

CONTINGENT FACULTY AT EXTENDED CAMPUSES:  
FRAMEWORK FOR LEADERS

---

A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
University of Missouri

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
Of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

ERIC CUNNINGHAM

Dr. Jennifer Hart, Dissertation Supervisor

DECEMBER 2010

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

CONTINGENT FACULTY AT EXTENDED CAMPUSES

presented by Eric Cunningham, a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

And hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

---

Professor Jennifer Hart

---

Professor Joe Donaldson

---

Professor Jay Scribner

---

Professor Bradley Curs

---

Professor Stephen Whitney

My dissertation is dedicated to my late step-dad, Francis "Dale" Vining. Pop....you showed me and your students that rocky starts in education should not prevent you from reaching your educational goals. We all miss you very much!

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to recognize my doctoral advisor, Dr. Jeni Hart. Without her expert editorial guidance and depth of content knowledge in my subject area this document would have never come to fruition. For her patient assistance I will be eternally grateful.

I would also like to recognize Dr. Joe Donaldson and Dr. Steve Graham. Their passion for the study of higher and continuing education and their skills as graduate faculty inspired me to pursue my doctoral education. I truly appreciate the friendship and encouragement they have provided over these many years.

In addition to Dr. Hart and Dr. Donaldson, I would like to thank the remaining members of my committee, Dr. Jay Scribner, Dr. Bradley Curs and Dr. Stephen Whitney for their guidance and support.

I would like to thank Dr. Von Pittman for his friendship and support. He recognizes well the challenges of doctoral studies for part-time students and his encouragement never waned.

Finally, I would like to thank my Association for Continuing Higher Education (ACHE) colleagues, Dr. Walter Pearson, Dr. A. David Stewart, Dr. Roxanne Gonzales and Dr. Marthann Schulte for their friendship and service as peer reviewers.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of Purpose.....	4
Research Question.....	8
Conceptual Framework: Essential Elements of Faculty Work.....	8
Definitions.....	10
Academic Freedom.....	10
Collegiality.....	11
Contingent Faculty.....	11
Equity.....	14
Extended Campus.....	15
Flexibility.....	18
Home Campus.....	19
Professional Growth.....	19
Design.....	21
Chapter Summary.....	23
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	25
Introduction.....	25

Taxonomy of Contingent Faculty.....	25
Academic Life.....	29
Extended Campuses.....	36
Tenure.....	41
Essential Elements of Faculty Work.....	44
Academic Freedom.....	44
Collegiality.....	47
Equity.....	48
Flexibility.....	49
Professional Growth.....	50
Chapter Summary.....	52
3. METHODS.....	56
Introduction.....	56
Design.....	56
Case Study Method.....	56
Site Selection.....	59
Data Collection.....	62
Sampling.....	63
Interviewing.....	64
Observation.....	64
Researcher's Role.....	65
Context Development: Mapping the Field.....	66
Data Analysis.....	66
Trustworthiness and Credibility.....	67

Limitations.....	69
Chapter Summary.....	70
4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	72
Introduction.....	72
Mapping the Field.....	72
Social Map.....	73
Personnel.....	73
Organizational Structure.....	77
Staff Functions and Activities.....	78
Spatial Map.....	79
Temporal Map.....	84
Faculty Worklife.....	88
Respect.....	88
Academic Freedom.....	91
Equity.....	93
Collegiality.....	95
Flexibility.....	98
Professional Growth.....	101
Emergent Categories.....	105
Teaching.....	105
Salary and Benefits.....	106
Support.....	108
Summary.....	108

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	110
Introduction.....	110
Discussion.....	110
Respect.....	110
Academic Freedom.....	112
Equity.....	114
Collegiality.....	115
Flexibility.....	117
Professional Growth.....	119
Teaching.....	120
Salary and Benefits.....	121
Support.....	121
Implications for Practice.....	122
Respect Implications.....	122
Academic Freedom Implications.....	123
Equity Implications.....	123
Collegiality Implications.....	124
Flexibility Implications.....	127
Professional Growth Implications.....	128
Teaching Implications.....	130
Salary and Benefits Implications.....	131
Support Implications.....	132



Recommendations for Future Research.....	134
Conclusions.....	136
APPENDIX	
1. Interview Protocol.....	138
2. Contingent Faculty Observation Worksheet .....	139
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	140
VITA.....	150

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Institutions with Extended Campuses.....	22
2. Student Demographics.....	74
3. Faculty Demographics.....	74
4. Campus Square Footage.....	79
5. Campus Operating Hours.....	84
6. Campus Class Hours.....	86
7. Assessment Framework and Checklist for Action.....	133

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### *Background*

The higher education landscape has changed over the past 60 years. We have seen the typical college student evolve from an 18 to 22 year old, coming directly out of secondary school with little or no responsibility for employment or family obligation, to a college student whose average age is much closer to 30, most often employed full-time and with a full range of adult responsibilities (Keller, 2001).

Another dramatic change is how a college education is delivered. As the men and women of World War II, armed not with guns but with the funding of the G.I. Bill, stormed the campuses of the late 1940s and 1950s, they predominately found an environment where they had to go to where the college was. That meant if they did not happen to live where their college of choice was located, they would have to move to that location or physically commute to campus each day. College was primarily a place-bound operation where a student was expected to come to the campus at the appointed days and times and the college determined what the student would learn if they wanted to receive an education from that institution (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; Rudolph, 1990). That picture of “how college was” remained fairly stable up until the 1970s. A complex mix of social, demographic and technology factors have steadily eroded the idealized view of the college environment since that time. Some of the factors include: an increasingly mobile society; rapid student population growth as the baby-boomers came of college age; movement of women into the workforce; the

dissolution of the nuclear family; the need for families to have dual incomes; educational and communication technology advances; and an attitude shift by potential students that empowered them to demand that higher education be delivered on their terms and not those dictated by colleges and universities (Drucker, 1997; Keller, 2001).

I do not mean to suggest that our college campuses, with great lawns, gardens and varied architecture, are on the verge of extinction as the renowned observer, Peter Drucker, has predicted (as cited in Lenzner & Johnson, 1997). I believe this model of higher education will exist for many decades to come. Traditional aged students will follow their legacy parents to their alma maters. They will seek the prestige of long established institutions as well as the social life among peers who gather by the thousands at our campuses. Even the opportunity a few Saturdays each fall to watch football will inspire young adults to continue to congregate in one spot to receive their college education.

Although I believe this tradition will continue, the proportion of students receiving their college education in the classic setting has been greatly diminished. Many colleges and universities now have some type of extended campus network that supplements or complements their *traditional* campuses (Fonseca & Bird, 2006; Wolfe & Strange, 2003). These may be suburban campuses associated with a large urban home campus separated by just a few miles and less than an hour driving time. They may be campuses dictated by the extension mission of land-grant universities that dot their individual states. The physical size and staffing of these facilities vary widely. There is also a model for

extended campus networks wherein colleges and universities have chosen to establish campuses hundreds or even thousands of miles from their home campus. These campuses are often overseas.

The reasons colleges and universities establish extended campus outposts are also varied. There is no denying that one of the reasons for establishing extended campus networks is the generation of revenue (Schneider, 2004). Although this impetus for higher education decision making may seem crass to academic purists, the reality of the college and university fiscal picture in the twenty-first century is that generation of revenue is a key factor of survival (Berry, 2005). If federal and state funding for higher education and particularly public higher education continues to diminish, the need to generate revenue internally will continue to increase (Gappa & Leslie, 1997; O'Meara, Kaufman & Kuntz, 2003). Colleges and universities will have to continue to seek alternate ways of generating revenue. Extended campus networks will likely be one of those ways for many institutions (Berry, 2005; Fonseca & Bird, 2006; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). Another reason may be the belief that part of the institutional mission is outreach to underserved populations, such as working adults and the military. Whatever their reason for doing so, the fact remains that hundreds of colleges and universities have already established extended campus networks and a sizable portion of the higher education credit hours being taught each year are being delivered in these venues (Blumenstyk, 2006; Fonseca & Bird, 2006).

### *Statement of Purpose*

As previously stated, the face of the student and how higher education is delivered has changed. College students are less likely to be traditional-aged and they are less likely to attend college at a long-established *traditional* campus. They are far more likely to be working adults attending college at a more convenient extended campus location near their home or office. These locations are much more likely to be staffed with contingent faculty (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Digranes & Digranes, 1999; Wolfe & Strange, 2003). The term, contingent faculty, will be explained more fully later in this chapter. These changes have primarily occurred outside the scrutiny of higher education researchers. There is a void in the professional literature addressing higher education at extended campuses. In my opinion, this likely has occurred because higher education researchers are most often full-time faculty researching issues focused on the traditional paradigm. Therefore, we find ourselves in a situation where a large portion of college students are attending college in a teaching and learning format that exists primarily “under the radar” (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). The dearth of information about contingent faculty on extended campuses in general and the teaching and learning practices at these campuses should be a concern of the academy. If the lack of research on the subject is any indication, the concern does not currently exist. Conley and Leslie (2002) further describe this lack of research as it applies directly to contingent faculty:

What is perhaps surprising to some is that we have very little historical information about the characteristics of part-time faculty overall and that we have even less information about the similarities and differences

among part-time faculty members and between part-time and full-time faculty in general (Introduction section, para. 2).

I have focused my research on faculty at extended campuses because there is virtually no research on the topic. In fact, to date, I have found nothing that directly addresses the issues of contingent faculty at extended campuses.

Contingent faculty members, even those teaching at extended campus locations, should expect mutual civility and respect. Unfortunately, contingent faculty teaching at extended campus locations often feel a separation in both time and distance from their colleagues because they may teach at different locations and on different days or at different times (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Fulton, 2000; Hoyt et al., 2008). Depending on the demographics of the full-time faculty and staff, these feelings of separation can be exacerbated by differences in gender, race, ethnicity and age (Gappa et al., 2007). Identifying these gaps and recommending opportunities to bridge them is a goal of my research.

I want to examine this subset of higher education for two reasons. The first is because the contingent faculty force has grown rapidly over the past 25 years and continues to grow today (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Wolfe & Strange, 2003). How the contingent faculty workforce is managed has an impact on the quality of higher education across all venues, but especially in non-traditional, adult learner programs where contingent faculty are used almost exclusively (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993, 1997). Second, contingent faculty in an extended campus environment are part of the higher education landscape who receives scant attention (Cunningham, 1999). Higher educational programs offered by host institutions at extended campuses are well-intentioned. However,

in practice they are hard to operate with the assurance of educational quality (Cunningham, 1999; Wolfe & Strange, 2003). The number of colleges and universities that employ extended campus operations is ever increasing (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). Those operations generally include a campus director, academic advisors, administrative staff and a force of contingent faculty. Seldom are full-time faculty assigned to these locations (Fonseca & Bird, 2006; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). It is how this body of contingent faculty perceive their work environment that is the focus of my research.

There are numerous organizations that track statistics dealing with faculty demographics. They include faculty organizations such as the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association (Rhoades, 2008). They also include the Chronicle of Higher Education and the National Center for Education Statistics. These organizations maintain figures for a variety of reasons and to serve a variety of constituents. Their findings reflect the growing use of contingent faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Rhoades, 2008). For example, the National Center for Education Statistics reported in 1993 that 42 percent of all faculty members were contingent. This was up from 20 percent in a survey done in 1968 (Wilson, 1998). Although the rate of growth of contingent faculty has slowed since 1993, growth of this portion of the total faculty continues. As reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education – Almanac* (2008) contingent faculty comprised 43, 44 and 48 percent of the total faculty in the years 1997, 2001 and 2005 respectively. Proportions may vary due to different definitions of non-tenure eligible faculty and



the type of institution examined. However, the important finding is the consistent upward trend in contingent faculty hiring in recent years (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Baron-Nixon, 2007). Additionally, contingent faculty are not an itinerant group, as they are so often portrayed. On average they have been employed by their institution for 5.4 years and they teach more than 1.8 classes per enrollment period. More than one-fourth of the contingent corps have taught eight or more years at the same institution (Balch, 1999).

Not only are their numbers large and growing, the contingent faculty force potentially brings many advantages to our campuses. They bring great diversity in age, gender, race and ethnicity, a quality that is sorely lacking at many institutions (Berger & Kirshstein, 2001). They often bring a fresh enthusiasm for teaching and a great deal of professional and personal experience. They allow our colleges and universities to maintain close ties to business and industry since their contingent faculty are often currently employed in corporate settings. Practicing professionals who come to the classroom as contingent faculty members bring a currency and “real-world” perspective that many full-time faculty, long removed from business and industry, if they were ever involved, may lack (Garli & Petersen, 2005; Schneider, 2004).

Regardless of what organization has gathered the statistics and what their motive may have been for reporting them, it is clear contingent faculty are here to stay in higher education, and for the foreseeable future their raw numbers and percentage of the whole are likely to increase. The reasons for using them are many, but primarily it is fiscally motivated (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004; Todd

2004). Whether revenue should be a primary motivator or not is nearly irrelevant or at least a matter for the research of others. There seems to be no indication that budgetary conditions will change in such a manner to curb the use of faculty who are not full-time (O'Meara, Kaufman, & Kuntz, 2003).

I believe Gappa, Austin and Trice (2005) capture the essence of my research purpose when they lament,

Part-time and adjunct faculty members, who often are hired under poorly defined and inequitable employment policies and practices, do not participate in decisions about their work and receive very little support ---- even if they represent the majority of all faculty members at the institution. When the work of all faculty is not supported and valued, institutions are unable to optimize fully the intellectual capital available to them (p. 35).

