AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Sylvia Gray for the degree of Doctor of Education in Education presented on May 31, 2017
Title: Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics.

Abstract approved: _____

<div align="center">Shelley I. Dubkin-Lee</div>

This dissertation was a qualitative case study focused on part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics courses in one large Pacific Northwest community college. The college was selected for its size and maturity; the topic was selected for three related reasons: part-time faculty have been widely relied upon to teach these courses nationwide; students in developmental education courses tend to have higher risk factors and attrition rates; and mathematics courses form the bulk of developmental education (pre-college-level courses, formerly termed remedial). Research indicates that high reliance on part-time faculty (variously termed "contingent," "fixed-term," "contract," "adjunct," or "non-tenure track faculty,") results in negative outcomes in terms of student success and completion. These outcomes are often attributed to poor integration of part-time faculty into the institution.

The research questions guiding this study were:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

The guiding theoretical perspective for this study was organizational theory, informed by systems theory. The research questions were informed by Wheatley's (2006) three critical domains necessary for a healthy organization: the fundamental identity of the organization; the ongoing urgency to connect members of the organization to information; and the importance of developing relationships throughout the organization. In order to gain a holistic view, the study examined the college context and interviewed part-time faculty, full-time faculty, faculty department chairs, an administrative aide, and a dean involved in developmental mathematics education. These collected data were then broken down into categories informed by Baron-Nixon's (2007) principles for connecting part-time faculty to a college mission and analyzed according to three units of analysis: institutional, departmental, and individual.

The key finding of this research was that while part-time faculty teaching developmental education mathematics courses at this particular northwest college were well-integrated into the college identity, and while in this department many efforts were made to integrate them in terms of information sharing and relationships, barriers remained hindering full integration. These barriers affected the ability of part-time faculty to optimally perform their duties, depending on their individual situation. The barriers were for the most part institutional and structural and needed to be addressed at the institutional level.

Keywords: part-time faculty, contingent faculty, adjunct faculty, developmental education, non-tenure track faculty, remedial education, organizational theory, systems theory

Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics

by
Sylvia Gray

A DISSERTATION

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

Presented May 31, 2017
Commencement June 2018

<u>Doctor of Education</u> dissertation of <u>Sylvia Gray</u> presented on <u>May 31, 2017</u>

APPROVED:

_____

Major Professor representing Education

_____

Dean of the College of Education

_____

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my dissertation will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my dissertation to any reader upon request.

_____

Sylvia Gray, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to my girlfriends from the neighborhood – Shelley Baker-Gard, Sally Churchill, Betsy Elliott, Melissa Schuler, and Judy Bluehorse Skelton – all of whom patiently listened to my stories and believed I could do this.

Above all, deepest thanks to my wonderful husband, Viktors Berstis, who unstintingly supports my endeavors in every way possible. Thanks to my daughter, Joy Dunlap, who said, "Mom, you should do it. You're not too old." Thanks to my son, Joel Kaplan, who said, "Do you mean we could call you 'doctor'?" with a hint of pride. Thanks to my parents, Gorman Gray and Helen Gill, for teaching me kindness, thinking skills, and a useful work ethic. And thanks to my three wonderful grandchildren, Helena Kodiak Star Ceilidh, Jupiter Ceilidh, and Miles Kaplan, who bring happiness into my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS   <u>Page</u>

Section I: Focus and Significance

Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics

> "It is time to challenge the assumption we have come to accept: that carelessly
> hiring contingent faculty and then providing them with poor working conditions
> and scant support is acceptable. Only by frankly, publicly, and collectively
> examining the various and sometime conflicting values that need to be balanced –
> equity and affordability, humaneness and efficiency – can we begin to make
> better choices." (Kezar & Maxey, 2014, pg. 36)

The balance of both numbers and percentages between full-time tenured (or tenure-track) and contingent, mostly part-time, faculty in institutions of higher education has changed dramatically in the past 40 years. (In this study, "part-time faculty" or "contingent" will be the terms of choice except when specific studies use other terminology.) In 1969, over the broad spectrum of universities, colleges, and community colleges, roughly 78% of faculty members were either full-time tenured or tenure-track, and 22% were non-tenure track, often part-time. For a dramatic comparison, in 2009 these respective figures had almost reversed themselves: roughly 35% were tenured/tenure track and 65% were not. Seven years later and most recently, Finkelstein, Conley, and Schuster, speaking comprehensively, hold that "the overall proportion of 'regular' faculty (i.e. full-time tenured or tenure track). . .has shrunk to 29.7%" (2016, p. 14).

Separating out community colleges, the earlier figures were closer to 30% tenured/tenure-track faculty and 70% part-time (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2009, 2010; Center for Community College Student Engagement [CCCSE], 2014b; Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker, 2014; House Committee, 2014; Eagen, 2007; Ehrenberg, 2012; JLB Associates, 2008; Kezar & Maxey, n.d.; Mitchell, Yildiz, & Batie, 2011; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; TIAA-CREF, 2014). Updating the figures, Finkelstein et al. suggest that tenured or tenure-track faculty in community colleges now make up only about "one-sixth (16.0%) of the faculty" (2016, p. 62).

In short, at least two thirds of all faculty members are now contingent. Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) considered it one of the most "noteworthy" of trends, an "astonishing development" (p. 195), and point out that "between 1969-70 and 2001, the number of part-timers increased by 376%, or roughly at a rate *more than five times as fast* as the full-time faculty increases" (p. 40, emphasis in the original). Most recently, in their comprehensive study, *The Faculty Factor: Reassessing the American Academy in a Turbulent Era)*, Finkelstein et al. continue to marvel, "The most striking and consequential development has been the continued— and in some cases, accelerated—reliance on non-career-ladder faculty, both full- and part-time to do the instructional 'heavy lifting'" (2016, p. 94). In the conclusion of their study, they note: "Of the many dimensions in which the academic profession has been transformed in recent years, the most consequential, arguably, has been the large expansion of part-time (adjunct) faculty" (2016, p. 473). They warn that "The shrinking of the core staff and the heavy reliance on 'independent contractors' – amid the concurrent growth in academic administrative ranks – promises to wreak havoc on any semblance of traditional notions of an academic community" (p. 96). The implications go even further:

> If a reinvigoration and elevation of student learning are to be achieved, the risk of concomitant *de*preciation of the faculty's pivotal role in student learning must enter the equation with adequate weight. That is to say, if the faculty factor is relegated to peripheral importance, then the long-term deleterious effects on student learning and on higher education more broadly and deeply – and indeed, on the national interest – are thereby compromised. Put another way, student learning is directly dependent on the quality and commitment of the faculty, that is, "student centricity" in the fullest sense requires also affording due recognition to the faculty's proper prerogative. (2016, p. 461)

These warnings have been sounded throughout the years. Two examples should suffice: In 1988, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges warned of the dangers of over-reliance on part-time faculty in its recommendations, which included "11. Develop policies and

programs for the selection, orientation, evaluation, and renewal of part-time faculty; and 12. Avoid the unrestrained expansion of part-time faculty and assure that the majority of credits awarded are earned in classes taught by full-time faculty" (pp. 15, 16). That same year, California's AB1725 warned of the dangers of excessive reliance on part-time faculty who were not supported properly, and in section 35 stated that "the legislature wishes to recognize and make efforts to address longstanding policy of the Board of Governors that at least 75 percent of the hours of credit instruction in the California community Colleges, as a system, should be taught by full-time instructors" (as cited in California Community College Chancellor's Office, 2005). In 2005 a workgroup confirmed that recommendation and held that 75% of community college faculty should be full-time. But these warnings and attempts were essentially ineffective, and even in California where that standard was adopted, the ideal has not been met (Walton, 2008).

The high percentages of part-time faculty use can partially be explained by growth in enrollments beginning in the 1970s and the perennial difficulty of living within budgets that were dramatically cut in the 1980s and seem never to be entirely sufficient or predictable (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015; Cohen et al., 2014; Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Love & Estanek, 2004). Despite these challenges there has been a desire to keep tuition low and to maintain flexibility in scheduling. This has all been facilitated by a steady and dramatic increase in hiring of part-time faculty, a course of action that has allowed colleges to meet the burgeoning needs while keeping costs to a minimum (Banachowski, 1997; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Kezar & Maxey, 2015). Other factors are: the augmented number of administrators and their growing salaries (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015); the need to respond to "disruptive innovations" such as for-profit competitors

(Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015); and the corporatization of higher education (Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006; Rhoades, 1998). In addition, in order for institutions to treat full-time, tenured faculty well, they tend to cut corners by hiring part-time or contingent faculty, especially to teach in lower-level and introductory courses (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Wagoner, 2007). Finally, the numbers of students who have been encouraged to achieve master's and higher degrees in fields where there have been cut-backs in faculty hiring throughout the country has left many in debt and unable to find positions other than as contingent or part-time faculty (Kezar & Maxey, 2014).

What may have been seen as a temporary expedient has become a permanent, nationwide fixture, without commensurate planning or thoughtful intention (AFT, 2009; Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baron-Nixon, 2007; CCCSE, 2014b; Donoghue, 2008; Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015; Kezar, 2012; Kezar & Maxey, n.d., 2015; Kezar, Maxey, & Badke, n.d; Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Plater, 2008). Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) claim that if this issue were a priority, administration could place a check on this trend or even reverse it, but the will has not been there. CCCSE (2014b) states that "even in an environment perpetually characterized by funding constraints, colleges can control how they use the resources they have. College leaders can ask themselves whether their expectations for part-time faculty are aligned with student needs" (p. 3).

In spite of the permanent aspects of this phenomenon, data on part-time faculty has not been systematically collected nationwide or even within individual institutions and consequently , and it is difficult to access, underlining the lack of formal intentionality (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015; Coalition on the Academic Workforce [CAW], 2012; Cross & Goldenburg, 2009; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Kezar & Maxey, 2012; Tam & Jacoby, 2009). Since 2013, matters have

slightly improved and accreditors are slightly beginning to acknowledge that the issue should be taken into consideration in accreditation reviews (Kezar, Maxey, & Eaton, 2014).

There is a litany of issues related to this "sweeping reconfiguration" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 191; Finkelstein et al., 2016), many negative. First, the poor level of pay is a top issue for many part-time faculty (AFT, 2009; Banachowski, 1997; Cohen et al., 2014; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Jacobs, 2004; Yakoboski, 2015). As the CAW 2012 report put it, "Although most faculty members serving in contingent positions hold a master's degree or higher. . .their earnings are not remotely commensurate with their training and education. . . . The gap is particularly striking for faculty members serving in part-time positions" (p. 4). Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker (2014) believe that despite the pay discrepancies and difficulties part-time faculty face, as long as full-time faculty are willing to add on classes for a smaller percentage of pay, and as long as administrators feel they need part-time faculty in order to live within their budgets, pro-rata pay will not likely become a reality: "[Unless] the law or collective bargaining agreements do not stop them, administrators will continue to employ lower-paid part-time instructors. Part-time instructors are to the community colleges what migrant workers are to the farms" (p. 92).

In addition to discrepant pay, another top concern for many part-time faculty is that they can typically be dismissed at will, which causes instability and stress (Banachowski, 1997; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; House Committee, 2014; Hutchens, 2011; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Street, Maisto, Merves, & Rhodes, 2012; Yakoboski, 2015). About half of the part-time faculty express frustration at the lack of a career ladder or possibility of full-time positions (AFT, 2009, 2010; CAW, 2012; Yakoboski, 2015). The lack of access to benefits is also an issue (AFT, 2009, 2010; CAW, 2012; Gappa & Leslie, 1993); 28% of part-time faculty are concerned about lack of

adequate retirement provisions, in part because of low earnings or debt level (Yakoboski, 2015). Furthermore, research has repeatedly confirmed that many part-time faculty feel unappreciated and treated as "second-class citizens" in their institutions, and empirical evidence demonstrates that these are not imagined slights (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; House Committee, 2014; kezar, 2012, 2013; Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Thirolf, 2012).

Apart from the above-mentioned practical issues, because part-time faculty are typically not well-integrated into institutions of higher education, there are also issues that affect the well-being of the institutions themselves. According to one adjunct, "I think they [full-time faculty] think of themselves as 'the faculty' and the rest are, you know, different, 'other'" (Thirolf, 2013, p. 276). Part-time faculty may feel isolated (Gappa & Leslie, 2002), and last minute assignments that do not allow adequate time for course planning are often the norm (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; House Committee, 2014; Street et al., 2012). Nor are part-time faculty well-supported in terms of general working conditions (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015; Baron-Nixon, 2007; CAW, 2012; CSSSE, 2014b; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012, 2013c; Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Street et al., 2012). They are typically left out of shared governance, an important role faculty have traditionally taken part in (Bérubé & Ruth, 2015; Jolley et al., 2013; Finkelstein et al., 2016; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). While some may volunteer their time to attend meetings or meet with students, generally they are not paid for their efforts: "I was welcome to serve on a committee and not get paid," as one interviewee expressed it (Jolley et al., 2013, p. 227). This also burdens their full-time colleagues with increased responsibilities within the college (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Academic freedom for part-time faculty, although assured in various college policies, is, in reality, abridged because of their precarious position (American Association of University

Professors [AAUP], 2013; Bérubé & Ruth, 2015; Berry, 2005, 2008-09; Hutchens, 2011; Lyons,

2004; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Apart from student evaluations, part-time faculty are rarely

formally assessed, and professional development is often not available (Baron-Nixon, 2007;

Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jolley et al., 2013; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Lyons, 2004, 2007).

Finally, the preponderance of research suggests negative links between the high use of

part-time faculty and student success and completion, results that have been generally attributed

to lack of integration and support of part-time faculty (Burgess & Samuels, 1999; Calcagno,

Bailey, Jenkins, Kienzl, & Leinbach, 2007; Eagen & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang,

2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagen, 2009, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Smith, 2010).

Finkelstein et al. state that:

> It stands to reason that student learning outcomes and environments across
> institutional settings have garnered so much attention in recent years. What is less
> understandable is why there has been almost no attention paid to those individuals
> who directly impact the learning environment for students – the faculty – or any
> real discussion about the working environment of the individuals who educate and
> support the students – faculty and staff. (2016, p. 237)

And there are also more subtle implications for full-time faculty and the academic

profession itself caused by the over-reliance on part-time faculty. The AAUP has repeatedly

warned that academia is jeopardizing itself, especially in terms of the professional standards

ensured by tenure, as a result of the high dependence on part-time faculty (2003, 2014). Bérubé

and Ruth (2015), among others, argue that tenure needs to be redefined according to both

teaching accomplishments as well as research, and that high standards must be required, lest the

whole profession be denigrated. Jacobs (2004), in another example, makes an interesting link

between full-time and part-time faculty conditions. He scoured the 1998 National Study of

Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data base, examining faculty members, both full-time and part-

time, who were hired at four-year universities. He then linked the long hours expected of full-

time faculty with the poor conditions of part-time faculty, who often work without reasonable pay, "status, recognition, job security, and research support" (p. 4). Based on these links, he argues that the use of part-timers pushes full-time faculty to work longer and harder because, among other reasons, more burdens of shared governance and student involvement are placed on their backs as a result. Finkelstein et al. (2016) confirm that, empirically, full-time faculty are working longer hours and that the status of faculty in general has been weakened, stating that "the faculty as a major stakeholder in higher education. . .has lost considerable ground in being able to exert influence over academic matters" (p. 460). Kezar and Maxey (2016), with regard to the current faculty models and practices, argue that, "These problems are significant, systemic, and not going away. They represent deep and critical flaws that suggest the current faculty models are broken and in need of revision" (p. 23).

When one contemplates the negative issues listed above, an obvious question arises: Why do part-time faculty continue to work under these circumstances? In the words of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995), "They teach for myriad reasons – some intrinsic, some extrinsic: they teach to perform, to contribute, and to support themselves and their families" (p. vii). One adjunct encapsulated the sentiment of many: "I love the teaching; I hate the adjunct part of it" (Thirolf, 2013, p. 275). Much of the research has relied on the NSOPF faculty surveys (since ended) and others, as well as qualitative studies, to support these statements. While there are a variety of motivations and categories of part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Kezar, 2013c; Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006), taken together these faculty love the teaching/learning process, care for the students, and sometimes simply want to give back (Maynard & Joseph, 2006; Thirolf, 2012; Yakoboski, 2015).

Kezar and Sam (2011) and earlier, Rhoades (1998), suggest that, because part-time faculty are trained professionals, and because professionals normally find intrinsic value in their work and are highly self-motivated, the business and economic models that have been used to examine and explain part-time faculty behavior and satisfaction have ignored this salient issue. Some part-time faculty hope, too often in vain, that their part-time teaching might lead to a full-time tenured position in the future, yet the intrinsic satisfaction they find fuels their endeavors (AFT, 2010; Cashwell, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kramer, Gloeckner, & Jacoby, 2012).

In fact, many of these faculty members have specific expertise, unique perspectives, and much good will and energy that is shared with students and could be (and sometimes is) welcomed into the institutions as helpful, positive additions. Many of them go above and beyond what they are paid for, and as Finkelstein et al. state, "these data reveal that, for the most part, faculty members are engaged in similar teaching activities regardless of appointment type" (2016, pp. 269, 270). As the 2014 CCCSE study articulated it, "For their incalculable contributions to the lives and learning of community college students, and for dedication to the work under circumstances that can be both trying and triumphal, we salute the thousands of part-time faculty who teach more than half of community college courses" (CCCSE, 2014b, Acknowledgements).

Moving closer to the topic of this dissertation, the institutional integration of part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics students, given the lack of intentional institutional planning with regard to the utilization of part-time faculty described above, it is not surprising that college students in developmental education courses (pre-college level courses, formerly termed "remedial") are taught by a higher ratio of part-time faculty than in other disciplines (Boyer, Butner, & Smith, 2006; Boylan, Bonham, Jackson, & Saxon, 1994; CCCSE, 2014a;

Levin & Calcagno, 2008; Roueche & Roueche, 1999). While some students are simply reprising rusty skills, many of them come from the most underrepresented segments of society, where often their experiences in K-12 educational institutions, in conjunction with other socio-economic factors, have challenged their educational success (Perin, 2002; Roueche & Roueche, 1999). Retention of these students has been, nation-wide, a perennial problem (AACC, 2012; Bailey, Jaggars, & Jenkins, 2015; Bonham & Boylan, 2012; O'Banion, 2013; Roueche & Roueche, 1999). Yet institutions tend to rely on high numbers of part-time faculty to teach this segment of students, typically without solid support and integration into the institution (CCCSE, 2014b; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Zientek, Ozel, Fong, & Griffin, 2013).

Organizational theorists advise that employees be deliberately well-integrated into an organization for healthy organizational functioning as well as for ethical and humane considerations (Barnard, 1938; Bolman & Deal, 2013; Deming, 1982; Peters & Watermann, 1982; Senge, 1990, 2006; Wheatley, 1992, 2006; Youngblood, 1997a, b; Zohar, 1997). Yet instructional contracts for part-time faculty characteristically only require teaching an assigned course without the attendant considerations of extra-class contact with students, participation in shared governance, or service to the college; often basic institutional supports are not provided, such as orientations, institutional information, introductions to other faculty, and the opportunities for relationship building. While there are many suggestions in the research for better integrating and supporting part-time faculty, and there are some instances where innovative efforts are being made, the bulk of part-time faculty are typically not well integrated into the institutions where they teach (Baron-Nixon, 2007; CCCSE, 2014b; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lyons, 2004, 2007; Kezar, 2012, 2013a; Kezar & Sam, 2010b).

Finally, Kezar & Maxey's (2015) important report, *Adapting by Design: Creating Faculty Roles and Defining Faculty Work to Ensure an Intentional Future for Colleges and Universities,* takes an overarching view on the research that has been done to date on part-time faculty use and suggests that it is a nationwide problem needing nationwide attention by many important entities, such as accrediting organizations, disciplinary societies, state policymakers, and more. In listing the issues resulting from overreliance on part-time faculty, they include issues of inequity, negative influence on student success, lack of professional development, lack of evaluation, lack of orientation, lack of job security, dehumanization, and the undermining of college missions. When one compares the issues that they list with the recommendations that have been ubiquitous since Gappa & Leslie's (1993) landmark work, *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education,* the intransigence of the problem is surprising.

1.1 Definitions

A great many terms have been used to describe "non-tenure track faculty" or "contingent faculty." There are some slight differences and nuances of meaning, but the faculty that fall under these labels deal with strikingly similar challenges (with the exception of those rare few who might have a part-time tenured position). A contingent or non-tenure track faculty member may be full-time or part-time, as would a "limited-term" or "contractual" faculty member. Part-time faculty may also be termed "adjunct." Other terms in less-common use are "casual," "special," "irregular, "temporary," "ad hoc," and more (Berry, 2005; Organization of American Historians (OAH), 2014). Suggestions have been made to call these faculty something more inclusive, such as "associated faculty" or "affiliated faculty" (Baron-Nixon, 2007), but these terms are not commonly in use.

For this dissertation, I have studied the part-time faculty at one Pacific Northwest community college and use the term in use at that institution, "part-time faculty." When referring to other scholars' work, or when the context broadens to other employment-insecure faculty, depending on the context, I use "contingent" or the particular terminology the researcher in discussion has used. "Developmental education" or "developmental mathematics," my terms of choice, refer to pre-college-level courses, but, in the past, have often been referred to as "remedial," as well as "compensatory," "preparatory," "pre-college" or "basic skills" (Cohen et al., 2014).

"Integration" is defined for this study as demonstrating an identity with the organization and evidence of being included in the informational and relational networks of the college. This can be demonstrated by such key things as inclusive recruitment, clear criteria for hiring, orientation, mentoring, shared information, professional development, recognition, inclusion in social gatherings, inclusion in shared governance, friendly relationships, acknowledgement of contributions, and a general feeling of inclusion (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

1.2 Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation has been to study the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses in one department of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. Because this student population often needs extra support and services (AACC, 2012; Fike & Fike, 2007; Roueche & Roueche, 1999), the part-time faculty serving these students comprise a particularly vital group for study. This case study has allowed for targeted understanding of the issues and suggests practical improvements (Merriam, 2009).

The research questions guiding this study are:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

Integration of employees into an organization is considered crucial by organizational theorists (Barnard, 1938; Bolman & Deal, 2013; Deming, 1982; Peters & Watermann, 1982; Senge, 2006; Wheatley, 2006; Youngblood, 1997a, b). Literature on part-time faculty demonstrates lack of support and organizational integration (Baron-Nixon, 2007; CCCSE, 2014b; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; House Committee, 2015; Lyons, 2004, 2007; Kezar, 2012, 2013; Kezar & Sam, 2010b). In addition, research suggests negative links between reliance on part-time faculty and student success and completion (Burgess & Samuels, 1999; Calcagno et al., 2008; Eagen & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagen, 2009, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Smith, 2010). Much of the research on part-time faculty to date has been on large-scale groups, although it has been shown that part-time faculty represent a great variety of situations and motivations (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Levin et al., 2006), and there is a need for particular and qualitative research on specific categories of part-time faculty (Kezar & Sam, 2010a). According to some studies, as many as 90% of incoming students to community colleges have been assigned to remedial courses, 85% of them into mathematics (Cohen et al., 2014). Of these, 58% of students enroll in a developmental course at community colleges (Bailey, Jeong, & Cho, 2009). Students taking developmental education courses have some of the greatest at-risk factors (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2012; Fike & Fike, 2007; Roueche & Roueche, 1998), and they are usually

taught by a higher percentage of part-time faculty than in other disciplines (Boyer et al., 2006; CCCSE, 2014b; Roueche & Roueche, 1999). Taken together, this implies that a study on organizational integration of faculty teaching developmental education in mathematics is of prime importance.

1.3 Guiding Theoretical Perspective

Wheatley (2006) has utilized systems and chaos theory to inform organizational theory, and her work has provided the guiding framework for this study. She proposes three critical domains for building organizational self-knowledge, leading to healthy, dynamic organizations: (1) the fundamental identity of the organization; (2) the urgency to connect members of the organization to information and (3) the importance of developing relationships throughout the organization.

My assumption, based on the research, is that better integration and support of part-time faculty would improve organizational health and help it to achieve its goals more effectively, particularly with regard to student success (Burgess & Samuels, 1999; Calcagno et al., 2007; Eagen & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagen, 2009, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Smith, 2010; Umbach, 2007). In this particular case study, this assumption is focused on the part-time faculty who teach students in developmental mathematics courses.

1.4 Scholarly Significance

This study brings together strands of research on organizational theory, on part-time faculty, and on developmental mathematics education. There has been much research on the high percentages of part-time faculty; on inadequate processes in hiring and supporting part-time faculty; and on effects on student success, all of which have been briefly described above and is

further-explored in the literature review section to follow. It has been established that there is a great variety of motivations and satisfaction among part-time faculty and that there is a gap in the literature exploring "differences in the experiences, outcomes, and commitment of non-tenure track faculty" (Kezar & Sam, 2010a, p. 68). Areas most needed in current research would be "differences by motivation, department, discipline, and institutional type" (Eagen, 2007; Kezar & Sam, 2010a, p. 68). Targeted studies on segments of part-time faculty are still rare and limited, particularly qualitative studies. It has also been noted that not many studies on the use of part-time faculty have employed the framework of organizational theory within which to explore the issues (Kezar & Sam 2010a; Kezar & Sam, 2011).

It is therefore essential to learn more about specific groups of part-time faculty who are teaching the bulk of community college students, using the framework of organizational theory. In this case study, I have focused on part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics courses on one campus, examining how they are integrated into the organization. This current study adds to general research on the use of part-time faculty with a focus on students in developmental mathematics education. As a case study, it is fairly unique in that it includes various categories of employees in the department, providing a more holistic understanding than previous studies.

1.5 Practical Significance

This case study has explored in what ways part-time faculty who are engaged in teaching developmental mathematics courses are integrated into the organization. Underlying this research project is the assumption, based on the research referenced above and examined in more detail in the literature review, that deliberate support, integration, and treatment of part-time

faculty will not only make the organization healthier, but will also enhance student learning and lead to increased student success.

Working from this assumption, this study has practical significance by elucidating the process and effect of integrating part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics courses. It concludes with suggestions for strategies supporting and integrating these crucial employees in order to provide good developmental student outcomes.

1.6 Findings

The key finding of this research was that while part-time faculty teaching developmental education mathematics courses at this particular northwest college were well-integrated into the college identity, and while in this department many efforts were made to integrate them in terms of information sharing and relationships, barriers remained hindering full integration. These barriers affected the ability of part-time faculty to optimally perform their duties, depending on their individual situation. The barriers were for the most part institutional and structural and needed to be addressed at the institutional level.

1.7 Summary

This study adds to the work already in existence on the burgeoning use of part-time faculty in higher education and its implications. The purpose of this dissertation has been to study the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses in one department of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. The research questions guiding this study are:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

Scholarship on part-time faculty is lacking in terms of "differences in the experiences, outcomes, and commitment of non-tenure track faculty" (Kezar & Sam, 2010a, p. 68). Areas most needed in current research are "differences by motivation, department, discipline, and institutional type" (Kezar & Sam, 2010a, p. 68). This study begins to fill those gaps by focusing on organizational integration of part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics courses, using Wheatley's framework of identity, information, and relationships as critical domains of an organization. The research ultimately suggests strategies where practical organizational changes and improvements could be made to improve support and integration of these crucial employees and to possibly improve developmental mathematics student outcomes.

Section II: Literature Review

The purpose of this literature review is to explore the research already done concerning integration of part-time faculty in higher education and provide a foundation for research on the questions:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

The research to date has tended to focus on categories of part-time faculty and their job satisfaction, as well as their correlation with student success. It has often offered suggestions for better support and integration, all of which are explored in this literature review as laying the groundwork for this study. In addition, research has been included focusing on part-time faculty engaged in teaching developmental education, particularly in community colleges (Creswell, 2014; Merriam, 2009). The literature review also demonstrates where there have been gaps in the literature, particularly in terms of sub-groups and organizational theory, and specifically situated in developmental mathematics (Kezar & Sam, 2010a).

To set a theoretical basis, the literature review first summarizes systems theory as applied to organizations and as relevant to the integration of employees into an institution. This provides the lens through which to examine integration of part-time faculty working in developmental education programs (Merriam, 2009).

2.1 Data Bases and Key Terms

To scan for literature relevant to the theoretical framework of the topic, search words included "organizational theory," "chaos theory," and "systems theory." To scan for literature on part-time faculty, search words were "contingent," "contingent faculty," "part-time faculty," "adjunct faculty," "non-tenure track faculty." To scan for studies on developmental education, search words included: "developmental education" and "remedial education." To find recommended practices, "community college" along with "best practices," "support," "integration," and "professional development" were used in conjunction with the previous terms.

The search began in Google Scholar, which provided a wealth of leads but did not include access to all articles or indicate whether they were "peer-reviewed." The next step was using Oregon State University Library's "1Search" when the title of the journal article was available, which led to varying data bases such as ERIC, JSTOR, Sage, Clio, and more. In addition to periodically scanning *Review of Educational Research* for topics that may have touched on those mentioned above, *Educators Reference Complete* and *Education Research Complete* provided more leads. Once appropriate journal articles, dissertations, and books were located, the citations in those sources proved a fruitful path forward.

The works on organizational theory discussed below include certain salient historical contributions as well as attempts to apply systems theory to organizations, but my research ultimately relies on Margaret Wheatley's presentation in *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (2006). The beginning date for the literature on part-time faculty is 1993 because of the landmark, constantly-referenced work of Gappa and Leslie, *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*. Two years later, Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron (1995) wrote a complementary and important study, *Strangers in Their Own Land: Part-Time Faculty in American Community Colleges*, which contains

interesting parallels to my own study. Apart from those, the research weighs towards work dating from after 2000. Peer-reviewed journal articles have been considered more reliable than other sources, but some conference proceedings, reports, and dissertations have also been referenced. Works on developmental education are prioritized after the influential overview by Roueche and Roueche (1999), *High Stakes, High Performance: Making Remedial Education Work,* again preferring more recent studies.

2.2 Approach to Literature Review

To set the theoretical limits of this dissertation, organizational theory defined by systems theory has been adopted, and Wheatley's three "critical domains" (identity, information, relationships) have been used as a guiding theoretical construct (Kezar & Sam, 2010a; Wheatley, 2006, p. 146).

The literature on part-time faculty is robust and employs a variety of nomenclature, including "non-tenure track," "adjunct," "contingent" faculty, and more, but these terms do not always mean the same thing. For instance, "contingent" faculty lack job security but may be employed part-time *or* full-time with time-limited contracts. Because research demonstrates there are enough similarities and overlap between community colleges and four-year colleges with regard to part-time faculty use, they are both included in the research as informative to the topic with distinctions noted throughout, though community colleges and part-time faculty are prioritized. A strong segment of this literature focuses on part-time faculty satisfaction (or dissatisfaction), suggestions for institutional support, and the effect of reliance on part-time faculty on student success (Kezar, 2012). This literature is the groundwork upon which this research will build.

There has also been much research on developmental education, although there are great discrepancies in practice between various community colleges. It has been a topic of current discussion and many adjustments have been in process (AACC, 2012; Bailey et al., 2015; Bonham & Boylan, 2012; O'Banion, 2013). The research in this dissertation focuses on the intersection of part-time faculty and developmental mathematics education.

2.3 Theoretical Basis: Systems Theory Applied to Organizational Theory

It has been noted that not many studies on the use of part-time faculty have employed the framework of organizational theory from which to explore the issues (Kezar & Sam 2010a). The perspective from which I explore these questions is organizational theory, informed by systems theory. This section begins by briefly describing systems theory; it then looks at Margaret Wheatley's work which relies on systems theory; it then compares Wheatley's work to that of other related or similar organizational theorists; and it concludes by connecting Wheatley's theory to the situations of part-time faculty.

2.3.1 Systems Theory.

I will rely on Capra's *The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems* (1996) for a basic explanation of systems theory as it is referred to in this study. Capra holds that "the essential properties of an organism, or living system, are properties of the whole, which none of the parts have. They arise from the interactions and relationships among the parts" (Capra, 1996, p. 29). Often there are a series of levels in a system, and, for full understanding, the system must be examined at these varying levels, shifting attention back and forth. Ultimately, the things which can be said are approximate.

