, and number of times each, since starting at the college.
2. What, if any, training or experience did you have prior to teaching your first class at the college?
3. How adequate was that preparation?
4. Do you feel connected to the college? If so how?
5. What issues have arisen in your teaching that would have been especially valuable for training to address prior to the assignment of your first course?
6. Were you aware that this college instituted a course in 1996 to prepare adjuncts for teaching? If yes, what, if anything, have you heard about it? Why did you decide not to enroll in it?
7. How have your teaching methods changed since teaching your first class? What triggered these changes?
8. Do you have any recommendations for improving professional development of adjuncts at this college?
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