#### *Research Question*

I plan to explore the life of faculty members at extended campuses. I want to better understand the context of their environment guided by the Essential Elements of Faculty Work Model (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2005). Specifically, the research question I seek to answer is: *Guided by the Essential Elements of Faculty Work, how do contingent faculty perceive their environment at extended campuses?*

#### *Conceptual Framework: Essential Elements of Faculty Work*

To guide my research and serve as a conceptual framework, I plan to use the Essential Elements of Faculty Work (EEFW) Model developed by Gappa et al. (2005) and detailed in their book, *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative* (2007). The elements I will use to guide my research are: academic freedom; equity; collegiality; flexibility and professional

growth. Gappa et al.'s (2005) work evolved from research done by Baxter Healthcare Corporation in 1997. The Baxter Healthcare research determined employees saw some aspects of their work experience as *entitlements* and some were seen as *benefits*. Failure of the employer to deliver on *entitlements* resulted in turnover, worker apathy and low productivity. This idea is somewhat similar to Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, wherein progression up the hierarchy is not possible until a lower level need is achieved (Ormrod, 1999). It also seemed to be true in the Baxter Healthcare research (Gappa et al., 2007). If the employer was not providing all *entitlements* as perceived by the employees, then *benefits* did not matter. The results of Baxter's practical research seems to bear out the human motivation theories developed several decades before by Alderfer, Herzberg, and Maslow that places high value on intrinsic motivators such as achievement and recognition in the workplace (Gappa et al., 2007).

The key *entitlement* determined by the Baxter Healthcare research was *respect*. *Respect* is the foundational element of the EEFW Model (Gappa et al., 2005). From a starting point of *respect*, Gappa, Austin and Trice found that the five elements of: academic freedom; equity; collegiality; flexibility and professional growth were important to all faculty members.

Using the conceptual framework of the Essential Elements of Faculty Work to guide me, I intend to explore the work environment for contingent faculty members at several extended campuses. Specifically, I will attempt to gain insight into this under-researched but expanding group of faculty to determine the degree to which the entitlement, respect, is foundational to a quality work

environment in higher education as it seemed to be in a healthcare setting. Then I will examine the elements of faculty work, academic freedom, equity, collegiality flexibility and professional growth as they relate to contingent faculty at extended campuses. I will attempt to ascertain how contingent faculty at several extended campuses perceive their environment in relation to academic freedom. I will do likewise for the rest of the framework elements of equity, collegiality, flexibility and professional growth.

### *Definitions*

The following terms and concepts are used frequently in the language of higher education. An understanding of their precise meaning is critical to the content and context of my study.

#### *Academic Freedom*

Gappa et al. (2007) begin by saying, “academic freedom encompasses the norms and values that protect each faculty member’s freedom of intellectual expression and inquiry” (p. 226). In most extended campuses contingent faculty scenarios, the freedom of expression is much more relevant than the freedom of inquiry since most appointments focus solely on teaching and not on research (Berger & Kirshstein, 2001). Contingent faculty members, as all faculty, must be free to express the truth as they see it. They must have the right to teach without the imposition or fear of institutional sanction for the political, religious or ideological views they may share in the classroom. Academic freedom does not mean the freedom to say anything one wants. There is a limiting factor of respect for the dignity of students and maintenance of a non-hostile classroom

environment (Gappa et al., 2007). Although there are volumes written on academic freedom, for the purposes of my research, the critical element of academic freedom is addressed above. Even contingent faculty must be free to express themselves freely in their classrooms.

### *Collegiality*

Collegiality refers to an institutional climate wherein faculty members feel they belong to a mutually respectful community of scholars who value each member's contributions to the institution (Gappa et al., 2007). When faculty members feel they are part of this community in explicit, implicit and symbolic ways, they feel they are respected. Faculty members who feel connected to their institutions are more likely to remain (Anonymous, 2005; Baron-Nixon, 2007; Hoyt et al., 2008). Therefore, a sense of collegiality and connection in an institutional community enhances the workplace satisfaction of faculty members who experience it and it strengthens the overall intellectual vitality of the institution. It also contributes to the kind of environment all faculty say they value (Gappa et al., 2007).

### *Contingent Faculty*

The higher education literature refers to those who teach with less than full-year contracts by a variety of names. A reader may see the use of adjunct faculty, part-time faculty, contingent faculty, lecturers, term faculty, visiting professors, affiliate faculty, non-tenure track faculty and even expendable academics. Berry (2005), in *Reclaiming the Ivory Tower: Organizing Adjuncts to Change Higher Education*, provides a list of 49 different terms to describe other

than regular faculty. This plethora of monikers speaks volumes to the ambiguous place these faculty members occupy in the higher education workforce (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Wallin, 2004;). The two terms most often found in the literature are adjunct faculty and part-time faculty (Berry, 2005). The term part-time faculty refers to those faculty members who return to teach at the same institution, year after year, but without formal guarantee of continuance. The adjunct label is generally reserved for those who teach more sporadically, often to cover a few specialized courses taught infrequently or who teach less often based on the personal desires of the faculty member (Greive & Worden, 2000). At best, the lines of distinction between the terms adjunct faculty and part-time faculty are blurry; they often appear in the literature as synonyms. In an effort to reduce confusion and for my research I will employ the less frequently used, but more inclusive term of contingent faculty. Contingent refers to the institution's use of faculty who are not full-time to cover the variety of teaching contingencies that their curricula and student needs demand. Regardless of the moniker, the faculty in these extended campus locations are almost always made up of those individuals who teach on a term by term contract basis (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). Most often their terms of employment only involve monetary compensation for a specific class or classes being taught during the academic term stated on their contract. Additionally, these faculty members seldom perform any of the classic functions of faculty other than teaching. They are seldom involved in research connected to the institution and they perform few service functions either in their academic discipline or in the community (Nickerson &

Schaefer, 2001; Wolfe & Strange, 2003). There are certainly exceptions to these rules, but it is rare. Depending on the institution, the contingent faculty members may perform academic advising functions and serve on extended campus committees. If these tasks are performed, the individuals are generally compensated separate from the terms of their instructional duties (Schneider, 2004). There are seldom any benefits such as medical insurance or retirement programs associated with these positions (Fulton, 2000; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001).

In 1978, Howard Tuckman tried to typify the composition of the contingent faculty. He developed a taxonomy that included such members as: semi-retireds; graduate students; hopeful full-timers; full-mooners; homeworkers; part-mooners; and part-unknowners. Fifteen years later, Gappa and Leslie (1993) modified or renamed some of Tuckman's categories into four groups. Gappa and Leslie place the contingent population into the following groups: career enders; specialists, experts and professionals; aspiring academic; and freelancers. Berger and Kirshstein (2001) rendered the contingent force down to just two groups, careerists and moonlighters.

In my 14 years of administering contingent faculty in higher education, I have clearly encountered all the groups that Howard Tuckman (1978), Judith Gappa and David Leslie (1993) and Andrea Berger and Rita Kirshstein (2001) have described in their books and articles. It has been my experience that although these authors have gone to great lengths to describe the uniqueness of

each category, that in practice, many of the individual faculty members actually exhibit characteristics ascribed to two or more of these categories.

Whether they fit neatly into one of these taxonomies or not, whether they are cross-categorical and blur the distinction among the categories presented, or whether they exist in other groups and exhibit characteristics not mentioned, this is the subset of the total faculty population on which my research will focus, the contingent faculty. My research will not focus on any of the taxonomies discussed above. They only serve to show how diverse and disparate the contingent force really is. It is likely this heterogeneity has contributed to the lack of voice exhibited and attention received by contingent faculty. It is my hope that my research will give them both voice and attention.

### *Equity*

For the purposes of this research, equity refers to equity in employment practices. Gappa et al. (2007) make it clear that equitable treatment in employment among faculty members does not mean identical treatment. Because it is not uncommon for a single institution to use all three types of academic appointments (tenure; contract-renewable; fixed-term) it is not expected that all will be treated alike. However, within each type of appointment each faculty member should be treated fairly. This generally involves a well defined system of notification of contract renewal or termination, equitable compensation, a system of academic rank, explicit performance evaluation criteria, and grievance procedures (Gappa et al., 2007).



### *Extended Campus*

Although the size and types of facilities employed at extended campuses may vary widely, the model for my study will fit this general description. The extended campus is far enough away from the home campus that day-to-day or even once weekly face-to-face interaction between home campus and extended campus administrators and faculty is operationally impractical. This may be due to physical distance that may be dozens, hundreds or even thousands of miles or it may be the realities of dense urban traffic that turns a few dozen miles into a multi-hour travel proposition. The extended campus may be in a single-use building owned by the college or university, but more often than not, it is a leased facility that may encompass a wing or a few floors of a building complex (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). This arrangement provides the institution with the desired fiscal flexibility to deal with change. The size of the facility can be increased through expanding lease agreements or the whole operation can move to account for changing student demographic patterns. These facilities tend to be divided between office space and classrooms (Fonseca & Bird, 2006).

The extended campuses are most often staffed by full-time administrative employees who perform a variety of standard higher education functions including admissions, registration, transcript evaluation, academic advisement, financial aid counseling and student account management (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). These employees are subject to the same compensation and benefit agreements that apply to their staff colleagues on the institutions' home campuses. The directors or senior administrators at extended campus locations

often hold faculty rank, have college teaching experience and are charged with supervising and evaluating the faculty on the extended campus. These administrators are, like most faculty members, academically prepared in only one discipline. Since they evaluate faculty in many disciplines, their evaluations of teaching and subsequent feedback to the faculty members is primarily focused on pedagogy, not content, unless the class observed just happens to be in their own academic discipline (Stoops, 2000). These same administrators most often bear the responsibility for recruiting and hiring the contingent faculty members at their campuses. How this is actually accomplished and the amount of oversight from the home campus will vary widely from institution to institution (Digranes & Digranes, 2000).

The student body at the extended campuses seldom mirrors the demographics at the home campus. Most home campuses still cater primarily to the traditional-aged student (18 – 25 years of age) who is transitioning from high school to college (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). These traditional-aged students rightfully have endless dreams about their future and they want curricular options to support those dreams. Their opportunities are limitless and they want their chosen institution to offer majors in literally everything from art to zoology and all the programs in between. These students need a full-range of services beyond academic advisement and course delivery that include housing, medical care, personal counseling and extracurricular activities (Tierney & Hentschke, 2007). At the extended campuses these services are absent for the simple fact they are usually not wanted or needed (Graham & Donaldson, 1996). The students at the

extended campus run the gamut from traditional post-secondary students, who have chosen an extended campus merely for ease of access or cost, to septuagenarians who have come to college in their seventh decade for a variety of intrinsic reasons. The typical student at an extended campus is somewhere in between. They are almost all employed, either full or part-time, and their average age for any particular campus will likely be in the 30s. They most often have an immediate family who includes a spouse and/or children (Kasworm & Pike, 1994).

The curricular delivery at the extended campuses also differs from that found on traditional campuses (Wlodkowski, 2003). The prevalent delivery mode on most traditional campuses continues to be classes held Monday through Friday from early morning until late afternoon. These courses are generally offered either two or three days per week and occur on a 15 or 16 week semester basis unless a quarter or trimester system is operating. A normal course load for undergraduate students would be 12 to 15 semester hours. A shortened summer term may also be available, but the selection of courses available is most often dramatically reduced (Wlodkowski, 2003). On extended campuses catering primarily to working adults, the mode of delivery is much different. Working adults who are also engaged partners and parents and busy members of their community find it hard to commit to semester length courses (Wlodkowski, 2003).

The following description of the teaching and learning environment at extended campuses is based on my own experience and countless hours of

discussion with colleagues from institutions such as Park University (MO), Troy University (AL), University of Maryland University College, Webster University (MO), Simpson College (IA) and others that operate extended campuses. Extended campuses usually use academic terms that run from 5 to 10 weeks. Most institutions offer a summer term that has a schedule that is just as robust as all the other terms. Daytime courses are often inconvenient for the working adult; thus, evening courses offered Monday through Thursday are most prevalent. Instead of courses being taught in 50 to 90 minutes classes, at the extended campuses, classes generally are 2 ½ to 5 hours in length. This format creates opportunities for teaching and learning not available to the shorter time formats, but it can also be a challenge for faculty members not used to conducting class for such long stretches of time. The weekend, a time for home football games and fraternity parties on many traditional campuses, is prime instructional time at many extended campuses. Although a delivery method of 4 to 5 hours on Saturday morning is what is most often used, other formats are also employed. Full 8 hour days on both Saturday and Sunday are sometimes combined with an every-other-weekend attendance format.

### *Flexibility*

Employees of the twenty-first century, including faculty members, have significant demands placed on them outside the workplace. Dual income couples and single parents must balance their worklife with the demands of maintaining a home, raising children and possibly caring for aging parents and other family members. Flexibility, as it is to be used in this research, means allowing

contingent faculty members to enter, exit and reenter into a teaching position with the institution without penalty or loss of status in relation to other contingent faculty members (Gappa et al., 2007).

### *Home Campus*

Reference to the “home campus” in this work refers to the location of the college’s or university’s central administration and full-time faculty. This location may or may not include all the trappings of a traditional college setting such as administration and classroom buildings, faculty office buildings, residence halls, student activity centers and athletic facilities. At a minimum, the home campus will house the institution’s upper administration such as the chief executive officer (e.g., president, chancellor); chief academic officer and assorted vice-presidents, provosts and deans to administer subordinate schools, colleges and programs, as well as oversee the many functional areas (e.g., enrollment management, plant and facilities) needed to keep the institution functioning. This is also the home of the full-time faculty. From this location the institution’s academic programs will be conceptualized and the corresponding curricula produced. Most often, the full-time faculty at the home campus are tenured or on a tenure-track (Tierney & Hentschke, 2007). They perform, depending on the institution type, the classic functions of faculty: teaching; research and service.