There are several other aspects of systems theory that bear emphasis. One is that networks are common to all living systems (Capra, 1996). Networks are "nonlinear" – they go in

all directions. In this process, they generate "feedback loops" from which the living system can learn (Capra, 1996, pp. 82, 83). Given a flow of energy into the network, the system will eventually self-organize into detectable patterns Capra ultimately defines the pattern of organization as "the configuration of relationships that determines the system's essential characteristics" (1996, p. 161).

Capra (1996) attributes another aspect of systems theory to the ideas of Ilya Prigogene, who introduced the idea of "dissipative structures," or that structures which tend toward change can actually thrive in disequilibrium and will find new ways to self-organize. In the 1970s, a synthesis of various related theories, including chaos theory, produced a list of what it took to self-organize: a source of energy, a stability of disequilibrium, appearance of new order, and feedback loops.

The final aspect of systems theories is process. Process is defined briefly as "the activity involved in the continual embodiment of the system's pattern of organization" (Capra, p. 161). Capra argues that all living systems are "cognitive systems," even before they develop brains.

2.3.2 Margaret Wheatley's principles and framework. Margaret Wheatley has been given credit for applying systems theory to organizational theory in her *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (Cutright, 2001; Wheatley, 2006)*.* Wheatley's theories derive greatly from systems and chaos models, and she emphasizes, above all, the organic interconnectedness of all things, which she conceives as a basis for organizational principles. She argues that most organizational efforts for change are not effective because they treat the organization in a mechanistic framework. Instead, she argues for working within the whole of a system. If something needs change, the system itself needs change. She suggests looking at the whole organization, narrowing it to individual problems, and moving back out

again. To be effective, people need to "leave behind the *imaginary organization* we design and learn to work with the *real organization*, which would always be a dense network of interdependent relationships" (Wheatley, 2006, p. 144, emphasis in the original). "To create better health in a living system, connect it to more of itself" (Wheatley, 2005, p. 93).

To make these ideas practicable, she advocates using principles, not techniques (Wheatley, 2005), and she defines three "critical domains": (1) the fundamental identity of the organization; (2) the urgency to connect members of the organization to information; and (3) the importance of developing relationships throughout the organization. (Wheatley, 2006). She argues that with those fundamentals in place, the organization will change positively as a matter of self-preservation. Wheatley (1998) advocates a complete transformation of the "story" told in the last 300 years of Western culture. She characterizes this "as a story of dominion and control and all-encompassing materialism" (p. 341), leading to the West's embrace of a mechanistic and technological story and giving up "most of what is essential to being human. We created ourselves devoid of spirit, will, passion, compassion, [and] even intelligence" (p. 342). In contrast, she advocates embracing a new story, where creativity, inspiration and innovation are free to breathe life into the organization. She quotes the famed management consultant, Deming, who at the end of his life stated that "quality was about the human spirit" (p. 349).

2.3.3 Organizational thinkers utilizing similar principles. In the array of organizational thinkers from the last century to the present—although working from earlier paradigms—some notably argued that communication networks and integration of employees are key to successful organizations. They spoke to the principles that were later articulated by Wheatley in the context of systems theory.

One salient example is Barnard's classic *The Functions of the Executive* (1938), which described formal hierarchical organizations but then moved to the importance of informal systems within any organization, describing them as "indefinite and rather structureless. . . . a shapeless mass of quite varied densities" (p. 115). He believed that informal organization emerged before the articulation of formal organization, and that it remained necessary to the functioning of the formal organization. From these informal systems arose communication, cohesiveness, and maintenance of "the feeling of personal integrity, of self-respect, or independent choice . . .a means of maintaining the personality of the individual against certain effects of formal organizations which tend to disintegrate the personality" (p. 122). He measured the "efficiency" of the organization by the degree to which it could satisfy individual motives. In order to achieve this, he summarized the functions of the executive as: (1) establishing and maintaining a system of communication; (2) securing essential services from other members; and (3) formulating organizational purposes and objectives. His principles of communication included providing access to the shortest and most direct channels to where a message needs to go and giving that access to everyone. His principles for securing cooperation from workers included good pay, good working conditions, awards, and enhanced participation and collegiality throughout the organization. While differently framed from those of Wheatley, these principles clearly resonate with her ideas.

Capra's (1996) above-referenced *The Web of Life,* was written to introduce the layperson to the scientific basis for systems theory. Later (n.d.), he gleaned four "lessons" applicable to organizations: 1) the importance of networks of communication; 2) that a social system cannot be directed but it can be disturbed and then will decide what is important to respond to; 3) that where there are unstable points in an organization, that is where creativity can assert itself; and

4) leadership involves having a strong vision and must nurture networks and creativity. In Capra and Luisi's (2014) more recent work, *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision,* they further explicate how systems theory may be applied to human organizations. Like Wheatley, they argue that the chief obstacle to change, from the systems viewpoint, is the fact that "the principles of classical management theory are so deeply ingrained in the ways we think about organizations that for most managers the design of formal structures, linked by clear lines of communication, coordination, and control, has become almost second nature" (p. 315). If we understand how the "natural change processes that are embedded in all living systems" work, we can then apply the principles to organizations (p. 316).

If an organization is a living system, it will have self-generating networks throughout itself. When people of the organization are enmeshed in these networks, the organization will be enabled to learn, survive, and thrive in challenging circumstances: "The organization's aliveness resides in its communities of practice" (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 317).

Not unlike Barnard's earlier observations, Capra and Luisi (2014) suggest there exists constant "interplay" between the formal structure of an organization and its informal networks. To enhance an organization's vitality, they recommend the organization "provide the social space for informal communications to flourish" (p. 318).

Furthermore, they suggest that a leader's role, far from the traditional executive dominance, is to offer impulses or guiding principles. The basis for this is that "most relationships between organisms in nature are essentially cooperative ones. The tendency to associate, establish links, cooperate, and maintain symbiotic relationships is one of the hallmarks of life" (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 318). According to Capra and Luisi, ultimately relying on these networks will allow an institution's order, when threatened, to break through to a new order in a

process of "emergence." When human organizations are formally designed—and there is indeed necessity for this—the organization will not be resilient enough to respond to threatening forces unless there is the vitality provided by the human and informal networks, allowing emergent structures.

Other thinkers have also applied systems and closely related chaos theories to organizations. Zohar (1997), for instance, advocated a "rewiring" of organizations according to the new systems or "quantum" paradigms. Although she holds that the older Newtonian system still has an important role to play, she argues that quantum physics *contain* Newtonian physics, which are more limited and only describe "one band of reality" (p. 6, emphasis in the original). She affirms that since organizations are made of human beings, like humans there are mental (rational, Newtonian), emotional (associative and habit-bound thinking), and spiritual (creative, intuitive) aspects to them. All of these need to be called into play to help an organization remain dynamic, and they form part of a holistic system. Zohar stresses that "employees *are* the company" and urges that "genuine empowerment means redesigning the infrastructures within which people interact with each other and with the company as a whole" (p. 89, emphasis in the original). Her thinking, like Wheatley's, is based on systems and chaos theory, and the principles she advocates complement Wheatley's thinking.

Youngblood (1997b) also applies a version of systems theory, chaos theory, to organizations and advocates creating culture among employees around mission and a shared vision; building in strong relationships; and emphasizing communication throughout the organization as key principles. He believes that incorporating employees into these aspects of the organization will help build a dynamic and successful organization.

Finally, widely accepted principles of human resource management are essentially congruent with the application of systems theory to organizations as Wheatley presents it. Bolman and Deal (2013), for instance, suggest that an organization should have an explicit and shared human resource philosophy. They offer Federal Express's example, which in a nutshell is "People, Service, Profit" (p. 141). They recommend careful and deliberate hiring; valuing and supporting employees; protection of jobs; inclusion and promotion from within; professional development; access to information and support; self-managing teams; empowerment of employees; and egalitarianism and allowance for participation in decision-making. They conclude: "When individuals find satisfaction and meaning in work, organizations profit from the effective use of their talent and energy. But when satisfaction and meaning are lacking, individuals withdraw, resist, or rebel. In the end, everyone loses" (p. 159). In a nutshell, inclusion and integration of employees in the identity, information, and relationships of the organization enhances its health and success.

2.3.4 Systems thinking applied to higher education. While there are not many examples of organizational thinkers applying systems theory specifically to higher education, there are a few. Cutright (2001) edited a collection of articles in *Chaos Theory and Higher Education* that all attempted to apply principles of systems and chaos theory to leadership, planning, and policy. He considers the use of chaos theory a helpful metaphor, and suggests, like Wheatley, that the dominant and inadequate organizational metaphor until recently has been the machine. One of these articles, for example, offers a list of chaos theory principles to inform strategic planning exercises (Perkins, Lanigan, Downey, & Levin, 2001). Examples that resonate with Wheatley's three "critical domains" are: "Proposition 2: Planning begins with a distillation of the institution's key values and purposes" (p. 62) and "Proposition 3: The widest possible

universe of information should be made available to all members of the institution. This universe of information includes ongoing, rich, and current feedback" (p. 64). The authors propose that real communication between real people, though less efficient than top-down planning, provides much more resilient end results.

Finally, Manning's (2013) *Organizational Theory in Higher Education* suggests that, among other possible frameworks to apply to higher education, the "New Science" (a harkening back to Wheatley's title) is an extremely fruitful framework for today's complex world of higher education. "Older paradigms emphasizing rationality, certainty, and control fail to provide the theoretical, philosophical, and practical depth needed to address today's challenges" (p. 135). By contrast, Manning's "New Science" framework:

- "provides a powerful theoretical analysis through and with which to view organizations
- better explains the environmental volatility and uncertainty of organizational life
- enables people within organizations to be more flexible and adaptable
- allows people to accept the idiosyncrasies of organizational life" (p. 137)

Manning quotes Wheatley to argue that the problems within organizations are more with people utilizing older frameworks, not with the actual practicalities of following new principles, of which she highlights "interrelatedness, mutual and multiple causality, multiple realities, uncertainty, and control as an illusion" (p. 138). She includes Stephenson's (2009) "heterarchy" as a key concept because this model "depend[s] on networks, connections, and, most importantly, trust for. . .[supporting] organizational form and effectiveness" (p. 142). She emphasizes the importance of cooperation, trust, networks, connectivity, communication, dialogue, self-organization, and leadership as a relationship.

2.3.5 Application of Wheatley's three critical domains to part-time faculty. To reiterate, Wheatley's (2006) three critical domains based on systems theory are: (1) the fundamental identity of the organization; (2) connection to information; and (3) building relationships within the system. The research presented in the following chapters uses the community college mission as a proxy for identity, and it explores: whether part-time faculty are aware of and have embraced that mission; whether they are connected to information networks in the college and if so, how they receive or access that information; and how or whether they have become integrated into the organization through relationships. This study is particularly salient in the context of the research which has shown that, typically, part-time faculty have not been connected well into the organization, a situation associated with poor student outcomes.

2.4 Research on Part-Time Faculty

This section begins by discussing the categories of part-time faculty and their motivations and satisfaction, which inform their identification with the college mission (my proxy for Wheatley's "identity"); it then turns to studies focused on researching or advocating support with regard to part-time faculty, which correlate to both Wheatley's "information" and "relationships." It concludes with a discussion of research focused on part-time faculty teaching in developmental education. This literature, taken together, will provide background for my study.

2.4.1 Part-time faculty individual life conditions. Research has established that there are differences in motivation and situation among part-time faculty (Curtis, Mahabir, & Vitullo, 2016; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Sam, 2010b), and this section discusses that research. Gappa and Leslie (1993) addressed some of these differences in chapters entitled "Who Are the Part-Time Faculty?" and "Employment Profiles of Part-Timers." They categorized four types of part-time faculty, distinctions that have since often been utilized: career enders,

specialists/experts/professionals, aspiring academics, and free-lancers. "Career enders" tend to be faculty who may have taught as a tenured faculty for many years and want to continue to teach without the obligations of research or service. "Specialists/ experts/professionals" tend to be those who have other employment and share that employment expertise, perhaps teaching once a year or once a term, in a specialized course. These were the original part-time faculty, and they were traditionally used to bring in high-profile names or experts that could increase the good reputation of the school (Wagoner, Metcalfe, & Olaore, 2004). "Aspiring academics" tend to be people seeking full-time employment or a tenured position in their field but teach part-time in hopes of obtaining a full-time position. "Free-Lancers" tend to be artists, writers, or persons with other life obligations, such as care for young or elderly dependents, with teaching as just one of a palette of obligations. In certain segments, especially among "career enders" and "specialists/experts/professionals," job satisfaction tends to be higher than that of "aspiring academics," whose lack of a career trajectory, underpayment, and non-integration takes a personal toll (Cashwell, 2009; Hudson, 2013; Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006; Kezar, 2013c; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Smith, 2010).

Levin et al. (2006) further nuance the distinctions, suggesting that there are two major bifurcations among faculty in higher education: the first between full-time tenured and part-time faculty, and the second between part-time faculty who rely on their work in academe to make a living and those who already have a reasonable living through jobs in the private sector and for whom teaching may even help advance their prestige and their own careers. Curtis et al. confirm this, suggesting that support should be targeted especially for those relying on teaching to make a living (2016).

Kezar (2013c) added even more detail to this picture by mining interviews performed for a previous study (Kezar, 2013a) to determine how non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) socially construct a supportive work environment. She found that individual perceptions of departmental support depended on dynamic and changing individual circumstances. Other perceptions were informed by level of academic degree, which tended to set expectations higher, or by comparisons with full-time tenure track faculty support or better situations in other colleges. Those with full-time employment elsewhere felt more supported. She reiterated the importance of considering part-time faculty a dynamic and multi-faceted group with varying needs. In a further study, Kezar and Bernstein-Sierra (2016) looked at how women's lives are particularly affected by changing needs, yet find themselves stuck in contingent status even after life obligations ease up and they would like to devote themselves to their careers.

Benjamin (2003) argued that part-time faculty are not as well-qualified as their tenured counterparts because fewer have doctoral degrees and therefore they cannot match the quality demanded of tenured faculty. Although it has been demonstrated that more faculty with tenure do have PhDs than part time faculty (Eagen, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 2002), the fact remains that part-time faculty are hired according to professional instructor qualifications and that their mindset and opinions about teaching and learning are similar to that of tenured faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 2002). The research confirms that part-time faculty are generally well-qualified, are motivated to teach, and are devoted to helping students learn. They tend to find intrinsic satisfaction in this activity (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012; Kezar & Sam, 2010b).

2.4.2 Part-time faculty satisfaction. Much research has centered on the level of satisfaction of part-time faculty, derived from, among other places, information from National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) from 1992 – 2004. The samples are nationwide and

large, though part-time faculty are not fully represented percentage-wise in these data bases. This research asserts that many part-time faculty are well-qualified, are motivated to teach, and are devoted to helping students learn. They tend to find intrinsic satisfaction in this activity (Antony & Hayden, 2011; Antony & Valadez, 2002; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012; Kezar & Sam, 2010b).

Kezar and Sam (2011) suggest, however, that the body of earlier research on satisfaction framed its questions based on the presumption, informed by business or economic models focused on non-professionals, that because of the poor working conditions and treatment, faculty would be dissatisfied and not fully committed to their jobs – a "deficit model" (p. 1420). What has been left out of the models informing the research is the fact that non-tenure track faculty are professionals who proceed professionally and are motivated professionally (Rhoades, 1998). When one adds in the fact that some of the part-time faculty prefer non-tenure track status as described above, their job satisfaction is to be expected. Even those faculty who desire full-time employment love the interaction with students, the opportunity to stay intellectually active and challenged, and the opportunity to engage in what they are professionally trained to do. The deficit, Kezar argues, is only in the working conditions. This is corroborated by Levin and Hernandez's (2014) research that "Part-time faculty members viewed themselves simultaneously as professionals and lacking professional status" (p. 547).

It is my contention that despite the negatives and dissatisfactions that can also be demonstrated, the actual satisfaction in teaching can be considered identification with the educational institution's mission as a proxy for the first "critical domain" of Margaret Wheatley, that of institutional identity, and. based on the literature, I have expected to find this same satisfaction in my study. Generally, part-time faculty love the teaching process and care deeply

that their students learn. That is what colleges, ultimately, are designed for and this is what part-time faculty embrace. Because there are a variety of individual life situations, for some the lifestyle works well (Antony & Hayden, 2011; Antony & Valadez, 2002; Eagen, 2007; Eagen, Jaeger & Grantham, 2015; Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Eagen, Jaeger & Grantham (2015) found that even though some part-time faculty desired full-time appointments, when they were better integrated and supported (essentially included in information and relationship networks) their satisfaction level increased.

There are still deficiencies that haunt part-time faculty. Most of the negatives can be associated with Wheatley's two other critical domains, lack of access to information and lack of integration into departments, especially in terms of relationships. For instance, many part-time faculty express frustrations at being treated as second class, noting the lack of basic institutional supports, the lack of integration into academic life and the institution, the lack of a career path, or the dwindling prospects for full-time employment (Eagen et al., 2015; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012; Meixner et al., 2010; Smith, 2010). Eagen et al. (2015) concluded that dissatisfaction of part-time faculty could be track backed to lack of basic logistical support, feelings that their personal growth and contributions were ignored, or lack of respect by their colleagues.

Some would like to be more involved in the life of the college, but in some cases they are overtly excluded, and in others they are welcome to be involved, but without pay. Related issues are vulnerability because of the lack of protections and the easiness with which part-time faculty can be dismissed the following term. Insecurity of appointments, symbolic of their lack of integration, are often noted as an issue leading to dissatisfaction (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012; Meixner et al., 2010; Smith, 2010). Closely related, many

studies have demonstrated that 50% or more of part-time faculty would prefer full-time employment (Eagan et al., 2015; Jacoby, 2006; AFT, 2010, CCCSE, 2014b; Cashwell, 2008; Kezar & Sam, 2011; Kramer et al., 2012). In some cases, part-time faculty begin with high hopes and good spirits, but, as time goes on, discouragement sets in (Jacoby, 2006; Thirolf, 2013). The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) (2012) finds that almost 75% of its part-time faculty respondents have applied for a full-time job or would accept one. While not often mentioned in lists of dissatisfactions, this insecurity threatens shared governance and academic freedom (Bérubé & Ruth, 2015; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Lyons, 2004).

Taken together, this body of research demonstrates that part-time faculty are well-engaged in the classroom and find satisfaction in their work—particularly in their interactions with students and the ability to be active in their professional field—and these positive findings can be correlated with the college mission which in this study serves as a proxy for Wheatley's critical domain of "identity." On the other hand, the circumstances of employment, depending on the individual's life situation, along with the feelings of non-connection and lack of support often lead to professional discouragement or dissatisfaction, and these can be associated with Wheatley's two critical domains of "information networks" and "relationships." Yet these expressed dissatisfactions can provide positive clues for what could and should be addressed by institutions. Many part-time faculty needs center on support and integration, or, put simply, the desire to feel valued by the institution.

2.4.3 Part-time faculty support and integration. Some of the research on satisfaction/dissatisfaction mentioned above hinted at inclusion, recognition, and support for faculty, and we now turn to research focused on those themes. Suggested standards in treatment of contingent or part-time faculty have often been repeated in the literature (AFT, 2002; AHA,

2003; Baron-Nixon, 2007; AAUP, 2003, 2013; Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Benjamin, 2003; CCCSE, 2014b; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Lyons, 2007; MLA, 1994, 2011; Nutting, 2003; OAH, 2014; Peterson, 2007; Roueche et al., 1995, 1996a, b; Schuster, 2003; Strom-Gottfriend & Dunlap, 2004; Yee, 2007; Thompson, 2003). They include hiring proactively with institutional mission in mind; providing orientation; providing basic supports for employment; providing improved or pro-rated pay; providing long-term and predictable appointments; providing professional development; providing clear guidelines for systematic assessment; and providing integration into the institutions, including participation in governance. It has been argued that some of the most negative effects of the "sweeping reconfiguration" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 191), "astonishing development" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 195), or "silent explosion" (Roueche et al., 1995, p. vii) in the use of contingent or part-time faculty could be ameliorated by providing an inclusive culture and reasonable supports for part-time faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baron-Nixon, 2007; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012; Kezar, 2013a, b; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Kezar & Sam, 2010a; Lyons, 2004, 2007; Roueche et al., 1995). Gappa and Leslie assert that "investing in their capabilities—instead of treating them like replaceable parts—should yield long-term returns in teaching effectiveness, morale, and institutional loyalty" (2002, p. 66).

Kezar (2012) suggests that support of part-time faculty should all be "embedded within a larger framework of what makes faculty effective" (p. 10). She recalls Gappa and Leslie (1993) in suggesting that respect for part-time faculty is one of the most fundamental concepts to inform the many changes that need to take place to properly support part time faculty.

An early study by Roueche et al. (1996a, 1996b) is included here as particularly salient for my study on integration of part time faculty teaching developmental mathematics, as I will be

exploring many of its themes in a more focused sample. Roueche et al. used a theory of "organizational identification" to make sense of the larger issues among part-time faculty, which they termed "Part-Time Faculty Integration Model" (PFIM). The definition of organizational identification included how a person's beliefs and values aligned with those of the organization along with a person's attachment or commitment to an organization, which could be enhanced by such things as moving up in rank or undermined by things as small as being shunned from a conversation. In addition, communication that was "frequent and rich" with colleagues and others could enhance identification with an organization. This study was based on qualitative analysis, purposefully choosing community colleges known for "exceptionally" integrating part-time faculty and examining their related studies and documents. Finally, there were interviews with administrators to ask about processes, including "recruitment, selection, orientation, staff development, evaluation, and integration" (Roueche et al., 1996b, "The Study," para 2). They put the information into a matrix to look for strategies that would help increase part-time faculty's integration. While their research was focused on community colleges that were using "exceptional" processes, they found few administrators were "aggressively and systemically directing their colleges' efforts toward integrating part-time faculty" (Roueche et al., 1996b, "Results," para 1), and they disappointingly found, at best, only small pockets of good practices, usually driven by a particularly dedicated individual. They suggested that what little they found demonstrated it was possible to do better, and they encouraged colleges to work on socializing and supporting part-time faculty:

> The socialization experience should give the part-timer the opportunity to learn about the culture of the organization, the mission of the community college, and the nature of the students – linking staff development and evaluation to rank advancement. Small increments in pay or a change in title can go a long way toward making individuals feel more a part of the organization. Finally, what is clear from research on socialization is that important organizational norms and

deeply held institutional values are rarely transmitted through faculty handbooks. We must remember that the personal touch, a one-on-one conversation or personal note, always has a greater socialization effect. Make the creation of rich communication connections between and among full- and part-time faculty a priority. . . . By weaving integration strategies throughout a complete system of utilization, the part-time faculty member is consistently and systematically socialized, communicated with, and included in the life of the college." (Roueche et al., 1996a, "Implications and Recommendations" para.4).

In the formal compilation of their work they suggest (in bold no less), "Colleges must take serious steps toward improving the utilization and integration of part-time faculty" (Roueche et al., 1995, p. 154; Roueche et al., 1996b). Their list of recommendations included the following:

- "All part-time faculty should be recruited, selected, and hired with clear purpose and direction" (1995, p. 154)

- "All part-time faculty should be required to participate in substantial orientation activities and provided with faculty support structures" (1995, p. 155)

- "All part-time faculty should be required to participate in professional development activities" (1995, p. 155)

- "All part-time faculty should be integrated into the life of the institution" (1995, p. 156)

- "The performance of all part-time faculty should be evaluated" (1995, p. 156)

- "Part-time faculty should have equitable pay schedules" (1995, p. 156)

More recently, there are a number of studies on logistical and other support of part-time faculty. Most of them recommend following good human resource principles and in most cases, the efforts are found wanting to some degree or another, with several exceptions. One article, for instance, focuses on distance education, suggesting that there are four basic needs for part-time faculty: professional development, effective communication, balance, and developing

relationships (Rogers, McIntyre, & Jazzar, 2010). These researchers recommend that professional development be aligned to the vision of the institution, focus on teaching and learning, include orientation and mentoring, and ensure that communication be ongoing and deliberate. Finally, the researchers stress the importance of relationship development for maintaining education as a human enterprise and allowing for network-building and a safe environment for part-time faculty to be able to ask questions. An article with a similar focus (Elliott, Rhoades, Jackson, & Mandernach, 2015) included adjuncts in their study of online professional development for faculty, arguing that this would help both the institution and the individual faculty member to perform optimally. They suggest that faculty development trainings need to be mandatory, be offered in a variety of flexible formats, and include theoretical, practical, and institutional information. James (2015), in a brief article focusing on adjunct faculty composition, points out the necessity of building collaborative relationships between full-time and part-time faculty, and she specifically points to librarians, learning center staff, technology staff, and academic support professionals. She suggests that department and faculty chairs should make this a priority. Thirolf argues that efforts to include faculty in the organization must include aspects of faculty identity and engagement and that all components of support should include "both academic and social elements" (2017, p. 307). All of these recommendations echo Wheatley's three critical domains for a healthy organization.

More systematically, Meixner et al. (2010) surveyed part-time faculty at a mid-level public university in a qualitative study. They asked part-time faculty about their most challenging teaching issues; what additional knowledge and skills they desired; how they were included in their departments; and whether they had any suggestions. They found great inconsistencies in outreach toward part-time faculty across the college; that more mentoring was

desired; that part-time faculty generally felt disconnected from the college; and that part-time faculty desired professional development, especially with regard to technology as well as teaching and planning strategies. There was a theme of marginalization, with some exceptions. They recommended that a high-level administrator be charged to work on these issues.

Oprean's (2012) dissertation explored what administrative support was offered to adjunct faculty in a survey of administrators at 42 community colleges in North Carolina. This study focused on four key practices: hiring, orientation, professional development, and evaluation practices. She found that, in most cases, the department chairs hired adjunct faculty with a minimum of screening and face-to-face contact. Orientation for part-time faculty took place to some degree, often in three to four hour sessions. Professional development was somewhat available but participation was voluntary on the part of adjuncts, usually without compensation, and scheduling was typically done at times when many adjuncts could not attend. For evaluating part-time faculty, most administrators relied on student evaluations alone.

Oprean's (2012) recommendations for the North Carolina community colleges were to follow the practices advocated in the literature, including more thorough and systematic hiring practices; mandatory orientations, with more options in terms of time and kind of orientation; more systematic professional development focused on student success with various time and format options; and alternatives for evaluation beyond student evaluations, such as classroom observations. In addition, she advocated that administrators be trained on how to work with part-time faculty, including supplying "well-defined duties" (p. 180) for not only mid-level but system-level administrators. She suggested that all this needed to be developed under senior administrators to be effective.

Kezar and Gehrke (2013) conducted a nationwide survey of academic leaders to find what administrators thought about the difference in support for non-tenure track faculty and tenure-track or tenured faculty. They found that those deans who wanted to more deliberately support part-time faculty needed higher-level administrative support to help them "meet the challenge" (p. 12). They found that attitudes and values of administrators informed the level of support that non-tenure-track faculty received. These further confirm Oprean's (2012) and Meixner et al.'s (2010) conclusions above.

Bowers (2013) studied from the viewpoint of adjunct faculty themselves, looking at their perceptions of professional development and support services at Tidewater Community College. She found that although the college offered various opportunities, the one that adjuncts used the most was the Blackboard online training, which was required for anyone teaching online courses. Other trainings were optional and often offered during times that were not conducive to attendance for adjunct faculty, who would have preferred evenings and weekends. They wanted to know more about their roles, policies and procedures, and availability of student services, and they wanted to improve their teaching skills. They also wanted to be oriented and to participate in division and department meetings and be able to connect with other faculty. They wanted to be involved in in-services and institutional activities, to be socialized into the college, and to be given mentoring, recognition and fair treatment.

Diegel (2013) conducted a phenomenological study to compare the perceptions between division chairs and adjunct faculty concerning teaching support, mentoring, and professional development, and to further examine how these division chairs supported or obstructed them. She chose three division chairs from one community college based on their willingness to participate and five part-time faculty from each of their respective divisions to interview. In

every case, she found three key results: that the division chairs expressed care about part-time faculty and did what they could to help them; there was active reliance on the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence for professional development opportunities; and that mentoring opportunities were assigned for all part-time faculty. The part-time faculty seemed to recognize that division chairs were extremely busy and were doing their best to help given the circumstances, and indicated that they felt supported when they needed items for their classes. They expressed a desire to be more systematically advised of college issues. This illustrates the important role of division chairs in setting the tone for part-time faculty and how important a simple thing like assigning mentors can be. It must be noted that those division chairs participating in this study understood the importance of support, and it would be interesting to compare this study in divisions where the chairs did not see this as a priority.

A key study by Kezar (2013b) took an organizational approach, setting out to examine how working conditions affected non-tenure track faculty's (NTTF) perceptions of their abilities to carry out their work. This is a unique and important study in setting out to empirically determine the difference between departments considered to be offering good support to part-time faculty and those that are not, something not adequately addressed in satisfaction studies referenced above. This was a qualitative case study comparing 25 departments in three different public universities, based on 107 interviews and examination of policies. It compared "supportive" and "non-supportive" departments based on policies that had been identified to have an impact on faculty performance, both negatively and positively, and the faculty perceptions of how "departmental policies shape their performance and ability to create quality learning experiences" (571). Negative policies were focused into five larger categories: "scheduling classes, lack of curriculum input, learning resources, feedback, and lack of learning

infrastructure" (p. 582). The positives were essentially the inverse of these negatives. Based on this categorization of departments, she examined specific working conditions and showed how they actually impacted the work place for faculty, for good and for ill. Surprisingly, she found that rather than simply a matter of putting policies in place, "supportive departments had put in place fewer policies that actually hindered NTTF work" (p. 590). Her essential finding was that "all areas – social science, science, humanities, and professional area – have these problems of unsupportive policies" (p. 590).

Using this same data but a different theoretical construct, Kezar identified four departmental cultures: "destructive, neutral, inclusive, and learning" (2013a, p. 163). The part-time faculty in the "destructive" and "neutral" departments, essentially those who treated part-time faculty with obvious disrespect, were the least able to perform well. The part-time faculty in "inclusive" departments were motivated to participate beyond the classroom, above and beyond what they were paid for. This was even more true for the departments she categorized as "learning," which minimized distinctions among faculty and "tied the support to a commitment to students and the goals of the institution around learning" (p. 175).

In yet another study utilizing the same data, Kezar (2013c) found that faculty department chairs can set the tone for the department, and this was one important factor in non-tenure-track faculty feeling they were supported. Also, if these faculty were able to build their own informal relationships within the department, they were often able to find their own kinds of support that otherwise might not have been offered to them.

More recently, Jolley et al. (2014) conducted a qualitative study focusing on part-time faculty in community colleges, interviewing 20 part-time faculty on teaching conditions as well as on assessment. Their research questions are similar to those in this current study, two of which

were: "What do adjunct faculty report in terms of their levels of engagement and participation with the colleges in which they work?" and "What are the perceived experiences and perceived value of part-time, contingent community college faculty members regarding assessment practices?" (p. 224). This study invited participation nationwide through word-of-mouth and on-line solicitations, and, after receiving responses, utilized a convenience sample. Nineteen of the respondents relied on teaching for income and had taught for more than ten years, and they represented several disciplines in the liberal arts. The themes that emerged centered upon a lack of faculty engagement, a lack of assessment, comments of being "unnoticed, uncounted, and unrecognized" (p. 225), haphazard hiring, unpredictability in scheduling, a lack of connection with other faculty and a desire to be engaged beyond the classroom in the institution, and, of course, frustrations concerning lack of pay. The researchers concluded that these working conditions should be addressed.

Akin to Kezar's study above, but quantitative in approach, is the Eagan et al. (2015) study, which concluded that support of part-time faculty demonstrated by relationships with colleagues and administrators, acknowledgement of efforts and contributions, and logistical support, were key to feelings of satisfaction. In other words, even though the part-time faculty they studied were "involuntary" – in that they would prefer full-time employment – they still reported feeling satisfied, integrated with, and respected by the organization. These scholars recommend that part-time faculty be better integrated and allowed to participate in departmental meetings and to use their extensive training in their various disciplines. In their recommendations for future research, they suggest that "by including measures of campus resources and perceptions of campus climate, future work may find that it is not part-time faculty's contingent status that contributes to less desirable outcomes; instead, perhaps it is the working conditions

they endure" (p. 476). They also recommend including professional development opportunities and funding to support the part-time faculty.