### *Professional Growth*

Few things are static in college teaching. Knowledge in one’s discipline, the students and their associated stakeholders, technology in both pedagogy and one’s field of expertise and even expectations change constantly. Faculty

members must professionally grow and evolve to stay abreast of these changes. To stay current, faculty development is crucial. In fact, faculty development is “a key lever for ensuring institutional quality, responsiveness, creativity, and excellence” (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006, p. 169). Since contingent faculty at extended campuses are seldom connected to academic departments and their associated department chairs, promoting professional growth within the contingent teaching corps should be a goal of every dean or program director. Ensuring faculty stay current and engaged in both the changing field of college teaching and in their academic disciplines merits the investment of institutional resources (Gappa et al., 2007).

There are many ways college and university administrators can assist in the professional growth of their contingent faculty. Ease of access to information is a first step. It seems so obvious, but it is not uncommon for contingent faculty to have to search for even the most rudimentary pieces of information to do their jobs (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Bob, 1998; Hoyt et al., 2008; McArdle, 2002). This may include logistical issues, such as parking and photocopying information, or pedagogical issues such as how the academic support system operates or how to place articles on library reserve for their students.

The professional development needs of contingent faculty at extended campuses are often less clear than for their full-time faculty counterparts at *traditional* colleges and universities (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Contingent faculty members are often employed elsewhere, full-time, out of academe and have little need of professional development (Hoyt et al., 2008). However, it has been my

experience that contingent faculty members at extended campus locations, regardless of their academic aspirations, appreciate being offered opportunities to be more involved in extended campus life. Therefore, to the extent possible and practical, contingent faculty should be consulted on the operation of an extended campus (Anonymous, 2005). This may include service on committees, task forces or focus groups. It may be nothing more formal than a one-on-one discussion with the campus director over an important topic. The interest contingent faculty show in these opportunities will vary dramatically based on their personal needs and their individual availability. This form of involvement and interaction improves the faculty member's knowledge of higher education culture and processes. This tends to professionalize the faculty member's relationship to the institution and makes them potentially marketable in administrative roles beyond teaching.

### *Design*

Well over one million faculty members now teach about 15 million students at over 4,000 colleges and universities (Gappa et al., 2005, 2007). Percentages provided by the National Center for Education Statistics report at least 430,000 contingent higher education faculty teach annually (as cited in Snyder, Tan, & Hoffman, 2004). This constitutes an enormous expenditure of human and fiscal resources. Many colleges across the United States use extended campus networks to bolster their enrollments and therefore their revenue streams. To provide an example of the prolific use of extended campus networks I have chosen the state of Missouri as a convenient point of

reference. Missouri is not atypical. The following table of some of the colleges and universities in Missouri reveals the extent of this practice. Each institution's internet website provides the locations of their extended campuses.

Table 1  
Institutions with Extended Campuses

Institution	Extended Campuses	Institutional Website
Central Methodist University	4	<a href="http://www.centralmethodist.edu">www.centralmethodist.edu</a>
Columbia College	>30	<a href="http://www.ccis.edu">www.ccis.edu</a>
Drury University	7	<a href="http://www.drury.edu">www.drury.edu</a>
Lincoln University	1	<a href="http://www.lincoln.edu">www.lincoln.edu</a>
Moberly Area Cmty College	4	<a href="http://www.macc.edu">www.macc.edu</a>
Park University	>40	<a href="http://www.park.edu">www.park.edu</a>
Webster University	>65	<a href="http://www.webster.edu">www.webster.edu</a>
William Woods University	>10	<a href="http://www.williamwoods.edu">www.williamwoods.edu</a>

Other institutions with significant numbers of extended campuses include the University of Maryland University College, University of Oklahoma, Central Michigan University, Troy University (AL), Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (FL/AZ), St. Leo's University (FL), Chapman University (CA), Central Texas College and the University of Phoenix (AZ). Some of these institutions have over 50 extended campus locations (Blumenstyk, 2006).

I have selected the case study method for my research. I believe this method will allow me to delve deep enough into the world of contingent faculty at extended campuses to begin to understand the work lives of contingent faculty. I will draw my data from a minimum of three extended campuses. I intend to observe contingent faculty members in their classroom settings and during faculty meetings. I will conduct semi-structured interviews with a minimum of five faculty members from each campus. These instruments will evolve as I identify



different themes from previous responses. My semi-structured questioning will be framed by faculty desires from the Essential Elements of Faculty Work (Gappa et al., 2005, 2007).

### *Chapter Summary*

From all appearances, the proliferation of extended campuses and contingent faculty will not abate for the foreseeable future. If that is so, my research is both timely and relevant and it is made even more so because of the complete lack of attention to either topic in the professional literature. There may be an occasional article addressing extended campus operations, but the scholarship generally addresses campus extensions where the configuration includes full-time, tenured faculty (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). Articles written on contingent faculty overwhelmingly address their use and performance at an institution's home campus. Literature on the use of contingent faculty at extended campuses is virtually non-existent.

Gappa et al.'s (2005, 2007) work on the elements of faculty life should produce data that are current, relevant and grounded in solid practice. It is my desire that this mix of just-in-time and practical information will resonate well with higher education practitioners who could use my findings to enhance the teaching and learning environments at their extended campuses.

I believe my research of contingent faculty in extended campus environments will examine a "community of difference" (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). I think my research will likely reveal a community who contributes to the goals of higher education, but also a community whose wants, needs and

expectations are markedly different from other academic communities in more traditional college and university settings. An understanding of this community is important because that understanding can potentially shape how contingent faculty are supported and ultimately how they perform in their teaching assignments within their institutions.

In the succeeding chapter, Review of Related Literature, I will expand on the definitions of the Essential Elements of Faculty Work that constitute the framework for my research and help organize my exploration of contingent faculty life. Because my research will focus on the higher education at extended campuses, I will provide an overview of that teaching and learning venue and, for comparison, describe the more traditional academic setting in the section called Academic Life. I will try to depict the diversity of the population of contingent faculty by sharing a variety of taxonomies that have been used to describe this part of our teaching corps. My research will undoubtedly examine different aspects of contingent faculty terms of employment. To provide a basis of comparison I will share some history and current viewpoints on the practice of tenure. These topics will provide a firm basis of knowledge for my research.

## Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature

### *Introduction*

Conley and Leslie (2002) described the dearth of information regarding higher education contingent faculty:

What is perhaps surprising to some is that we have very little historical information about the characteristics of part-time faculty overall and that we have even less information about the similarities and differences among part-time faculty members and between part-time and full-time faculty in general (Introduction section, para. 2).

This void is even more acute when you consider only the realm of extended campuses (Rudolph, 1990). The primary reason I have focused my research on faculty at extended campuses is that there is virtually no research on the topic. In fact, to date, I have found nothing that directly addresses the issues of contingent faculty at extended campuses. To provide a context for the problem, in this chapter I will provide a review of the literature related to my research topic. I will examine the professional literature areas of: the taxonomy of contingent faculty; academic life; branch and extended campus operations; tenure, the gold standard of faculty employment; and expanded definitions and background on the Essential Elements of Faculty Work (Gappa et al., 2007).

### *Taxonomy of Contingent Faculty*

In 1978, Howard Tuckman tried to typify the composition of the contingent faculty. He developed a taxonomy that included such members as: semi-retireds; graduate students; hopeful full-timers; full-mooners; homeworkers; part-mooners; and part-unknowners. Tuckman's semi-retireds were former full-time faculty members or working professionals who had a desire to do some college teaching

but who had no aspiration for full-time employment. Graduate students, as the name implies, are graduate students who supplemented their income and gained teaching experience as contingent faculty at institutions other than the one in which they were pursuing their degree. Hopeful full-timers was Tuckman's name for those who desired full-time employment as a faculty member but had yet to achieve that goal. They most often were piecing together their income teaching at several institutions. Full-mooners were employed full-time in a profession other than college teaching and taught sparingly to supplement income or for the intrinsic value of teaching. Homeworkers generally had responsibilities as a caregiver in their home. They taught when their caregiver duties allowed them to do so and their income from teaching was often a supplement to their spouses' or partners' income. Tuckman's part-mooners combined their teaching with less than full-time employment in another field. Their compensation as a contingent faculty member and their pay from other part-time employment comprised their total income. The reasons for this combination were many. Tuckman's research left him with nearly 12 percent of his respondents in a vague category he called part-unknowners. This group's reasons for teaching part-time were unknown, transitory or highly subjective.

Fifteen years later, Gappa and Leslie (1993) modified or renamed some of Tuckman's (1978) categories into four groups. They arranged the contingent faculty population into groups called career enders; specialists, experts and professionals; aspiring academics; and freelancers.

Gappa and Leslie (1993) renamed Tuckman's (1978) semiretireds, the career enders, and broadened the category slightly. They expanded the group to include individuals who are already fully retired and those who are in transition from established careers, more often outside of the academy, and were presently making time for college teaching. Tuckman's full-mooners became Gappa and Leslie's specialist, expert or professional. This subset seems to be populated by faculty members driven by a passion for college teaching rather than income. They were generally fully employed in their chosen profession but chose to share their expertise in their field with college students. They taught specialty courses within their discipline or they taught broader survey courses. Gappa and Leslie added a touch of glamour to the hopeful full-timers and have anointed them, aspiring academics. This group, as the name implies, aspires to be fully engaged in an academic career. This may not mean teaching full-time. Gappa and Leslie clearly point out this distinction. The aspiring academic may merely desire to be fully included in the academic culture. They may only be seeking the prestige and the collegial contact of the professoriate. Others in this category are truly doing whatever it may take as a part-timer to position themselves for a full-time teaching position. Aspiring academics include those contingent faculty members who are teaching for multiple institutions to piece together a career and a viable income while they wait for a full-time position to be offered. This category also includes those who truly desire a full academic career but are not mobile because of ties to a spouse's career or other family commitments that leave them geographically bound and less able to pursue their own career opportunities.

Gappa and Leslie aggregated Tuckman's part-unknowners, part-mooners and homeworkers into the more common term of freelancer. Although consolidating to a single moniker, they broadened the category to include contingent faculty whose careers are comprised of all their part-time jobs, only one of which is college teaching. The freelancers teach sparingly by choice and do not seek full-time academic employment.

The following paragraph from Gappa and Leslie (1993) is a snapshot of the diversity among the contingent faculty who are responsible for a significant amount of college instruction in this country. Gappa and Leslie write of a subset of their interviews:

Of the forty-four part-time faculty members we interviewed, eight were otherwise unemployed (four of these by choice), six were self-employed in their own businesses, six had other full-time jobs at the same institution, five were teaching elsewhere, five were retired, three were artists, three had corporate jobs, three were graduate students, two were musicians, two were state government administrators, and one reported that he was a starving poet and massage therapist (p. 49).

More recently, Berger and Kirshstein (2001) further collapsed the taxonomy of contingent faculty to two groups, careerists and moonlighters. For the careerist, their part-time higher education teaching career was their primary employment source. They forged a strong relationship with an institution that met most of the employment needs. The moonlighters had primary employment outside of college teaching. Their part-time teaching assignments were something they pursued for myriad reasons other than primary employment.

## *Academic Life*

Before I can examine the nuances of the extended campus environment, I will establish what academic culture is like for faculty members across the spectrum of higher education institutions, from research universities, both public and private, to two-year community colleges. As one might imagine, life for faculty members differs dramatically based on where one works. Some of the variety found is captured by scholar Ernest Boyer, writing in the foreword of Burton Clark's (1987) *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Boyer, in summarizing Clark's work, said that he found in academe few universal truths. To Boyer there seems to be an exception to virtually every common practice. This seems particularly true in how college faculty members spend their time. Boyer reports faculty time seems to be contingent on such inconstant factors as the types of institutions where they teach, their mix of academic disciplines, their academic rank, the amount of time spent in collegial interaction and their degree of involvement in campus decision making. In short, Boyer sees a profession consisting of many professions and a blending of many similarities and just as many differences in a uniquely American way.

Clark (1987) himself provided an even broader view of academic life and the American higher education system. He suggests that American higher education is simultaneously under-organized in some respects and over-organized in others. We have no national education ministry and no formal system of control. Each state exerts a certain amount of control that varies from state to state. Institutions submit to membership in regional accrediting bodies

and participate in a variety professional organizations (Clark, 1987; Rudolph, 1990).

Reflecting on earlier times, Clark (1987) describes academic life prior to World War II as an idyllic place. The faculty had “crawled out from under the dominance of trustees and administrators” (p. 259) and were firmly in control of higher education. They were free to research and teach as they saw fit to a small and privileged class of college students. The student bodies were kept artificially small by cost and admissions standards that few could achieve. Stanley Katz (2006) supported Clark’s take on faculty life in days gone by. He believed the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was a distinctive period for the professoriate. The time was characterized by a small and but fairly coherent group of scholars educated at a select few leading universities, committed both to one another and to the colleges and universities where they practiced their craft.

Whether those days were truly idyllic or not, times have changed dramatically in higher education (Clark, 1997). Joan Hirt (2006), in her book, *Where You Work Matters*, accounted for some of the lack of standardization in higher education when she identified the different types of colleges and universities across the country. Although the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Carnegie Foundation, 2005) has technical categories for different institutions, most of us are familiar with these more general types by the terminology that Hirt offered: liberal arts institutions, religiously affiliated campuses, comprehensive universities, research universities,



historically black colleges and universities, community colleges, and Hispanic-serving institutions.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) offer three different perspectives of the culture in academe. They provide a conservative view, a liberal humanist view and a critical postmodernist view of the contemporary academy. The conservative position is that professors who were radical students of the 1960s now have control of the academy. Roger Kimball (1990; 1998) from his editions of the controversial book, *Tenured Radicals: How Politics has Corrupted our Higher Education*, described what Tierney and Bensimon saw as the conservative view of the academy. Kimball (1990) wrote of the professoriate that:

The truth is that when the children of the Sixties received their professorships and deanships they did not abandon the dream of radical cultural transformation; they set out to implement it. Now, instead of disrupting classes, they are teaching them; instead of attempting to destroy our educational institutions physically, they are subverting them from within. Thus it is what were once the political and educational ambitions of academic renegades now appear as ideals on the agenda of the powers that be (pp. 166-167).

The conservatives' view was further captured in 1984 by then Secretary of Education, William Bennett. Bennett described higher education as being out of step with society and having lost its sense of purpose (as cited in Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Of the faculty, he said they taught their subjects in an ideological manner (as cited in Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The focus on ideology was a key indictment by the conservatives. They characterized their radical colleagues as ideological and disengaged intellectuals who preferred to conduct esoteric research rather than teach undergraduate courses. The conservatives described faculty as misanthropes who preferred to remain alone

and aloof to develop obscure theories that are ideologically tainted (Sykes, 1988; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The conservatives even placed some of the blame of rising costs of higher education on their radical comrades. They believed that the costs of questionable research are borne by the student in higher tuition.

The conservatives charged that even the sacrosanct concept of academic freedom was damaged by leftist faculty. Junior faculty who did not walk the correct ideological line in their teaching and research were in grave peril of attaining tenure. The conservatives' rhetoric received considerable notoriety in the press and even the halls of Congress, but had the least support in the academy (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Their position failed to be a rallying cry somewhat because they were equally guilty of the shortcomings they decried. They accused radicals of replacing a value-neutral curriculum with a politically correct one that was tainted by their ideologies. However, the conservatives themselves were unable admit that their own ideas were ideologically tainted (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

The liberal humanist view of academic life lacked the accusatory tone of the conservatives and therefore made it more palatable to the bulk of the professoriate (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The liberal humanists held that higher education had long been, and continues to be, devoted to the life of the mind (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). In this view, the functions of research, teaching and service are still the bedrock of faculty work. The liberal humanists perceived the relationship between the academy and society had always been tenuous and they believed that conditions were unlikely to change. Although they

acknowledged that tension is not healthy or productive, the liberal humanist believed that scholars need distance from everyday life in order to address intellectual issues while shouldering the responsibility to provide creative solutions to social and environmental problems (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Unlike their conservative colleagues who wish for academic life to be maintained as they perceive it used to be, the liberal humanists were content to preserve critical core values, such as academic freedom, while adapting to the needs of society (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). This more centrist view resonated well with a large portion of the faculty. Drawing on the research of Eugene Rice (1996) that he would later publish, Ernest Boyer (1990) in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, offered the research mission in higher education had become a problem. Even though original research is an important product of academe and is central to the mission of some institutions, it created a shadow over the entire higher higher learning enterprise. Boyer argued the emphasis on undergraduate education had been overtaken by the European university tradition, which placed greater value on graduate education and research. Boyer accusingly stated, “the focus had moved from the student to the professorate, from general to specialized education and from loyalty to the campus to loyalty to the profession (pp. 12-13).

The nuclear arms and space races of the post Second World War era turned the focus of academic life to research (O’Meara & Rice, 2005; Rhoades, 2006; Rudolph, 1990). The survival of our way of life appeared to hinge on our research products and the government and society looked to colleges and

universities for the answers. Higher education responded well, but there has been collateral damage (Rhoades, 2006). Undergraduate teaching has suffered (Geiger, 1993; O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Rhoades, 2006). Research has become the primary scholarly activity. The rewards for research, in terms of financial incentive, versus those for teaching and service, were clearly evident.

Regardless of whether the faculty member was at a public research institution or a private liberal arts college, they derived greater fiscal rewards for conducting research than for teaching undergraduates (Fairweather, 1993; Kennedy, 2006; Rhoades, 2006). The liberal humanists cited a misaligned reward system for creating a condition where the undergraduate curriculum is taught primarily by graduate assistants. Faculty devoted most of their time to research rather than teaching. Senior faculty seldom taught undergraduates at all in lieu of exclusively teaching graduate students. Class sizes swelled as course sections were reduced so that faculty could spend more time on their research (Fogg, 2004; O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

There was also a critical postmodern view of academic culture. Where the conservatives pointed at the problem of leftist ideologues, like the liberal humanists, the critical postmodernists believed the problems in higher education were structural (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). This was a stance shared with the liberal humanists. However, there was a sharp contrast between the technical nature of structural woes identified by the liberal humanists, and the structural deficiencies cited by the critical postmodernists that are rooted in ideology and culture. The critical postmodernists held "ideology is the set of doctrines through

which those in an organization make sense of their own experience” (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996, p. 14). Culture was a product of social and ideological relations. It was neither handed down from generation to generation without problems, nor was it static. Academic culture evolved as new individuals enter the institution and are transformed by current contexts and social life (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Critical postmodernists supported the development of institutions in which interrelatedness and concern for others was the dominant theme. This implied a community that is de-normed. It was a community where differences of opinion were brought to light and documented, not simply for the sake of hearing multiple voices, but so the community might examine different ways of dealing with the problems of the academy (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Unified, consensual concepts of reality were rejected in favor of a climate where it was understood and accepted that different people and groups will always have competing concepts of reality. They rejected the idea that we can ever understand ultimate “T”ruth through reason; instead, truth was considered fleeting and transitory and subject to many, diverse interpretations (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The challenge for the critical postmodernists was to find ways within the academy to accommodate myriad points of view and create a climate in which individuals would truly set aside their parochial views and embrace true organizational change (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The critical postmodernists suggest that “communities of difference” exist in academe and they believe these differences

are good and healthy for higher education and that differences should not be suppressed (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

### *Extended Campuses*

The picture of colleges and universities as a cluster of ivy covered stone buildings in a primarily pastoral setting where faculty and students stroll through manicured grounds as they transit from offices and residence halls to classrooms buildings is one that has faded with time. Although that picture still exists and is a pleasant scene, a great number of degree seeking students have a different college experience. College students today, especially adult learners, attend classes in a wide variety of settings that look nothing like Dartmouth or Mount Holyoke. Their classrooms may be in a 25 story building conveniently located off the intersection of two interstate highways. They may take classes in a leased strip-mall store-front facility; this building's main redeeming feature may be that it is conveniently located near the students' workplace or home. The classroom may be rented from a local high school to take advantage of rooms that already have whiteboards and audio-visual equipment. Certain subsets of students may attend classes in facilities provided by their employer (Meister, 1998, 2001). Such employers range from state and federal government agencies, to the military, and from moderate-sized companies to huge corporations (Blumenstyk, 2006; Meister, 2001). In other instances, a host college or university may lease or own a stand-alone building or buildings with the sole purpose of housing its administrative and teaching functions of its extended campus. Even in this

model, the buildings are generally selected for their perceived convenience for student access and any regard for the aesthetics of the setting is secondary.

Just as the physical setting of classrooms for extended campus programs can vary, so can the operational makeup of the campus. There are infinite numbers of combinations of types of facilities and arrangements of administrators and faculty used in extended campus operations.

In an effort to somewhat narrow the type of campus germane to the current study, I will share a description used by Fonseca and Bird (2006) in a presentation to the National Association of Branch Campus Administrators. They shared the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) actually has a definition of a branch campus, but in practice there is little consensus about the meaning of the term and the definition falls short of capturing the great diversity in type, structure and organization of branch campuses. CIHE defines a branch campus as an organization that is geographically separated from its parent main campus and meets all four of the following criteria: (a) it offers 50% or more of an academic program leading to a degree, certificate or other credential, or at which a degree can be completed; (b) is permanent in nature; (c) has its own faculty and administration and (4) has its own budgetary and hiring authority. Fonseca and Bird also share the U.S. National Center for Education Statistic's definition of a branch institution as one that is not temporary, is located in a community beyond commuting distance from its home campus and offers full programs of study, not just selected courses.

In sum, extended campuses are legitimate facilities operated by accredited institutions with the purpose of delivering significant parts of their academic programs. They are visually different from the institutions' home campuses. Few extended campuses offer the campus life aspects of residence and dining halls, student unions, recreation centers, and other non-academic facilities normally available to students in more *traditional* settings (Cunningham, 1999; Gabor & Heggan, 1995). In the extended campus business, form follows function. The facilities that are available are to house faculty and staff functions and provide classroom space and little else (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). One might surmise that these barebones facilities would fail to attract students. Such is not the case. The number of extended campus operations are growing rapidly (Fonseca & Bird, 2006; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). This growth is two-fold. The number of institutions that have extended campuses continues to increase as does the number of campuses hosted by each institution (Digranes & Digranes, 1999; Fonseca & Bird, 2006). However, the academic literature provides little in describing what extended campuses are and how they operate.

In 2001, Nickerson and Schaefer, in one of the very few published empirical studies of extended campuses, identified almost 1,100 different extended campuses that included community college, baccalaureate and graduate formats. Even with the obvious expansion of extended campus operations, they remain largely ignored in the academic literature (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). It is difficult to even gather an accurate list of extended campuses. Both rapid growth and the fact that the National Center for Education



Statistics stopped collecting separate extended campus statistics in 1986 have exacerbated the situation (Fonseca & Bird, 2006).

Another aspect of divergence between traditional home campuses and their extended campus counterparts is the make-up of the faculty. Regardless of the type of higher education institution, the faculty on traditional home campuses have a considerable body of full-time, tenure-track members (Cataldi, Fahimi & Bradburn, 2004). Yet, the current trend is away from faculties being comprised primarily of tenure-track faculty members and the increased use of contingent faculty. The *Almanac of the Chronicle of Higher Education* (2008) puts the percentage of tenure track and tenured faculty at 49.6% for all types of institutions, with the remainder employed as contingent. This shift is the grist for dozens of articles and hours upon hours of not-so-cordial discussion (Todd, 2004). Depending on the type of institution, the source referenced and the manner of data collection, contingent faculty are teaching at least one-third of all undergraduate courses each year (Baron-Nixon, 2007). The percentage will likely be at its lowest at small, liberal arts colleges and at its highest at community colleges (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001; Schmid & Herman, 2003).

Although Fonseca and Bird (2006) speak disparagingly of extended campuses that employ contingent faculty at the expense of full-time, tenure-track faculty, Nickerson and Schaefer's data reveal contingent faculty are a well-established part of the extended campus environment. They reported that 62% of the institutions that responded to their survey indicated contingent faculty were present in higher percentages at their extended campuses than at their home

campus. From this, it is possible that a very sizable body of faculty are employed at extended campuses, who are under-represented in the professional literature (Cunningham, 1999; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001).

A key question appears to be: why do extended campuses appear to be expanding in number at a time when, on the surface, technology appears to be replacing the need for physical locations (Carnevale, 2007; Diaz & Cartnal, 1999; Golden, 2006; *Trends in Adult Learning*, 2006)? Among possible answers is the fact that the vast majority of students are geographically restricted in their choice of colleges (Snyder, 2008). Statistics tell us that the vast majority of U.S. students attend college in their home state, most within a few hours' drive of home (Pearson, 2004). A good portion of these students are fundamentally place-bound. They are limited in their choice of colleges and universities by financial constraints, family responsibilities, personal characteristics, lifestyle choices and most often, multiple combinations of these factors (Pearson, 2004; Sandeen, 2004; *Trends in Adult Learning*, 2006). These students appear to desire education within a 30-minute commuting range, leading to much of the explosive demand for campus locations near their home or place of employment (Snyder, 2008; *Trends in Adult Learning*, 2006). In fact, Fonseca and Bird (2006) argue that extended campuses have helped to create much of the explosion in college attendance by adult learners as much as one could argue that these campuses exist because they are a response to increasing enrollment.

## *Tenure*

Any research on the staffing of faculty, regardless of where they might teach, must at least address the practice of tenure and how it fits into the higher education landscape. In general, tenure is an arrangement under which faculty have permanent or continuous appointments in which their service can be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of voluntary retirement, or under extraordinary circumstances because of institutional financial exigencies (Mallon, 2001). These appointments are granted after a probationary period that averages about 6 years. Candidates for tenure are generally judged by their peers on adequacy of teaching, research and service (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Keast & Macy, 1973; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). How these criteria are weighted varies dramatically based on institutional type and departmental mission (Chait, 2002). Tenure is conferred by the concurrence of top administrators and governing boards (Finkelstein & Schuster, 2001; Keast & Macy, 1973; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The practice of tenure is widespread. Seventy-five percent of full-time faculty teach on campuses with tenure policies. Almost all research universities (97%) and public four-year colleges (98%) offer tenure (Alstete, 2000).