Finally, the Center for Community College Student Engagement's (CCCSE) (2014b) study, *Contingent Commitments: Bringing Part-time Faculty into Focus,* emphasized the commitment part-time faculty bring to their tasks, demonstrating the lack of institutional integration of part-time faculty and the resulting contingent-faculty ignorance of resources for students. This study relied on nationwide data from the Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (CCFSSE) collected from 2009-2013, as well as focus groups throughout the country (CCCSE, Methodology, 2014c). This important study not only found institutions needing many types of improvement regarding treatment of part-time faculty, it also offered strong suggestions for better support and integration of part-time faculty, all focused ultimately on serving students better. It admonished college leaders to help contingent faculty learn about the college support services for students, to understand the importance of connecting with students in and out of the classroom, to be trained on other "high-impact" practices, and to be incentivized to participate in these activities. They recommended developing and systematizing hiring practices, orientation, and evaluation for contingent faculty; providing a mentor for each person; and bringing them into relationships, communication, and culture of the institution.

2.4.4 Examples of part-time faculty support and integration. Although the institutions were broadly in need of improvement, this same study (CCCSE, 2014b) also collected examples of certain institutions offering model support in one way or another. In the interest of brevity, I will simply mention two other good sources for collections or examples that may be consulted, in addition to the CCCSE report. *Best Practices for Supporting Adjunct Faculty* (Lyons, 2007) contains a collection of case studies and reports on individual colleges working to improve

support for part-time faculty. *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Changing Campuses for the New Faculty Majority* (Kezar, 2012) also contains a series of case studies illustrating efforts and approaches at eight different colleges, including three community colleges. Of those three colleges, Vancouver Community College is an outstanding model in following best practices advocated in the research.

This scan of research on support and integration of part-time faculty into the institution demonstrates that the recommendations for support of part-time faculty are common-sense and universal, but that implementation of these excellent ideas are spotty, sporadic, and sparse. The next section will discuss research that has attempted to measure the effects of utilizing large percentages of part-time faculty on student success. It is important to include because the matter of supporting part-time faculty goes beyond the treatment of individual faculty, beyond the health of the institution, and gets right to the crux of the community college mission: helping students to learn and succeed.

2.4.5 Part-time faculty, best practices, and student success. The heart of the community college mission is the faculty-student relationship. Among the well-known best practices for student retention and learning is a primary one: faculty-student contact (Chambliss & Takacs, 2014; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; O'Banion, 2013). In terms of student services, a well-established positive practice is the connection of students to student services by forging relationships throughout the college, particularly with faculty (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, n.d.; O'Banion, 2013). Yet the high dependence on part-time faculty seems to undermine the chances that students will experience this basic best practice. Part-time faculty contracts generally specify that the work required by a part-time faculty member is classroom teaching while outside classroom involvement or

engagement is normally not required and rarely paid (CCCSE, 2014b; Gappa & Leslie, 1993;

Kezar, 2012; Kezar, 2013b). These basic realities militate against relationship-building between

faculty and students and against integration into the institution.

In addition, there is research that attempts to find whether part-time faculty use the same

practices as full-time faculty in the classroom. Although Landrum (2009) found that there was no

difference between full and part-time faculty in student evaluations, Baldwin and Wawrzynski

(2011) investigated whether part-time faculty used best-practices and student-centered methods

of teaching to the same degree that full-time faculty did, and found that they did not. They

speculated the reason could be time constraints, lack of professional development, or, once again,

lack of integration. Umbach's (2007) often-cited study, utilizing the 2004 Faculty Survey of

Student Engagement, found that contingent status, especially when part-time, was negatively

correlated with four of the "seven effective educational practices": class preparation,

collaborative teaching techniques, expectations for students, and faculty-student contact.

Without going into further detail, numerous studies on part-time faculty and student

success have relied on large nationwide data bases such as the National Center for Educational

Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) data, while a few look at data

from individual colleges. The preponderance of studies has demonstrated negative results, and,

without fail, they attribute the findings to lack of institutional integration and supports (Burgess

& Samuels, 1999; Calcagno et al., 2008; Eagen & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang,

2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagen, 2009, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Smith, 2010). One

article advocating better support for part-time faculty nicely captured this consensus:

> We suggest that much of the student success gap has. . .far more to do with a lack
> of institutional intentionality in professional development for part-time faculty, a
> decided lack of access to institutional resources, and a failure to include these
> faculty in curricular and policy decisions. (Roney & Ulerick, 2013)

It must also be acknowledged that there are a few studies that examine specific colleges and find no differences between part-time faculty and full-time teaching. By a number of different measures the two groups appear to be just as effective in their teaching—in some cases, teaching effectiveness even improves with part-time faculty (Figlio, Schapior, & Soter, 2015; Rogers, 2015). Figlio et al. acknowledge that their students are among the most privileged nationwide, while Rogers studies a large community college, but 90% of the daytime classes at this community college are taught by full-time faculty. These last two studies remind us that the individual, institutional context is all-important and that part-time faculty, given the right context and support, are equal to or sometimes even better able to teach students successfully.

It is important to underline the fact that many part-time faculty give their hearts and best efforts to teaching and many do excellent work in the classroom. These studies do not impugn part-time faculty (I was one for fourteen years) who are doing their best to serve students with, as the CCCSE study stated, "one hand tied behind their back" (CCCSE, 2014b, p. 8). Rather, the common denominator in the literature is the lack of institutional integration and support.

2.4.6 Developmental education and part-time faculty. Parker, Barrett, and Bustillos (2014) point out that developmental education courses have been offered since Harvard opened its doors, and Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker (2014) aver that nearly all community colleges offer developmental education. It is estimated that 58% of entering community college students need at least one developmental course, and the majority of these (up to 85%) are referred to developmental math. Many of these referred students never manage to complete a college level math course. Among other marginalizing characteristics, they may be bilingual, first generation, come from low socioeconomic backgrounds, may have dependents, and are likely to attend part-time. They may be older students.

As a foundational point, the first year experience for college students is considered crucial for students regardless of status (Chambliss & Takacs, 2014; CCCSE, 2014a; Reason, Terenzini, & Domingo, 2006), and as stated above, many students must take developmental courses in their first year of college, especially at community colleges, and particularly in mathematics (AACC, 2012; CCCSE, 2014a; Daiek, Dixon & Talbert, 2012; Fike & Fike, 2007; Roueche & Roueche, 1999). Too many of these students stall or drop out in developmental education courses, and, rather than stepping stones, these courses can become barriers (Bailey, 2009; Bailey et al., 2015; Bonham & Boylan, 2012; CCCSE, 2014a; Kozeracki, 2002; O'Banion, 2013; Roueche & Roueche, 1999). According to an Achieving the Dream study of 27 community colleges, of those students who were placed in developmental education math, less than 25% had moved on to college level courses within three years (Khazanov, 2011). More recent research by the Community College Research Center (CCRC) analyzing 150,000 community college students found that only 30% of students referred to developmental education math courses had finished the pre-college sequence within three years and only 16% made it through their first college-level mathematics course (Bailey et al., 2015).

Who are these students? Many of the students in developmental education courses are from historically under-represented minority populations, have disabilities, come from a low socioeconomic status, are academically disadvantaged, or are probationary (Fike & Fike, 2007; George, Khazanov & McCarthy, 2015; Kisker & Oucalt, 2005; Roueche & Roueche, 1999). Heisserer and Parette (2002) name five categories that at-risk students fall into: minorities, students with disabilities, students of low socioeconomic status, academically disadvantaged students, and probationary students. To this list, Parker, Barrett, and Bustillos (2014) add first generation students. While some of the students enrolling in developmental education courses

may simply be returning older students who need a refresher course (Boylan, 1999; George et al., 2015; Khazanov, 2011), the chances are high that many students with at-risk characteristics are in developmental education courses. The social and economic implications that follow indicate that if community colleges are to meet their missions, supporting and educating these students is an "imperative" (Parker et al., 2014, p. 4). A number of studies, after controlling for such characteristics as academic preparation and family background, found that developmental education courses do positively affect student outcomes (Parker et al., 2014).

Various pressures, including an ethical obligation to help students achieve their goals in a reasonable time frame, and public critique of higher education in general, have combined to provide a current nationwide focus on student success and completion. These efforts have singled out the importance of reassessing and focusing on improving developmental education (AACC, 2012; Bailey et al., 2015; O'Banion, 2014). The tensions in play focus on balancing goals of access versus completion and of financial efficiency versus meeting students' real needs (Parker et al., 2014). Speaking to various programs that have sought to eradicate developmental education from colleges, they state that "Eliminating the developmental education courses does not eliminate the need" (p. 156). They further argue that barriers for students often extend beyond the classroom into their personal lives, and this needs to be part of the equation.

> While some state leaders bemoaned that they cannot afford developmental education, some institutional leaders argue they cannot afford not to [fund developmental education]. Investing in students by providing adequate and appropriate academic and social support will likely see high returns for the state and its higher education institutions. (p. 160)

In addition, they argue that such funding will influence other social issues:

> Given the increasing diversity of higher education and that students of color are disproportionately enrolled in developmental courses, improving developmental education (with adequate funding) allows states a means to directly and positively impact racial and ethnic equity goals. (p. 162)

Finally, they argue that, at heart, this is not an issue of budgets and returns, but of access and

success:

> While some state leaders may argue that financial instability and economic
> imperatives require higher education to eliminate developmental education in
> some contexts (due to what some narrowly view as ineffective or inefficient
> programs), we see a moral imperative for students who are so-called
> developmental or underprepared to not only have access to four year institutions
> (if they choose), but also maintain the full commitment of their institutions to
> support their success. (p. 164)

Developmental education courses nation-wide have been even more heavily reliant on

part-time faculty than most other disciplines (Boylan et al., 1994; Boyer, Butner, & Smith, 2006;

Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Roueche & Roueche, 1999; Roueche et al., 1996b). According to the

CCCSE report, nationwide, upwards of 76% of developmental education class are taught by part-

time faculty (2014). These courses often lack prestige, a trend attributed in part to the overall

number of part-time faculty teaching them, or in an alternative explanation, to their intrinsic lack

of prestige as lower-level courses (Kozeracki, 2002; Perin, 2002). In developmental education

mathematics courses at community colleges, the part-time faculty percentages were reported in

1994 to be 83% (Boylan et al., 1994). Reliance on part-time faculty for students in

developmental education courses has been described as "a situation whereby the students who

need the most attention, help, and consideration are taught by the instructors least involved in the

college" (Burgess & Samuels, 1999). This is not merely a matter of academic prestige. As

indicated above, over-reliance on part-time faculty may have a negative influence on completion

of programs or transfer into other programs supports (Burgess & Samuels, 1999; Calcagno et al.,

2008; Eagen & Jaeger, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagen, 2009,

2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Smith, 2010).

One of the earliest studies seeking to measure the effects of part-time faculty on student success was performed at Mercer County Community College (MCCC) (Bolge, 1995). This study expressed concerns about "deprofessionalization" of academia caused by moving toward more part-time faculty hires (Bolge, 1995, p. 5), yet MCCC had a policy of training both full-time and part-time faculty in teaching skills. In addition, it also assigned a mentoring faculty member to each part-time hire and offered teaching effectiveness workshops and professional development opportunities for part-time faculty commensurate with those offered to full-time faculty. Part of the concern behind this study was for developmental education students' success, and the classes chosen to study were Basic Mathematics, MS100, because these students were perceived to be more at-risk than other students. This study concluded that there were no significant differences of student learning, whether taught by part-time or full-time faculty. It is notable that this result arose in an institution that provided part-time faculty deliberate training, professional development, and integration.

Eney and Davidson (2012) not only recommended the general suggested practices and policies mentioned above for part-time faculty teaching developmental education, but they also added the need for deliberate hiring, appropriate compensation, support service, and inclusion in decision-making processes to that list. One case study, reporting on positive effects of a grant, showed how better integration of part-time developmental mathematics instructors was achieved by leveraging the part-time faculty members' desire for inclusion (Gerhard & Burn, 2014). The study noted that part-time faculty members' desire to be included allowed the college to achieve its goals in spite of only offering small stipends with offers of professional development, and it also noted that unless these faculty participated they were in jeopardy of losing their jobs. Still, any efforts to include part-time faculty are by definition laudable.

There are other miscellaneous articles touching on this topic. Boylan and Bliss (1997) attempted to demonstrate how various program components affected developmental education student success and found that tutor training was a key ingredient. Braxton and McLendon (2001) collected best practices for general student retention, among which was included training faculty and rewards for doing so. Levin and Calcagno (2008) in their list of seven questions to help evaluate developmental education programs, included this: "6. What is the effect of institutional factors, such as the percentage of faculty members who are part-time or the availability of professional development for faculty members, on the effectiveness of remedial courses?" (p. 189). Datray, Saxon, and Martirosyan (2014) performed a literature review on suggested practices for development education instructors, which recommended improved practices of hiring, training, evaluation, professional development, and integration into the organization. Boyer et al. (2006), utilizing NSOPF study from 1999, compared faculty teaching developmental education to faculty in other departments and concluded that student-faculty contact hours with developmental education students were lower than in non-developmental education classes, even though students taking developmental education courses were likely to need more personal contact.

Zientek et al. (2013) performed a survey of community college students and teachers in developmental mathematics courses at three Texas community colleges and found that the status of teachers, full-time or part-time, was statistically significant. Further comparisons showed that there was better organizational communication and better professional development for full-time faculty compared to that of part-time faculty. Kisker and Outcalt (2005), in their study of faculty teaching both honors and developmental education courses, noted that developmental education courses are crucial for preparing students—many of whom are from historically

underrepresented segments of society—for successful participation in college courses. According to this survey, developmental education instructors served in approximately the same percentages as faculty in other departments. They found noteworthy racial patterns. In particular, African Americans and Native Americans were much more likely to teach developmental education courses than in other disciplines. They found that instructors teaching developmental education courses were dedicated, believed in developmental education, and were engaged with community college organizations at a higher level than other faculty, and, contrary to Boyer et al. (2006), that they spent more time engaged in instructional activities than other faculty did.

Smith's (2010) dissertation research expected to find that, for students enrolled in developmental education courses, increased exposure to part-time faculty would result in negative retention levels, as other segments of the college did. But, in fact, the developmental education student retention levels during certain years were as high as that of other students or higher, to the point that being in a developmental education course could be one of the predictive factors for retention. This counter-intuitive finding was explained when he looked further into the circumstances of developmental education at Kansas City Kansas Community College. The college was working hard to improve outcomes in developmental education, including offering non-credit refresher courses, cultivating highly collaborative departments, and sponsoring professional development inclusive of part-time faculty.

Montes' (2014) dissertation explored the challenges of education for Latino/a students taking developmental mathematics courses in conjunction with the learning from non-tenure track instructors in a community college that had both a majority of Latino/a students and part-time faculty. He found that student-faculty interactions were crucial, but that they were hindered by the lack of support for the non-tenure track faculty.

In summary, the few studies examining the issues of part-time faculty teaching developmental education courses have found that to be more effective, part-time faculty need more deliberate integration and support. The fact that the least-supported faculty are the majority teaching the most underrepresented students nationwide, and that there is sparse research in this area, provided the motivation for this current research.

2.4.7 Current readings and thought in the scholarly literature. Kezar's *How Colleges Change: Understanding, Leading and Enacting Change* (2014) is a practical guide to effectively working toward positive change. Finkelstein, Conley and Schuster (2016) *The Faculty Factor: Reassessing the American Academy in a Turbulent Era* is an up-to-date resource for data on changes in higher education and focuses attention on part-time faculty. Kezar and Maxey's *Envisioning the Faculty for the 21st century: Moving to a Mission-Oriented and Learner-Centered Model* (2016) rethinks the whole system and offers a vision for a healthy, inclusive, and effective model that will best meet needs for all of higher education with special attention to the issues surrounding part-time faculty and best serving students.

2.5 Summary of Literature Review

This literature review presented organizational theory as a relevant framework for research on the integration of part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics. The research questions guiding this study are:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

The review introduced basic concepts of systems theory as applied to organizations and Margaret Wheatley's three critical domains (identity, information, relationships) which form the framework for this study. It then introduced the current state of research on part-time faculty, describing the variety of part-time faculty situations, that many part-time faculty do find satisfaction in the classroom teaching experience (which I use as a gauge of "mission," a proxy for institutional identity), but that many also find frustration with regard to integration into and support by the institution (a measure of the effectiveness of "information" and "relationships"). Commonly-suggested practices for part-time faculty include robust support and integration.

Students enrolled in developmental education courses tend to be generally more at-risk than students prepared to immediately enroll in college-level courses. Paradoxically, the highest percentages of part-time faculty, those faculty in most need of institutional supports, are teaching these most vulnerable students.

That there is little research at this conjuncture of these topics implies the need for a closer qualitative look at part-time faculty teaching developmental education courses. The fact that students in developmental mathematics education courses have higher rates of non-persistence than those who are already prepared scholastically for college, the fact that higher percentages of traditionally under-represented students are also found in these courses, and the fact that nationwide a higher percentage of part-time faculty are teaching those courses than in other departments, taken together, set the stage for the study to follow. The study will focus on the integration into the college of part-time faculty teaching these students.

Section III: Methodology

The section presents procedures and methods that were used in the study, including the research questions and justification, the positionality of the researcher, the philosophical approach to the study, the framing theory, and the choice of case study methodology. It includes the process of data collection and analysis as well as addresses trustworthiness and limitations to the study.

3.1 Research Questions and Justification

The research questions guiding this study are:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

For this study, "integration" has been defined by Wheatley's three critical domains: identity, information, and relationships. I have crafted the questions with this construct in mind, weaving in the "best practices" repeatedly found within the literature. These include proactive hiring, orientation to the department and the larger institution, basic supports for employment, mentoring, professional development, inclusion in information loops and shared governance, clear guidelines for systematic assessment and evaluation, attention to issues of status, and long-term, predictable appointments. Integration may also be demonstrated by a personal feeling of being included in and supported by the institution. (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Bowers, 2013; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Oprean, 2012; Meixner et al., 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Lyons, 2004, 2007; Roueche et al., 1995, 1996a, 1996b; Wheatley, 2006).

The definition of "part-time" faculty relies on the definition found in the Faculty

Agreement (PNWCC and Union, 2015) where the research took place:

> 1.21 "Part-time Faculty" shall mean any person who is hired as. . .an Instructor to:
> a. work 30 hours or more in an academic term; or b. teach a three credit hour class
> or its equivalent in instructional contact hours in an academic term."

Elsewhere, the Faculty Agreement elaborates on the employment practices surrounding part-time

faculty:

> Article 4: The employment of part-time Faculty may be for one, two, three or four
> terms in an academic year. Employment of part-time Faculty is not tenure-related
> and does not create any right, interest, or expectancy for any future employment
> except as expressly provided in this Article.

The measure of "in what ways" (addressing the research question) has been informed

specifically by Baron-Nixon's *Connecting Non Full-Time Faculty to Institutional Mission* (2007).

She asserts that organizations must "create and foster an organizational climate and culture that

are: Inclusive. . . , supportive. . . , and collegial" (p. 15). She provides concrete proposals to

administrators to make this culture a reality, categorizing these recommendations in the list

below, which I utilize in examining the culture at PNWCC:

- Deliberate and inclusive recruitment (p. 22)

- Hiring based on clear criteria (p. 23)

- Clear expectations and assignments (p. 24)

- Orientation to the institution and department (p. 29)

- Participation in institutional life (p. 35)

- Professional Development (p. 64)

- Recognition (p. 76)

- Connection to the department (p. 47)

- Mentoring (p. 56)

There have been convincing, large-scale quantitative studies investigating the reliance on large numbers of part-time faculty and the notable negative correlation with student success and completion. These studies have suggested that the cause is the lack of integration of part-time faculty into the institutions (Burgess & Samuels, 1999; Calcagno et al., 2008; Eagen & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagen, 2008, 2009, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Smith, 2010). There is a growing body of research on organizational integration of part-time faculty (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Bowers, 2013; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, & Maxey, 2015; Lyons, 2004, 2007; Meixner et al., 2010; Oprean, 2012; Roueche et al., 1995, 1996a, 1996b). However, there are only a few studies focused on part-time faculty teaching developmental education, none of which use the lens of organizational theory (Gerhard & Burn, 2014; Montes, 2014; Zientek et al., 2013).

The literature indicates that better integration and support of part-time faculty will improve organizational health and help it to achieve its goals more effectively (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Bowers, 2013; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Oprean, 2012; Meixner et al., 2010; Kezar & Maxey, 2015; Lyons, 2004, 2007; Roueche et al., 1995, 1996a, 1996b), particularly with regard to student success and completion (Burgess & Samuels, 1999; Calcagno et al., 2008; Eagen & Jaeger, 2008, 2009; Ehrenberg & Zhang, 2005; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagen, 2009, 2011; Jaeger & Hinz, 2008; Smith, 2010). In this specific case, the focus is on part-time faculty teaching developmental education students enrolled in developmental mathematics courses (Boylan & Bliss, 1997; Braxton & McLendon, 2001; Datray et al., 2014).

This case study of one department of a large, multi-campus community college has added to this body of literature and has allowed for in-depth examination of the questions. Applying the

lens of organizational systems theory has been unique. The conclusions may be found applicable to other institutions as well (Yin, 2006).

3.2 Positionality

My personal experiences as a contingent faculty member for 14 years and later as a full-time faculty member, compared side by side, were completely discrepant in terms of organizational integration. These differing experiences, as well as observations of others' experiences, provided the passion motivating this research and informed the research problem. My scholarly curiosity has been genuine regardless of personal experience. The research was conducted at the institution where I was a full-time faculty member and chair of the shared governance body, a somewhat conspicuous faculty position that allowed access to upper administration in the college but conferred no weight in terms of hiring or supervision. The research was conducted on the same campus where I am housed, but the department was completely separated from my normal activities. As Stake (2010) suggested, "it is quite appropriate for researchers to study their own places. . . . Better design, longer study, more triangulation are part of what is needed" (p. 163). In that spirit, I guarded against prejudicial results by triangulating college data, interviews, by using member checking, and by noting parallels with previous scholarly research.

3.3 Philosophical Approach: Critical Realism

My personal approach to this research is Critical Realism. Associated with the work of Indo-British philosopher Roy Bhaskar, Critical Realism is a philosophy focused on science, "a theory of what (good) science is and does" (Gorski, 2013b, p. 660). Gorski argues that, while different ontologically, all of the three main approaches in social science—positivism,

interpretivism, and social constructivism—offer insights, yet contain "yawning gaps" between

their philosophies and actual practice. Critical Realism, on the other hand,

> is "realist" in the generic sense that it takes a "mind-independent" nature as a
> fundamental "condition of possibility" for natural science. But it is also realist in
> the "critical" sense that it sees science as a human activity that is inevitably
> mediated (if not determined) by human language and social power. (Gorski,
> 2013b, p. 664)

Critical Realism also "draws a distinction between the 'intransitive' and 'transitive'

dimensions of science, between a natural world as it really is and our changing concepts of it"

(Gorski, 2013b, p. 664). Sayer (2000) suggests that "it is the evident *fallibility* of our knowledge

– the experience of getting things wrong. . .that justifies us in believing that the world exists

regardless of what we happen to think about it" (p. 2, emphasis in the original).

The idea of the "real" includes all the various levels of entities or mechanisms in the

world, along with their abilities and potentials. The domain of "actual" refers to entities or

mechanisms whose potentials have been "activated." And the "empirical" refers to entities or

mechanisms that have not only been activated but that have been observed (Collier, 1994; Gorski,

2013b, p. 665). This approach is thus realist in that it acknowledges the existence of entities or

mechanisms that can be studied based on observations of actualities and add to the empirical

body of any work, but it is also "critical" in that it understands that social sciences cannot be

reduced to the "natural world"—that the social world includes networks and emergent properties

that cannot be completely pinned down in the Newtonian sense. Context and hermeneutical

meaning in social science are important and helpful to include, in the sense that given a

particular social context, things can be learned and improvements can be suggested.

Human beings can be described on an individual level, but social science "is concerned,

at least paradigmatically, with the persistent *relations* between individuals (and groups), and with

the relations between these relations" (Bhaskar, as cited in Collier, 1994, p. 139). The different

relations in different contexts are what make up the basis for the social sciences and lead to the

possibility of a "transformational model of social activity" (Collier, 1994, p. 141).

The social sciences are fundamentally committed to human well-being and are not

"value-neutral" (Gorski, 2013b, p. 669). Social science and its continuing research will have

important things to say about what a good society would look like, and how what we have now

might be improved. "If one can demonstrate a systematic connection between inaccurate beliefs

and oppressive social structures, then one has not only explained the beliefs but also supplied a

motivation for changing the structures" (Gorski, 2013b, p. 667).

3.4 Guiding Theoretical Perspective

Newtonian theory was called into question during the 20th century, and, since then, other

superseding paradigms have emerged, systems theory being one now generally accepted as

legitimate. This scientific shift toward systems theory has been applied to organizational theory

by various thinkers. Wheatley (2006) is known for embracing systems theory to inform

organizational theory, and her work provides the guiding framework for this study. She has

proposed three critical domains for building organizational health: (1) the fundamental identity

of the organization; (2) the urgency to connect members of the organization into information;

and (3) the importance of developing relationships throughout the organization.

Wheatley's application of systems theory to organizations has formed the theoretical

framework for this study, and it meshes nicely with Critical Realism, which has provided the

theoretical base. Wheatley believes that there are a few basic, underlying principles from which

fluidity and change can take place (Wheatley, 2006). The living systems she relies on embrace

humanity, while oppressive systems are typically founded in mechanical, hierarchical structures.

When organizational structures are observed within this guiding framework there may emerge a motivation to change the structures.

3.5 Methodological Approach

Qualitative research may have the best "promise of making a difference in people's lives" because it focuses on "discovery, insight and understanding from the perspectives of those being studied" (Merriam, 2009, p. 1). Its goal is to improve practice. This method may discover new relationships in a complex setting, better illuminating the situation than a purely quantitative study would. Interpretation is characteristic of the approach and it may "emphasize, describe, [and] judge" (Merriam, 190, p. 22). In qualitative research, the researcher is the chief instrument of information gathering and uses the inductive method of analysis (Merriam, 1998, 2009).

Among various approaches within the larger rubric of qualitative studies, a case study is the most appropriate approach to this subject matter within the bounds laid out above. "A case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved" (Merriam, 1998, p. 19) and is an "intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single unit or bounded system" (Merriam, 1998, p. 12). It shares an approach with historical analysis in that it pulls together many factors based on primary sources, but it goes further in that it also includes current observations and interviews. According to the authoritative Yin,

> A case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in
> which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and
> as one result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to
> converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result benefits from the
> prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and
> analysis. (2014, p. 17)

While a qualitative study cannot be expected to have generalizability or repeatability in the same sense that quantitative research might, its strengths lie in its particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic nature (Merriam, 1998). A case study's strength is that it is "anchored in real-life

situations. . . [and] result[s] in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon" (Merriam, 2009, p. 51). Its findings are rich in description and may uncover meanings and alternative ways people interpret their experiences that quantitative studies are unable to (Merriam, 2009). Findings may be generalizable to theories (Yin, 2014), and comparison with themes in prior research can be informative. At the very least, one can make tentative extrapolations with the understanding that specific contexts may differ (Merriam, 2009). Ultimately, the reader will decide whether and how the study is applicable to other situations.

This is an embedded single-case study (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2014) to determine in what ways part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics in one department of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest have been integrated organizationally. The college was selected for its size and maturity. Because of the intentionally holistic design of this study, and in keeping with Wheatley's theories, there are three units of analysis: institution, department, and individual. An embedded, single-case study is most appropriate for this research because it will allow for a specific and rich examination to find in what ways part-time faculty are integrated into a department, looking at it from three different vantage points, the three units of analysis. This will allow for determination of who is responsible for part-time faculty integration and where it is succeeding or failing. There are attendant implications for organizational health including, in this case, student success and completion.

3.6 Data Sources and Description of Data

The following describes the process used to gather data and analyze it. Research was first conducted concerning the department itself at the campus and institution level. This included examination of the college website, program reviews, task force reports, and collective bargaining documents. All developmental education programs have recently been subject to

changes in the curriculum brought about, in part, by pressures associated with the completion

agenda, and this formed part of the context for this study (AACC, 2013; Bailey et al., 2015;

O'Banion, 2013).

Upon approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), invitations to part-time faculty

teaching mathematics courses on one campus were extended (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Levin et al.,

2011; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2014). As department chairs and full-time faculty carry many of the

responsibilities of extra-classroom obligations—including contractual obligations to welcome

part-time faculty into the department and to mentor them—I interviewed the faculty department

chairs and several other full-time faculty (PNWCC and Union, 2015). I also interviewed the

administrative aide who was involved with basic supports for the part-time faculty. For a higher-

level administrative perspective, I interviewed the dean.

3.7 Sampling

The sampling technique was purposeful, and snowball sampling was used as necessary

(Creswell, 2014; Merriam, 2009). In order to solicit participation, I first talked briefly to the

outgoing dean to see if the research would be welcomed, along with one department chair. I then

solicited participation from faculty members with a short description of the project through an

email that was sent out by one of the department chairs to the whole department (see Appendix

A). The recruitment invitation for part-time faculty notified participants of the project and

requested contact and scheduling information. Because scholarly research has shown that there

are a wide variety of situations and motivations of part-time faculty, care was taken to include

this diversity, including such factors as gender, race, age, situation, length of time in the

department, and motivation (Creswell, 2014; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2013a, 2013b,

2013c; Levin et al., 2011). For the administrative aide, faculty department chairs, and dean, the

interviewee was based upon holding the given position in the department, and I sent direct emails to each of them requesting their participation with appropriately modified information.

Potential participants were informed of the purpose of the study, risks, and data access, and they were assured that interviews would be coded and wording redacted so that their identities and confidentiality would be respected. They were informed that despite these precautions, because of the particularity of the study, identities could conceivably be discerned (Creswell, 2014).

All interviewees signed a consent form before the interview began (see Appendix B). At the end of the interview they were given the option to fill out a brief questionnaire addressing demographic information (See Appendix C).

After the first couple of interviews, an interviewee suggested—and the IRB allowed— that the consent form and the list of open-ended questions be forwarded to the interviewees by email before the interview. The total number of interviewees was to be no more than thirty and ended up being sixteen. With regard to part-time faculty, I interviewed all who agreed to participate, and they represented a variety of part-time faculty categories noted in the scholarly research (Merriam, 2009). The interviews were expected to be 60-90 minutes, in person, on the phone, or by Skype, and they ended up all being in person and ranging from just over 30 minutes to about 90 minutes. They were recorded so that note-taking could be kept to a minimum and the focus could remain on the interviewee. The interviews were transcribed by a professional transcription service and were analyzed throughout the collection process, which led—with the permission of the IRB—to some adjustments and evolution as the project progressed (Merriam, 2009). The interviews were analyzed to find how these part-time faculty were integrated into the department and the college, using Wheatley's (2006) organizational framework of identity,

information, and relationships, keeping the three levels of analysis and the three research questions in mind.

3.8 Interview Questions

The questions were informed by case study methodology and the principles of systems theory applied to organizations, drawn from Margaret Wheatley's (2006) three critical domains: (1) identity of the organization; (2) access to information; and (3) relationships within the organization. College mission was used as a proxy for "identity." Sub-themes that were expected to emerge, based on the consensus of scholarly literature referenced above, were issues of hiring, orientation to the department and the larger institution, professional development, evaluation, mentoring, status, employment insecurity, relationships, and a personal feeling of integration (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Bowers, 2013; CCCSE, 2014; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c; Kezar, & Maxey, 2015; Lyons, 2004, 2007; Meixner et al., 2010; Oprean, 2012; Roueche et al., 1995, 1996a, 1996b). In conjunction with Wheatley's themes, this list and any other emergent themes guided the assessment of "in what ways" for each of the research questions

The interview questions were semi-structured and were open-ended, grounded in case study methodology (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011), Wheatley's framework, and the literature on part-time faculty utilization in higher education, though the exact wording and order varied to allow for probing and emergent themes (see Appendix D).

3.9 Analysis

Data analysis in qualitative studies is "emergent" and "dynamic" (Merriam, 2009, p. 169), and constant comparative analysis took place throughout the process of collecting interviews. This included adjusting—again, with IRB approval—the interview questions and adding a

"snowball" aspect to data collection. It also included reflecting on unexpected themes (Merriam, 2009).