Tenure provides faculty sufficient economic security to allow brilliant minds to intellectually explore without fear of retribution (Olswang, 2003). Tenure creates an atmosphere favorable to academic freedom for all faculty, regardless of faculty status (tenured; tenure track non-tenured; full-time, non-tenure track; contingent), because the tenured faculty form an independent body capable of

vigilant action to protect the academic freedom of their non-tenured colleagues (Caison, 2003; Keast & Macy, 1973; Mallon, 2001). Since tenure creates a long-term commitment of the faculty to the college or university, it contributes to institutional stability and esprit. Hence it promotes collegiality, joint responsibility for professional and institutional standards, and effective institutional governance (Keast & Macy, 1973; Plater, 2001). By forcing institutions to make tough decisions at a specific point in time (end of probationary period) to either grant tenure or not, the tenure system helps institutions sever bonds with faculty who are merely agreeable but not outstanding and who may otherwise be continued in employment out of generosity, empathy, friendship or worse yet, neglect (Keast & Macy; 1973). Tenure has an economic value that helps offset the generally lower financial rewards of a higher education career. This enables colleges and universities to compete for professional talent against better financed potential employers (Keast & Macy, 1973; Nixon, Helms, & Williams, 2001). Tenure ensures that employment cannot be severed to punish a faculty member for his or her exercise of independent research or relevant classroom speech, no matter how controversial. Tenure ensures that institutional due process, using a peer-review system, is available to adjudicate impending terminations. This due process guarantees that terminations are not punishments for the legitimate exercise of academic freedom (Olswang, 2003; Van Alstyne, 1994). Tenure provides a measure of job security for faculty. In some ways it serves as a proxy for active unions. Without tenure, faculty members may enlist

the help of unions to bolster their collective power in issues of compensation and job security (Nixon et al., 2001; O'Toole, 1994).

The preceding paragraph highlights some of the positive aspects of the practice of tenure. By many other accounts there are also significant drawbacks to the use of tenure as a system of faculty employment (Caison, 2003). There are dozens of books and hundreds of articles that catalog the battles over the pluses and minuses of tenure (Huer, 1991; Mallon, 2001). These battles constituted a cold war until about 20 years ago when the publication of Sykes' (1988) *Profscam* ignited a fiery controversy. Other books, such as Kimball's (1990) *Tenured Radicals* and Smith's (1990) *Killing the Spirit* and numerous popular press articles of that period poured fuel on the fire (Mallon, 2001). These works advocated for large scale change in how business is conducted in higher education and a complete reassessment of the basic professorial functions of teaching, research and service. The issue of tenure was certainly center stage during these attacks. These conflicts continue to simmer and create a source of continuous tension between administrators and faculty (Caison, 2003; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

I will mention only one of the charges made by tenure's detractors. Tenure is a viable system of faculty employment and if applied to hiring practices in extended campus situations, would likely work quite well (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). However, one negative aspect of tenure cannot be ignored in any discussion of faculty hiring practices at extended campuses. That aspect is cost. Full-time, tenured faculty can cost more than three times as much to employ as contingent

faculty (Schneider, 2004). This differential is primarily driven by the costs of health insurance, retirement contributions, matching social security and other non-salary forms of compensation that many contingent faculty do not receive (Schneider, 2004). Since most institutions opened extended campuses for revenue generation purposes rather than some altruistic reason, the cost of the faculty is a key issue (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). If the cost of faculty can be minimized while still delivering quality academic programs then the institution benefits (Schneider, 2004). However, the employment arrangement for contingent faculty may create an inhospitable work climate where the contributions of the faculty seem marginalized and unappreciated (Hart, 2010).

#### *Essential Elements of Faculty Work*

To guide my research and serve as a conceptual framework, I plan to use the Essential Elements of Faculty Work Model developed by Gappa, Austin and Trice (2005; 2007) and detailed in their book, *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative*. Their model previewed in the November / December 2005 issue of *Change* magazine. Gappa et al.'s work was inspired by work done by Baxter Healthcare Corporation in 1997. Gappa et al. agreed with the Baxter model in that the *entitlement* of respect must be present for any of the *benefits* in the Gappa et al. model to matter to faculty members.

#### *Academic Freedom*

The concept of academic freedom as practiced in the United States has its beginnings in Europe in the nineteenth century (Rudolph, 1990). There, the Germans advocated for the concept of *lehrfreiheit*, which meant that a professor

was free to examine bodies of evidence and to report findings in the lecture hall or in print; that professors should enjoy freedom of teaching and freedom of inquiry. This concept became important to faculty because of the controversy over evolution in the 1870s (Rudolph, 1990). Darwin's theory created two factions and often faculty members' jobs were at stake if their views on evolution and creation differed from key university administrators (Mallon, 2001; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996, Alstete, 2000; Olswang, 2003). In the U.S., concerns over the security of the professoriate manifested itself in the creation of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915 by 18 full professors at Johns Hopkins University. The AAUP grew during the 1920s and 1930s, and along with the Association of American Colleges (AAC), became the joint framers of the *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. To the present, this is the pivotal and oft cited document on the subject of academic freedom (Huer, 1991).

Academic freedom, as defined by the AAUP and supported by numerous court decisions, is the right of faculty to research, report, and teach anything they perceive to be appropriate and in a manner of their choosing. This concept was deemed by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1967 as a "special concern of the First Amendment," the amendment that insures freedom of speech (Baez & Centra, 1995) and a protected property interest under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Baez & Centra, 1995; Olswang, 2003).

Academic freedom is somewhat romanticized, but otherwise appropriately described by the late Yale University president, Kingman Brewster, Jr. when he said,

If the university is alive and productive it is a place where colleagues are in constant dialogue; defending their latest intellectual enthusiasm, attacking the contrary views of others...It is vital that this context be uninhibited by fear of reprisal (as cited in Mallon, 2001, p. 18).

Mallon further described academic freedom using Adams' (1974) words, "freedom to follow untried trails and to explore the frontiers of knowledge without fear of dismissal before the task can be finished" (p. 18). These descriptions of academic freedom create a vision of the university environment that is a foundation of American higher education (Mallon, 2001; Rudolph, 1990). It would be hard to imagine our system of colleges and universities if academic freedom did not exist.

Gappa et al. (2007) concisely define this important concept by saying, "academic freedom encompasses the norms and values that protect each faculty member's freedom of intellectual expression and inquiry" (p. 226). In most extended campuses contingent faculty scenarios, the freedom of expression is much more relevant than the freedom of inquiry since most appointments focus solely on teaching and not on research (Berger & Kirshstein, 2001). Contingent faculty members, as all faculty, must be free to express the truth as they see it. They must have the right to teach without the imposition or fear of institutional sanction for the political, religious or ideological views they may share in the classroom (Gappa, 2007). Academic freedom does not mean the freedom to say anything that one wants. There is a limiting factor of respect for the dignity of



students and maintenance of a non-hostile classroom environment (Gappa et al., 2007). Although there are volumes written on academic freedom, for the purposes of my research, the critical element of academic freedom is addressed above. Even contingent faculty must be free to express themselves freely in their classrooms.

### *Collegiality*

Regardless of where they teach or the terms of their employment, faculty members habitually refer to one another as colleagues (Lyons, 2007). The idea of being part of a “collegium of scholars,” all working together toward the common good of higher education is historically embedded in academe (Gappa et al., 2007; Pelikan, 1992). Collegiality is far more than just a nostalgic notion in higher education. The concept of collegiality is part of the foundation for the academic workplace. Collegiality refers to opportunities for faculty members, wherever they serve their institution, to feel that they belong to a mutually respectful community of scholars (Gappa et al., 2007). Faculty members who feel they are a part of the academic community in explicit, implicit and symbolic ways truly feel they belong and are professionally respected (Gappa et al., 2007; Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin, 2000). This sense of belonging is likely to enhance workplace satisfaction and overall morale (Rice et al., 2000). There is research that suggests faculty who feel connected to their colleges and universities are more likely to want to remain (Burnstad & Gadberry, 2005; Church, 2000; Lyon, 2007). Therefore collegial interactions and the workplace satisfaction that accompanies it tend to strengthen the institution overall (Gappa et al., 2007).

Collegiality is far more than a matter of sociability. It is a professional, not personal, criterion that can be used to describe both the academic workplace and the individuals that comprise the faculty (Gappa et al., 2007). The challenge is to create a collegial environment in which faculty members value each other for their unique contributions to the institution. This feeling needs to be generated for all, regardless of employment and appointment status. When this occurs it contributes to the overall intellectual vitality of the institution (Gappa et al., 2007; Rice et al., 2000).

To create a collegial environment for contingent faculty members there is a need to go well beyond providing opportunities for social contact with the full-time faculty (Burnstad, 2000; Lyons, 2007). The challenge is to at least provide the option for contingent faculty to participate in the decision-making and governance processes of their academic departments and the institution (Berry, 2005; Dubson, 2001). Frequently, contingent faculty are employed outside academe in professional organizations. They can offer a great deal in current practical perspective in their disciplines (Berry, 2005; Dubson, 2001; Gappa et al., 2007).

### *Equity*

The preponderance of institutions using extended campus formats use single academic term appointments, whereby the faculty, most of whom are hired on a contingent basis, are paid for the teaching of that term only (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). All contingent faculty members at that institution are generally compensated the same for teaching a prescribed course or number of credit

hours (Schneider, 2004). Moreover, as Gappa et al. (2007) point out, equitable treatment does not mean identical treatment. Rather, equitable treatment means each faculty member is treated fairly after differences among faculty appointment types are taken into account. Tenured faculty members should be treated fairly with respect to other tenured faculty members and contingent faculty members should be treated fairly with respect to other contingent faculty members. You can clearly debate the quality of the treatment of the contingent faculty (Hart, 2010), but because there is so little research about the specific practices at extended campuses, it is hard to substantiate the equity situation in that environment.

### *Flexibility*

For better or worse, contingent faculty have almost infinite flexibility (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; 1997). The teaching assignments they choose to accept can be balanced with other professional and personal demands. Since most contingent faculty teaching opportunities range from 5 to 16 week academic terms (Fulton, 2000; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001), a great deal of scheduling flexibility is afforded. Although they are in the minority (Hoyt et al., 2008), those contingent faculty who are trying to piece together full-time employment with part-time teaching assignments may have much less flexibility. For this group their options may be limited as they weave teaching appointments at several institutions together into a very inflexible schedule. Out of fiscal necessity they are forced to accept teaching assignments when they present themselves and not based on the other demands of their lives (Fulton, 2000).

### *Professional Growth*

Few things are more dynamic than the profession of college teaching (Lyons, McIntosh, & Kysilka, 2003; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Wehlburg & Chadwick-Blossey, 2003). Faculty, regardless of their employment condition with their college or university, are faced with staying abreast of new knowledge in their discipline and in pedagogy; adapting to the changes in the student population; learning to use new technologies and coming to grips with new expectations from a variety of stakeholders that include students, parents, employers, accrediting bodies and legislators (Gappa, et al. 2007). These demands require faculty to continually grow in their teaching careers (Lyons et al., 2003; Wehlburg & Chadwick-Blossey, 2003).

Faculty development programs and opportunities for broad professional growth began to appear on campuses in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Gappa et al., 2007; Millis, 1994). These programs looked at many aspects of improving the academy and especially focused on undergraduate teaching. In addition to funds generated by the individual colleges and universities, professional growth money became available from a wide variety of public and private benefactors such as the Danforth Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

Some programs focused on the faculty member as a teaching scholar (Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Millis, 1994). They tried to assist the faculty member in

learning more about the teaching profession and instructional skills. They helped the faculty members better understand the learning needs of their students. The programs provided opportunities to gain feedback on their own teaching so they could adapt and improve. Evolving information on human learning and cognition were often part of the development curricula (Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Millis, 1994).

Other programs focused on the instructional process (Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Millis, 1994). They assisted faculty in establishing specific educational objectives for their courses. In an attempt to use new knowledge of student learning, these programs helped faculty design alternative learning experiences. They assisted faculty in the fledgling stages of outcomes assessment and provided opportunities to incorporate a variety of media into their courses (Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Millis, 1994).

Although professional growth opportunities have increased in number and expanded in focus over the past three decades, the needs and desires of many faculty members are still not met (Gappa et al., 2007). For one reason or another, time constraints prevent faculty members from taking advantage of professional development programs (Sorcinelli et al., 2006). These constraints may be from the sheer magnitude of the demands on their time or it may be that program offerings are not available when faculty members are also available. Some programs still lag behind in addressing some of the newest demands such as teaching online and serving the needs of a rapidly changing diverse student population (Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

Virtually any difficulty faced by developers and coordinators of professional growth programs is exacerbated when they attempt to provide professional development offerings to contingent faculty (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Gappa et al., 2007). This is even more true when the contingent faculty are located at an extended campus. Even with the best intentions, delivery of professional growth programs to campuses far from an institution's home campus becomes a daunting task (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001).

### *Chapter Summary*

The last two decades of the twentieth century demonstrated contingent faculty have become a permanent part of the higher education workforce. The National Surveys of Postsecondary Faculty in 1993, 1999, and 2004 put the percentage of contingent faculty in the institutions surveyed at 42%, 43% and 44% respectively (Berger & Kirshstein, 2001; Cataldi, Fahimi & Bradburn, 2004; Conley & Leslie, 2002; Schneider, 2004). It appears that contingent faculty comprise just under half of the higher education teaching corps. The latest figures available from the U.S. Department of Education put the percentage of contingent faculty at 47.6 percent (Snyder, Dillow & Hoffman, 2008). Certainly the numbers and percentages vary across different types of institutions. For many institutions, the practice of hiring contingent faculty began as an administrative policy that offered a convenient way of meeting the demands for instruction while maintaining cost effectiveness during tight budgetary times (Schneider, 2004). As can be seen from the statistics above, the hiring of contingent faculty now has become a more permanent strategy for colleges and

universities and one that has made part-timers a substantial group among the professoriate that is unlikely to change (Anthony & Valadez, 2002; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

The contingent faculty problem is well-worn ground in higher education. Everyone knows the conventional wisdom: Contingent faculty are cheap labor, they get treated poorly by their institutions, they have little contact with the wider university and they are not on campus long enough to help students. In general, the thinking goes: the growing use of contingents is destroying much of what once made an academic career special (Smallwood, 2001).