After the interviews were transcribed by a professional service, they were sorted into a spread sheet according to the research questions, the expected issues as described in the scholarly literature, the three major themes of the framework, and emergent themes (Wheatley, 2006). The open-ended nature of the questions allowed for unexpected opinions, experiences, or viewpoints, and, indeed, as will be demonstrated in Sections IV and V, a few unexpected themes emerged. The archival research, including documents and background information collected, became part of the complete case study data base, and this was incorporated into the overarching analysis (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2014). Using all of the data, both interview and archival, a case study was created.

3.10 Trustworthiness

Merriam (2009) states that "one of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured" (p. 213). Assumptions concerning qualitative research, congruent with the epistemological approach of Critical Realism and Wheatley's guiding framework, are that the social world includes networks and emergent properties that cannot be completely pinned down in the Newtonian sense. However, within social contexts, true things may be said, though they may be fallible (Collier, 1994; Gorski, 2013a, 2013b). Use of various complementary techniques can increase the chances of approaching validity. For consistency, I triangulated the data: college data, interviews, member checks, and expected patterns based on previous scholarly research (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2014). I observed and included data that might "support alternative explanations" (Merriam, 2009, p.

219). For the member checks, I asked interviewees to read the transcripts to make sure they agreed that they represented their intent, giving them the opportunity to make corrections or to add any information (Yin, 2014). They had two weeks before the information was considered usable for this work, but they were given the right to retract or delete anything that they chose. One interviewee wrote out further thoughts and sent them to me, another added a few comments orally after the interview, while another changed wording in a few spots and deleted a few portions.

The number and differing roles of interviewees provided a holistic picture of the department that took thematic shape, and, where the comments diverged, they were easily explained by the life circumstances of the participant, echoing the themes already described based on former scholarly research (Merriam, 2009). The interviews and data base will be maintained for a minimum of three years to provide a chain of evidence that will allow for the research to be inspected (Yin, 2014).

As above-mentioned, qualitative studies cannot be expected to have generalizability or repeatability in the same sense that quantitative research might, but comparison with themes in prior research can be informative and, at the very least, one can make tentative extrapolations with the understanding that specific contexts may differ (Merriam, 2009).

3.11 Limitations

A case study's strength is that it is "anchored in real-life situations. . . [and] result[s] in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon" (Merriam, 2009, p. 51). This study's limitation was similar to its strength: it was focused on a single department within a large campus and institution, and I interviewed a limited number of people. In addition, participation was voluntary and it may be that some other faculty profiles may exist that were not represented by these

interviewees. Transfer to other situations will be reliant on the interpretation of the "reader, not the researcher" to determine its applicability (Merriam, 2009, p. 51). The viewpoint of the researcher, even with biases made transparent, has the potential to also influence the findings.

3.12 Procedures for Protecting Participants

Recruitment began upon approval of the project by the IRB. Potential participants were informed of the purpose of the study, risks, and data access, and they were assured that interviews would be coded and wording redacted so that their identities and confidentiality were respected.

More specifically, the interviews were stored on my home computer, at least until the dissertation was finished and any articles based on the research were written. They were stored without identifiers, but a code sheet with the original names was retained in a different file, in case further studies using the same data might be performed in the future. If the results of this project are published, participants' identity will not be made public. Audio recordings were accessible only to qualified transcribers and myself. The agreement was signed by participants with the understanding that they could step out at any time without any negative repercussions.

3.13 Summary of Methods

This was a qualitative embedded single-case study looking at organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses in one department of a large multi-campus college in the Pacific Northwest. It was based on interviews of part-time faculty, full-time faculty, department chairs, an administrative aide, and a dean in developmental mathematics. Background information and data was sought from the college website and other applicable documents. The data was analyzed by expected themes based on organizational theory

and informed by the literature on part-time faculty and student success. New and particular

insights were expected and allowed to emerge.

Section IV: Research Findings

This dissertation was a qualitative case study focused on part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics courses in one large Pacific Northwest community college. The college was selected for its size and maturity; the topic was selected for three related reasons: part-time faculty have been widely relied upon to teach these courses nationwide; students in developmental education courses tend to have higher risk factors and attrition rates; and mathematics courses form the bulk of developmental education (pre-college-level courses, formerly termed remedial). Research indicates that high reliance on part-time faculty (variously termed "contingent," "fixed-term," "contract," "adjunct," or "non-tenure track faculty,") results in negative outcomes in terms of student success and completion. These outcomes are often attributed to poor integration of part-time faculty into the institution.

The research questions guiding this study were:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

The guiding theoretical perspective for this study was organizational theory, informed by systems theory. The research questions were informed by Wheatley's (2006) three critical domains necessary for a healthy organization: the fundamental identity of the organization; the ongoing urgency to connect members of the organization to information; and the importance of developing relationships throughout the organization. In order to gain a holistic view, the study examined the college context and interviewed part-time faculty, full-time faculty, faculty

department chairs, an administrative aide, and a dean involved in developmental mathematics education. These collected data were then broken down into categories informed by Baron-Nixon's (2007) principles for connecting part-time faculty to a college mission and analyzed according to three units of analysis: institutional, departmental, and individual.

4.1 Protocols

Members of the Pacific Northwest Community College (PNWCC) Mathematics Department on Campus One were invited to participate in the study through an email which was forwarded by one of the department chairs to all faculty in the department. I invited the dean and an administrative aide in an individual email (see Appendix A). "Snowball" sampling was used after the first email, when the faculty department chairs recommended or referred to certain part-time faculty who might be interested but who had not yet responded. In those cases, I sent an identical follow up email to each. In one case, the opportunity to participate arose in conversation, at which point the same email was resent.

A professional service transcribed all interviews; I sent copies to the interviewees for any corrections. Three made adjustments: one added some written comments; one added some information orally, and another changed wording in a few places. All have been redacted to protect the identities of the individuals, and all committees, campuses, colleges, and names have been changed. Softeners ("you know," "like," "I mean," and "just") and repeats have been omitted from the quotations below for brevity and clarity. I have chosen to rely on verbatim quotes to build the picture of how part-time faculty are integrated into this department, and to honor their heart and their intent.

4.2 Interviewees

For this study, I interviewed a total of 16 people in the mathematics department on "Campus One" of PNWCC: eight part-time faculty, six full-time faculty—two of whom were Faculty Department Chairs and all of whom had formerly served as part-time faculty (ranging from two terms to twelve years)—one administrative assistant, and one dean. Two of the full-time faculty were specifically motivated to participate in this study because of their own earlier part-time experiences, and they were actively involved in helping to integrate part-time faculty into their department. Of the 16 total, 14 designated themselves as "White" or "Caucasian"; one as "African-American"; and one declined to answer the question. Ten designated themselves as female; six as male. Years teaching or serving at PNWCC spanned from one term to 33 years. Of the full-time faculty, all had a Master's Degree in Mathematics with one "grandfathered-in" Masters in Math Education. Of the part-time faculty, one had a Master's in Mathematics and another was finalizing that degree, three had Master's degrees in Engineering, two had a Master's in Math Education, and one had Master of Arts with a B.A. in Mathematics and a great deal of experience teaching pre-college mathematics. In a few cases, the faculty member had started at a different college or a different campus and then moved to Campus One.

4.3 Units of Analysis

There were three units of analysis. One was the institution itself, the second (and most prominent) was the department on one campus, and the third was the individual members of the department. At the institutional level, many barriers to integration appeared. At the department level, efforts to integrate part-time faculty have achieved qualified success. At the individual level, of the part-time faculty interviewed, four major categories emerged based on individual life circumstances and that followed patterns predicted in the scholarly literature: career enders (satisfied); specialists/experts/professionals (essentially satisfied but not fully integrated);

aspiring academics (somewhat integrated with very mixed feelings); and free-lancers, whose life situations, for the moment, prefer part-time but—in these particular cases—would prefer a full-time position in the future (hopeful and generally positive) (Cashwell, 2009; Hudson, 2013; Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006; Kezar, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c; Maynard & Joseph, 2008; Smith, 2010; Thirolf, 2013). Of the full-time faculty, those who had previously served for a long period as part-time faculty felt urgently the need to change the system while others expressed regret at the barriers but seemed to feel there was no help for the entrenched situation as it stands and sought to do their best within the system.

4.4 Changing Context for Developmental Education Mathematics (DE Math)

There has been an urgency, nationwide, among community colleges to look at the factors that might be undermining students' ability to complete their degrees—a concern commonly referred to as "The Completion Agenda"—and that urgency has been embraced in this state and at PNWCC (AACC, 2013; Bailey et al., 2015; CCWD, 2014; O'Banion, 2013). Among various indicators, such as lack of coherent General Education programs (Bailey et al., 2015) and the lack of career guidance and systematic advising (O'Banion, 2013), incorrect initial placement into DE courses has also been considered a stumbling block, one that can lead to either discouragement, boredom, or wasteful use of financial aid or personal resources on unneeded courses (Bailey et al., 2015; O'Banion, 2013). More recently, in a widely-disseminated book, Goldrick-Rab demonstrate that a lack of individual financial resources contributes greatly to many students' inability to complete their college education (2016). At the state and national level, dwindling or insufficient support for colleges continues to be a factor (Barnshaw & Dunietz, 2015; Cohen et al., 2014; Kezar & Sam, 2010b; Love & Estanek, 2004).

PNWCC, like many other colleges, has spent time and energy discussing the implications of high levels of incomplete degrees among students. In 2012 a college-wide committee, the "Completion Agenda Group" (CAG), was formed to address these issues and help determine where monies should be strategically directed. Math class completions were, among other things, highlighted as intransigent problems (PNWCC, 2013, Developmental).

4.5 Ratios at PNWCC of Full-time and Part-time Faculty in the Math Department

In the Fall Quarter of 2016, full-time faculty taught—campus-wide—only 38% of course sections. By implication, part-time faculty taught the other 62% of courses (PNWCC, Fall 2016, "Percent of Select Sections. . ."). As sobering as these numbers are, this represents an improvement from earlier years. In the Fall Term of 2012, 35% of the classes were taught by full-time faculty, and in 2011, during the height of the great recession, it reached as low as 24% (State Education Coordinating Commission, 2016).

Narrowing the focus to the Math Department in Campus One, in Fall 2016 there were 17 full-time faculty, including two one-year interim positions, and 39 part-time faculty (PNWCC Campus One Mathematics Department Chair, personal communication, April 24, 2017). In ratios, 30% of the faculty were full-time and 70% were part time while, in terms of classes taught, 36.5% of DE Math courses were taught by full-time faculty and 63.5% of them were taught by part-time faculty. By contrast, college-level Mathematics course sections at Campus One were taught by 74.5% full-time faculty and 25.5% part-time faculty (PNWCC, 2016b, 2016c). This is an improvement over the earlier ratios during the academic years of 2011-2013 when the ratio of classes taught reached 21% full-time/79% part-time in DE Math courses and 57% full-time/43% part-time in college-level Math courses (PNWCC, 2013b).

That part-time faculty teach a larger percentage of courses in DE Math compared to all other programs is typical nationwide (Boylan et al., 1994; Boyer et al., 2006; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Roueche & Roueche, 1999; Roueche et al., 1996b). In addition to, historically, a higher value being placed on upper-level courses, this can partly be explained locally by the Instructor Qualifications and the move of all mathematics courses from the former DE Department (see below) along with the class divisions built into the system. A Campus One instructor described the local phenomenon:

> I would say [MTH] 20, 60, the traditional Algebra pathway [all DE courses]. . .is traditionally taught by part-time. [Interviewer: Why is that?] I would say, first of all, there's more part-time than full-time. And I would say that most full-time instructors prefer high level classes, because the students don't have all these other issues that DE students have. But we do have some dedicated full-time instructors who do teach the pre-college classes. But we have so many of them that most of them are taught by part-time.

4.6 College Structure and Relevant DE Math History at PNWCC

For over 15 years, PNWCC's union has bargained for three segments of educators in the same contract: full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and academic professionals. While the progress over the years has been incremental, it has made a positive difference in the lives of part-time faculty. In the last round of negotiations, there was an added "Memorandum of Understanding" that allowed for temporary provision of funding for part-time faculty for professional development and participation in college endeavors outside of the classroom, of which more below. In addition, an unprecedented—but limited—pilot program offering "Multi-Year Contracts" to a total of 300 part-time faculty (out of about 1100 part-time faculty), 100 per year, was initiated in 2016 (Union president, personal communication, May 5, 2017; PNWCC and Union, 2015).

PNWCC has a long-entrenched but slightly difficult structure. On one hand, there are Math Departments on all campuses, each with its own culture and configuration. On the other hand, there is a Math Collective Area Committee (CAC) that provides the forum for all mathematics faculty in the college to meet periodically. The CAC carries out responsibilities (all subject ultimately to administrative approval) in constructing and vetting curriculum, defining proper instructor qualifications, and every five years, conducting a college-wide Program Review to meet requirements of accreditation and help provide a consistent vision and continual improvements as necessary.

On Campus One, unlike other campuses, the lowest level of introductory Mathematics courses had for many years been housed in the DE Department. Because of a concern by administration for the lack of consistency across college campuses, an administrative decision was made to restructure the Campus One Mathematics Department. As the reconfiguration was being constructed, a public promise was made by administrators, including a guarantee specifically by the Campus One President and all administrators in the room that day, that the same number of full-time DE Math faculty (three) would be maintained after the move (two interviews recounted this story).

As a result, all the pre-college math courses were merged into the Math department, beginning in 2010 (PNWCC, 2013b, 2015). Because the former DE Department had historically made special provisions for well-experienced teachers from the Elementary-High (El-Hi) School system or those with Masters in Mathematics Education degrees, there were many discussions on instructor qualifications. Arguments were made by those teaching DE Math courses that, indeed, a Math Education degree more highly qualifies instructors to teach pre-college math courses and better serves students than a pure Mathematics degree.

On the other hand, there was an attitude on the part of certain traditionalist math instructors that pure math degrees were superior, and they did not want to weaken the credibility of the math departments in general at PNWCC by loosening the required degree standards for instructor qualifications. Those faculty affected negatively by this opinion expressed frustration that others refuse to acknowledge that what is needed is further training in education and how to actually teach mathematics. One stated: "I have sat in cubicles, shared walls with people who have flat out said that I don't belong there." Another argued: "So to me, if anything, that degree [Math Education] should hold more weight, not less weight, than the pure math degree. So that's troubling to me. . . . I've been . . .at meetings at times when people have [even] been vocal about putting down education course work."

But on the other hand, one of the department chairs described an epiphany, "I had this realization that, what profession is there, other than teaching at a community college, that somebody who gets a degree, specifically, to teach at a community college is not allowed to be hired full-time? That's ridiculous." In the meantime, much work was done in the CAC to allow part-time faculty to continue teaching the DE Courses by writing in "Demonstrated Competency" definitions, and there was an addition made to the Minimum Instructor Qualifications to at least allow those with Math Education Masters degrees, along with a Bachelor's degree in Mathematics and 18 credits of Master's level math courses to qualify for a full-time job (PNWCC, 2015). While more open than before, it still effectively blocks expert teachers of pre-college level math from obtaining a full-time job unless they further their education in pure, traditional mathematics.

During this same period, two of the three full-time DE Math instructors retired, but when the Campus One Math Department Chairs tried to post for DE job replacements as had been

promised, they were not allowed to do so. They were required to post the positions with a minimum qualification of a Masters Degree in Mathematics, and, as a result the earlier promise to explicitly hire full-time faculty focused on teaching DE Math was not kept. I was told by one faculty member, "It's never going to happen." There remains some feeling across the college in the Math CAC that Math Education degrees are "less than," though according to the faculty department chair, that prejudice is more deeply felt on the other campuses than at Campus One. Because the majority of part-time faculty teach these pre-college classes, and many do not hold the MA in Mathematics, a doubly-classed structural system remains within the department. One part-time faculty described the phenomenon:

> I think it's getting better as time goes on. But there's been a few instances where some of the full-time faculty think that the part-time faculty aren't doing a good job teaching the lower level classes. Which I've always found rather ironic, because those are the classes that the full-time people [in] general don't want to teach, because they're harder to teach.

On another, but related, topic, there has been a long-existent desire on the part of several math faculty to provide an alternative to the traditionally required DE Math courses— alternatives that would be keyed to practical, contextual, and meaningful knowledge for students, informed by best practices, and offered as an alternative to the previously required traditional pathway for students placed into that level of courses (PNWCC, 2013b). This was accomplished with much hard work on the part of DE Math faculty, and with administrative support it was offered beginning in Fall term of 2014. The hope was the students would find it more meaningful and that its relevance would increase the numbers of successful completions. One part-time faculty commented on the change:

> I think that the math department has done a good job . . .especially lately in really doing constant improvement on their curriculum. And I like that they now offer two math pathways, which I think is very important and very good. So I see a lot of this positive change.

4.7 Identity

Wheatley suggests that an organization's identity goes deeper than formally crafted statements, and she has worked intensely as a consultant to try to articulate an organization's true focus (2006). In this study, I rely on the college mission statement as a proxy for understanding organizational identity and to gauge whether individuals are identifying with that mission. In the case of PNWCC, the college mission currently states: "PNWCC supports student success by delivering access to quality education while advancing economic development and promoting sustainability in a collaborative culture of diversity, equity and inclusion" (PNWCC, 2016a). Recently, the college president consolidated the mission and other college goals into his personal work plan to focus on "Opportunity and Equitable Student Success" (PNWCC, 2017). In interviewing the participants, however, I purposely avoided handing them the formal statement and tried to educe what they believed the college mission was, what truly motivated their efforts, and how those two matched up.

4.7.1 Student success. What motivated *every* participant, without prompting, was the students and the participants' role in helping them to learn and attain their goals. Many of the comments contained a subtext of helping to improve student's economic and social standing. These clearly matched the "student success" and "diversity, equity, and inclusion" aspects of the college mission. Many heartfelt comments were made, and these few excerpts from participant interviews symbolize the wide agreement on the mission of student success:

- And the reason I am teaching is because I want to help people improve their lives. And the one thing that really blocks more people than anything is math. And so I get great pleasure in being able to get people to appreciate, at least, math as being something they can actually use and teaching them how to use it. That makes my day, every day. I love those guys. I told them today, I love you guys. And they're looking at me like, we love you.

- But I like providing a good experience for everyone. . . And college is so important. . . .I get to serve. . .the community that's more underserved. I feel. . .the community college plays such an incredible role in the community by providing low cost education and job training. And I'm so proud to be a part of that.

- You get to see people . . . turn their lives around. . . . And I love helping people achieve their goals in life. And it's fun to see people that say they couldn't do mathematics and then say, "Voila, I can after all!" It's so rewarding.

- . . .the students, their goals. . .what they value and what they think is important in their community. Their efforts to change their lives with education. That's the motivation. And then the second one, which that is the main one whenever I see any kind of inequity. . .when we're not meeting their needs in a real way, like welcoming them into this learning culture. . . there's a push there, a lot of change has to happen.

- I think working with the students and seeing them progress through the term. And now, I'm having some students for a second term. And actually, next term, I'll have them a third term which is lovely, just seeing those students that continue on with me and how they're growing both mathematically, with their math notation and just gaining confidence in themselves. . . . Sometimes, when they get in and they're doing well, then they'll be like, "Oh, this is the first time I've even done well in math." And that's very rewarding.

- My students. Period.

In a few cases, there were further statements of motivation that reached beyond students

to include the department or the full college:

- . . . I love interacting with students. I love thinking about what they want, what they're trying to accomplish and doing whatever I can to help them. I love interacting with my colleagues. They're just an incredible group of people that have the same kind of values that I do. And we have an amazing community both here in my department in PNWCC Campus One and in the CAC as a whole.

- The satisfaction of helping students and my faculty members, totally. I am here to serve.

4.7.2 Diversity, equity, and inclusion: DE math students. To elaborate on this aspect

of the mission, students in the developmental education courses tend to come with a wide variety

of needs. While some may just needed a refresher course, many have failed throughout their El-Hi education to grasp Mathematics, have—for various reasons—been left behind, and/or have experienced the emotional disadvantages attached to failing repeatedly in this required subject. These difficult experiences, coupled with other risk factors such as low-income status, first generation student status, and possibly coming from a "diverse" background, all indicate that these students might need a little extra support (AACC, 2012; Bailey et al., 2015; Bonham & Boylan, 2012; O'Banion, 2013; Perin, 2002; Roueche & Roueche, 1999).

Mathematics is a gateway to college, and without passing at a certain level, a student will not be able to achieve a degree. While the only interview question that focused on developmental education students asked, "What motivates you to teach developmental education math classes in this department/college?" many faculty were moved to elaborate—sometimes at great length—on the differences between teaching college-level math courses and developmental education courses. There was a consensus that it took different skills to work with this student population; that it was challenging in ways that teaching college-level courses were not; and that it was extremely rewarding. Here are a few illustrative examples, mostly from part-time faculty:

- I think when I started I thought my role and job duties would be to teach people math. And I found that it's quite a bit more than that. And it usually has a lot more to do with the people and the people skills than the actual math skills.

- Going into a Math 20 class, that's like going into a different planet. The student population is just so different. And so the education required to be an effective teacher at that level is completely. . .it's not getting a Master's degree in Math. That doesn't prepare you at all. Right?

- . . . and they usually come in kind of terrified. I think math has a way of making people feel stupid at times. And they usually had a bad experience. . . . And I like that they'll come in and work and ask questions, and realize I don't have fangs, and claws, and leave being math literate. . . .I think in community college we tend to get people who that didn't work for the first time around. A lot of them trying again.

- . . .but I love the lower level. . . . I think it's more challenging.

- I like the diversity of the students. They all seem very appreciative of anything that you are helping them with. . . .They're here because they want to be here. They're so happy when they learn something that they've struggled with for sometimes fifty years. And, all of a sudden, they get it.

- And so, a person that's teaching that level class, they've just got all kinds of empathy requirements that a calculus student doesn't have. They have all kinds of digging deep into their own psyche to even conjure up what it is that's blocking this student from understanding something that, from our perspective is just obvious.

4.7.3 Falling short of the college mission. Without exception, the college's mission of student success and diversity, equity, and inclusion was a driving force for these faculty. But the comments above were balanced by others mentioning the larger context and difficulties inherent in relying on part-time faculty who were not as well-supported as full-time faculty. This theme emerged to a greater degree than I had expected or focused on in the questions. I will quote two of these comments by full-time faculty at length:

- For us in the math department, Math 20, Math 60, Math 65 and 95, those are the classes that are most taught by part-timers, and. . .students who don't succeed in those classes don't get to go to college, basically. So those are literally gateway classes to higher education. And. . .failure is a mess if you look at it along racial lines, along gender lines. And we need part-time and full-time faculty both—for all those classes need real pedagogical and curricular support from the college that we don't have right now. We need it at a system-wide level, not like one workshop for one instructor at a time who's engaging in professional development. And I think that the part-time/full-time split there makes it even harder. Because it's like we don't even have a system to reach out to our part-timers now for them to access professional development funds that are available, right?. . . So, talking about things on the larger level, it's really intense. . . . We only have a couple of full-timers who are. . .really dedicated to developmental ed as their true interest. And it should be half of our full-timers. But somehow that's not who we hire, because somehow that's the way the system works.

- The students in these classes need our help as educators more than others, and they are being underserved. It is so very sad. So many of my full-time colleagues do not teach many (if any) of these courses—and in some cases that might be a good thing. But the reality is that a vast majority of these classes are being taught by faculty members who have less resources available to devote to teaching and

to professional development. I want to try to help reduce this imbalance. I feel like I could rant forever on this topic but I will stop there.

In two cases, the interviewees took the initiative to look at the formal college mission. In an interesting counterpoint to the comments above, this following salient statement questioned the validity of the college's mission statement compared to its actual practices regarding part-time faculty:

> I can't say the system necessarily rewards its mission. . . . So one of the college's goals is equality. We have very much a two-class system in the faculty. But it seems like this college only exists because of a large group of people who are paid less, given lower priority on classes, less benefits, less job security. This system would just not exist without these lower class. . .or employee[s], working hard to support it.

The dean also made a telling statement suggesting that the reason part-time faculty worked under the prevailing conditions was indeed their identification with the college mission:

> The general mission of the community college [is] to serve the community and to help students be successful. . . . And I believe that those motivations align with that, because if they didn't I don't really think the part-timers would still be around.

4.8 Information and Relationships

Wheatley's second "critical domain" focuses on information. Because part-time faculty are paid specifically for their time in the classroom (PNWCC and Union, 2015) and, typically, are less connected than full-time faculty, they can often miss key information that can help them be effective. The interview questions were constructed to separately examine information and Wheatley's third "critical domain," relationships. However, in the responses, the two topics were inevitably intertwined right from the beginning as encapsulated by this statement: "I think the real network of information here is just the people who are working here." This has made it difficult to separate the two aspects, because, as will be demonstrated below, it can be said that part-time faculty got the bulk of their information through other people. This department makes a

concerted effort to both bring part-time faculty into the information loops and, to a great degree, it is being done through face-to-face relationships. Communication tools such as email and Google Drive are used but only in a secondary role.

I have chosen to flip the order of the two aspects, dealing with relationships first, and then moving to the more formal communications in the college and the department. But since the two aspects are organically intertwined, there is overlap as essentially this is a false dichotomy.

4.8.1 Relationships.

4.8.1.1 *Faculty department chairs*. Everyone spoke warmly of the Faculty Department Chairs, Krista and Nathan, as a source of information and, more broadly, support. They were referred to as key by every single person interviewed. They themselves expressed goals of integrating and supporting part-time faculty. Regarding this, the dean stated:

> You do a lot more with part-timers as Department Chair than you [do] as
> Dean. . . . When I applied for this position . . .one of the things I was very clear
> about was, I know the Department Chairs run the Department. I know exactly
> what Department Chairs do. And I know how hard it is for them to do it. So, you
> let them do their thing.

Unusually, Campus One has two department chairs who split up their time in the department. As one comes in early and one stays late, there is a resource person available to part-time faculty most of the time, and this was repeatedly commented on as extremely helpful. For example, one part-timer who teaches nights stated:

> One thing that's pretty cool is the way we have two department heads. And
> Krista's got the early shift and Nathan's got the later shift. So Nathan is there
> when I am there. And I think that's fantastic, because otherwise I would be totally
> on my own.

The chairs expressed that they have grown to understand that they need to pro-actively support the part-time faculty, include them as much as is possible, and treat them with appreciation and respect. Almost without fail, when I asked part-time faculty whom they went to

when they ran into problems, the faculty department chairs were mentioned. Nathan and Krista

have set the tone for the department and it is clearly appreciated.

These two chairs have worked extremely hard to build relationships with the part-time

faculty in the department, to be a constant resource, and to disburse information in a manageable

form. Krista stated the goals:

> But also in the Department Chair role, I really have gotten to know the part-time
> faculty, not just recognize their name[s], but getting to work with them, being a
> resource, helping them, encouraging them to be as if they are full-time. You know,
> you can be involved. There's no hierarchy here. We want you to be involved
> as. . .you're full-time to the most that you can.

One faculty member described them as: "Nathan and Krista are good communicators.

They get stuff out that the math faculty needs to know, our department full-time and part-time.

They keep their list really up to date." Another confirmed, "But if you really want to know

something just ask Nathan and Krista. They know everything about our department." Another

affirmed, "Krista and Nathan's doors are always open." Yet another stated,

> I'm totally trusting of my department chairs. And they're just remarkable. They're
> very intelligent. They work very hard. And they're reliable. They're very fair. If it
> comes to a situation between student and instructor, or whatever it is, they will
> listen to both parties, period. No taking sides whatsoever. And they'll say, "These
> are some options." That's so nice. If we all had that skill and that patience, the
> world would be better.

One full-time faculty, though, added a cautionary note:

> I know that Nathan and Krista are totally supportive of all of us when it comes to
> those issues. But again, I think it's one of those things where depending on the
> person's personality how vulnerable they feel in the situation.

Krista herself described her efforts to support part-time faculty:

> Some people will ask you more often than others. There's some that I never hear
> from, which I'm hoping that that means they're not having any issues. Or maybe
> they just are in and out of here too fast. But I would say, probably even more than
> in the past, they seem to feel comfortable just to come in and ask one of us. "Hey,
> I just need to tell you something that happened to me today in my classroom. Or,

> do you know how I can handle this?" So we get a lot of that. . . And I think that used to be the case [fear of asking], and is still for maybe some people. But in general, I would say, from when I was doing Department Chair [earlier] I didn't have as many people coming up and asking me questions. . . . But now, almost every day we see part-time instructors with issues of a student in class or wondering how to do something or where to find something. Or, do we have some resources? So there's a lot more of that, I think going on in the past few years.

Finally, the dean stated,

> So a lot of the interaction with part-timers happens at the Department Chair level. And so, for me, I check in with the Department Chairs, see what's going on, see what they need from me. And then, unfortunately, usually the only time I really get to interact with part-timers is when something is wrong and there's a student complaint.

> **4.8.1.2** *Colleagues***.** One of the full-time faculty asserted, "We have a good informal

network of support." Many part-time faculty spoke of just asking their colleagues when they had

questions, as illustrated in many the above quotations. Some have a relationship with a particular

colleague or friend, or they have become acquainted with folks in the department and there is a

kind of organic information-sharing. Here is one illustrative comment:

> And so I feel like most of the things that I have learned have been get an email, and then I just ask around. . . . For example, the first week you get the registration email. And how to do late adds, and all that kind of stuff. And how to do no shows. And so then you kind of ask questions around.

Another stated, "I mean, the co-workers who sit near me are the people I happen to know. I talk

to them." Nathan described the department as full of camaraderie:

> I think I would be surprised if there are many more than maybe two or three part-timers who don't know at least two or three full-timers on a first name basis. If you walk through our office you are equally likely to find two part-timers talking to each other, two full-timers talking to each other or a part-time and a full-time person talking to one another. So I think that's pretty indicative of good community.

And several full-time faculty mentioned deliberate efforts to reach out and be a resource and

support for part-time faculty. One described her efforts as:

> If they have any questions or anything, I try to help them out, as much as I can, because I know not all of them get support that they need. So some of them, we just talk in passing. Or there's a row of cubicles that I walk by all the time. And I talk to the people that are there. Some of them are my friends. And they never want [a] full-time [position]. I've known them from here and other places. And one of them. . .needed a place to store his stuff. So he's got a corner in my cubicle. He writes me little notes. . .and leaves them on my desk. So you know, I basically just try and make them welcome.

Another stated:

> Mostly just trying to work side by side with those who teach the same courses that I do, is more of where I make the connections. And I always try to include them in whatever I'm doing. Oh, I'm doing this free activity. Do you want to see it? . . . One of the instructors was teaching part-time and is also teaching the Math Ed. So I just shared …everything. They'll want the assignment lists. They'll want activities, exams, all that stuff. So I share that stuff. A lot of times, they'll come up to me and ask me if I have a good idea for teaching this concept. So it's a pretty open community for that, I think.

However, one full-time faculty member observed that full-time faculty constantly ask for help and shared their strategies for dealing with difficult situations in the classroom. But he stated, "I don't see that from part-timers. And it might be part of that they need to project this confident 'I'm doing this job right, I'll be back next quarter, no problem' image. Or they may have that impression."

4.8.1.3 *Mentoring*. The faculty contract has long stated that "New Faculty members will be assigned a Faculty mentor during their first two years of teaching" (PNWCC and Union, 2015a, p. 11), yet throughout the college, because of the great disparity in numbers between full-time faculty and part-time faculty and lack of enforcement, it is, at best, practiced haphazardly. A number of the part-time faculty who started earlier or on other campuses described their feelings of being lost. One said, "I sort of felt like I was sort of floating and didn't really know what I was doing for a while." Another, who clearly had not been assigned a mentor, stated,

> And I think that having some sort of a mentor for maybe even the first few terms of teaching would be very helpful. You know, so you get a little more of that

detail on things. Or maybe, if you try to teach a topic and it doesn't go so well and you're not sure how else to teach it, someone who you knew you could contact without having the feeling you're bothering them.

Currently in the Campus One Mathematics Department there is a concerted effort to connect new part-time faculty with a mentor. Nathan described the practice as:

Now there we actually are stronger than the other campuses. . . . We pair them up with a mentor. The mentor visits their class early in the term. They go over the syllabus. They go over not just the first test, but how the first test has been graded.

Krista mentioned that when hiring new part-time faculty,

One thing we really look for is them being willing to get on with a mentor. That's something that we started not too many years ago is, instead of tossing them a book and saying, "good luck,". . .is connecting them with people that are teaching the same thing.

Usually the mentors are full-time faculty teaching the same courses, but, in some cases, though they are not paid for it, well-established part-time faculty have been called upon to help mentor.

In his interview, Brandon, a full-time faculty member, described his experience mentoring as,

We have a new part time faculty this term who is a former student of mine. And I've written him recommendations for just so many different things. And I've kind of made up my mind to try to take him under my wing, if you will, and just sort of support him in all of the ways that people supported me, and ways that I wish people had supported me.

A part-time faculty described the mentoring relationship as: "I can't imagine having gone through this without kind of having [the mentor] that I feel comfortable enough with to just kind of bluntly ask questions and to not have to. . .look good in front of."

4.8.1.4 *Level Teams*. Almost every person interviewed mentioned the "Level Teams" at least in passing and, in many cases, with great enthusiasm. These were the brainchild of Brandon, who had taken the idea from PNWCC Two where he had worked earlier as part-time faculty.

Each of the levels of math, from the lowest level to the highest, has designated meetings. He

described it as:

> The idea is to just sort of provide support for everyone teaching a class, full-time
> and part-time. . .on any given level. Like Math 20, Math 60—each group should
> have a Level Team. The idea is to meet at least twice a quarter or so, to just get
> together, talk about how the class is going, share ideas about teaching and
> pedagogy. And if there's questions. . .just bring them to the meeting and we'll talk
> them out with more than a few people there.

One person volunteers to organize the level team. Usually this is a full-time instructor,

since they have contractual obligations to be involved in committee work (PNWCC and Union,

2015), but, occasionally, a part-time instructor—who is paid at a "Special Projects Rate" of

about $30.00 an hour (PNWCC and Union, 2015)—will take on the responsibility. They try to

find a meeting time that will fit the schedules of all those teaching a specific course—no small

feat in itself. Brandon estimates that less than half of those who teach any given class participate,

and, of those who do, some only attend two of four meetings per term.

These "Level Teams" have been made feasible because of the (one-time) funding agreed

to in collective bargaining to support part-time faculty professional development and

participation on college committees, something that had not traditionally been included in their

normal contracts. Krista explained,

> But we have started paying part-time for the Level Teams that we created. . . .
> That's where they actually put in some work and get paid with those new funds,
> which has been wonderful. I mean, I see people meeting in that little room over
> there all the time. And it's mostly part-time with a few full-time which is
> fantastic. . . . It's just super.

Another commented:

> Well, last year it was extra hard, because. . .they didn't get paid to go. This year
> with the new pot of money. . .approved for the workshop rate. So they get $12.50
> an hour to show up. And so this year our first staff meeting there were two full-
> timers, the leader, myself, and then two part-timers who were there to talk and
> think about the class, and ask questions. It went really well. I think they earned

their $12.50. Easily. Because I learned stuff from them about the course and had some things to think about. [Interviewer: So, they felt free to share, it sounds like.] Yeah, that's the whole idea. The facilitator brings. . .a list of a couple of questions about how the course is going to kind of just get us going, get ideas out into the air. And, of course, if anybody else has a good question, talk about those too.

To clarify, this funding was paid at a "stipend rate" of $50.00 per four hours, which college administrators have determined as appropriate, and then this $50.00 has been parsed out to $12.50 per hour for participation. While a number of people commented on the ridiculously low pay (doesn't even cover babysitting, one person commented), a number also acknowledged that the pay, even while inadequate, still made a statement that participation by the part-time faculty was valued. A number of part-time faculty expressed gratitude for being included. One described the experience:

I learned so many things from those little team meetings of ours. . . . So it kind of brings some things to your attention you hadn't thought about before. . .how people score papers and how they give quizzes, and when they give quizzes. . . . Like recently, I decided to just give homework quizzes instead of collecting all their homework. And as a result, I get people asking more questions in class. . .because they know they're going to be quizzed. And then I found out this one instructor gives her quizzes at the end of the class period. And I thought, perfect. I like that idea. I'm going to start giving quizzes at the end. Because that will give. . .the last fifteen minutes to do the quiz. . . . You get some ideas you hadn't really thought about from talking over in these team meetings. And I change things.

Brandon described the phenomenon: "So the level teams have been amazing for that. I get to meet with them on a semi-regular basis. And I'm convinced that I learned more from them than they learned from me. But we share ideas, and materials and things of that nature."

These were only a few of the positive comments. It appears that these meetings include part-time faculty in a way that they have not been typically included before, that they are feeling valued, and that they are improving their teaching at the same time.

4.7.2 Information: Formal Communications.

4.7.2.1 *Recruitment, hiring, interviews, and course scheduling.* The PNWCC

Employment website requires all applicants for part-time jobs to upload their resume into a part-time faculty applicant pool, and departments are technically expected to hire from that site. It's

formal and rather impersonal, and the department has found it

> mismanaged. . . . In the part-time pool they have files up there for people who
> were hired full-time ten years ago. Their file is still sitting there. . .because it
> never goes away. . . . Or Krista used to cold-call people. And they'd say, "Oh, I
> moved to Colorado three years ago. . . ." That's not a source for us at all.

In response to this broken system, department chairs are forced to rely on connections

with other campuses that may have part-time faculty looking for further classes, or they pull

from tutors in the tutoring enters, they give extra weight to people who take initiative to contact

them, or they rely on personal recommendations. Even so, all must technically use the faculty

pool, so they find ways to manage:

> We get contacted by someone and tell them to apply for the pool because we have
> to hire out of the pool. But sometimes somebody that's got the initiative to contact
> us to want to come and meet with us, instead of just throwing an app in there,
> we're finding that a lot of times those are preferable candidates for becoming
> part-time.

From the standpoint of aspiring part-time faculty, the process is opaque. In the words of

one department member, "I think it's by word of mouth." In the comment of another, "So it's

this weird thing where. . .there has to be some kind of personal contact to get a job here. My

application was in the pile here for years before I got called"—and that call was the result of a

personal contact. Another described her experience:

> I had a friend who was a math teacher here. . . . I asked her who the chairperson
> of the department was. And I called her up and asked if I could come in and talk
> to her and bring her my resume. I had put an application in online into the part
> time instructor pool, and I hadn't heard anything. And I was curious if it was me
> or, they didn't have a need or. . .I didn't really know how it worked. . . . And I
> came in and talked to her. And she had explained to me that they schedule classes
> quite a bit ahead of time. And, you know, "Nice to meet you and I'll keep you in

mind for future classes. . . ." And school, I believe had started that week, or was starting the following week. . . . And they had a teacher not show up. . .and so they called me up in a panic and said, "Can you teach this class?" And I said, "Sure, why not?" So. . .I did not have a formal interview.

One chair described a flurry of last-minute hiring in a moment of crisis and commented

that, in retrospect, that didn't work so well. As a result,

So we're being more careful, even when we're desperate now to do more. We have them come in and chat with them. We look carefully at their letter and their resume. . .but talking more about not just experience. Because sometimes the ones that technically on paper look just great, don't end up doing the best job in the classroom. So one thing we really look for is them being willing to get on with a mentor.

As for the hiring process,

Of course, we interview them. But we don't…Like at Campus Three, they make them do teaching demos. We don't do that. [Interviewer: So basically, it's just a chit chat with you? And you look at their qualifications?] That's basically it. We're not too very rigorous.

The above comment is seconded yet qualified by another:

And yet, you want to protect the students from having a bad experience. . . . So we have been pretty fortunate in the last couple years, and careful, as we're hiring and have some gems. We wouldn't want to lose them. We would love for them to get full-time. . . . We've started realizing that we want to think of every part-time person as a potential full-timer, not for someone that's just filling a gap. It might never happen. But that's what you want to be thinking, that you might be training a person that's going to be full-time. So even though the hiring process isn't as stringent as. . .all the things you go through for full-time, we want to try to get that kind of quality in every part-timer that we can. So that's hard. It's hard.

One full-time faculty commented,

But I think part of it is the human nature of it. And not having a clue in that stack of. . .if there's fifty or a hundred applications, you have no idea. . . . Does whoever's doing the hiring that quarter [and] needs to hire within a month have time to read those hundred applications right now again?"

On a related subject, one part-time faculty wondered how classes were scheduled, for, to

her at least, the decision-making process was not transparent:

I don't know how part-time faculty members are placed into classes. Is it a seniority thing? Is it a who's best for what's available? So, if it's the seniority thing that's really, I'm very worried. Because I, obviously, don't have a lot of terms under my belt. So, I'm trying to be optimistic.

4.8.2.2 Orientation. At this time there is nothing standardized from the college except for one checklist of links to policies all new employees are to read (apparently, to cover the college on legal and compliance issues). Beyond that, it is left to the faculty department chairs and the administrative aides to help situate new faculty. Because a number of the part-time faculty interviewed for this research had been hired numbers of years ago, and some had begun at other campuses, their stories of getting oriented can be summed up in one comment, "When I started I was handed a book and a couple of example syllabi, and [I was told], 'This is when your class meets. Have fun.'"

But it's clear that there is more effort now to onboard new part-time faculty. One of the department chairs described the current process:

We have a checklist. . . . The first thing we do is take them on a little tour, show them where the coffee machine is, show them where desks where they'll sit. They have a choice of a Mac or a PC to use. Introduce to them to as many people that are around, so that they can just like start feeling like a part of being here. But also Molly [administrative aide] is like the number one, because she gets their ID going. She gets their background check. She gets them all kinds of information that they need. And then we have a document ten pages long [on which] one of our full-timers collaborated: "Here's all kinds of stuff you might need to know. . . ." We kind of have a checklist that we go down to try to make sure that we don't forget anything. . . . And we give them sample syllabi and give them emails of people who are teaching the same course. We try to hook them up immediately with a mentor. So we try to make them feel connected right away, because they can feel really disconnected even after they're hired. So just trying to make sure that, every time we see someone, we introduce them.

In spite of those efforts, there were a number of stories of part-time faculty finding out basic things several years after beginning the job. One relatively recent hire described her experience:

I was given the HR packet of things to read online, and various things like that. Like the mission statement, and the vision statement, and the equity statement and all of those kinds of things. . .big checklist. And I had to submit and sign off that I had done all those things. . . . But I had to seek out everything else. . . . I had to know that I had to look at Course Outcomes (CO) stuff. But luckily I know several people who are resources in the math faculty department. That's the only way that I know that you figure things out. . . . It's definitely not specific to math. It's just specific to being a part-time instructor. When you get hired HR doesn't do a great job of explaining your benefits. . . . And so there's a big gap of lack of knowledge. I don't know if it's because I got hired and started in the summer, so I wasn't a traditional faculty hire maybe. . . . So there were a lot of things that took me a long time to figure out.

Another part-time faculty stated:

Asked questions, poked around, looked online. [If I] had a need that I couldn't figure out I'd would go ask around. . .various people. So, for example, I was here for maybe two years before I found out that you could get a part-time faculty [parking] permit with pretax money by filling out a form at student registration. And the only reason I figured that out was because I saw the form sitting out there, and I picked one up when I was waiting. . . and said "What is this?" And they explained it to me.

Another part-time faculty member who had expressed satisfaction with his orientation offered

one other suggestion:

Did it help me? As a new teacher, I could have used more [of] what does teaching really mean? How do you do handling of classroom disturbance-oriented people, that kind of thing, that you get in the world of education. . . . We certainly could use a look-see into that area.

4.8.2.3 *Email and Google drive.* Nearly everyone mentioned email. A number spoke

ruefully of the incredible number of emails coming at them: "Three hundred emails a day. It's

overwhelming. . . I think that email is the go-to method of the school." Another stated, "Gee,

everybody and their mother's left elbow puts me on every letter. . .every note." One part-timer

expressed it this way: "I'm not sure what issues I'm even made aware of. Most of that is above

my pay grade. Whether it be things at the Board level, or President of the College issues or

whatever, that doesn't impact me and my students in the classroom." There was a certain

acceptance of the general problem:

> I think that PNWCC, as a whole, just has a communication issue. When you're dealing with a monster that's this big, how do you make sure that you're reaching the outskirts when you have multiple campuses? You have tons of part-timers. . .

> The Faculty Department Chairs have become "proactive," (their word), about trying to

sort out and send out key items to part-time faculty. Those who can't manage to look at all the

emails coming across their desks seem to pay attention to the ones from the Faculty Department

Chairs, who try to cull out the most important bits of information. As one of the department

chairs described it,

> They're on the same list serves as us. And so if we see something that is particularly targeted in a way that we think that there would either be a lot of interest in it or a lot of value in it, we do echo the message. We send it out again.

A part-time faculty member stated, "Oh, they do a great job. I think of them as the hourglass. All

this stuff and they protect us. It all comes down to this neck. And they have to filter that."

Even with the efforts, there was evidence that some part-time faculty had been

overlooked with regards to this basic source: "I've gotten onto the email lists. I didn't even know

to ask for that. Sometime in the Spring term in the middle I was added to math department lists

and stuff like that. . .it was after I was teaching."

In addition to the orientation mentioned above and proactive emailing, the department

chairs have set up a Google Drive with many resources specifically for the Math Department.

Nathan described it as:

> We have a site on the Google drive that has…tons of syllabi, tons of class activities. And then all of the procedural stuff is all in a central location. Krista has a two-page general information Title IX resources, ADA all that that we all use. And so we don't have to create that stuff ourselves. And then we also have templates, specific to each class. So they can just go and put their name and their office hours, what their schedule is going to

be. If they're new, most of them just end up just using somebody else's schedule the first time they teach it. . . . So I'm saying they take advantage of the stuff. It's all shared stuff.

Part-time faculty mentioned finding the collection of resources extremely helpful, and some were proud to have contributed to the collections with their own assignments. Another, though, found it overwhelming: "There's a shared drive on Google. It's not really organized well enough for me to get a lot of value out of it."

4.8.2.4 *Resources for Students*. Commenting on part-time faculty knowledge of resources for students, the dean said,

> I think that if we can help to integrate them, I think that there's nothing but benefit to be had. So the students' biggest interaction is in the classroom. So if the person who is in the classroom knows about the resources and [is] able to provide those resources to the student, then that's major.

Part-time faculty seemed to find out about resources available for students in a variety of ways. One described it as:

> You walk around campus. You see the signs. People put up flyers. They have the sandwich boards. . .and so you see these things. And you kind of get an idea that they exist. Sometimes you get emails about them. . . . So you kind of just run into it here and there. But there is a list I've seen recently of a ton of student resources available. And I try to tell my students at the beginning of the term that really, whatever they're having trouble with, there is a resource here for them, because there really is. It's great in that way.

Two part-time faculty had worked in areas with special supports for students. One described it, "A lot of our students need different resources at different times. And because you work so closely with that student resource specialist I feel like I have a little bit more knowledge that those exist." Others found out on their own:

> I've also tried to figure out resources available to students because I've had some students who needed things and I did not know what resources were available. A lot of that came from just poking around and asking questions, or having students that needed help with something, and then going out and actually asking.

Sometimes it was also accidental. "I ran into someone who said, 'I work in student advising and we have counseling for students who are having any mental health issues.' I had no idea before that." Another said,

> Well, they sent us out a copy of what needs to be in our syllabus every year. And it's got a list of all those places. Which, this is probably something I don't do really well. I kind of know they exist because I've read through that. I don't know a lot about them. If I have a student who's struggling that seems to need something I'll do some research into those places to see if one of them will fit.

Two part-time faculty mentioned that they found out about resources from students. One said:

> And I've also had students come to me and say, "Oh, I went to this place and they had way better tutoring than that place." Or, "If you want to print stuff, you can print stuff free at the Women's Resource Area (WRA). You can print ten pages a day free, and it's not on your account, so. . ." [I've learned] from my students. I mean, really, why not?"

And the other suggested: "Just listening to the success stories that students have and listening to their failure stories. Don't go here. Do this."

Others mentioned referring students to counselors, inviting representatives from the Women's Resource Area into the classroom, asking colleagues, and asking Molly, the administrative aide: "She's wonderful. She's great. She's been here a long time. She knows a lot of people. And I've asked her about counseling issues, and she's sent me to different people. So that's been very helpful." Another stated:

> I'm a big advocate of the Women's Resource Area. I feel that it's misnamed because it should be "Peoples' Resources Area" because it has guys, girls and all of us. . . . And I've had to do this many times. "Hey, I'm happy to walk over there. I'm going over to the resource center. And I'm going to talk to them about something else here. You want to go and just see where it is?" Get them in there. . .just to touch the door is the first step of overcoming the fear of, I can't, I won't, I don't. And that's not too bad.

One faculty member suggested more training might be helpful: "I've received no input as to how to deal with conflicts with students. . . . It would be helpful." But this same faculty member recounted stories of walking students over to take advantage of various resources:

> I had another student who showed up to class on an exam day, coming apart at the seams. He had just found out that his best friend from back home committed suicide the night before. And so I walked him over to counseling and kind of handed him off over there.

4.8.2.5 Assessment. Systematic assessment of instructors is considered a "best practice," and this department does a first-term and then periodic assessments for part-time faculty, generally performed by the department chairs. In addition, students submit online course evaluations each term. One part-time instructor commented,

> I've been assessed, because one of the department chairs comes and watches me teach every once in a while and gives me feedback. And then your students fill out the assessments at the end of the term. And those are pretty helpful. You know, you can do this better. And we liked how you did this. And one student really likes how you did it, and one student really hates how you did that same thing.

However, the comments in total showed that even with good intent, there was still room for improvement. For instance, one instructor noted: "And I know it should be done, but I thought before the end of your second term of teaching. . . . I contacted the department and was told that I am on the list of people that they are to assess this fall." Another who had been assessed twice in about five years commented, "I got a couple of hints on things, but I wouldn't say it was comprehensive. They were both good, but not terribly thorough." A long-time part-time instructor noted,

> I think when people come in and observe your class too, just saying a few words about how you're doing helps. . . . I've been observed by Krista. And I've been observed by Chris. And I can't remember if there's anybody else. But they've always been very positive. And that makes me feel good. Usually, I go too fast is one of the things that. . . . "Stop, Sally. And. . .wait and see if students can formulate questions to ask you. . . . It's been helpful. And I love the positive

feedbacks, you know. I had to submit a test that I had just recently given, complete with the answers, just to see that I'm asking the right questions and everything like that.

Another expressed the need for feedback and guidance if there was something that needed correcting: "And if the full-timers really do have some legitimate concerns about students not being taught certain things that they need to be taught, then somehow or another that needs to get politely communicated."

On the other hand, one of the chairs commented:

I don't know if it's just me or if it's the norm, but three out of four times I had an evaluation meeting with the part-time faculty and I make any sort of suggestion about things that might change, they just sit there and argue with me.

One of the part-time faculty essentially confirmed that and questioned the process:

He came in the classroom for about the first, I think hour of class. . . . He had me send him some of my exams and stuff. We talked about that later. And I'm not sure it was that helpful. I mean, a class is more than an hour. It's ten weeks. . . . And so, if you're an instructor who really thinks about the class, there's a progression. You know, tying things together, especially the things that are more difficult. It's really not about what you do one specific day.

But this same instructor then added:

There's almost like this huge fear of critique in education, like everyone is so worried about being told they're doing something wrong. And that's sort of wrong thinking. We're sort of all in this together. We should we helping each other to get better at this.

4.8.2.6 *Professional Development*. One full-time faculty member stated, "That is slim and narrow, I think, the professional development. I'm trying to think of one part-time person that's ever gone anywhere." Another stated, "I can't think of a single part-time person who's ever done anything." And most of the part-time faculty had little to say about it, when asked. One mentioned taking advantage of training to use the distance learning system; another spoke of the Campus One Part-time Faculty Inservice offered once a year:

I generally do that every year. It was the first couple of years. . . . But they pay me. And I get free food. And you know, I get a chance to talk to people, which is actually great. I took a calligraphy class last term because I didn't realize we had that in the Art Department. And it turned out to be fantastic. But I only know about it because the instructor for it, who was wonderful, was in that same workshop.

Professional development opportunities at PNWCC Campus One are offered through the Teaching Learning Resource Center (TLRC) and all faculty are invited to participate. During the current fiscal period there is one-time stipend funding for part-time faculty participation—an incentive for attendance at various events—but few interviewees mentioned this campus-level professional development and only one talked about participating in college-wide trainings or events. In general, interviewees explained that there were two main obstacles: scheduling and (even with the small stipends) lack of financial remuneration.

Several comments concerning professional development for part-timers came from full-time faculty who were more aware of the needs of students on a department- and college-wide scale. One put it urgently (also quoted above):

And we need part-time and full-time faculty both—for all those [DE] classes need real pedagogical and curricular support from the college that we don't have right now. We need it at a system-wide level, not like one workshop for one instructor at a time who's engaging in professional development. And I think that the part-time/full-time split there makes it even harder. Because it's like we don't even have a system to reach out to our part-timers now for them to access professional development funds that are available, right? . . . So, talking about things on the larger level, it's really intense.

This year, as a result of the division leadership applying for a specific grant, the department offered not only to full-time faculty but all part-time faculty an opportunity to attend the State Mathematical Association of Two Year Colleges Conference (SMATYC). None of the part-time faculty I interviewed mentioned it, though college-wide, 35 part-time math faculty had indicated interest in attending. Some full-time faculty commented that it seemed wasteful and

one called it a "bizarre" choice– it was a conference at the beach, and she thought that being reliably paid for working together on curriculum and teaching strategies would have been a better way to spend the money. Yet the she did later add, "But it's inexpensive. It's in [the state]. And it's a good opportunity, because they don't usually get to go to conferences at all."

4.8.2.7 *Shared governance*. When I asked part-time faculty whether they were involved in "shared governance," most seemed to be unfamiliar with the terminology. I then explained it as participating in the college on such things as the Math CAC, curriculum committees, or the Academic Advisory Council (AAC). Put that way, it seemed that the chief way part-time faculty were involved was in math committees, particularly those that worked on curriculum. One full-time faculty member suggested part-time faculty were involved in shared governance "Just through the CAC, I would say. Although, if they're on the curriculum committee they can influence curriculum."

Part-time faculty are invited to all the Math Department committees, but they are only required by contract to attend one non-specified two-hour committee meeting per term (PNWCC and Union, 2015, 5.42). Some of the CAC meetings provide a stipend for attendance, and recently there have also been some stipends to participate in other meetings as well. As Nathan stated it,

> I would say fifty percent of our part-time faculty is actively involved in CAC—
> participation in CAC both on the general level, but also on the committee level
> and even on some of the hard committees, like the learning assessment
> committees. So we are trying to get them paid for every minute of work that
> they're doing this year, while we have this opportunity.

Krista added:

> And they are, a lot of times, on book and Course Outcomes (CO) committees.
> That's very common. . . The book selection and the course outcomes and
> updates. . .so that's pretty common that we'll get people joining those, part-time.
> That's probably one of their biggest places they do participate.

One full-time faculty member described efforts to include part-time faculty much more fully:

> I do know that our CAC has really tried, over the last several years, to include part-time more. So I know they're getting invited way more than they were when I started. . . . And also to invite them to participate on CO committees so that they can have their input. . . . So there's a lot more being done than there used to be, especially at the pre-college [level].

There are a number of other meetings as well: Campus One Math Department meetings and curricular meetings. Some of the meetings grant the part-time faculty a stipend to participate ($50.00 for up to a 4-hour meeting). One part-time faculty stated, "So I got invited to this term's, last week in fact it was, the Campus One Math Department meeting. So, I chose to go to that. It's not required." A full-time faculty member observed:

> I think there's more that would be involved if there was more awareness of exactly what's available and. . .that you can be paid for that stuff. I think not everybody's really aware of that. . . . It's just that system of mystery of how you get paid for any work outside your class, I think, is a barrier to more part-time participation in shared governance.

And one part-time faculty described his contributions as

> I go to most the CAC meetings. I vote in them. My vote has never swung something. Usually the votes are, you know, fifty-five people for and two people abstain or something. There's really never been something that was even remotely close. That's about the extent of it though.

Most part-time faculty seemed to recognize that attendance can help them integrate into the department and loop them in to more information. Barriers to attendance had to do with scheduling, the difficulty of driving in to the campus just for one meeting, the poor (or nonexistent pay), and other obligations, such as working another full-time job. But most seemed generally positive about the efforts to include them and typically felt it was worthwhile to attend:

> I go to the CAC meetings, which is not required as a part-timer. But I like to know what's going on. So I usually attend those when I can. . . . I feel like those are a pretty good way of getting information of what's going on in the department.

4.9 General Integration

4.9.1 Contributions. When asked about part-time faculty contributions, one full-time

faculty commented:

> Well, in the classroom [their skills are] clearly utilized. And from our
> inexperienced young Master's holders to our retired high school teachers who
> have tons of ability and experience, they're all in the classroom. And they all work
> really hard. Students reap that benefit. . . . And I think that's really where most of
> us get our recognition that matters, that's meaningful for faculty, especially part-
> time faculty, because they're not at inservice. They're not at all these events where
> an administrator stops by to thank us for being there.

Indeed, when part-time faculty were asked about their contributions to the college, they

all spoke of their efforts in the classroom. One described it this way: "I think I'm pretty good at

conveying information and helping students learn." Another stated, "By allowing me to teach.

By getting me in front of a classroom." One stated,

> I love to teach. Well, I again go back to the classroom. . . . And really
> supporting—I mean the students are good. . .often, they're working hard. If I can
> connect with a student it can make all the difference in the world.

Another elaborated more fully:

> In the classroom, I think I have a skill with words. I think I have a certain ability
> with people, especially with students. . . . So personally, I like to keep things
> positive. I like to be supportive and try to bring students up and show them that
> they can do things. I mean, even in any class, math or writing, they're doing more
> things right than wrong. The things they're doing wrong might be eighty percent
> of their grade, which would be a problem. But I take the time to say, "Yes, you
> did this right. You did this right. You did this right. Oh, here, you missed the
> minus sign." And then it's three things right, one little mistake, I think that sends
> a better message. I wouldn't say [my skills are] utilized a lot outside of that.

Still focused on the students and the classroom, several mentioned preparation outside of

class:

> I'm pretty self-motivated. So most of the work I do, outside the classroom to
> make my classes better. . . . I feel like I do a lot of work for my classes. I don't
> phone it in. I don't just print lecture notes from the textbook publisher's website
> and go deliver those by rote in class.

Another also added sharing her preparation work with others:

> I love, actually, preparing notes for my classes. I've written workbooks for all of my classes. . . . So I like writing up my own examples for them to think about. And I share them. . . . I've done it with a couple of them. Take the flash drive, copy, print it, whatever you want. You can alter it. . .so you can do what you want with it. Sure.

Those who had been able to participate on the Level Teams spoke of sharing teaching expertise. "I like the idea of us having these team meetings, to support one another. This is just something that started last year." Another felt that her contributions were valued in the group:

> This term when these level team meetings, so meaning the Math 60 group of faculty, and the Math 20 group, I feel like I have variety of ideas to share because of all those prior years of teaching these classes, in a high school setting. And in the high school setting you not only focus on the content, but you focus a lot on teaching strategies. So, I have the teaching part down, and I have the content part down too. And so I think that there's a lot of ideas that we share.

Brandon echoed this in this above-quoted statement: "I'm convinced that I learned more from them than they learned from me."

Full-time faculty added more insight on part-time faculty participation as well, with one affirming, "We have a lot of part-timers who really do get actively involved." For instance, one noted that a couple of part-timers took notes at CAC meetings. When asked whether they were compensated for that service, she said, "They get paid to attend the meeting. So, they kind of get paid for it." Another mentioned that one part-time faculty had been serving on the Assessment Committee (AC). Another mentioned the great participation and learning taking place in the Level Teams and noted that one of them is being run by a part-time faculty member: "She's been here for a long time. So we take advantage of that. And I think that might even help sometimes with the level teams if it's being run by another part timer; they might feel more comfortable to participate."

One full-time faculty member had written a grant and part-time faculty were invited to

participate:

> I got lucky last year, I got a grant that I've been able to help with some part-time participation. It's a state grant to support Open Educational Resources (OER) pilot. . . . But everybody who adopts it, or tries it out and pilots it during the year gets, until we run out of money, gets five hundred bucks for all their prep. That's good money. And so we've had really good participation and pretty good. . .I think it's like more than half part-timers. . . . And their input's really valuable to us as we try to figure out how to switch to less expensive materials for our students.

And still, these positive reports are not universal, depending on the situation. One of the

part-time faculty who has a full-time job outside the college stated,

> I can't say I've really ever had any interaction within the organization about how I do things, or how I could do them better, or maybe something that I do better than someone else. Especially with part time people, I don't think there's any real sharing of materials, or classroom skills, or visiting other people's classrooms to see how they run them and how they work. So, I wouldn't say that there's been a lot of that sort of utilization of my skills or other people's skills.

Another stated:

> But I think it's really cool to have people from the outside with outside experiences come in and teaching. I know a couple of other engineers that are part-time faculty here. And I think that's really cool. And I think it'd be cooler if some of the engineering people could integrate more with the math people and kind of cross. . . . Like those of us who are engineers and using math in an engineering kind of context, versus those who are using math in a purely mathematics context, have a little more of that.

Another expressed a wish that his other skills might be utilized:

> I certainly would like to be part of a change that deals with measures of aspects, so that we can measure change and decide whether that's useful or not. It would also give us a kind of a future—are we going in the right direction? And what else is happening? Should we be looking at this kind of education? Should we be doing as much computer? Are we teaching people to think? Are we teaching people to create?

In terms of formal recognition of part-time faculty achievements, Nathan mentioned that

a faculty member had expressed a desire for a more positive department by acknowledging and

honoring contributions. But he felt there were difficulties in choosing how to acknowledge contributions: "The problem with public recognition is that every time you recognize somebody there's forty people you're not recognizing. And so, you have to find a way to do that in a delicate sort of way." Krista discussed noticing where a given faculty member's "sweet spot" was by looking at course evaluations, student success rates in the following class, as well as asking part-time faculty for their preferences, and attempting to assign courses based on individual strengths.

Other than that, the best formal recognition had to do with being one of the chosen few to receive a "Multi-Year Contract"—the new category for part-time faculty recently negotiated by the union on a pilot basis. One recipient said:

> I'm just thrilled to death to have gotten that three-year. . .multi-year contract. It just made me feel like they had felt my services were positive and I was a contribution to the Math Department. And it was just kind of an honor to be selected as one of the multi-year contract people. It just made me feel. . .accepted, what I'm doing is good work. [Interviewer: And this is after, what, thirty years?] Thirty years.

In contrast, another stated his frustration:

> If I were rewarded for this stuff, obviously, I'd feel like I was more of a part of the system or even, you know, acknowledged. . . . So I've applied for these full-time positions. . . . No one really knows what I do in the classroom. They don't really know if the student experience is better. So, you know, recently, there were these two full-time positions at Campus Two. I submitted the application. I didn't even get to the second round, which was a little surprising considering I have so much experience. And I feel like I do work hard. And I get great evaluations. But if you can't check certain boxes, you're just not rewarded. I feel like if the things I did were even acknowledged, or known about, I would probably feel more a part of this place. But it feels like I just kind of do my own thing. And I'm very sort of isolated. And that's sort of it.

Similarly, another stated:

> And instead of looking externally for that value, because I'm not receiving it, unfortunately, from PNWCC, I'm having to look internal for it and on my own value and know that I'm doing a good job or that I'm a good educator even if

someone outside of myself isn't rewarding me and in many ways. . . . Perhaps that word "respect," you know, recognizing I am an educator.

4.9.2 Integration. As is obvious from the above comments, this department has clearly made efforts to better integrate part-time faculty, but the true difficulties of integrating part-time faculty are well-described in this comment by a full-time faculty member.

> Just the basic, the big idea of that sort of collegiality of the faculty, the sort of ideal that we all are here kind of helping each other become better as instructors, deeper understanding of our disciplines, reacting to the real needs of our students with different backgrounds and different races, different genders. The part-time/full-time split makes that collegiality harder. Like knowing that my job is, just dollar sign wise, so much more valuable than their job, for the same. . .the same work, as far as like getting in a class and working hard for the students. But, you know, the stuff I do outside, many of them do it too, but just don't get paid. That makes collegiality a little harder for us achieve. We work hard to do it anyway. I think most people push toward that and are pushing toward it. But I think it's just this piece of our puzzle where in the interest of saving a few bucks over the years we've made. . .we've decreased the professional respect of the faculty generally by not being respectful enough of our part-time faculty.