The passion for this issue is evident by the following piece by James Todd (2004). Writing 4 years after his retirement from a tenured career in academe, his disdain for the use of contingent faculty is unmistakable as he writes:

The extensive use of adjuncts in place of tenure-track positions reflects a crisis in higher education. The policy not only demeans the professoriate, it also erodes the process of shared governance in colleges and universities, promotes faculty inequity, undermines institutional allegiance and faculty morale, eliminates common standards for professional responsibilities and working conditions, and perhaps worst of all, by creating an atmosphere of arbitrary procedures and chronic job insecurity, it destroys the intellectual and creative self-confidence of professors that is central to the integrity of any college or university (p. 17).

Todd's (2004) disdain for the practice of using contingent faculty is not unique and is clearly shared by his more senior colleagues. However, Todd and his like-minded comrades seem to ignore several facts that mediate his attack. As evidenced by the percentages shown above, contingent faculty are now, for better or worse, a permanent part of the total faculty. I can find nothing in the professional literature that suggests this situation will change. The fiscal impact

would be too great on institutions already besieged by rising costs and uncertain income. Todd also makes the flawed assumption that everyone seeks from a faculty career the things he sought, such as prestige, comfortable salary, benefits and job security. It cannot be denied that these things are generally desirable, but Todd assumes that is what everyone wants and that just is not the case (Fogg, 2004; Wilson, 1998). Our society and the academy are markedly different from how they were when he embarked on his career (Clark, 1987; 1997). Two income households and employment mobility are just two factors of societal change that make contingent faculty positions desirable for college teachers of the twenty-first century (Gappa et al., 2007; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). As a family's primary bread-winner climbs the career ladder and moves from location to location, the partner is often excited about the opportunity to teach on a part-time basis at a college or university near their new home (Berger & Kirshstein, 2001; Conley & Leslie, 2002; Fogg, 2004; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Smallwood, 2001). The faculty that Todd fondly remembers was primarily a white men's club (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The greater use of contingent faculty has had the unintended, but important, result of exposing our undergraduate students to a much more diverse body of teachers. In gender, race, ethnicity, religion and age, our faculty is more diverse than in times past, particularly among contingent faculty (Berger & Kirshstein, 2001; Conley & Leslie, 2002).

Many argue that a core of full-time faculty is necessary at colleges and universities as the foundation for the institution. This core does provide the continuity necessary to maintain institutional integrity and curricular consistency



(Gappa, et al., 2007; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). However, Todd's (2004) belief that the employment conditions he sought in his career are necessary for the health of the academy and desirable for all those who wish to teach today are just not founded in fact (see Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

My research in no way will attempt to solve the perceived crisis Todd (2004) presents. I expect this debate will continue for some time. I accept the many reports that contingent faculty are both numerous and are here to stay (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Gappa et al., 2007; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Those two things being true, it would seem that more research effort should be expended to examine the world of contingent faculty to determine what measures can be taken to enhance workplace conditions for contingent faculty and, in turn, enhance the learning environment of our college classrooms.

In *Chapter 3: Methods*, I will discuss the case study method. My data collection techniques will be discussed. This section will include discussion of my role as a researcher, context development, sampling, interviewing and observation. I will describe my plan for data analysis and how I intend to address questions of trustworthiness and credibility. Finally, I will revisit some of the limitations of my research.

## Chapter 3: Methods

### *Introduction*

This chapter details how I plan to explore the life of faculty members at extended campuses. I want to better understand the context of their environment guided by the Essential Elements of Faculty Work model (Gappa et al., 2005) described in the previous chapters. Specifically, the research question I seek to answer is: *Guided by the Essential Elements of Faculty Work how do contingent faculty perceive their environment at extended campuses?*

### *Design*

#### *Case Study Method*

In general, a case study is a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, a single depository of documents, or one particular event (Yin, 2003). Although that general description focuses on the singular, case studies do lend themselves to situations where researchers examine two or more subjects, settings or depositories of data (Stake, 1997; 2000), as will be the case in my study.

The general design of a case study can be represented by a funnel (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The start of the study is the wide end. As Bogdan and Biklen (1998) describe researchers look for possible places and categories or groups of people that might be the subject or source of data, find the location they think they want to study and then search widely trying to judge the feasibility of the site or data source for their purposes. They look for clues on how they might proceed and what might be feasible to do. They begin to collect data,

simultaneously reviewing them, and making decisions about where to go with the research. They decide how to distribute their time, who to interview, and what to explore in depth. Researchers may discard old ideas and plans and develop new ones based on their preliminary work. They continually modify the design and choose procedures as they learn more about the topic of study. In time, they make specific decisions on what aspect of the setting, subject, or data source they will study. Their work finally develops a focus. Research and interview questions are formulated. The data collection and research activities narrow to particular sites, subjects, materials, topics, questions and themes. From broad exploratory beginnings, the case study process moves to more directed data collection and analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The analysis phase of a case study, like most qualitative methods, is not linear and generally occurs in several cyclical, overlapping phases (Leedy, 1997).

The case study is the preferred strategy when *how* or *why* questions are being posed. The study can be explanatory, exploratory or descriptive (Gall, et al., 2007; Yin, 2003). My case study will be primarily exploratory and because my study attempts to answer a “how” question (*How do contingent faculty perceive their environment at extended campuses?*), the use of an explanatory element is also appropriate (Yin, 2003).

Two primary conditions need to exist for a case study. The researcher must have minimal control over the behavioral events and the focus must be on contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context (Yin, 2003).

Creswell (1994, 2003) further describes the case study method as an:

exploration of a single entity or phenomenon (the case) bounded by time and activity (a program, event, process, institution or social group), wherein a researcher collects detailed information by using a variety of data collection procedures during a sustained period of time (p. 12; p. 15).

The case study has its historical roots in medicine and law, but has become a mainstay of educational research (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 2003).

Stake (2000) also points out that when illuminating the purpose of a case study, the researchers should be sure to answer the question, why would a constituent population want a particular remedy or body of knowledge derived from the research? This refers to why this research would be of interest to the target audience. The research I propose is important for two broad reasons. There are multiple stakeholders who could benefit from this research and the conditions that exist in higher education will likely increase the size of the environment in which results of this research could be transferred. The stakeholders of this issue are many and varied. They include the colleges and universities themselves and higher education in general. They include individuals such as students, parents, partners, employers and, of course, the contingent faculty members. If this research could lead to improvements in the work life of contingent faculty at extended campuses, all these stakeholders would benefit. Additionally, there is no indication in the higher education literature, or from my daily observation of the higher and continuing education environment, to suggest any retrenchment in the proliferation of the extended campus phenomenon or the use of contingent faculty (Fonseca & Bird, 2006). Therefore, any best practices recommended by this research will enjoy an ever-growing audience over time.

The processes of case study research involve prolonged engagement and persistent observation (Yin, 2003). Researchers and respondents often share the same environment and the same backgrounds (Creswell, 2003; Gall et al., 2007). Data collection can be in the form of words (e.g., interviews, questionnaires), images or physical objects. In some cases, quantitative data, such as achievement test scores or census figures, are incorporated into the research to provide more depth and a technique to enhance trustworthiness by triangulating data sources (Yin, 2003).

### *Site Selection*

I conducted my research at extended campuses of a nearly 160 year-old institution. This institution is located west of the Mississippi and got its start in the mid-nineteenth century, like so many of its counterparts, as a private, single-sex college. It would remain that way for nearly 120 years when changes in enrollment patterns and economic realities forced it to be more entrepreneurial and look for ways to increase enrollments beyond its base of traditional aged students (Board of Trustees Report, 1969). Fortunately, several societal dynamics were in play that opened the doors for this institution to flourish. First, the end of the Vietnam War shifted the attention of the military from the conduct of day-to-day combat operations to training and educating a peace-time, Cold War force. College credit quickly replaced combat tours as the measure of merit for promotion for enlisted soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines (Kime, 2003). Led by the example of the University of Maryland University College, a handful of higher education institutions joined forces with the military to provide on-base,

off-duty higher education. The host institution for my research was one of those institutions and here forward will be referred to by the pseudonym, Great Plains University. Those institutions have continued to serve the military college student population through the Cold War, Operation Desert Storm and the War on Terror.

That nearly 40 year period has been a time of great change for the military in many respects but the changes that have most impacted their higher education partners has been: the major reduction in forces following the collapse of the Warsaw Pact nations and the end of hostilities after Operation Desert Storm; the closing of dozens of military installations through the congressionally enacted Base Reduction and Closure (BRAC) Act; and the high operations tempo of military forces after the attack on the World Trade Centers in September 2001 resulting in the War on Terror that continues today (Kime, 2003). This final dynamic was exacerbated by the intervening invasion of Iraq and the continued relative small size of the active military force structure.

My intent here is not to give a long lesson on military voluntary education and the colleges and universities that support it. My intent is to show how Great Plains University developed an extended campus network with the hundreds of contingent faculty they have today. From their relationship with the military, their presence on bases around the country grew over a period from the early 1970s to the mid-1990s. However, BRAC actions began to close bases across the country and consolidate military resources in lower-cost areas. Great Plains University and its military education colleague institutions were forced out of their rent-free facilities on bases and left to decide whether to buy or lease facilities on

the local economy or surrender their academic foothold in the area. Institutions went both directions all over the country (Hudgins, 2000; Kime, 2003).

In some cases they stayed and found property that they could either purchase or lease and continued to offer their educational programs. Based on the economic realities of current program size, loss of military population, projections for the future and cost of obtainable square footage, they chose to abandon some of their operations in that area. Fortunately, the BRAC process was slow enough it provided sufficient lead-time that the institutions could inform students of their intentions. In addition, plans could be made to not accept any new students and begin *teaching-out* the current students to complete their degree programs or broker transfers to institutions remaining in the area.

The events discussed above influenced Great Plains University. The institution continued to operate in some areas. In a small number of cases, they decided that remaining in the area was not economically feasible. Two of the three extended campuses where I gathered my research data reflect the institution's decision to lease facilities in the local area that would accommodate their operations. In one case, a military installation in the greater mountain west was closed. At the time of the closing, the extended campus of Great Plains University had been on the local military installation for nearly 20 years. They chose to remain. From here forward, this campus will be referred to as the Mountain Campus.

A similar situation occurred in the Chicago metropolitan area. A major military facility closed and the institution decided to acquire facilities in the heavily

populated corridor along Lake Michigan between Chicago and Milwaukee, WI. This campus will be referred to as the Lake Campus.

The third campus I visited for my research did not spring from the military model. The institution in this case found a large metropolitan area along the Mississippi River and located a campus in easy reach of a sizable population of working adults not served by other institutions. This campus will be referred to as the River Campus.

### *Data Collection*

The use of the case study will allow me to delve deep into the world of contingent faculty at extended campuses to learn about their worklife experiences. I will draw my data from three different extended campuses. The campuses I choose will vary demographically. One will be in a large city, one in a suburban ring around a huge metropolitan area and the third will come from a suburb of a moderate size city. Since this is primarily an exploratory case study this diversity in location should give a broader perspective of contingent faculty at extended campuses. I intend to observe contingent faculty in their classrooms and conduct semi-structured interviews with contingent faculty members. My questioning will be guided by faculty desires from the Essential Elements of Faculty Work (Gappa et al., 2005, 2007) and applied to contingent faculty who work on extended campuses. Applying Gappa et al.'s (2005, 2007) unfolding work should yield data that are rich, relevant and observed through a lens of best practices. It is my hope that this mix of currency and practicality will resonate well with higher education planners and administrators who could potentially



implement recommendations that emerge from my findings.

At each of the campuses I visit, I will interview a minimum of five contingent faculty members. The campus directors will serve as “gatekeepers” to help me gain access to the contingent faculty members (Creswell, 2003). The campus directors will provide both the interview venue and make initial coordination with the subjects. From a list of current faculty members at a particular campus, I will select ones that I would like to interview. This contact with faculty will require me to gain permission from both the institutional review board at the University of Missouri and the human subjects committee of Great Plains University (pseudonym used for confidentiality). I, along with these entities, will protect the interests of the contingent faculty members that participate in my research.

*Sampling.* I intend to use a purposeful sampling technique to select a small group of individuals who can respond knowledgeably about the phenomenon of contingent faculty teaching at extended campus locations. Respondents for this study must meet two criteria. They must have taught for their current institution for at least two years and they must have taught a minimum of eight courses. The intent of establishing a minimum level of experience with an institution and in teaching is to improve the quality of the respondent’s knowledge of the environment.

I will use both the *typical-case* and *reputational-case* selection techniques. The typical-case technique involves selecting subjects who I determine possess the characteristics I seek. The reputational-case technique involves enlisting the

help of local experts to identify appropriate respondents; these experts may also be considered gatekeepers. In my research this will likely mean relying on extended campus administrators to assist in identifying faculty meeting the parameters I select.

*Interviewing.* One of my researcher roles as a participant-observer will be to conduct semi-structured interviews with the contingent faculty subjects (Creswell, 2003; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). I will use an interview protocol that should reveal the faculty members' perception of respect, academic freedom, equity, collegiality, flexibility and professional growth (see Appendix 1). The identity of participants will be confidential. The faculty members in my research will be assigned pseudonyms to protect their identity.

*Observation.* My other researcher role is that of observer. Since my research question involves determining how contingent faculty members perceive the environment in which they teach, observing them in that environment may reveal data that do not emerge from the interviews. I intend to do a minimum of two classroom observations at each extended campus. Additionally, I will continuously observe faculty as they come and go through the other areas of the campus. Observation may be particularly revealing in the areas of respect and collegiality. The way contingent faculty members interact with students, faculty colleagues and campus administrators may serve to confirm or refute data gathered during the interviews (Creswell, 2003; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

*Researcher's role.* Case study research is interpretative research, with the inquirer typically involved in a sustained and intensive experience with participants (Creswell, 2003). My specific role will be of participant-observer (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). This relationship introduces a range of strategic, ethical and personal issues in to the qualitative research process. With these concerns in mind, I must explicitly identify my biases, values and personal interests about the research topic and process (Creswell, 2003).