When asked about how they felt about "general integration" into the department—a key question for this dissertation—it seemed that the department had indeed improved in this regard and was continuing to work at things. One of the many efforts was to just come together in community-building meetings. Nathan described one of those meetings:

> But we just had one three weeks ago. And we always start it with food. So we had a potluck. And that was the socialization part. And then we had a really robust meeting for an hour and a half. And I was having to cut people off because we had guests. And I was like, "Listen, we've got guests. So, and we cannot solve the world's problems. So, put a sock in it." We get along really well in this department, so. . . . But I think that part of it is because we do stuff like that.

And in spite of the department's best efforts, it can never entirely work because of the numbers and structural divide. One very satisfied part-timer stated:

> Within the Math Department we pretty much know each other. But we recently have hired so many more part-timers. I would love to have a meeting where we could get acquainted with all of these new part-timers. A lot of them only teach

one class. Or they all teach on a day when I'm not here. And it would be awfully
nice to meet these other part-time staff members.

And Nathan described the realities of how relationships were built – or not:

Just by chatting with each other. But, you know, the new part-time faculty that we
have this year, I actually don't really know any of them at all. I'm even the
mentor of one of them. But we're doing it all via email. And I haven't been able
to make it to her class yet. And so, I would say I have really strong relationships
with sixty percent of them. . .but I would say I have very little relationship with
the other forty percent. Well, some of that might just be the clock, right? Because
I don't even come in until one o'clock. So, if somebody only teaches in the
morning, then I don't have a relationship with them. But Krista does. But I think
statistically, that would be evidence that this…these relationships are built by
happenstance, not by anything deliberate.

The department chairs both described a growing awareness and effort concerning part-

time faculty support. Krista described this phenomenon:

I think we're putting more effort into that, now than we used to. When we did
some questions and we had some input from our faculty, we realized they didn't
feel as connected as we thought they did. . . . And we realized that we really
needed to step up making them feel more connected—more of an effort to get
them involved and make them feel like their voice matters.

She offered an example of having posted pictures of all full-time math faculty in the

department, at which point some part-time faculty asked why they were not included.

Having thus been enlightened, the chairs began including the part-time faculty:

I think we did it just alphabetically after that or something. But it's little things
that you might not think about that are making someone feel connected. . . .
They're an instructor, period. Yes, they haven't been hired full-time, but they're
still in the classroom. They're still preparing. They're still interacting with
students.

She then described the changed efforts they have evolved to:

I think we're being more proactive about checking and, you know, not just saying
"Hi," but saying "How's your class going? Is there anything we could help you
with? Have you connected with a Level Team? Are you on one of those?". . . So
we're just doing the best we can to be flexible. And just making sure that we
encourage them to [participate] and make them feel welcome. . . . Or just say,

"Did you know there's a position open?" I mean, trying to keep the interaction. . .being more purposeful about engagement, that's a big issue for me.

When asked why there is more of an effort to include part-time faculty these days, one full-time faculty member answered at some length with several theories:

There was a little bit more of a push, I think from administration, to kind of include them. Well, it seemed like they wanted us to make sure they were included. But we also, as a CAC, just decided, we need their input. Some of them, if they've taught enough during the year they are voting members. But then you also need to be informed if they're voting members. So we want them to be included. Now that we've negotiated to where they can get pay for it. . . . And so that's kind of brought it into the forefront of, okay, if this money is there to pay for them for the extra work, how can [we] use it and get them involved? Some of them didn't come because they, quite honestly, didn't have the time to donate their time. Now that they can get paid, they're making time for it. So I think we've kind of recognized, more and more, we need to have them included. There's been some turnovers of people coming up that are newer and maybe [have] been a part-timer. And so they're like, "We need to include these people and give them more support than I got when I was. . . . And so it might just be turnover in staff. And now the people here want to make sure that their voice is heard too. And we've also become very aware of we have such a small percentage taught by full-timers, we need to make sure that whatever we're doing gets shared with them so there's more consistency. . .or vice versa.

The funding for staff development and participation on committees had made a great difference for many. Predictably, and in agreement with scholarly research already cited above, those part-timers who had other jobs were relatively satisfied but could not often participate on committees; those who were retired and teaching by choice, were satisfied with arrangements; and those who had taught for a while and were trying to actually make a living were, in a word, frustrated.

Ultimately, the potential for a great department exists, but there are many structurally difficult barriers. Those barriers will be further discussed in Chapter 5. Below are some of the comments in reaction to the questions on feelings of integration:

Faculty in the "satisfied" category had many positive things to say, such as "I felt very

welcomed. I've been made to feel comfortable and welcomed." Another stated,

> I've never had it so good. . . . And then you come in here to work. It's organized.
> We have resources. We have other people that can help you. If you're working
> with a student with accommodations, there's a whole group of people that know
> what they're doing. If you have a person that's having a bad day, there's a whole
> group of counselors and advisors that know what they're doing. There's
> somebody to sign them up called registration. And they're very fair. This is a
> wonderful place to be. We have people to help us. . . . Don't change anything
> there.

Another described her experience as:

> We have an amazing Math Department over there, I mean just amazing. Their
> personalities are all so much fun. So it's so easy to joke around and be part of the
> crowd. It's nice. It's an amazing Math Department. I just can't say enough about
> how wonderful those folks are over there. And they're so helpful to me too. I get
> stuck on something and I go, "Help." And they're right there on top of things.

Yet, as expected, those who have other jobs are limited in their ability to be integrated:

> So, I think it would be really fun to go to all the. . .about sixteen meetings that
> they have every week. But right now I can't, so. . . . I don't know that it would
> actually make my teaching all that better. It would just be personally interesting to
> me. And fun to learn.

Another stated:

> The integration is a strange idea to me. Because especially there is that divide
> with time, because part-time instructors are not. . .the only time you're committing
> to is the time that you're in class. . . . And you don't get paid for anything else.
> And as much as people would probably like to be involved in those sorts of things,
> there's really sometimes neither the time or the financial ability to be able to do
> that.

Faculty in the "mixed feelings" category expressed this in different ways. One asked,

"What integration?" Another stated, "I don't really feel like it exists. I don't feel like I'm

integral. . . . I don't really feel part of the place, other than through the students. And they're not

going to be here forever." In another part of the interview, the same faculty stated "I feel like a

lot of faculty are just sort of loosely tied on. . . . But I don't really feel terribly connected to it. I feel like I kind of do my thing. And then the world revolves. . .whether I do it or not."

4.10 Summary

This section has presented findings that emerged in the interviews with regard to part-time faculty integration into the PNWCC Campus One Mathematics Department with a special focus on Developmental Education Mathematics. It focused on Wheatley's three critical domains for a healthy organization—identity, information, and relationships—and included a look at best practices for integration and support of part-time faculty.

Chapter 5 will discuss the findings, explicate the barriers to part-time faculty integration, include caveats concerning the research, and suggest topics for further research. It will conclude with suggestions for better integration of part-time faculty.

Section V: Conclusion

When I really got into teaching I was a little more idealistic about it, a little more driven, I guess, by movies that show one teacher making a difference. And now that I've been here for a number of years. . .you sort of get to know a system and the rules of the system are not always set up to. . .I don't know, provide the best outcomes, until it gets bad.

PNWCC Part-time Faculty

This dissertation was a qualitative case study focused on part-time faculty teaching developmental mathematics courses in one large Pacific Northwest community college. The college was selected for its size and maturity; the topic was selected for three related reasons: part-time faculty have been widely relied upon to teach these courses nationwide; students in developmental education courses tend to have higher risk factors and attrition rates; and mathematics courses form the bulk of developmental education (pre-college-level courses, formerly termed remedial). Research indicates that high reliance on part-time faculty (variously termed "contingent," "fixed-term," "contract," "adjunct," or "non-tenure track faculty,") results in negative outcomes in terms of student success and completion. These outcomes are often attributed to poor integration of part-time faculty into the institution.

The research questions guiding this study were:

- In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest?

- In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties?

- In what ways could the integration be improved?

The guiding theoretical perspective for this study was organizational theory, informed by systems theory. The research questions were informed by Wheatley's (2006) three critical

domains necessary for a healthy organization: the fundamental identity of the organization; the ongoing urgency to connect members of the organization to information; and the importance of developing relationships throughout the organization. In order to gain a holistic view, the study examined the college context and interviewed part-time faculty, full-time faculty, faculty department chairs, an administrative aide, and a dean involved in developmental mathematics education. These collected data were then broken down into categories informed by Baron-Nixon's (2007) principles for connecting part-time faculty to a college mission and analyzed according to three units of analysis: institutional, departmental, and individual.

This chapter, unlike Chapter Four, is organized by the three research questions. The "Brief Summary of Findings" is followed by a more thorough discussion of each.

5.1 Brief Summary of Findings

The first research question is "In what ways are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics integrated into the college on one campus of a large college in the Pacific Northwest?" Assuming the college mission is a reliable proxy for identity then, to answer briefly, all are well-integrated in terms of college identity. Despite the many efforts made to integrate part-timers into this department in terms of sharing information and building relationships, there are varying degrees of integration, informed mostly by the life situation of the individual part-time faculty.

The second research question is, "In what ways does the integration affect their [part-time faculty's] ability to perform their duties?" To answer briefly, it affects them in learning and sharing teaching strategies, in aspiring to systematic teaching in the various classes, in supporting students, in their ability to ask for help, in morale, and in varying degrees of empowerment and disempowerment.

The third question is, "In what ways could the integration be improved?" To answer briefly, the institution must deliberately remove systemic barriers that hinder part-time faculty both from being able to be fully integrated into the college and from following those practices that best support their students in the developmental mathematics classes—often the most vulnerable students on campus.

The key finding of this research was that while part-time faculty teaching developmental education mathematics courses at this particular northwest college were well-integrated into the college identity, and while in this department many efforts were made to integrate them in terms of information sharing and relationships, barriers remained hindering full integration. These barriers affected the ability of part-time faculty to optimally perform their duties, depending on their individual situation. The barriers were for the most part institutional and structural and needed to be addressed at the institutional level.

5.2 Limitations

Qualitative research of this nature is a snapshot filled with thick, rich detail. While a total of sixteen interviewees is a reasonable sample size, interviewees were self-selecting. Several full-time faculty were the first and most willing to participate. Part-time faculty who have outside employment were the next readily available group. Utilizing the "snowball" method, part-time faculty in other categories (aspiring academics and career enders) were also willing to participate. The department is very large, so those who were interviewed may or may not represent the totality of the department.

Even as the research was conducted, changes in the larger context were taking place. A revised college-wide placement system for new students was being implemented that errs on the side of placing students at higher levels of math courses than had previously been the case. How

this will affect employment of part-time faculty who had been accustomed to teach the pre-college courses remains to be seen.

Finally, my own viewpoint, even with biases made transparent, may influence the findings. My personal experiences in terms of organizational integration as a contingent faculty member for 14 years were completely discrepant from those I encountered when I became a full-time, permanent faculty member. These experienced and observed differences provided the passion motivating this research and informed the research problem.

5.3 In what ways are Part-time Faculty Integrated?

5.3.1 Identity. Based on the analysis of the interviews in Chapter 4, the college's mission of "student success and equitable opportunity" is deeply entrenched at the institutional, departmental, and individual level, as can be discerned from the interviews. There were a couple of comments questioning the institutional commitment when the bulk of faculty are part-time faculty being paid less and treated as easily expendable.

5.3.2 Information. At the institutional level, information is widely shared through email, almost to a fault. Several interviewees pointed out that, due to the sheer volume, email loses effectiveness because of the overload of information. From the departmental level, the shared Google drive filled with information on college policies, the templates for syllabi, and the many resources for each course are extremely good practices and available to all. Within the department, the chairs offer an "hourglass" function of screening information and resending items of special importance. If faculty want more information on a particular topic, they can find it. The efforts to orient are minimal but still helpful. The effort to assess faculty in their first term, including a visit to the classroom, and to systematically schedule assessments follows good

practice. There are some efforts to share supports and resources for students. At the individual level, the information is there if the individual is willing to try to find it.

5.3.3 Relationships. In terms of relationships, at the institutional level there is not much to offer. At the departmental level, the warm concern of the faculty department chairs, the current efforts to match new hires up with mentors, the invites of part-timers to all department and CAC meetings, and the general friendliness in the department (an aspect frequently mentioned in interviews), are excellent practices. At the individual level, because the relationships are generally easy, part-time faculty can and often do ask for help and direction when dealing with challenges and often rely on these relationships to find out about necessary student resources. There were some doubts expressed that all part-time faculty felt able to ask for help, but those I interviewed felt able to do so.

At the institutional level, the Level Teams (see above) have been temporarily funded, and they have been a wonderful morale booster for many part-time faculty in spite of the embarrassingly small amount of pay—a criticism which arose frequently. At the department level, in addition to the information-sharing that has gone on, Level Teams have also benefitted everyone who has participated in terms of feeling acknowledged and supported and in terms of learning from one another. On an individual level, Level Teams provided a widely-remarked-upon difference in the felt integration and good morale of the department for those who have been able to participate.

5.3.4 Key findings. The key finding of this research was that while part-time faculty teaching developmental education mathematics courses at this particular northwest college were well-integrated into the college identity, and while in this department many efforts were made to integrate them in terms of information sharing and relationships, barriers remained hindering full

integration. These barriers affected the ability of part-time faculty to optimally perform their duties, depending on their individual situation. The barriers were for the most part institutional and structural and needed to be addressed at the institutional level.

5.3.5 Specific points of practice. In this section, the checklist derived from Baron-Nixon's (2007) work will be used as the organizing factor. Each will be examined according to the three units of analysis: institutional, departmental, and individual.

5.3.5.1 *Deliberate and inclusive recruitment*. As we have seen above, interested applicants are told to upload their applications into the applicant pool, but the institution lacks structural support to keep it updated or checked for accuracy and currency. Without institutional efforts to monitor for a diverse pool of candidates, it is not possible to follow deliberate and equitable hiring practices. Departmentally, the chairs have therefore had to rely on other cues to find appropriate part-time faculty: recommendations (many informal and relationally based), people who took the initiative to contact the department, willingness to be mentored, and the chairs' generally practiced good judgment. On the individual level—that is, the perspective of potential hires—the method of applying for and being considered for a position is opaque.

5.3.5.2 *Hiring based on clear criteria.* Institutionally, there are clear instructor qualifications posted. Departmentally, it is based on the good judgment of the practiced Faculty Department Chairs. Individually, apart from the instructor qualifications, the hiring process is mystifying.

5.3.5.3 *Clear expectations and assignments.* Institutionally, basic duties are described in the faculty contract. Departmentally, the faculty department chairs or mentors try to help new faculty understand the expectations and requirements, and they serve as a resource for them,

though it is not clear that all part-time faculty avail themselves of the help. Individually, the faculty seem to feel competent and their commitment to the mission of serving students is clear.

As a sub-category of clear expectations and assignments, assessment is also a key factor. Institutionally, there are obligations of assessment written into the faculty contract for part-time faculty. These must be carried out at the departmental level and this department does perform systematic assessments. Individually, there were mixed reactions expressed both by several part-time faculty and at least one department chair at the efficacy of them, but, at the same time, the effort seemed to be appreciated. This is good practice.

5.3.5.4 *Orientation to the institution and department.* Institutionally, there is one less-than-ideal online checklist of compliance information. Other than that, orientation is not formally required or systematic. At the department level, good efforts have been made to orient part-time faculty, mainly on procedural and departmental issues, though they do not include training on good teaching principles. Some of the part-time faculty interviewed had missed out on key information, in spite of the efforts, but all seemed to understand that they were welcome to ask if they needed help. Individually, the experiences were varied but also reflected that many had started in departments other than this one.

5.3.5.5 *Participation in institutional life.* Institutionally, part-time faculty are invited to participate in the Collective Area Committees and are sometimes paid a stipend for participation. All are included in email invites to various events. Departmentally, part-time faculty have been systematically invited to participate in all endeavors in the department, including dual-credit, textbook choice, and other key matters. Beyond that, the individual part-time faculty I interviewed were not involved in other aspects of shared governance or larger college involvements.

5.3.5.6 *Professional development.* Institutionally, all part-time faculty are invited to trainings through the Teaching Learning Resource Centers (TLRC), currently many of which offer stipends for attendance. There was one unique invitation to participate in a funded state-wide math conference for a limited number of part-time faculty. None of the interviewees mentioned or seemed to participate in these opportunities. Departmentally, part-time faculty have been invited to participate in the Level Teams and currently receive a stipend to do so. This was often commented on as helpful, though the stipend was clearly inadequate. The temporary funding has made a difference in the amounts of participation. Individually, some have participated and enjoyed and learned from Level Teams; others are unable because of other work obligations, scheduling issues, and so forth.

5.3.5.7 *Recognition.* Institutionally, there is no formal recognition apart from once-a-year acknowledgement of years served at the institution in five-year increments. The availability of the new Multi-Year Contracts has been a decision at the institutional level and has the potential to reward long-serving or excellent part-time faculty. Departmentally, the decisions are made as to who receives them, and the Multi-Year Contracts appear to acknowledge and confirm part-time contributions. Others stated that the Level Teams had welcomed their contributions and they felt gratified in that context. Individually, part-time faculty felt their contributions were in the classroom, and that reflects their contract, as they have not typically been paid for further participation. Most seemed to feel that mainly the students acknowledged their contributions.

5.3.5.8 *Connection to the department.* Institutionally, there is one annual inservice meeting for faculty department chairs with a choice of informational sessions.These sessions may or may not suggest inviting part-time faculty to participate and connect to department. Departmentally, the invitation to various meetings extends to part-time faculty, though pay is not

always available for any given activity. Individually, most part-time faculty felt somewhat connected, though the specialists/experts/professionals and aspiring academics were less so. Some of the reasons will be described below.

   5.3.5.9 *Mentoring.* Institutionally, mentoring is not systematically supported or practiced, despite being stipulated in the faculty contract. In this department there is currently a deliberate effort to connect new faculty with another person in the department as a way for part-time faculty to build relationships, get immediate feedback, and have better access to information. While not a developed mentoring program, in some cases the connection with another faculty member has worked extremely well. It appears, though, that even in this department some have missed out on a mentoring relationship or that the arrangements have not always worked. Individual experiences varied, mainly determined by their part-time category.

   5.3.6 Institutional barriers. As one part-timer stated, "There's lots of good people here, at PNWCC. But the structure itself—there's some things I would change." This follows the patterns discovered in Kezar's important study – that barriers were placed in the way of contingent faculty hindering their work, not that these faculty lacked the will or personal qualifications or abilities (2013a). I have included here with further explication some of the barriers not explored above that frequently surfaced in the interviews (despite not being directly addressed in my interview questions). These followed the patterns of inequities and frustrations found in the literature for the past twenty and more years.

   As was documented in Sections I and II of this dissertation, even while higher education has suffered from a lack of adequate funding and support, institutions have continued their attempts to serve students, cutting corners where they can. The reality is that savings have been achieved in great part on the backs of part-time faculty. The system of hyper-reliance on a large

majority of part-time faculty, according to the research demonstrated above in Sections I and II, has undermined student success as well as the stature, efficacy, academic freedom, and morale of faculty in general. This has been a nationwide pattern that has been frequently questioned in the scholarly literature but in actual practice at individual institutions has not often been addressed.

Institutions can prioritize according to their values and mission, and the barriers pointed out below are not unassailable and should be acknowledged as undermining for students and faculty alike, and indeed undermining for the institutions themselves. These should be addressed systematically and deliberately.

5.3.6.1 *Hierarchy.* Despite the aspirations implicit in the statement of one faculty department chair, "There's no hierarchy here," as well as the good intent of many full-time faculty in the department, a number of faculty mentioned the existence of the hierarchy. There was the hierarchy of faculty with Math degrees versus "Math Teaching degrees," of which part-timers were the majority holders. There was the hierarchy of college-level courses and Developmental Ed courses. There was the hierarchy of wages and lack of comparable pay for participation outside the classroom in various endeavors. There was the hierarchy of secure versus insecure faculty positions. There was the physical situation of the part-time faculty desks versus the cubicles of full-time faculty. Many of these issues were mentioned in the interviews, and those not already considered in Section IV will be addressed below. While some hierarchical issues may be unavoidable, addressing issues supporting equitable and inclusive recruitment and hiring; addressing equitable pay and reimbursement for extra-class endeavors; addressing the insecurity most part-time faculty experience; and addressing the physical set-up of the departmental space, could greatly ameliorate these structural issues. The issues of the degrees

could be influenced by the administration but is also dependent on the views and beliefs of full-time faculty within the math CAC.

5.3.6.2 *Office space.* The structural arrangement of part-time faculty desks in this department was often commented on. As one full-time faculty put it: "There's not adequate space to meet with students over there for part-time people." One faculty department chair recounted the story of strenuously advocating for more reasonable desks for part-time faculty during a recent remodel. But the end result was still less than ideal, and he stated, "I know the part-time people absolutely hate their part-time stations. So that's something else that needs to be corrected." One full-time faculty commented: "There is really no attempt on the institution's part to make that [integration] easy. And I say that in just the physical-ness of how they constructed our office space. The part-timers are all along the wall, facing a wall. The rest of us are all in our cubicles. And it's a shame." Another said, "And so I think, by making you all sit and face the wall, it's almost like being put in the corner, you know what I mean?"

One full-time faculty did mention that the way the room was set up offered more chances to bump into part-time faculty, and from that standpoint the setup was positive. But as one part-timer stated, "I don't even have a spot…like a drawer that I can store something in. . .I'd have to carry everything with me back and forth everywhere I go." Another said, "Our offices are nice. But there's very little room. As you can see, I'm carrying my office with me—I'm kind of living in the trunk."

There is little space, tiny amounts of storage, and no privacy, all of which hinders part-timers' ability to prepare for classes or to meet with and personally support students. Finally, this setup offers a clearly demarcated "less-than" structural disadvantage and as such undermines

their feelings of integration into the department and the institution. This is the result of planning at the institutional level with little regard to equity and inclusion of part-time faculty.

5.3.6.3 *Pay.* Issues of pay were commented on throughout the interviews, though there was no interview question focused on remuneration for the work part-time faculty do. The lack of adequate pay for part-time faculty is a structural, inequitable hindrance to integration and the health of the institution, potentially affecting students. The currently available stipend payment for participation in department meetings and other outside-class participation—so important to integration—breaks down to $12.50 per hour. This was remarked upon as almost insulting many times by both full- and part-time faculty, though being paid at all still seemed to make a difference. One stated, "And recently. . .I'm actually going to go to another meeting and asking someone, well, will [I] be paid for that? And just feeling like I'm groveling." These inadequate, temporary stipends for participation in the college outside the classroom, though appreciated as a gesture, are still a systemic, structural hindrance. Let it be said that full-time faculty and administrators do not volunteer, no matter how dedicated, because their salaries reasonably cover their work efforts.

This fact that, otherwise, part-time faculty are not paid to work outside of the classroom militates against their efforts to support students. As one part-timer lamented, "But a thought I always have is, if I was a full-timer, one thing I would do is. . .meet with each student at least once per term for like thirty minutes. . . ." He also added,

> If someone said, here, we'll pay you this…even thirty bucks an hour. Give me thirty bucks an hour and I'll meet with each student. I would do that. I think that would be so helpful. And our failure rate is, I think, is high. The repeat rate for math is high, very high. That doesn't help any. . . . That helps them [the students] get deeper in debt.

The pay for teaching at a part-time rate may not be an issue for those who already have full-time jobs or are living on retirement but working for the love of teaching and a few limited dollars on the side. But those who are trying to make a living are discouraged at the low level of pay and they question their choices, despite their dedication to students. One lamented, "But it's amazing the disparity. . .or the difference in the monies." In another part of the interview he stated, "I feel like a farm worker, almost."

The dean observed:

> And our part-timers, . . .those of them who take a real interest in this job work really hard. They're at CAC day. They make decisions with us in committees. They work on stuff. And there would be more of them, and more committees doing more work with us if they knew they were going to get paid, because frankly it's hard work.

Some simply volunteer their efforts to support students. Some attend professional development opportunities despite no pay. Some work only in the classroom, as, contractually, that is what they are actually paid for. Despite the warm milieu within this department, there was a feeling of unfairness and lack of acknowledgment of efforts. This could be greatly ameliorated by an institutional commitment to pay them a commensurate wage.

5.3.6.4 *Instability.* The instability of employment is a constant worry for those relying on this employment to make a living. As one fairly satisfied part-timer stated, "I certainly feel…separate from. Like there's a sense that…obviously, there's a sense of impermanence."

One articulated how the feeling of integration was negated by the insecurity of appointment:

> How can I put this diplomatically? Their enrollment went down and so did my professional relationship with them because of that. . . . They had no more classes for me. And I did not get one of the temporary full-time things here that I applied for. So I was looking at, after say five years or something of working, having no future prospects. . .which was not the happiest thing to have happen.

Another poignantly expressed the term-to-term stress:

> I thought I would have two classes in the spring. . . . and now I'll just have one.
> And I haven't had [only] one class in the spring in I don't know how long. A long
> time. And I'm not happy. I'm not happy. . . . I don't know what I'm going to do
> this spring, to be honest. Is that the [straw] that breaks the camel's back? How
> much longer can I afford to stay here? So there's that uncertainty. So that's
> definitely stressful, very stressful.

Related to both the insecurity and the pay, long-term life stability for those trying to make

a living was the further issue of retirement. One said:

> It's a very tenuous sort of employment. It doesn't really have any future stability
> or, in some ways, even a future in it. You know, it's not like I can keep doing this
> until I'm sixty or. . .well, I could. But then I'd have to keep doing it until I was
> seventy or eighty. . . . What have I saved for retirement, you know?

Another stated his frustration: "And I was talking to a full-timer earlier today. And they were

talking about retirement. . . . Well, that's nice. . . . I just said I didn't want to go there."

In addition, some part-time faculty worried that the new placement system will tend to

place students in higher level classes than has been traditionally practiced and lessen the number

of developmental education courses available. This would mean fewer classes for those with

instructor qualifications to teach Developmental Education but not college-level courses. As one

part-time faculty put it:

> The math placement system is changing. And so, I think that brings a level of
> uncertainty to my job. I hope it benefits the students. But there's a lot of questions
> even how it's all going to affect scheduling and classes. Because it's unpredictable
> right now what the impact will be. So I feel that stress, probably more than a full-
> time faculty person certainly.

These are systemic institutional difficulties beyond the scope of the department, yet they reach

into the department and weaken it. The institution has managed to correlate classes with

enrollment by easily dropping and easily hiring part-time faculty. There are many things that

could be done to lessen the instability for these individual faculty, including offering more multi-

year contracts to long-term faculty (this costs the institution nothing), and by making it a policy to offer newly available courses to part-time faculty already employed before taking on new part-time faculty.

5.3.6.5 *Lack of career trajectory.* Those part-time faculty who work to make a living all expressed a desire to serve in a full-time position. In the totality of these comments, and correlating with their life circumstances, there was hope, trepidation, discouragement, or frustration. There was a general feeling that if the college entrusts these students to them now, and the part-time faculty receive good course evaluations and assessments, why on earth could that not count in their favor when a position opened? The institution could address this by more careful and inclusive hiring procedures and by making it a policy to prefer part-time faculty who have been faithfully serving at PNWCC when a full-time job opens.

5.3.6.6 *Dependence on faculty department chairs*. We have seen that the faculty department chairs in this department have made every effort to support and integrate their part-time faculty. There is no guarantee, however, that faculty department chairs college-wide have the same concerns or follow the good practices documented here. Do all faculty department chairs get training and have the same understanding? According to experiences in other departments referenced in the interviews, it appears that there is not consistency of practice throughout the institution. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that future department chairs in this department will continue with the same level of dedication, although it may help that the precedent has been established. This concern could be addressed by mandatory and complete training for Faculty Department chairs, as well as requiring assessments of the chairs periodically in which part-time faculty have an opportunity to share information.

At least two people in the interviews mentioned that there seems to be a new emphasis on supporting part-time faculty in the college. If that is truly the case, it may be the culture of the whole institution may be starting to gradually shift for the better.

5.4 In What Ways does the Integration Affect their Ability to Perform their Duties?

Taking all of this evidence into account, let it be said that these part-time faculty are amazingly dedicated and do their very best, despite the structural issues above-mentioned. Even those who expressed the various frustrations also made many positive comments about the students, their colleagues, the Campus One Mathematics Department, and the college in general. They continue to serve their students because they have identified with the college and have embraced the college mission.

The efforts to include them have made this department as good a department as one can imagine under the circumstances. The invitations to all department events, the friendliness and willingness to mentor, and the approachable availability of the faculty department chairs, full-time faculty, and even other part-time faculty, has made for an essentially warm and welcoming department. One faculty department chair being available in the evening for part-time faculty support was also often commented on as extremely helpful. The temporary pay for participation in department events, however inadequate, has made a visible difference in terms of participation and professional development, and the learning and sharing environment has been an ideal practice. All of these efforts have contributed to, on the whole, a department where help is at hand when needed and part-time faculty are able to perform their duties in a reasonable manner.

However, the structural issues that hinder part-time faculty also hinder their full integration into the department and into the college. In spite of this department's best efforts, and in subtle and not-so-subtle ways, this undermines some part-time faculty serving at their full

potential. As one full-timer stated, "I think there's things that are still blocking the ability to really intermingle." The worries of unstable employment eat away at some part-time faculty. The low pay humiliates and worries them. The visible office structure and lack of place to keep things at a desk or privacy to meet with students undermines them. One of the department chairs commented,

> The only thing I can think is if we just are really aware that that's an issue for them and try to be as supportive as we can, and encourage and offer opportunities and be flexible. . . You know, you do everything you can. But there are some things that happen to them that you have no control over and they won't be successful. And there's nothing you can do. And it's frustrating. . . . And you wish that you could, you know, get them more involved. But it's just…it can't happen.

Another full-time faculty mentioned, "We do what we can…and do the best that we can. I'm sure they feel…I don't want to use the word 'separated'. . . . So they feel like they're left behind or not getting everything." This is a hidden, but very real, layer of sub-strata that works against part-time faculty being fully integrated and supported in order to carry out their duties.

5.5 In What Ways could the Integration be Improved?

First of all, there are deeply troubling issues with funding of community colleges in the state. While this recommendation goes beyond the institution, the state and national context does affect the college at all levels, and, in particular, students and part-time faculty. But one wonders: if the state did offer better support to the colleges, would the colleges prioritize pay and support for part-time faculty? Assuming that they would, this could make a crucial difference.

Changing deeply entrenched practices in large, unwieldy institutions is a difficult matter, even with the best intentions. The decision-makers and administration at PNWCC, it can be said, are concerned with and working toward "Opportunity and Equitable Student Success," which does include the economic viability of the institution. Maxey and Kezar (2015) suggest that

divergent interests within institutions obstruct change, yet there can be a practical way forward by working from areas of consensus within the college – above all, in this case, the shared mission (PNWCC, 2017). Kezar's *How Colleges Change: Understanding, Leading and Enacting Change* (2014) is a practical guide to effectively working toward positive change. Kezar and Maxey's *Envisioning the Faculty for the 21ˢᵗ Century: Moving to a Mission-Oriented and Learner-Centered Model* (2016) rethinks the whole system and offers a vision for a healthier, inclusive, and effective model that will best meet needs for part-time faculty. Vancouver Community College offers an ideal model of hiring and integration that addresses most of the issues highlighted here (Cosco & Longmate, 2012). Likewise, Valencia Community College models good recruiting, hiring, and professional development practices that lead to more secure employment and internal hiring (CCCSE, 2014b).

Many of the interviewees offered specific suggestions that are collected verbatim in Appendix E. These include continuing the funding for part-time faculty participation; changing the whole system; hiring more full-time faculty; paying more equitably while simultaneously including expectations of outside-of-class engagement; copying best practices from neighboring colleges; providing better orientation and support and inclusive events for part-time faculty; redesigning the offices more equitably; and rethinking math courses.

Pulling everything together, based on the interviews and data that has been offered in this study, these are my recommendations. All of them address the institutional system which has built-in barriers against part-time faculty participation and support. All of the improvements could ultimately provide better support for students. Some are easier than others. I believe that with consistent work and dogged determination, at least some of these could be accomplished within the next few years.

- Provide an ongoing source of funding for professional development and participation for part-time faculty, and pay it at the "special projects rate," not the stipend rate. This funding should be easy to apply for and easy to access.

- Provide Human Resources support for a vetted and current pool of applicants. This must include attention to recruiting diversity applicants.

- Make the hiring process transparent to all, including the applicants who have placed their applications in the pool. When hiring part-time faculty to teach developmental education classes, prioritize training in teaching mathematics.

- Make the class scheduling process as transparent as possible.

- Provide a systematic college-wide orientation for all, and, for part-time faculty, a further orientation that focuses on teaching and other instructional needs.

- Provide systematic training for faculty department chairs college-wide on how best to support part-time faculty.

- Continue to provide two faculty department chairs for this large department, one of whom will be present in the evening to support evening faculty and students.

- Do a structural remodel in the Math department that expands the walls and provides similar office space for part-time faculty to that of full-time faculty.

- Provide acknowledgement for part-time faculty who have served and passed their assessments by adjusting and expanding the "Multi-Year Contracts" for all those who qualify. This costs the college nothing except a minimum commitment to the part-time faculty who have already demonstrated their dedication to the college and their good teaching skills. Once in place, allow these faculty first right of refusal when full-time positions open.

- Consult best practices for supporting developmental education students and provide full-time positions, or at least stable part-time positions, with additional requirements and pay for outside-class duties to help support these students.

- Provide easily accessible data on all departments and outcomes that can disaggregate information on part-time faculty and full-time faculty in order to better examine what changes could be made to better support part-time faculty.

- When funding is available from the state, prioritize course pay, pay for extra-class participation, and professional development for part-time faculty

5.6 Recommendations for Further Research

This study's limitations are similar to its strengths: it was focused on a single department within a large campus and institution. There are many other themes that arose in this research that, while unable to be followed completely here, might provide fertile avenues for future research.

It has been noted that, nationwide, developmental education students tend to be the most underrepresented students, and that succeeding or failing in pre-college courses can determine whether a student can attend college or get a degree. Yet these vulnerable students are taught by a higher percentage of the most vulnerable and least integrated instructors. This study has made a small contribution, but there is overall little research that has been done on this intersection of vulnerability and this should be explored more fully. One point of focus on this intersection would be to examine race and gender issues, both with regard to part-time faculty and students. Montes' (2014) study made an important contribution to this but much more could be done.

In the process of this research, the importance of faculty department chairs came to the fore. Much of the attention in research on part-time faculty has focused on the part-time faculty

themselves, but less on practices of faculty department chairs: their appointments, their training, their efforts to hire, assess, and support part-time faculty, and their own assessment. Kezar's examination of departments in three public universities, described above, provides a model approach (2013a, 2013b, 2013c). One recent and rich dissertation continued this task, exploring the challenges of faculty department chairs and their relationships with and effect on part-time faculty in different kinds of departments. A major finding in that study is "understanding institutional context is essential to making sense of the relationship between part-time faculty and quality" (Ott, 2016, p. 140). This beginning work confirms my own sense that department chairs would be a fruitful avenue for further research.

Research has shown the correlation of part-time faculty and a higher percentage of student failure to complete a degree, be retained from one term to the next, or transfer. In almost all of these studies, the differences have been attributed to the lack of integration and support of part-time faculty, and, as has been explored in Section II, in the exceptions to this correlation, institutions have attempted to support part-time faculty with professional development and other measures. While this further research went beyond the bounds of this case study, it would be interesting to isolate certain colleges with good supports and compare their success rates with colleges that offer little support for part-time faculty.

Finally, in my overall research, it appeared that there is little research on the hidden costs of part-time faculty turnover, particularly in departments teaching developmental education. While not the specific topic of this study, it appears that when training, professional development, and support of part-time faculty have been extended by the department and institution, losing that member represents a loss of investment on the college's part. Or, on the other hand, the institution may simply be reluctant to expend monies on training, professional development, and

support of part-time faculty because it expects to lose them as a result of the short-term and tenuous nature of the contracts. This undermines the ability of these part-time faculty to effectively carry out their duties in all the ways already explicated in this dissertation. Further research on this topic would help clarify hidden costs.

5.7 Summary

This chapter has summarized the findings and responded to the three research questions. The key finding of this research is that while part-time faculty teaching developmental education mathematics courses are well-integrated into the college identity, and while in this department many efforts have been made to integrate them in terms of information sharing and relationships, barriers remain hindering full integration. These barriers are for the most part institutional and structural and must be addressed at the institutional level.

References

Akroyd, D. & Engle, D. (2014). An examination of the levels and differences in organizational

commitment of full and part time community college faculty. *Journal of Modern*

Education Review 4(10), 742-49. doi: 10.15341/jmer(2155-7993)/10.04.2014/002

American Association of University Professors. (2013). New report on contingent faculty and

governance. Retrieved from: http://www.aaup.org/news/new-report-contingent-faculty-

and-governance

American Association of University Professors. (2014). Contingent appointments and the

academic profession. Retrieved from

http://www.aaup.org/file/Contingent%20Appointment.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges. (2012). *Reclaiming the American dream:*

Community colleges and the nation's future. Retrieved from

http://www.aacc.nche.edu/aboutcc/21stcenturyreport_old/index.html

American Federation of Teachers. (2002). Standards of good practice in the employment of part-

time/adjunct faculty. Retrieved from

http://www.nacua.org/documents/Stand_Parttime.pdf

American Federation of Teachers. (2009). *The American academic: The state of higher*

education workforce 1997-2007. Retrieved from http://www. aft.

org/pdfs/highered/aa_highedworkforce0209.pdf

American Federation of Teachers. (2010). *The American academic: A national survey of part-*

time/adjunct faculty. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org

American Historical Association. (2003). Standards for employment of part-time faculty.

Retrieved from https://www. historians.org/jobs-and-professional-

development/statements-and-standards-of-the-profession/standards-for-employment-of-part-time-faculty

Antony, J. S., & Hayden, R. A. (2011). Job satisfaction of American part-time college faculty: Results from a national study a decade later. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 35*(9), 689-709. doi: 10.1080/10668920801949513

Antony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 41-56. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2002.0023

Bailey, T. (2009). Challenge and opportunity: Rethinking the role and function of developmental education in community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 145,* 11-30. doi: 10.1002/cc.352

Bailey, T. R., Jaggars, S. S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges: A clearer path to student success.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Bailey, T., Jeong, D. W., & Cho, S. (2010). Referral, enrollment, and completion in developmental education sequences in community colleges. *Economics of Education Review, 29,* 255-270. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.09.002

Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Baldwin, R. G., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; what we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist 55*(11), 1485-1509. doi: 10. 1177/0002764211409194

Banachowski, G. (1997). *Advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time faculty in community colleges.* (ERIC Digest No. ED405037). Los Angeles, CA. Retrieved from https://www.ericdigests.org/1997-4/part.htm

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barnshaw, J., & Dunietz, S. (2015). *Busting the myths: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2014-15*. Retrieved from the American Association of University Professors website: https://www.aaup.org/reports-publications/2014-15salarysurvey

Baron-Nixon, L. (2007). *Connecting non full-time faculty to institutional mission: A guidebook for college/university administrators and faculty developers.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Benjamin, E. (2003). Reappraisal and implications for policy and research. *New Directions for Higher Education, 123,* 79-114. doi:10.1002/he.123

Berry, J. (2005). *Reclaiming the ivory tower: Organizing adjuncts to change higher education.* New York, NY: Monthly Review.

Berry, J. (2009). Contingent faculty and academic freedom: A contradiction in terms. *Works and Days, 51/52*(26), *53/54*(27), 359-368.

Bérubé, M., & Ruth, J. (2015). *The humanities, higher education, & academic freedom: Three necessary arguments.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bolge, R. D. (1995). *Examination of student learning as a function of instructor status (full-time vs. part-time) at Mercer Community College.* West Windsor, NJ: Mercer Community College.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice & leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bonham, B. S., & Boylan, H. R. (2012). Developmental mathematics: Challenges, promising practices, and recent initiatives. *Journal of Developmental Education, 36*(2), 14-21.

Bowers, O. S. (2013). *Adjunct faculty perception of professional development and support services* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.

Boyer, P. G., Butner, B. K., & Smith, D. (2006). A portrait of remedial instruction: Faculty workload and assessment techniques. *Higher Education, 54,* 605-613. doi: 10. 1007/s10734-006-9030-8

Boylan, H. R. (1999). Harvard symposium 2000: Developmental education: Demographics, outcomes and activities. *Journal of Developmental Education, 23*(2), 2-8.

Boylan, H. R. & Bliss, L. B. (1997). Program components and their relationship to student performance. *Journal of Developmental Education 20*(3), 2-8.

Boylan, H. R., Bonham, B. S., Jackson, J., & Saxon, D. P. (1994). Staffing patterns in developmental education programs: Full-time/part-time, credentials, and program placement. *Research in Developmental Education, 11*(5), 1-4.

Braxton, J. M., & McClendon, S. A. (2001). The fostering of social integration and retention through institutional practice. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, *3*(1), 57-71. doi: 10. 2190/RGXJ-U08C-06VB-JK7D

Burgess, L. A., & Samuels, C. (1999). Impact of full-time versus part-time instructor status on college student retention ad academic performance in sequential courses. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 23*(5), 487-498. doi: 10. 1080106689299264684

Calcagno, J. C., Bailey, T., Jenkins, D., Kienzl, G., & Leinbach, T. (2008). Community college

    student success: What institutional characteristics make a difference? *Economics of*

    Education Review 27, 632-645. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.07.003

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2005). *Workgroup on 75/25 issues:*

    Report and recommendations. Retrieved from

    http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/workgroup_75_25_propo

    sal.pdf

Capra, F. (n.d.) Life and leadership: A systems approach. Retrieved from http://www.

    fritjofcapra.net/seminars.html

Capra, F. (1996). *The web of life: A new scientific understanding of living systems.* New York,

    NY: Anchor Books.

Capra, F., & Luisi, P. L. (2014). *The systems view of life: A unifying vision.* Cambridge, England:

    Cambridge University.

Cashwell, A. L. (2009). *Factors affecting part-time faculty job satisfaction in the Colorado*

    community college system (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Colorado State University,

    Fort Collins, CO.

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2014a). *A matter of degrees: Practices to*

    pathways (High-impact practices for community college student success). Austin, TX:

    The University of Texas at Austin, Program in Higher Education Leadership.

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2014b). *Contingent commitments:*

    Bringing part-time faculty into focus (A special report from the Center for Community

    College Student Engagement). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Program

in Higher Education Leadership. Retrieved from

http://www.CCCSE.org/docs/PTF_Special_Report.pdf

Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014c). Methodology supplement.

Contingent commitments: Bringing part-time faculty into focus. (A special report from

the Center for Community College Student Engagement). Austin, TX: The University of

Texas at Austin, Program in Higher Education Leadership. Retrieved from

http://www.CCCSE.org/docs/PTF_Methodology.pdf

Chambliss, D. F., & Takacs, C. G. (2014). *How colleges work.* Cambridge, MA. Harvard.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). The seven principles for good practice in

undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39(7),* 3-7.

Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (2012). A portrait of part-time faculty members: a

summary of findings on part-time faculty respondents to the coalition on the academic

workforce survey of contingent faculty members and instructors. Retrieved from

http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf

Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., & Kisker, C. B. (2014). *The American community college* (Sixth

ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

State Education Coordinating Commission. (2016). *House Bill 2152: Relating to higher*

education employees: A report to the legislature. Retrieved June 5, 2016.

Collier, A. (1994). *Critical realism: An introduction to Roy Bhaskar's philosophy.* New York,

NY: Verso.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). *Building communities: A vision for a*

new century. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED307012.pdf

Cosco, F & Longmate, J. An instructive model of how more equity and equality is possible: The Vancouver Community College model. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority* (pp. 55-83). New York, NY: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Cross, J. G. & Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). *Off-track Profs: Nontenured teachers in higher education.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Curtis, J. W., Mahabir, C., & Vitullo, M. W. (2016). Sociology faculty members employed part-time in community colleges: Structural disadvantage, cultural devaluation, and faculty-student relationships. *Teaching Sociology 44*(4), 270-286. doi: 10.1177/0092055X16654744

Cutright, M. (2001). Introduction. In M. Cutright, Editor, *Chaos theory & higher education: Leadership, planning & policy* (1-12). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Datray, J. L., Saxon, D. P., & Martirosyan, N. M. (2014). Adjunct faculty in developmental education: Best practices, challenges, and recommendations. *Community College Enterprise*, *20*(1), 36-48.

Daiek, D., Dixon, S., & Talbert, L. (2012). At issue: Developmental education and the success of our community college students. *Community College Enterprise 18*(1), 37-40.

Deming, W. E. (1982). *Out of the crisis.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development. (2014). *Developmental Education Redesign: Decreasing Attrition and Time to Completion at [the State's] Community Colleges.* Retrieved from http://www.achievingthedream.org

Diegel, B. L. (2013). Perceptions of community college adjunct faculty and division chairpersons: Support, mentoring, and professional development to sustain academic quality. *Community College Journal of Research and Practices, 37*(8), 596-607. doi: 10. 1080/10668926. 2012. 720863

Donoghue. F. (2008). *The last professors: The twilight of the humanities in the corporate university*. New York, NY: Fordham University.

Eagen, K. (2007). A national picture of part-time community college faculty: Changing trends in demographics and employment characteristics. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 140,* 5-14. doi: 10.1002/cc.299

Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2008). Closing the gate: Part-time faculty instruction in gatekeeper courses and first-year persistence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 115,* 39-53. doi: 10.1002/tl.324

Eagan, M. K. & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education, 50,* 168-188. doi: 10.1007/s11162-008-9113-8

Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*(3), 448-483. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2015.0012

Elliott, M, Rhoades, N. Jackson, C. M., Mandernach, B. J. (2015). Professional development: Designing initiatives to meet the needs of online faculty. *The Journal of Educators Online,* 160-188.

Ehrenberg, R. G. (2012). American higher education in transition. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 26*(1), 193-216.

Ehrenberg, R. G. & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *The Journal of Human Resources, (40)*3, 647-659. doi: 10.1257/jep.26.1.193

Eney, P. R., & Davidson, E. (2012). Improving supervision of part-time instructors. *Journal of Developmental Education 36*(2), 29-39.

Figlio, D. N., Schapior, M. O., & Soter, K. B. (2015). Are tenure track professors better teachers? *Review of Economics and Statistics 97*(4), pp.715-724. doi: 10.1162/REST_a_00529

Fike, D. S., & Fike, R. (2007). Does faculty employment status impact developmental mathematics outcomes? *Journal of Developmental Education, 31*(1), 2-11.

Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *The faculty factor: Reassessing the American academy in a turbulent era.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118*, 59-68. doi: 10.1002/cc.64

George, M., Khazanov, L., & McCarthy, C. (2015). Peer coaching of at-risk students in a remedial mathematics course. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 39*(11), 1022-1038. doi: 1080/10668926.2014.922133

Gerhard, G., & Burn, H. E. (2014). Effective engagement strategies for non-tenure-track faculty in precollege mathematics reform in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *38*(2-3), 208-217. doi: 10. 1080/10668926.2014.851967

Goldrick-Rab, S. (2016). *Paying the price: College costs, financial aid, and the betrayal of the American dream.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago.

Gorski, P. S. (2013a). Beyond the fact/value distinction: Ethical naturalism and the social sciences. *Sociology*, *50,* 543-553. doi: 10.1007/s12115-013-9709-2

Gorski, P. S. (2013b). What is critical realism? And why should you care? *Contemporary Sociology, 42*(5), 658-670. doi: 10.1177/0094306113499533

Heisserer, D. L., & Parette, P. (2002). Advising at-risk students in college and university settings. *College Student Journal, 6*(1), 69-83.

House Committee on Education and the Workforce Democratic Staff. (2014). *The just-in-time professor: A staff report summarizing eForum responses on the working conditions of contingent faculty in higher education.* Retrieved from http://democrats.edworkforce.house.gov/sites/democrats.edworkforce.house.gov/files/documents/1.24.14-AdjunctEforumReport.pdf

Hudson, B. K. (2013). *Non-tenure-track faculty job satisfaction and organizational sense of belonging* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Montana State University, Bozeman, MT.

Hutchens, N. H. (2011). Using a legal lens to better understand and frame issues shaping the employment environment of non-tenure track faculty members. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(11), 1443-1460. doi: 10.1177/0002764211409192

Jacobs, J. A. (2004). The faculty time divide. *Sociological Forum, 19*(1), 3-27. doi: 10.4337/9781848440159.00019

Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation

    rates. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1081-1103). doi: 10.1353/jhe.2006.0050

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on associate's

    degree completion. *Community College Review, 36,* 167-194. doi: 10.1007/s11162-008-

    9113-8

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagen, M. K. (2011). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state

    system of public higher education. *Educational Policy 25* (3), 507-537. doi:

    10.1177/0895904810361723

Jaeger, A., & Hinz, D. (2008). The effects of part-time faculty on first semester freshmen

    retention: A predictive model using logistic regression. *Journal of College Student*

    Retention, 10(3), 265-286. doi: 10.2190/CS.10.3.b

James, E. M. (2015). Encouraging connections to support a positive culture of writing

    assessment: Adjunct composition instructors, students, and campus resources. *Forum*

    Issues about Part-Time and Contingent Faculty, 18(2), A2-A10.

Jolley, M. R., Cross, E. & Bryant M. (2013). A critical challenge: The engagement and

    assessment of contingent, part-time adjunct faculty professors in United States

    community colleges. *Community college Journal of Research and Practice, 38*(2-3), 218-

    230. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2014.851969

JLB Associates, Inc. (2008). *Reversing course: The troubled state of academic staffing and a*

    path forward. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Kezar, A. (2012). Needed policies, practices, and values: Creating a culture to support and

    professionalize non-tenure track faculty. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track*

faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority (pp. 2-27). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2013a). Departmental cultures and non-tenure-track faculty: Willingness, capacity, and opportunity to perform at four-year institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education 84*(2), 153-188. doi:10.1353/jhe.2013.0011

Kezar, A. (2013b). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education, (54),* 571-598. doi: 10.1007/s11162-013-9288-5

Kezar, A. (2013c). Non-tenure-track faculty's social construction of a supportive work environment. *Teachers College Record, 115,* 1-47.

Kezar, A. (2014). *How colleges change: Understanding, leading, and enacting change.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Kezar, A., & Bernstein-Sierra, S. (2016). Contingent faculty as nonideal workers. *New Directions For Higher Education*, *2016*(176), 25-35. doi:10.1002/he.20207

Kezar, A., & Gehrke, S. (2013). Creating a high-quality place to teach, learn, and work. *Peer Review*, *15*(3). Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/2013/summer/kezar-gehrke

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (n.d.). *National trends for faculty composition over time.* Retrieved from The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success website: www.thechangingfaculty.org

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2012). Missing from the institutional data picture: Non-tenure-track faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 155*. doi:10.1002/ir.20021

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Troubling ethical lapses: The treatment of contingent faculty. *Change: The Magazine of Higher learning, 46*(4), 34-37. doi: 10.1080/00091383.2014.925761

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2015). *Adapting by design: Creating faculty roles and defining faculty work to ensure an intentional future for colleges and university.* Retrieved from The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success website: http://adaptingbydesign.thechangingfaculty.org/

Kezar, A., Maxey, D., & Badke, L. (n.d.). *The Imperative for change: Fostering understanding of the necessity of changing non-tenure-track faculty policies and practices.* Retrieved from The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success website: www.thechangingfaculty.org

Kezar, A., Maxey, D., & Eaton, J. (2014). *An examination of the changing faculty: Ensuring institutional quality and achieving desired student learning outcomes.* Council for Higher Education Accreditation, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://www.uscrossier.org/pullias/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/CHEA_Examination_Changing_Faculty_2013.pdf

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010a). Non-tenure-track faculty in Higher education: Theories and tensions. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(5) Vol II. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010b). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(4) Vol. I. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2011). Understanding non-tenure track faculty: New assumptions and theories for conceptualizing behavior. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(11), 1419-1442. doi: 10.1177/0002764211408879

Khazanov, L. (2011). Mentoring at-risk students in a remedial mathematics course. *Mathematics and Computer Education, 45*(2), 106-118.

Kisker, C. B., & Outcalt, C. L. (2005). Community college honors and developmental faculty: Characteristics, practices, and implications for access and educational equity. *Community College Review, 33*(2). doi: 10.1177/009155210503300201

Kozeracki, C. A. (2002). ERIC review: Issues in developmental education. *Community College Review*, *29*(4), 83-100. doi: 10.1177/009155210202900405

Kramer, A. L., Gloeckner, G. W., & Jacoby, D. (2012). Roads scholars: Part-time faculty job satisfaction in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, (38)*4, 287-299. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2010.485005

Landrum, R. E. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty? *College Teaching*, *57*(1), 23-26. doi: 10.3200/CTCH. 57.1.23-26

Levin, J. S., & Calcagno, J. C. (2008). Remediation in the community college: An evaluator's perspective. *Community College Review, 35*(3), 181-207. doi: 10.1177/0091552107310118

Levin, J. S., & Hernandez, V. M. (2014). Divided identity: Part-time faculty in public colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education, 37*(4), 531-557. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2014. 0033

Levin, J. S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community college faculty: At work in the new economy.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Love, P. G. & Estanek, S. M. (2004). *Rethinking student affairs practice.* San Francisco, CA:

    Jossey-Bass.

Lyons, R. E. (2004). *Success strategies for adjunct faculty*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Lyons. R. E., (Ed.). (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty.* Boston, MA: Anker.

Manning, K. (2013). *Organizational theory in higher education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Maxey, D. & Kezar, A. (2015). Revealing opportunities and obstacles for changing non-tenure-

    track faculty practices: An examination of stakeholders' awareness of institutional

    contradictions. *The Journal of Higher Education 86*(4), 564-594. doi:

    10.1353/jhe.2015.0022

Maynard, D. C. & Joseph, T. A. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed?: The influence

    of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education 55,* 139-

    154. doi 10.1007/s10734-006-9039-z

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit

    of faculty and students. *College Teaching, 58,* 141-147. doi:

    10.1080/87567555.2010.484032

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, D. E., Yildiz, S., & Batie, M. (2011). Five faculty labor market dilemmas facing

    community colleges in the new economy. *Community College Journal of Research and

    Practice, 35*(8), 620-644. doi: 10.1080/10668920801901274

Modern Language Association. (1994). MLA statement on the use of part-time and full-time

    adjunct faculty members. Retrieved from https://www.mla.org/statement_faculty

Modern Language Association. (2011). Professional employment practices for non-tenure-track

    faculty members: Recommendations and evaluative questions. Retrieved from

    http://www.mla.org/pdf/clip_stmt_final_may11.pdf

Montes, R. (2014). How do non-tenure track faculty interact with Latino and Latina students in

    gatekeeper math courses at an urban community college? (Unpublished doctoral

    dissertation). University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (n.d.). *Principles of good practice for*

    student affairs. Retrieved from

    https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/Principles_of_Good_Practice_in_Student_A

    ffairs.pdf

Nutting, M. M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? *New Directions for Higher*

    Education, *123,* 33-40. doi: org/10.1002/he.118

O'Banion, T. (Ed.). (2013). *Academic advising: The key to student success.* Washington, DC:

    Community College Press.

O'Banion, T. (2013). *Access, success and completion: A primer for community college faculty,*

    administrators, staff, and trustees. Chandler, AZ: League for Innovation.

Oprean, C. P. (2012). *Hiring, orientation, professional development, and evaluation: The*

    administrative support of adjunct faculty. Retrieved from NC Docks,

    http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/wcu/f/Oprean2012.pdf

Organization of American Historians. (2014). Standards for part-time, adjunct and contingent faculty. Retrieved from http://www.oah.org/about/reports/reports-statements/standards-for-part-time-adjunct-and-contingent-faculty/

Ott, M W. (2016*). Teasing out the complex relationship between part-time faculty and quality: A qualitative case study comparing departments at a large, public university.* Retrieved from Harvard University Dash Repository website: www.dash.harvard.edu

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2013a). Developmental math: Student demographics and progression. Retrieved April 4, 2017.

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2013b). Program review: Mathematics. Retrieved April 4, 2017.

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2015). MTH instructor qualifications. Retrieved April 4, 2017

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2016a). College mission. Retrieved April 4, 2017.

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2016b). Counts of math sections taught by faculty status. Retrieved April 4, 2017.

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2016c). Percent of select sections taught by full-time faculty. Retrieved April 4, 2017

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2016d). Course schedule. Retrieved December 1, 2016.

Pacific Northwest Community College Website. (2017). President's work plan. Retrieved April 4, 2017.

Pacific Northwest Community College and Union. (2015). Faculty Agreement: September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2019. Retrieved from Union website.

Parker, T. L., Barrett, M. S., & Bustillos, L. T. (2014). *The state of developmental education: Higher education and public policy priorities.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Perin, D. (2002). The location of developmental education in community colleges: A discussion of the merits of mainstreaming vs. centralization. *Community College Review*, *30*(1), 27-44. doi: 10.1177/009155210203000102

Perkins, J. R., Lanigan, J. B., Downey, J. A., & Levin, B. H. (2001). Chaos theory applied to college planning: A case study in defense of ten propositions. In M. Cutright (Ed.), *Chaos theory & higher education: Leadership, planning & policy* (pp. 79-112). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies.* New York, NY: Warner Books.

Peterson, D. (2007). A proven program for supporting adjunct faculty online. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty* (pp. 49-67). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Plater, W. M. (2008). The twenty-first century professoriate. *Academe 94*(4), 35-40.

Reason, R. D., Terenzini, P. T., & Domingo, R. J. (2006). First things first: Developing academic competence in the first year of college. *Research in Higher Education, 47*(2), 149-175. doi: 10.1007/s11162-005-8884-4

Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor.* New York, NY: State University of New York.

Rogers, B. H., McIntyre, M., & Jazzar, M. (2010). Mentoring adjunct faculty using the cornerstones of effective communication and practice. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning 18*(1), 53-59. doi: 10.1080/13611260903448375

Rogers, G. S. (2015). Part-time faculty and community college student success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *39*(7), 673-684. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2014.908426

Roney, K., & Ulerick, S. L. (2013). A roadmap to engaging part-time faculty in high-impact practices. *Peer Review*, *15*(3), 24-26.

Roueche, J. E., & Roueche, S. D. (1999). *High stakes, high performance: Making remedial education work*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1995*). Strangers in their own land: Part-time faculty in American community colleges.* Washington, DC: AACC.

Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1996a). Identifying the strangers: Exploring part-time faculty integration in American community colleges. *Community College Review, 23*(4), n.p.

Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1996b). In the company of strangers: Addressing utilization and integration of part-time in American community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practices, 20*, 119-145.

Sayer, A. (2000) *Realism and social science*. London, England: Sage.

Schuster, J. H. (2003). The faculty makeover: What does it mean for students? *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 15-22. doi: 10.1002/he.116

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Smith, C. V. (2010). *The impact of part-time faculty on student retention: A case study in higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, MO.

Stephenson, K. (2009). Neither hierarchy nor network: An argument for heterarchy. *People & Strategy 32*(1), 4-7.

Street, S., Maisto, M., Merves, E., & Rhoades, G. (2012). *Who is professor "staff" and how can this person teach so many classes?* (Report #2). Retrieved from Center for the Future of Higher Education website: https://www.futureofhighered.org/

Strom-Gottfried, K., & Dunlap, K. M. (2004). Assimilating adjuncts: Strategies for orienting contract faculty. *Journal of Social Work Education, (40)*3, 445-452.

Tam, T., & Jacoby, D. (2009). What we can't say about contingent faculty. *Academe, 95*(3), 19-22.

Thirolf, K. Q. (2013). How faculty identity discourses of community college part-time faculty change over time. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37*(3), 177-184. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2013,739511.

Thirolf, K.Q. (2017). Reconceptualizing a more inclusive faculty engagement model: Including and engaging part-time faculty at Community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 41*(4/5), 303-310. Doi:10.1080/10668926.1251357

Thompson, K. (2003). Contingent faculty and student learning: Welcome to the strativersity. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *123*, 41-48. doi: 10.1002/he.119

TIAA-CREF Financial Services. (2014). *Helping to improve the professional and financial well-being of adjuncts.* Retrieved from the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success website: www.thechangingfaculty.org

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 91-123. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2006.0080

Wagoner, R. L. (2007). Globalization, the new economy, and part-time faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges 140,* 21-27. doi: 10.1002/cc.301

Wagoner, R. L., Metcalfe, A. S., & Olaore, I. (2004). Fiscal reality and academic quality: Part-time faculty and the challenge to organizational culture at community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(1), 25-44. doi: 10.1080/10668920390276948

Walton, I. (2008). Academic excellence: Why California's community colleges need the 75/25 full-time faculty standard. Retrieved from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges website: http://www.asccc.org/content/academic-excellence-why-californias-community-colleges-need-7525-full-time-faculty-standard

Waltman, J., Bergom, I, Hollenshead, C. Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education 83*(3), 411-434. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2012.0014

Wheatley, M. J. (2006). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Wheatley, M. J. (1998). What is our work? In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 340-351). New York, NY: Wiley.

Wheatley, M. J. (2005). *Finding our way: Leadership for an uncertain time*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Yakoboski, P. J. (2015). The career experience of academics in adjunct faculty positions. Retrieved from the TIAA-CREF Institute website: https://www. tiaa-crefinstitute. org/public/pdf/adjunct_career_experience_full.Pdf

Yee, K. (2007). Ensuring an effective start for adjunct faculty: Orientation with multiple options. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty* (pp. 13-30). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Youngblood, M. D. (1997a). Leadership at the edge of chaos. *Strategy and Leadership,* 25(5), 8-14. Retrieved from http://www.parshift.com/Speakers/Speak006.htm

Youngblood, M. D. (1997b). *Life at the edge of chaos: Creating the quantum organizations.* Dallas, TX: Perceval.

Zientek, L. R., Ozel, Z. E. Y., Fong, C. J., & Griffin, M. (2013). Student success in developmental mathematics courses. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37*(12), 990-1010. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2010.491993

Zohar, D. (1997). *Rewiring the corporate brain: Using the new science to rethink how we structure and lead organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Recruitment Documents

Dear Part-Time Faculty Member Teaching Developmental Math Courses at PNWCC, Sylvania Campus:

Would you be willing to participate as an interviewee in my Oregon State University dissertation research project, "Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics"?   The research will entail a 1-2 hour in-person interview which will be recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. The interviews will be coded and the wording redacted to protect the identities of the interviewees to every degree possible.

Here is a brief description of the project:

> The purpose of this dissertation will be to study the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses at one campus of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. Because this student population often needs extra support and services, the part-time faculty serving these students comprise a particularly vital group for study. This case study allows for targeted understanding of the issues and will suggest practical improvements. The research questions guiding this study are: How well are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest? In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties? In what ways could the integration be improved?

The information you share in the interview will help build a picture of how part-time faculty members are integrated into the college and department, as well as suggest improvements that can be made.

If you are interested, please respond by emailing Sylvia Gray at **sgray@PNWCC.edu** or by calling her cell number, 503-244-2305 with your name and contact information for purposes of scheduling the interview. Before participating in the interview, you will also be asked to sign a consent form.

Thank you for considering participating in this study! If you have any questions about it, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Gray
OSU Doctoral Student, Department of Education
Cell: 503-244-2355
sgray@PNWCC.edu

Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee, Principle Investigator
Shelley.Dubkin-Lee@oregonstate.edu
541-737-4733

Dear Full-time Faculty in the Math Department at PNWCC, Sylvania Campus:

Would you be willing to participate as an interviewee in my Oregon State University dissertation research project, "Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics"? I would like to include full-time faculty in this research because they play a key role in the integration of part-time faculty. The research will entail a 1-2 hour in-person interview which will be recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. The interviews will be coded and the wording redacted to protect the identities of the interviewees to every degree possible.

Here is a brief description of the project:

> The purpose of this dissertation will be to study the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses at one campus of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. Because this student population often needs extra support and services, the part-time faculty serving these students comprise a particularly vital group for study. This case study allows for targeted understanding of the issues and will suggest practical improvements. The research questions guiding this study are: How well are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest? In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties? In what ways could the integration be improved?

The information you share in the interview will help build a picture of how part-time faculty members are integrated into the college and department, as well as suggest improvements that can be made.