I have considerable background in the area of contingent faculty at extended campuses. My duties as associate dean require me to conduct faculty development activities and review faculty evaluations conducted by students and campus directors. I regularly visit different extended campuses and interact with contingent faculty in both formal and informal settings. I will not be a disinterested observer. Creswell (2003) warns that “backyard” research is fraught with difficulty. The etic perspective will be undoubtedly be evident in this research. My challenge will be to present the emic perspective fully and accurately and through a variety of techniques to create trustworthiness and credibility (Gall et al., 2007).

My close relationship with the topic and the research subjects may have drawbacks. However, as the primary “measuring instrument” (Gall et al., 2007) in this case study, my professional and practitioner perspective of contingent faculty at extended campus locations will likely be invaluable. The challenge, as previously stated, will be to use the appropriate measures to develop

trustworthiness and credibility. These measures will be described in detail later in this chapter.

*Context development: Mapping the field.* At each site where I gather data, I will use the social science and educational method of mapping the field (see Appendix 2). This is part of my analysis strategy for observational data. I will construct a social map of the numbers and kinds of people, a description of the organizational structure and the activities in which the people engage. A spatial map will describe the location, the facilities and any specialized services provided. My temporal map will try to describe the culture and tempo of organizational life, the schedule of activities and unwritten routines (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989; 2001). This effort will help readers better understand the context of my research and will be presented in Chapter 4.

### *Data Analysis*

Tesch (1990) provided a review of various methods of qualitative data analysis. Gall et al. (2007) continue to support the usefulness of her findings. Tesch reduced her research to three categories of analysis. They include interpretational analysis, structural analysis and reflective analysis. I intend to use interpretational analysis to examine data that emanates from the Essential Elements of Faculty Work categories. Data that emerges from outside those categories will be examined using reflective analysis.

Interpretational analysis refers to examining the data for constructs, themes and patterns that can be used to describe and explain the phenomenon. The first step in interpretational analysis is to develop categories. Gall et al.

(2007) point out researchers can either develop their own categories or build on those from other researchers. In my research, the Essential Elements of Faculty Work (EEFW) of respect, academic freedom, equity, collegiality, flexibility and professional growth, developed by Gappa et al. (2005) will serve as the initial categories. Other categories may emerge as my research unfolds. Categories are constructs that refer to phenomena found in the data. Each segment of data, which may be an interview question and the associated response or some other artifact, is coded to one or more category.

Reflective analysis refers to using primarily intuition and judgment to evaluate the phenomenon. Reflective analysis involves a conscious decision by the researcher to rely on personal intuition and knowledge of the field to analyze the data. Gall et al. (2007) offer an analogy to describe reflective analysis. “The artist reflects on phenomena and then portrays them in such a way as to reveal both their surface features and essences” (p. 472). An educational researcher endeavors to do likewise in reflective analysis. The process is often referred to as *connoisseurship* (Gall et al., 2007), implying that the researcher needs to have considerable background and expert knowledge in the field. It is hoped that my 20 years in higher education, 14 of which involved working with contingent faculty in extended campuses, will serve as sufficient preparation to utilize reflective analysis.

### *Trustworthiness and Credibility*

It is important that researchers, especially qualitative researchers, convey the steps they will take to check for the accuracy and credibility of their findings

(Creswell, 2003; Gall et al., 2007; Merriam, 1988). These checks help determine if the findings are accurate from the standpoint of the researcher, the participant or the readers of an account. How well this is accomplished lends an air of trustworthiness and authenticity to the study (Creswell, 2003).

The communication of the findings is a critical phase of case study research. The case study final report generally takes the form of a *rich, descriptive narrative* that attempts to reconstruct the respondents' reality and enhances the authenticity of the research. The presentation style of the findings should draw the reader closely into the respondents' world and give the discussion the feel of shared experiences (Creswell, 2003; Gall, et al., 2007; Stake, 2000).

*Triangulation* will also be used to enhance the trustworthiness of the findings. By using multiple sources of data, such as interviews and observations, the credibility of the study is strengthened. In addition, redundancy of data gathering will be considered to help clarify meaning and verify the repeatability or saturation of an interpretation (Creswell, 2003; Gall et al., 2007; Stake, 2000).

I also intend to use *member-checking* to assist in the credibility process. This involves having the original respondents review statements in the researchers report for accuracy and completeness. This technique helps authenticate the emic perspective, that is, the perspective of the individuals studied. This is a significant goal in all case studies (Creswell, 2003; Gall et al., 2007).

Finally, I will use *peer debriefing* to enhance credibility. Because I have worked in the field of higher and continuing education for more than a decade I have developed a corps of colleagues who have extensive background in both the context, extended campus operations, and the subjects, contingent faculty, of my research (Creswell, 2003). The use of all the techniques above will serve to mitigate the inherent biases I have as a participant-observer.

### *Limitations*

Creswell (2003) warns that “backyard” research can be problematic. My task is to accurately describe the environment and experiences of contingent faculty at these extended campuses. I must present the emic perspective of the contingent faculty. Care must be taken to avoid documenting preconceived notions rather than capturing the lived experiences of the research subjects.

I have considerable experience with extended campuses and contingent faculty in general. I have overseen different aspects of extended campus life and have been directly responsible for contingent faculty integration and development programs for more than 10 years. Fortunately, I will have considerable separation from my potential subjects in both time and distance. Most of the potential research locations are hundreds of miles away.

Gathering willing subjects from a group of busy professionals is not an easy task. The campus directors will assist me in this process. I will take care that all faculty interviewed are willing participants and that the campus director does not personally “select” a group of faculty that may have like-minded opinions or agendas. The campus director will provide me a list of current faculty.

From that list I will select the contingent faculty members that I wish to interview.

Even with these precautions, it will require a significant measure of personal discipline on my part to report what I see and hear from the contingent faculty members I interview and observe and not what I “know” from my own experience. I will use Mark Twain’s famous caution to keep me on track. The wise Missourian offered, “it ain’t what you don’t know that gets you into trouble. It’s what you know for sure that just ain’t so” (Rasmussen, 2001). In addition to Twain’s sage advice, I will use multiple sources of data, member-checking and peer debriefing to enhance the trustworthiness of my research. Whether the results of this report can transfer to other institutions will be up to the reader.

#### *Chapter Summary*

Using the case study method, I plan to examine the life of contingent faculty members at extended campuses. I want to better understand the context of their faculty work settings. Using the Essential Elements of Faculty Work model (Gappa et al., 2005; 2007) as a framework, I plan to determine how contingent faculty perceive their working conditions. From this effort I hope my findings will produce a more clear picture of the extended campus environment that higher education administrators can employ to enhance teaching and learning at their campuses.

In the next chapter, *Presentation and Analysis of Data*, my task will be to manage, organize and make sense of the accumulated raw data. This will include the management of a considerable collection of interview transcripts, field notes from observations and researcher journal entries. The task is to transform



the raw data into something meaningful by analysis and inference. Since I am using a case study method, my findings will involve detailed description of the extended campus setting and the contingent faculty who teach there. This description will be followed by in-depth analysis of themes, patterns or issues that emanate from the data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008).

## Chapter 4: Presentation and Analysis of Data

### *Introduction*

Great Plains University's main campus is typical for the pattern of liberal arts and sciences colleges born in the nineteenth century. Its footprint is small consisting of less than 50 acres. Its buildings are primarily brick and some are actually ivy covered. The campus is completely space landlocked with little room for physical growth without major disruption of neighbors. The students are traditional-aged with most coming directly from high school. There are residence halls, a library, a bookstore and intercollegiate sports. The campuses of my research are much different places than the main campus of Great Plains University and the following section will attempt to give the reader a clear view of the non-traditional academic environment in which my research was conducted.

### *Mapping the Field*

To develop the context of my research and help the reader see what I saw, I will use the social science method referred to as mapping the field (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989; 2001). This technique involves using text to construct a series of "maps." There will be a social map, a spatial map and a temporal map. The social map involves creating a picture of the numbers and kinds of people, a description of the organizational structure and the activities in which the people engage. The spatial map consists of describing the physical facilities associated with the campus. It includes a description of the location of the campus, a discussion of the physical facilities that comprise the campus and highlights any specialized services provided. The temporal map intends to

capture the culture and tempo of organizational life at the campus. This map describes the schedule of activities and provides a window to myriad unwritten routines (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989; 2001). The mapping effort should help readers better understand the context of my research and thereby assist in making meaning of my findings.

My descriptions in each map will be a composite of the three campuses I visited and of the people I observed. If a particular feature at a specific campus is, in my opinion, noteworthy then I will identify that campus and discuss the anomaly.

### *Social Map*

*Personnel.* The three campuses ranged in size, based on student population, from 500 to 1,100 students. This count is more accurately described as an unduplicated headcount, i.e., the exact number of students served by the campus in a fiscal year. The word “served” in this case refers to a student taking at least one course during the year. This method of counting differs from the more traditional use of full-time equivalents (FTE) employed by the institution’s main campus in its Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) report. From discussions with colleagues from similar institutions, this method of indicating relative size by student headcount is typical. Additionally, from my discussions with extended campus administrators, it is apparent they generally measure their size in more fiscal metrics. These counts generally involve enrollments or credit hours. An enrollment equals one student taking one course for a certain number of credit hours. Enrollments and credit hours habitually are

associated with tuition costs. Therefore the arithmetic of multiplying enrollments or credit hours by tuition costs produces a rough gross revenue figure. This figure is extremely important to the institution since the primary reason for the extended campus' existence is the generation of revenue.

The student populations at these extended campuses are diverse in age, ethnicity, gender and socioeconomic strata. The students are generally female, in their early 30s, employed and have family responsibilities of some sort. The following table provides additional detail.

Table 2  
Student Demographics

Average Age	33
Female	56%
Minorities	29%
Military (Member & Family Members)	22%
Financial Assistance (Federal, State & Institutional)	79%

The faculty populations at these extended campuses are diverse in age but are not nearly as diverse in ethnicity. Unlike their students, they are predominately male. The following table provides additional detail.

Table 3  
Faculty Demographics

Age: 30 & under	3%
Age: 31 to 40	17%
Age: 41 to 50	28%
Age: 51 to 60	30%
Age: 61 & over	22%
Female	36%
Minorities	8%
Terminal Degree	23%

The staffing model at these campuses can be characterized as lean and multi-functional. The “lean” description is always a source of debate between local extended campus leaders and their colleagues at the main campus. From my experience over many years and my recent sustained observation of extended campus life, everyone at the campus has plenty to do, all day and every day. Additionally, most staff members at these extended campuses are able to perform several functions. This condition is born of necessity. Except for academic advising, the depth of staffing for the primary person in charge of a specific function (e.g., reception, admissions, financial aid) was never greater than one person. Therefore, for the campus to function when someone is absent for illness or vacation, an extensive level of cross-training is necessary. The staffing at these campuses includes several categories that I will refer to as the leadership, academic advisors, administrative process positions and facility support positions.

The leadership positions on the three campuses I visited included a campus director and an assistant campus director. Based on the wishes and style of the campus director, the two leadership positions divide specific tasks such as faculty hiring processes, academic course schedule creation, student issue resolution and course quality monitoring. Even with well defined divisions of labor, both the campus director and assistant director must be able to perform each other’s duties. Without this redundancy, the campus’ operations could be gravely crippled in the event of a serious illness or family tragedy or the turnover of one of the positions. The leaders at the campuses possess graduate degrees

and often teach at the campus as contingent faculty members. The leaders come from a wide variety of backgrounds but in the three cases I observed, none of them are first career higher education administrators or faculty members.

Samples of their previous careers include previous or retired military officers, a long-serving management position in a major college football operation, a retired K-12 educator and an experienced social worker. Their necessary skill sets include solid organizational and interpersonal skills, team building, coaching and problem solving.

The academic advisors are, at a minimum, baccalaureate level educated and are most often in their first academic advising position. They often have served the institution in one of the administrative process positions and been promoted to their academic advising role. Depending on the campus, the numbers of advisors ranged from two to four. Their amount of experience ranged from a few weeks to 15 years with the institution.

The administrative process positions are generally filled by individuals who are both employees and students of the college. A primary employee benefit of this institution is a 100% tuition waiver for full-time employees for undergraduate courses. The incumbents in these positions range from employees in their first full-time job to retirees who enjoy the compensation and stimulation of a fast-paced position with a respected mission, yet with minimal responsibility. These are entry-level positions requiring no previous specific experience. The impact of the conditions described above creates a situation of relatively high turnover.

There are also staff members in, what I will call, facility support positions. These positions include a campus security officer, a custodial person, test proctors and computer laboratory technicians. Based on the size of the facilities I observed, there is seldom more than one individual in each category listed above in the building at a time. Because some of the institutions' operations are in shared use buildings, often some of the functions, such as custodial and security, are also shared use.

*Organizational structure.* The local campus director has the latitude to create the organizational structure and the lines of supervision. In the cases I observed, the campuses were large enough to warrant an assistant campus director. The direct supervision duties were divided between the campus director and the assistant campus director. Therefore, academic advisors, administrative process personnel and facility support personnel would report directly to either the campus director or the assistant campus director. In these three cases, the division of supervision was handled differently on each campus. At the Mountain Campus, because the assistant campus director was relatively new to the position, the campus director was the direct supervisor for all staff members. The assistant director's efforts were directed mostly at managing the faculty. The campus director at the Lake Campus delegated supervision of the staff, except for the campus admissions manager, to the assistant campus director. Management of the faculty is shared between the director and assistant director. The Lake Campus director also has major responsibility for supervising five other campus directors in a regional campus arrangement. The River Campus director

is the primary faculty manager and the assistant campus director supervises the staff.