If you are interested, please respond by emailing Sylvia Gray at **sgray@PNWCC.edu** or by calling my cell number, 503-244-2305 with your name and contact information for purposes of scheduling the interview. Before participating in the interview, you will also be asked to sign a consent form.

Thank you for considering participating in this study! If you have any questions about it, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Gray
OSU Doctoral Student, Department of Education
Cell: 503-244-2355
sgray@PNWCC.edu

Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee, Principle Investigator
Shelley.Dubkin-Lee@oregonstate.edu
541-737-4733

Dear Faculty Department Chair(s) over Developmental Math Courses at PNWCC, Sylvania Campus:

Would you be willing to participate as an interviewee in my Oregon State University dissertation research project, "Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics"? I would like to include faculty department chairs in this research because they play a key role in the integration of part-time faculty. The research will entail a 1-2 hour in-person interview which will be recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. The interviews will be coded and the wording redacted to protect the identities of the interviewees to every degree possible.

 Here is a brief description of the project:

> The purpose of this dissertation will be to study the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses at one campus of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. Because this student population often needs extra support and services, the part-time faculty serving these students comprise a particularly vital group for study. This case study allows for targeted understanding of the issues and will suggest practical improvements. The research questions guiding this study are: How well are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest? In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties? In what ways could the integration be improved?

The information you share in the interview will help build a picture of how part-time faculty members are integrated into the college and department, as well as suggest improvements that can be made.

If you are interested, please respond by emailing Sylvia Gray at **sgray@PNWCC.edu** or by calling her cell number, 503-244-2305 with your name and contact information for purposes of scheduling the interview.. Before participating in the interview, you will also be asked to sign a consent form.

Thank you for considering participating in this study! If you have any questions about it, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Gray
OSU Doctoral Student, Department of Education
Cell: 503-244-2355
sgray@PNWCC.edu

Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee, Principle Investigator
Shelley.Dubkin-Lee@oregonstate.edu
541-737-4733

Dear Dean of the Math Department at PNWCC, Sylvania Campus:

Would you be willing to participate as an interviewee in my Oregon State University dissertation research project, "Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics"? I would like to include a dean (and a former dean, if possible) in this research because a dean plays a role in the integration of part-time faculty into the department and the college. The research will entail a 1-2 hour in-person interview which will be recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. The interviews will be coded and the wording redacted to protect the identities of the interviewees to every degree possible.

Here is a brief description of the project:

> The purpose of this dissertation will be to study the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses at one campus of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. Because this student population often needs extra support and services, the part-time faculty serving these students comprise a particularly vital group for study. This case study allows for targeted understanding of the issues and will suggest practical improvements. The research questions guiding this study are: How well are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest? In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties? In what ways could the integration be improved?

The information you share in the interview will help build a picture of how part-time faculty members are integrated into the college and department, as well as suggest improvements that can be made.

If you are interested, please respond by emailing Sylvia Gray at **sgray@PNWCC.edu** or by calling her cell number, 503-244-2305 with your name and contact information for purposes of scheduling the interview. Before participating in the interview, you will also be asked to sign a consent form.

Thank you for considering participating in this study! If you have any questions about it, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Gray
OSU Doctoral Student, Department of Education
Cell: 503-244-2355
sgray@PNWCC.edu

Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee, Principle Investigator
Shelley.Dubkin-Lee@oregonstate.edu
541-737-4733

Dear Administrative Assistant(s) for the Math Department at PNWCC, Sylvania Campus:

Would you be willing to participate as an interviewee in my Oregon State University dissertation research project, "Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics"? I would like to include at least one administrative assistant in this research because you play an important role in the integration of part-time faculty into the department and college. The research will entail a 1-2 hour in-person interview which will be recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. The interviews will be coded and the wording redacted to protect the identities of the interviewees to every degree possible.

Here is a brief description of the project:

> The purpose of this dissertation will be to study the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses at one campus of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. Because this student population often needs extra support and services, the part-time faculty serving these students comprise a particularly vital group for study. This case study allows for targeted understanding of the issues and will suggest practical improvements. The research questions guiding this study are: How well are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest? In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties? In what ways could the integration be improved?

The information you share in the interview will help build a picture of how part-time faculty members are integrated into the college and department, as well as suggest improvements that can be made.

If you are interested, please respond by emailing Sylvia Gray at **sgray@PNWCC.edu** or by calling her cell number, 503-244-2305 with your name and contact information. Before participating in the interview, you will also be asked to sign a consent form.

Thank you for considering participating in this study! If you have any questions about it, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Gray
OSU Doctoral Student, Department of Education
Cell: 503-244-2355
sgray@PNWCC.edu

Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee, Principle Investigator
Shelley.Dubkin-Lee@oregonstate.edu
541-737-4733

Appendix B: Consent Form

OSU
Oregon State
U N I V E R S I T Y

College of Education   104 Furman Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331-3502

T 541-737-4661 | F 541-737-8971| http://oregonstate.edu/education

CONSENT FORM

Project Title:
Organizational Integration of Part-Time Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics
Principal Investigator: Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee
Student Researcher: Sylvia Gray
Version Date: 09/27/2016

---

1.   WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS FORM?

This form contains information you will need to help you decide whether to be in this research study or not. Please read the form carefully and ask the study team member(s) questions about anything that is not clear.

2.   WHY IS THIS RESEARCH STUDY BEING DONE?

The purpose of this research study is to examine the organizational integration of part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses at one campus of a large, multi-campus community college in the Pacific Northwest. Because this student population often needs extra support and services, the part-time faculty serving these students comprise a particularly vital group for study. This case study allows for targeted understanding of the issues and will suggest practical improvements. The research questions guiding this study are: How well are part-time faculty who teach developmental mathematics courses integrated into the college on one campus of a large community college in the Pacific Northwest? In what ways does the integration affect their ability to perform their duties? In what ways could the integration be improved?

This is being conducted by the doctoral student, Sylvia Gray, for the completion of a dissertation.

3.   WHY AM I BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

You are being asked to take part in this study because you are a part of the department that has been selected for study.

4.   WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

You will respond to the researcher with your contact information.

You will participate in a 1-2 hour in-person (alternatively phone or Skype) interview, which will be recorded, or alternatively recorded by notetaking. At the end of the interview, there will be a brief optional questionnaire concerning demographics. The interview will be transcribed either by the interviewer or a professional transcription service, and a copy will be sent to you to assure accuracy and to allow for any other information you may like to add or subtract from the interview. You will have two weeks to respond, and if no response is received, the transcription will be considered available for use. The interview will then be coded, a pseudonym assigned, and redacted to protect the identity of the participant. The interviews will be analyzed for themes and information pertaining to the research questions and any other themes that may appear, and the study will be then written into a final report as part of a dissertation and will be shared with all the interviewees within three months of the completed research.

Study duration: The interviews will take about 1-2 hours. Reading the transcripts and adding any feedback or information will be however long it takes for the interviewee – expected about ½ hour.

In addition to the interviews, the researcher will be consulting available documents and data pertaining to the college and the department. Employee level data may be accessed but it will be limited to numbers or percentages of students in classes taught by part-time or full-time faculty, including course completion data, and no student–level data will be included. It will be limited to percentages and numbers. Any employee-level data will be protected and redacted.

Recordings and photographs; : The interviews will be audio-recorded. If it is preferred that the researcher take notes, that can be an option.

_____I agree to be audio recorded.
Initials

_____I do <u>not</u> agree to be audio-recorded, but notes may be taken.
Initials

Storage and Future use of data: The interviews will be stored on the student researcher's home computer at least until the research and further studies using the same data are completed. They will be individually stored without identifiers, but a code sheet with the original names will be retained in a separate file. All research material will be stored by Principle Investigator for at least three years post study completion. The completed dissertation will be submitted to the Scholars Archive at Oregon State University, and copies will be shared with interviewees by email within three months of the completed research.

Because it is not possible for us to know what studies may be a part of our future work, we ask that you give permission now for us to use data that we collect about you as part of this study without being

contacted about each future study. Future use of this data will be limited to studies about integration of and support for community college employees.

If you agree now to future use of your data, but decide in the future that you would like to have your data removed from the research database, please contact Shelley Dubkin-Lee (shelley.dubkin-lee@oregonstate.edu) or Sylvia Gray (sgray@PNWCC.edu).

_____You may store my data for use in future studies.
Initials

_____ You may not store my data for use in future studies.
Initials

Future contact: We may contact you in the future for another similar study. You may ask us to stop contacting you at any time.

Study Results: The final study will be shared with all participants.

5. WHAT ARE THE RISKS AND POSSIBLE DISCOMFORTS OF THIS STUDY?
The possible risks and/or discomforts associated with the being in the study include; :

Unlikely risks would be personal discomfort concerning topics (in which case the interviewee is not required to answer the questions); the possibility that, in spite of redaction and other efforts to conceal identities, the identity of an individual might be surmised; the possibility that though the computer is protected, the coding of interviews might be discovered.
The security and confidentiality of information collected online cannot be guaranteed. Confidentiality will be kept to the extent permitted by the technology being used. Information collected online can be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or contain viruses.

6. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THIS STUDY?
This project assumes that further knowledge on this topic is a positive good for society. This research may have specific positive results in that suggestions for improvement may result in positive changes for the department in question, and for other departments who may consult the research. If no improvements are needed, it will provide a positive model for a department with regard to integration of part-time faculty into a department and college.

This study is not designed to benefit you directly.

7. WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY?
You will not be paid for being in this research study.

8. DOES ANY MEMBER OF THE STUDY TEAM HAVE A CONFLICTING INTEREST?

There are no conflicts of interest.

9. WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION I GIVE?

The information you provide during this research study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Research records will be stored securely. Regulatory agencies and Oregon State University employees may access or inspect records pertaining to this research as part of routine oversight or university business. Some of these records could contain information that personally identifies you.

If the results of this project are published your identity will not be made public, and any quotations will be redacted. If the information is shared at PNWCC, your identity will be protected and any quotations redacted. Audio recordings will be accessible only to qualified transcribers and the researcher.

10. WHAT OTHER CHOICES DO I HAVE IF I DO NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. If you choose to withdraw from this project before it ends, the researchers may keep information collected about you and this information may be included in study reports. Participants are free to skip any questions they would prefer not to answer.

Your decision to take part or not take part in this study will not affect your employment or benefits at PNWCC. Your decision to take part or not take part in this study will not affect your relationship with the researcher.

11. WHO DO I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact: Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee at Oregon State University (shelley.dubkin-lee@oregonstate.edu), or Sylvia Gray at Portland Community College (sgray@PNWCC.edu).

If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu

WHAT DOES MY SIGNATURE ON THIS CONSENT FORM MEAN?

Your signature indicates that this study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. You will receive a copy of this form.

Participant's Name (printed); : _____

_____   _____
 (Signature of Participant)   (Date)

_____   _____
(Signature of Person Obtaining Consent)   (Date)

Appendix C: Demographic Questions

Please supply the following (optional) information for the study. As with your interview, your identity and information will be protected:

Name:

Gender:

Age Bracket:

Race or ethnic identity:

Degrees:

Appendix D: Interview Questions

- **Part-time faculty (6-20, depending on saturation of information):**
  - (Basic information): Please describe your role and job duties. How long have you been in community college education, at this college, and in this role? Do you prefer teaching part-time or full-time, and why? (Basic demographic data will be collected at the end of the interview.)
  - (Identity of Organization):
    - What motivates you to work as a part-time (or one-year temporary) faculty member at this institution?
    - What motivates you to teach developmental education math classes in this department/college?
    - What provides meaning for you in your work?
    - Do you feel your motivations align with the institutional mission (use what you assume the mission is for your answer)?
    - Do you personally feel a part of the organization and its mission?
  - (Information networks): (Please provide examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
    - How have you been included and integrated into the information networks of the institution?
      - For instance, how did you find out about the job opportunity in the first place?
      - How were you interviewed for the position?
      - Were you given an orientation? If so, how helpful was it, and if not, how did you figure out how things worked in the college?
      - How have you learned about processes and requirements?
      - How do you now find or receive information in the organization on how to do your job?
      - How have you learned about resources available for you?
      - How have you learned about resources available to support students at the college, such as counseling, advising, Women's Resource Center, Multicultural Center, or other?
      - How do you now learn about issues current in the college?
    - How have you learned about events, training, or professional development opportunities? In what ways have you participated in them?
    - Have you been assessed or critiqued, and if so, in what ways was it helpful to you?
    - Have you participated in shared governance in the college?
    - How have your talents and skills been utilized within the organization?
  - (Relationships): (Please give examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
    - How have you built relationships within the organization?
      - Have you been introduced to other faculty members?
      - In what ways have you made collegial relationships, if at all?
    - In what ways have you been mentored, if at all? How has this helped or hindered your integration into the institution?
    - Whom do you turn to if you run into difficulties in the college or the classroom?

- o (Emergent): In general, how do you feel about your integration into the college?
  - How has it helped or hindered your ability to do a good job?
  - Have you experienced any obstacles or barriers to being well-integrated into the department and organization, affecting your ability to doing your best work?
  - Do you have any suggestions for the college on these topics?
  - Is there anything else you would like to share with me concerning your position as a part-time faculty member within this department and institution?
- **Full-time faculty and Department Chair** (at least 1 each, but possibly more):
  - o (Basic information): Please describe your role and job duties. How long have you been in community college education, at this college, and in this role? Have you had experience as a part-time faculty? (Basic demographic data will be collected at the end of the interview.)
  - o (Identity of Organization):
    - What motivates you to work as a faculty member at this institution?
    - What motivates you to teach developmental education math classes in this department/college?
    - What provides meaning for you in your work?
    - Do you believe that part-time faculty have the same motivations and meaning?
    - How do you think that part-time faculty motivations align with institutional mission (use what you assume the mission is for your answer)?
  - o (Information Networks): (Please provide examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
    - How have part-time faculty been included and integrated into the information networks of the institution?
      - For instance, how do you think they find or receive information on job availability in the first place?
      - How are part-time faculty interviewed for the position?
      - Do they receive an orientation of any sort? How extensive, and who provides it?
      - How do they generally receive information on how to do their job, on processes and requirements, on available resources, student services, on events, or on current issues?
      - How are they included in professional development opportunities?
      - In what ways are they encouraged to participate in the college beyond the classroom, if at all?
      - How have they been encouraged to participate in shared governance, if at all?
      - How have their talents and skills been utilized and recognized within the organization?
  - o (Relationships): (Please give examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
    - How have you built relationships with part-time faculty?

- In what way are you able to help part-time faculty connect with other people within the institution?
- Have they been mentored, and in what way?
- Have part-time faculty asked you for help if they ran into difficulties in the college or the classroom?

o (Emergent): In general, how do you feel about integration of part-time faculty in this institution?

- How has it helped or hindered their abilities to do a good job?
- Are you aware of any obstacles or barriers keeping part-time faculty from being well-integrated into the department and organization, affecting their ability to do their best work?
- Do you have any suggestions for the college on these topics?
- Is there anything else you would like to share with me concerning your role with regard to part-time faculty within this department and institution?

- **Administrative Aide(s) (1 or 2):**
  o (Basic information): Please describe your role and job duties. How long have you been in community college education, at this college, and in this role? Have you had experience as a part-time faculty? (Basic demographic data will be collected at the end of the interview.) (Identity of Organization):
    - What motivates you to work at this institution?
    - What motivates you to support the teaching of developmental education math classes in this department/college?
    - What provides meaning for you in your work?
    - Do you believe that part-time faculty have the same motivations and meaning?
    - How do you think that part-time faculty motivations align with institutional mission (use what you assume the mission is for your answer)?
  o (Information Networks): (Please give examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
    - How have part-time faculty been included and integrated into the information networks of the institution?
      - For instance, how do you think they find or receive information on job availability in the first place?
      - How are part-time faculty interviewed for the position?
      - Do they receive an orientation of any sort? How extensive, and who provides it?
      - How do they generally receive information on how to do their job, on processes and requirements, on available resources, student services, on events on current issues?
      - How are they included in professional development opportunities?
      - In what ways are they encouraged to participate in the college beyond the classroom, if at all?
      - How have they been encouraged to participate in shared governance, if at all?

- How have their talents and skills been utilized and recognized within the organization?
  - o (Relationships): (Please give examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
    - How have you built relationships with part-time faculty?
    - In what way are you able to help part-time faculty connect with other people within the institution?
    - Have they been mentored, and in what way?
    - Have part-time faculty asked you for help if they ran into difficulties in the college or the classroom?
  - o (Emergent): In general, how do you feel about integration of part-time faculty in this institution?
    - How has it helped or hindered their abilities to do a good job?
    - Are you aware of any obstacles or barriers keeping part-time faculty from being well-integrated into the department and organization, affecting their ability to do their best work?
    - Do you have any suggestions for the college on these topics?
    - Is there anything else you would like to share with me concerning your role with regard to part-time faculty within this department and institution?

- **Dean (1 or 2):**
  - o (Basic information): Please describe your role and job duties. How long have you been in community college education, at this college, and in this role? Have you had experience as a part-time faculty? (Basic demographic data will be collected at the end of the interview.)
  - o (Identity of Organization):
    - What motivates you to work at this institution?
    - What motivates you to support the teaching of developmental education math classes in this department/college?
    - What provides meaning for you in your work?
    - Do you believe that part-time faculty have the same motivations and meaning?
    - How do you think that part-time faculty motivations align with institutional mission (use what you assume the mission is for your answer)?
  - o (Information Networks): (Please give examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
    - How have part-time faculty been included and integrated into the information networks of the institution?
      - For instance, how do you think they find or receive information on job availability in the first place?
      - How are part-time faculty interviewed for the position?
      - Do part-time faculty receive an orientation of any sort? If so, how extensive, and who provides it?
      - How do they generally receive information on how to do their job, on processes and requirements, on available resources, student services, on events, on current issues?

- How are they included in professional development opportunities?
  - In what ways are they encouraged to participate in the college beyond the classroom, if at all?
  - How have they been encouraged to participate in shared governance?
  - How have their talents and skills been utilized and recognized within the organization?
- (Relationships): (Please give examples, positive and/or negative throughout.)
  - How have you built relationships with part-time faculty?
  - In what ways are you able to help part-time faculty connect with other people within the institution?
  - Have they been mentored, and in what way?
  - Have part-time faculty asked you for help if they ran into difficulties in the college or the classroom?
- (Emergent):
  - In general, how do you feel about integration of part-time faculty in this institution?
  - How has it helped or hindered their abilities to do a good job?
  - Are you aware of any obstacles or barriers keeping part-time faculty from being well-integrated into the department and organization, affecting their ability to do their best work?
  - Do you have any suggestions for the college on these topics?
  - Is there anything else you would like to share with me concerning your role with regard to part-time faculty within this department and institution?

Appendix E: Suggestions for Improvements

The Whole System Needs to be Changed

- So one of the college's goals is equality. We have very much a two-class system in the faculty. I don't see it. I don't see that as being consistent with the college's values. I feel like two thirds the classes are taught by part-time faculty, some by choice, sure. But I have conversations, almost every term with someone who is just so ready to get out of here because they just don't want to be full-time anymore…or part-time, sorry. . . . Well, because they can't be hired full-time. And they're just ready to go do something else, you know. Like Trent over at Campus 3 got fed up and just went into, I think actuarial work. And then he came back. And maybe he's back into that. I don't know. But, you know, it seems like this college only exists because of a large group of people who are paid less, given lower priority on classes, less benefits, less job security. This system would just not exist without these lower class…or employee, working hard to support it. And, you know, there's always sort of the dangling of, oh, you could get hired full-time, but only if you're willing to do a lot of extra work outside of your job duties, and not just extra work but the right kind of extra work. Well, not everyone can be on a committee. It's just kind of an illusory prospect. And it's not like I have a solution. You really can't get rid of the system. There are too many people with vested interests who would not allow that to happen. . . . When I really got into teaching I was a little more idealistic about it, a little more driven, I guess, by movies that show like one teacher making a difference. And now that I've been here for a number of years, it's sort of…You know, you sort of get to know a system and sort of the rules of the system are not always set up to…I don't know, provide the best outcomes, until it gets bad. And listening to myself, it sounds like I'm saying a lot of negative things here. I generally like working here. I like the people I work with. I love meeting with students. I like having autonomy in the classroom. I don't like…I wouldn't like it if someone was watching every day and criticizing everything I do. *It's just, in the long-run I don't think that this model really lines up with the college's values.. . . It's not a very realistic suggestion. But I don't know of any incremental changes that would really make a big difference.*

- I see the transition towards…I mean, it's been going on forever, this transition towards part-time, using part-time instructors. I think that it does impact the quality of instruction though. And I think that…I think it impacts attitude and morale. I think there's a certain class of instructors who want to teach part-time and who feel, you know. But there's also a certain class that are teaching seven classes for three different college districts in order to try to pay back $70,000 in student loans, right? And they're phoning it in. So, to the degree that it accommodates certain professionals who want that quality of life, it's a tool. To the degree that it's a fallback to…for a certain class of individuals who are trying to scrape together an income, it's a hindrance to students, I think.. . .Quality of instruction. …I mean, I see handwritten exams thrown together. . . I mean, there's no way you can teach five classes. . . .So, you know, when you have someone part-time who isn't really interested in being an educator, and who's doing this in order to just pay bills, I think that that's certainly more likely a part-time person. Not to say that isn't possible to have that happen at someone full-time. But, yeah. There's no…It's check marking boxes.. . .

Oh, sure. I mean, I've experienced it in class. . . .In math it happens a lot when you get engineers teaching mathematics, as kind of a backup or as a fallback.

- One of the challenges…One of the differences between…You know, you look at your typical part-timer and they have multiple part-time things across multiple colleges. You look at CTE part-timers, they have a full-time job and they teach on the side. So you have two completely different categories of people where the needs of one definitely don't necessarily make the needs of everybody. You know, when they did multiyear contracts, so your contracts are awesome for the first group. But the second group, they have full-time jobs and they teach. But if a department needs to hand out X number of multiyear contracts, that proves a challenge for them because they're told you need to hand these out. And they're like, "Well, who do I give them to? Because it's not like that first group where you have people who are taking and teaching across multiple campuses, multiple institutions. *So finding a way to reach those people, those part-timers, and find out specifically what they need, categorizing that, collecting that, kind of managing that and being able to address those at an institutional level.*

Hire More Full-time Faculty

- That's a tough one. I guess…I know that there's a lot of good stuff going, College-wide, to support part-time. I guess the *only thing I just hope is somehow, budget-wise we can work on our part-time/full-time ratios.* But then again, sometimes we hear we're better off than other places. So, you know, it's a tough one. It's a tough one.. . .That's my opinion.
- And I mean, even though I feel completely privileged and entitled and happy with my position. This is my dream job, and I'm in it for life. I've heard, like at a party for example, like at a cocktail party, or a barbeque at somebody's house, like an administrators house for example. Like talking to someone who's a dean somewhere, dean of instructions or something like that. And they say, "What do you do?" And you say, "Oh, I'm Matt. I teach math at Campus One." They go oh, "Full-time or part-time?" And I go, "Full-time." And they say, "Full-time instructors are gold". That's a quote. And I thought, *hire more of us, you know. We're not hiding in hills. We're not… Full-time instructors are not something we have to mine like precious metal. We make them, right? The college invests in us, and there we are. We're here, right? We have…I mean, we have a couple of empty cubicles in the math department right now. We'd love to fill them up, you know? And we have…I can name four or five of my part-time colleagues right now who I'd be more than happy to welcome as full-time. Like I would be more than confident that they'd be committed to this job for their career, you know? And that's just the people I know at PNWCC. That doesn't even consider all the interesting, thoughtful young people who want to make this world better outside of our walls. And so I just think that the shift towards the larger part-time, that the full-time/part-time ratio being anything worse than fifty/fifty is a bad split. I think that fifty/fifty kind of might make sense with our retirees and our young people. But the job is difficult. We need the shared governance duties, the committee work. We need participation in more people who are seriously engaged in the work. And they can't be engaged in it unless they're getting paid and they know how to get paid. You know, they know that their work is valued. That's the thing, I know my work is valued, so I work hard. Other people, part-timers do not*

know…to sometimes know your work is not valued, then you have to ask yourself how hard do I want to work? That's hard.

Copy Good Practices from Other Colleges

- And then at PNWCC 4 it's like kind of the opposite. *It's like genuine support from like a dedicated person with some release time to like have that be part of their job. Super valuable.* That job changed often enough that as a part-timer you benefited from more than one person's knowledge and expertise while you worked there. *Clear, clear access to like workshops, professional development, whether it was things like they had a good…their advising department reaches out to faculty every year and gives a little, you know, faculty advising workshop.* This was is a…*You'd do it in the summer. You got paid three hundred bucks. And as a teacher, full-time or part-time, you know a lot more about the advising system at their college..* . . There was not a big class. It probably cost the college just a few grand. *But like the twenty people in that class are now like twice as valuable to students as far as points of contact for student services. And like, and also just like mathematical workshops, teaching math pedagogy workshops.* Always obvious that this stuff is here for us and we can do that. And, of course grants, the grant participation was paid always at a good rate, stuff like that

- *We should have dedicated faculty, full-time faculty with release time whose job is to support our part-time faculty's development as teachers, and members of…and learning about curriculum, and learning how to do faculty work.* We don't have that right now. Especially in…I don't know if every department, but in a huge department like math we need it. We need something.

- PNWCC 4 again, *had the best part-time review process. And they had like a real—like you knew that they were coming this quarter. They'd contact you at the beginning of the quarter and pick the class. You knew you were going to sit down afterward. And they had notes they were going to share with you, and thoughts.*

- Well, at PNWCC 4 the basic thing they had that we don't have is a dedicated person in the department whose role is part-time supervisor. Their job is to be the person for…And they pass it around from full-timer to full-timer. They all share this duty for like maybe two years at a stretch or something. A year maybe, I can't remember. But that's the person who's going to be doing all the classroom visits that year, who's going to be available for any questions part-timers have about the job conditions, support for teaching, connecting part-timers to professional development opportunities. Just kind of this person's job for just a year or two at a time. And it really worked. Like I got connected to a lot of good like workshops and trainings and stuff there kind of on a regular basis.

- And the two schools I worked at more as a part-timer, it became kind of more apparent what was not working at PNWCC 2, and what was really working well at PNWCC 4. There were really differences. And some of the things that worked well at PNWCC 4 we don't have here, and I miss them for our part-timers.

Orientation

- I think they should have a mandatory six hour training from HR. You know, have people come in, HR, student services. I mean even in the day, we all went through orientation, classified people. I would think an orientation. I understand that part-time people probably have the fulltime job

during the day. And they can't come at day/night, you know. And so, I know they get a stipend for coming out Wednesday night during in-service. But even if they just had a packet that was given to people, you know. I think there is an old one in there – I save a lot of stuff...from HR, that was kind of a checklist. So just have a little welcoming thing, maybe even on a Saturday, you know, and talk about what's available for students. What's available for the instructor. I mean, how you process and where you get this, that and the other, you know? I don't know. Serve them lunch, they'll come.

- [orientation] Did it help me? As a new teacher, I could have used more what does teaching really mean? How do you do handling of classroom disturbance oriented people, that kind of thing, that you get in the world of education. My number of education courses are...splttt....as you can imagine. . . .Mistake there...looking at the possibilities of lawsuits and other things and how one person can disturb an entire class. . . . We certainly could use a look-see into that area.

- I would like to see, maybe, some sort of a website where you could go to read all about the sort of administrative sort of things, and to know who to contact if you have further questions. And then maybe some sort of like a short-term mentoring sort of a thing for when you start. I think that would be helpful.

Support and Events for Part-Time Faculty

- There has to be a way to reach out. And it may be department-wise. It may be division-wise. But ways that you can reach out to the part-timers to find out what they need. You know, be able to ask the part-timers, okay, what do you need to be successful? That's a pretty big question that Technical does when they do their retreat is, okay, what do you guys need to be successful? Where do you feel as though...Where do you feel as though you don't have the information, you know? You want to do professional development, or you want to do these things.

- One of the things that Technical did was ...once a year they did a part-time event where full-timers were encouraged to come for that interaction in the first hour of lunch, get to know the part-timers. And then after that hour, for the next hour it was all focused on what the department could for part-timers. . . . And so it's a really, really good idea. They've been doing it three, four years now. And I think that it's a really, really good opportunity of both college-wide information and for department-specific information.

Pay

- And then we need...part-time faculty need to be paid for office hours. They need to be paid for their work outside the class. That needs to be part of their contract so they know it's valued and valuable. They already know it's important to students. But they need to know that the college isn't just saying something when they say students come first. They have to pay people who are working with the students. And that's key. We need...And we need a system of getting paid for work outside the classroom that makes sense and is responsive to the decision making of our CACs. And works on the schedule of how we work, rather than some kind of randomly imposed schedule from outside. Because that doesn't make any sense.

- And then if they really actually want people's long term participation in other things they need to pay them for it. They need to have set times and they need to pay.

- If they're being paid $4,500 to teach this class, and they're sitting on a CAC subcommittee, especially something like a learning assessment committee and they're not getting paid, that's the college just getting free labor. That's just wrong.

- They have a good start with starting to pay them to come and help out. I think they need to continue that and maybe expand it, especially if they're not going to hire more full-timers and it's going to continue to be sixty percent, sometimes more, percentage. Yeah. I think it's in the thirties for full-timers; it's closer to seventy percent [for part-timers]. If they're going to continue to have that large of a percentage of our classes taught by part-timers, they really need to have them involved more so that they can understand the expectations and give their input, if those expectations changes at all.. . .That's pretty much it. Just make sure that they feel welcome and included. And if they're going to do work, pay them for it. Don't expect them to get it to them for free. Because it's not right to do that. They can't expect that, from a moral standpoint.

- They teach over half of our classes. They need to be a part of it. But I don't think it's fair to ask them to do that if they aren't going to get paid for it. You can't ask them to give us their time when they're trying to make a living and they've got other institutions also. And I think before we….Well, we've only had the money for the part-timers for about a year, not even a year. [The money to help them get a little development?] Yeah. And I felt it was very kind and generous of them to put all the time that they were putting in. Because I felt bad that they…I mean, I had…My 60 through 95 committee, I had several part-timers. And they were all donating their time to come in, because they felt passionate about that. Some of them wanted full-time jobs too. So they were participating to get to know…But a lot of them were just there because they wanted to be there. And I thought that was extremely generous. And I really felt like they deserved to be paid to be there. And a lot of them had years and years of experience and a lot to give. And they were just giving it for free. And I felt that was sad. So I am glad that now they've negotiated to give them some pay for that time. And I think they should give their input on what we teach, how we teach it, what book we're going to get, because they're going to have to use it. And they teach over half of our classes. So they need to be included. But they deserve to be paid if they're going to put their time in, so…

- I think that a lot of part-time faculty are working very hard for not a lot of pay, and that makes it difficult to see working here as more than just a job. After I got hired as a permanent full-time faculty, my life changed so much. My short term and long term financial needs felt taken care of, and it allowed me to focus more of my attention on the college's mission and my students' needs.

- There's some unfairness. And then there are part-timers that, I'm going to guess, are wanting to be fulltime. And so that's a way for them to get a foot in the door. Because it is, I think, pretty competitive here to become a full-timer. And you know, some of the full-timers I work with I think, God, you really don't know how good you've got it. You've got your summers off. And your kids have health insurance. And you can have a baby. . . . But when I say that, I'm saying it almost like I'm – there's that word – jealous…jealous of a full-timer. And that financial – what's the even word I'm looking for – safety, yeah, the security that they have. And I was talking to a

full-timer earlier today. And they were talking about retirement. And you know, it's like, okay. Well, that's nice.. . .You know, I just said I didn't want to go there.

- Yeah, because I think it's,…by not paying them for all of their work we're…It's like by, you disrespect one person with the job, you disrespect everybody with that job.

Rethink Math Courses

- And then the other thing in the math, that I see, that I think that…I don't know. This is just a personal pet peeve. But the move towards online…I mean, we have to decide, in these remedial classes…in these developmental classes, what are we really trying to… What are we really trying to instill? What skills are we really trying to instill? I doubt very few of our students need to solve for the vertex of a parabola ever in their lives, right? What they're really getting is this capacity to think and communicate in a logical way. This means this, which means this, which means. . .therefore, this leads to this, right? Communicate and to be able to communicate that. To think critically and to… What's they're getting out of Math 60, 65, 95. The slope of a line maybe, maybe not. But certainly, all of them.