The contingent faculty at the campuses had no structure whatsoever. Although they may teach along departmental lines (e.g., business, criminal justice, psychology) they are not grouped in departments. At this institution, there is no system of faculty rank for contingent faculty. However, other institutions do employ systems of rank for their contingent faculty. Sometimes the system mirrors the faculty rank system of their full-time faculty. Often however, it is a system that intentionally diverges from that used by the full-time faculty (Greive & Worden, 2000). At two of the three campuses I visited, there was a position called a lead faculty member. This faculty member was employed to assist the campus director with a variety of tasks that influenced teaching quality. The lead faculty member would conduct classroom observations and provide feedback to peer contingent faculty members. They would assist the campus director in preparing teaching workshops and activities for faculty meetings. They also assisted the campus director in screening and interviewing applicants for teaching positions.

*Staff functions and activities.* Almost any essential function that occurs at the institution's main campus is replicated, in miniature, at the extended campus. The functions of program information dissemination, admissions, registration, placement testing, financial aid counseling, academic advising and, of course, teaching, are all performed. The campus leadership attends to most of the functions not directly associated with the college operations, such as staff



counseling and human resource processes. Additionally, the functions not specifically related to higher education institutions, but common to almost any enterprise, such as security monitoring and custodial operations, are also present.

*Spatial Map*

Although the functions of a college or university are replicated at the extended campus, how those functions are packaged is far from the classic perception of how an institution of higher education should appear. There are no manicured lawns or multiple building configurations. Everything at these extended campuses is compact. Form clearly follows function. Of the three campuses I visited, only the River Campus has a stand-alone building; Great Plains University owns this building. The Lake Campus and the Mountain Campus are housed in shared use arrangements. The Lake Campus is in a sprawling single-floor multi-use facility. The Mountain Campus is on the third floor of a three-story building. The square footage for each campus is shown in the following table.

Table 4  
Campus Square Footage

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Square Footage</b>
Mountain	8,878
Lake	16,505
River	19,255

Even the River Campus, which is a stand-alone building, does not look like a college as we expect to see them. The two-story building sits on the back

side of a large parking lot covering several acres. The parking lot serves several other buildings that are identical to the River Campus building. These sister buildings house a wide variety of non-academic, business functions. In all three cases, the business activities of the universities' neighbors are important. The adjacent businesses are for the most part daytime enterprises. Their primary business activities are conducted between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. This is critically important to the campuses because their peak activity periods begin around 5:00 p.m., with several hundred student commuters arriving near that time.

Another critical aspect of the campuses' exteriors is signage. It is to the college's advantage for the campus to be easy to find for current and prospective students and to achieve a certain amount of general awareness marketing by erecting signs that are easily seen by passing motorists. The River Campus has its own exterior sign near the street. It is a lighted sign with the institution's logo and name on a pole approximately 25 feet in the air. The front of the building also displays the institution's name. The Lake Campus and Mountain Campus, since they are in leased, shared facilities, have to coordinate with and compensate their landlords for their signage. Both the Mountain Campus and the Lake Campus have large, lighted signs along the roof lines of their buildings. They also have monument signs along the major streets adjacent to their parking areas.

From an interview with a senior official from Great Plains University, I found the primary considerations taken into account when an institution selects an extended campus location include ease of access to the building from major

road networks, visibility from the road networks, parking space, signage rights and affordable interior square footage (name omitted for confidentiality, personal communication, February 1, 2010).

The primary consideration of interior space is efficiency. Whether purchasing a building or leasing one, the college or university will pay for the facility by the square foot in some manner. There is seldom any wasted space. There will be private office space for those functions requiring complete privacy, such as leader functions of the campus director and assistant director, academic advising and financial aid counseling. Most of the other functions of reception, admissions and registration are handled by staff members operating over a counter and sitting in cubicle space. When well organized, this arrangement is both student-service friendly and aesthetically pleasing. Although very different from each other, the Mountain, Lake and River Campuses all accomplished the missions of service and appearance in their own way. The River Campus has a front reception area completely separated from the other offices. The receptionist triages the needs of the visitor and then either sends or delivers the person to the appropriate staff member. Visitors to the Mountain Campus come into an open lounge space as they enter the facility and are met by a receptionist who stands to greet them from behind a chest-high counter. The offices housing the other functions are arrayed around the receptionist's counter and desk area. The Lake Campus has sliding glass windows separating visitors from staff members at three stations. Again, although different, all seemed to function equally well.

The preponderance of square footage at any extended campus is taken

up by classroom space. Like all spaces in an extended campus facility the classrooms are calculated for a specific need. Higher education institutions serving non-traditional populations often purport small class sizes as one of their commendable features (Bash, 1999; Trends in adult learning, 2006). You will not likely find cavernous lecture halls at extended campuses. A classroom that will properly seat 35 students is generally considered very large. A more typical classroom will seat 25 students or less. The modern, extended campus classroom will always have a computer station and computer projection capability. Because the classrooms may be used for a wide variety of courses from mathematics to English composition, from business to criminal justice and everything in between, the classrooms must be flexible in their arrangement. The walls are generally outfitted with multiple whiteboards. The students sit at tables that are from 6 to 8 feet in length and can be configured however the faculty member deems appropriate for that evening's learning activities. Some classrooms may have interactive screens or document cameras that provide faculty members additional capabilities. Extended campuses will also have computer laboratory facilities for computer science and computer information systems classes, and to support writing intensive courses such as English composition. A feature conspicuous by its absence on extended campuses is the science laboratory generally found on traditional college campuses. Science laboratory courses are seldom required in curricula offered to and preferred by non-traditional students and therefore the extended campuses are seldom outfitted with laboratories. This could clearly be perceived as an academic

weakness of extended campuses. However, it appears that students do not demand those facilities and in reality, laboratories would be very hard to offer in many extended campus locations. Laboratories generally require extensive running water, ventilation to the building exterior, some means of flammable gas distribution and refrigeration. Most of these requirements would require costly retrofitting of leased facilities that landlords would be reluctant to provide or even allow.

There is little private faculty space at extended campuses. Most of the faculty are only on campus long enough to teach their courses. All of the campuses I observed had a system of faculty “boxes” where phone messages and other paper items could be left for the faculty member. There is seldom space for faculty to securely store anything such as coats, purses or briefcases.

Faculty and students often share basic administrative equipment such as computers, printers, copiers, staplers and three-hole punches. These items are generally found in a small computer lab-type space set aside and outfitted so faculty can produce tests and handouts and students can print off their assignments. At the three campuses I visited, the student and faculty populations are sufficiently large that the faculty actually have separate workroom space from those facilities used by the students.

Even leisure space is often joint use. The largest leisure spaces on the three campuses I visited were intended primarily for student use and were most often equipped with an array of vending machines, a microwave oven, a water fountain and some coffee production system. In some cases the faculty will have

some leisure space that is shared with the staff. That was the case with both the Lake Campus and River Campus. More often, if they spend any leisure time on campus, they spend it in the space with the students, which is the situation I found at the Mountain Campus.

*Temporal Map*

The three campuses I visited operate their administrative processes on a fairly typical business workday basis. The offices were generally open and staffed by 9:00 a.m. and they provide services such as information dissemination, admissions, registration, financial aid counseling and academic advising until about 6:00 p.m. The actual times for each campus are seen in the following table.

Table 5  
Campus Operating Hours

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Monday – Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
Lake Campus	9:00 a.m. – 6:30 p.m.	9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.
River Campus	9:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m.	9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Mountain Campus	9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.	9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

This model is intended to be customer friendly to meet the needs of busy adult students who may be able to get free at various times of day. Most often there are specific peaks of activity. Midday times are particularly busy as students attempt to accomplish college business over their lunch hours. Since most of the classes are evening delivered, the next peak activity period is around the start of class times. Extended campuses can be particularly frantic from about 4:30 p.m. until the start of classes, which may be from as early as 5:00 p.m. to as late as

6:00 p.m. The tempo of campus activity is also influenced by the opening of course registration windows. Academic advising will be particularly busy prior to and during the registration period. Administrative processes such as admissions, registration and financial aid counseling will likewise be busy during the registration period and on through the time of add/drop when students make adjustments to their schedules.

Although there are many tranquil periods of time for the staff, these are not times of inactivity. Even if there are no prospective or current students in the building there are myriad tasks to accomplish. During periods of peak student activity, hundreds of transactions, both electronic and paper, occur that must be further processed and reconciled during more peaceful times. The staff attempt during these times to stay on top of the transactions generated during the peak activity periods.

Student activity on an extended campus can most often be described as harried or frantic. During my observations, the students arrived just shortly before the start of class time in the late afternoon or early evening. They were often coming directly from their places of employment. They were often trying to switch from their daytime role of parent, employee, or even employer, to college student in a matter of minutes. Because the start of class time roughly coincides with evening meal time, the students often were making some attempt to eat before class starts. This may involve arriving at the campus with a bag of food from a fast-food vendor or something prepared at home and brought with them. It may involve grabbing something resembling nourishment from a vending machine.

Extended campus policies that reference food in classrooms range from very liberal to draconian on military installations where custodial staff is very limited. Suffice it to say the students arrive on campus with little time to spare and they must transition from their “real” life to that of student, coordinate the rest of their lives via computer or cellular phones, eat if they choose and make any last minute preparations for class. The following table gives further insight into the academic life of the working adult student and the contingent faculty members who teach them at extended campuses. Note that the Lake Campus uses a one night per week instructional format and the Mountain Campus and River Campus uses a two night per week format. All campuses teach on an 8-week academic term and maintain 40 contact hours of instruction.

Table 6  
Campus Class Hours

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Mon – Thu</b>	<b>Mon/Wed or Tue/Thu</b>	<b>Saturday</b>
Lake Campus	5:00 – 10:00 pm		8:30 am -1:30 pm
River Campus		5:00-7:30 or 7:45-10:15	
Mountain Campus		5:30-8:00 or 8:05-10:35	

Contingent faculty arrive on campus much as the students do. They are most often coming from some other employment, which may be in higher education, but more often than not in any of a thousand other positions. They are short on time, are hungry, need to make contact with their families and have some final preparation to accomplish prior to class. Their situation is so similar to the students’ that it is sometimes hard to tell the faculty from the students. This, of course, is made possible by the fact there is seldom any discernable age difference between the students and the faculty. The students’ ages range widely



and so do the faculty members'. That said, a trained observer can generally tell the two groups apart. The most senior people in the hallways and classrooms will most often be faculty. The faculty members will generally have more weathered briefcases and book luggage. They will also appear a bit more serene since they are masters of their subjects and the fear of the unknown is regularly evident on the students' faces, although this is not always the case. New contingent faculty members can be just as anxious about an impending class period as their students.

Faculty members often pass each other in the hallways without speaking. This is the result of several factors. First, as pointed out above, it is often hard to tell faculty members from students. Unless they know each other personally, two faculty members would not necessarily pick each other out as colleagues. Since they spend very little time on campus, except to teach at their appointed times, faculty have very little opportunity to meet each other. As previously mentioned there is no academic departmental structure or organization. Contingent faculty members are hired to teach specific courses and their only opportunity to meet colleagues occurs during periodic, campus-wide faculty events. These events may be social, intended for professional development, or both. The events, regardless of their intention or format, are seldom mandatory and occur generally less than a half dozen times a year. This creates a situation where faculty members can teach for years at the same extended campus and never cross paths with a long-serving colleague teaching in the same discipline.

The previous descriptions serve to map the field to create a mental picture

of academic life at the extended campuses where I conducted my research. From this starting point I will now delve deeper into the worklife of the contingent faculty members who I interviewed.

### *Faculty Worklife*

To review, as a framework I used the *Essential Elements of Faculty Work* (EEFW) (Gappa et al., 2007). The EEFW include the constructs of respect, academic freedom, equity, collegiality, flexibility, and professional growth. These constructs serve as the initial categories from which I analyzed my data. From here on, first names of participants are pseudonyms and their campuses are indicated in parentheses following their name.

#### *Respect*

All but one of the 17 faculty interviewed specifically indicated that respect was critically important to them and they felt respected as a contingent faculty member teaching at an extended campus of Great Plains University.

The one dissenting faculty member did not directly say he did not feel respected, but he allowed that:

Adjunct faculty might feel like they are not trusted or they are being watched a lot. They get a lot of top down management. They can be treated like worker-bees. Adjunct faculty will just keep silent. No one wants to rock the boat. They may not ask you to teach this course. (Bill, Lake Campus)

Several faculty indicated that respect was not universal across all institutions. One participant reported that he was also teaching as a contingent faculty member at the state's flagship university, just a few miles from the

Mountain Campus. At that institution he felt, “I didn’t even exist. They didn’t even know who I was.” (Carl, Mountain Campus)

Certain overt actions by campus leaders and staff members are taken as signs of respect by contingent faculty members. Many of the faculty interviewed shared a specific example of actions that to them seemed to indicate a climate of respect. Three of the faculty members, chuckling as they responded, indicated that the most significant sign of respect to them was being asked to teach term after term. Their responses indicate they know their campus directors have complete latitude on who they hire to teach each term. They shared:

The respect they have for me is they asked me back. They ask me back to teach term after term. I am honored to do that. (Reggie, Mountain Campus)

My biggest thing, they asked me back. (Tom, River Campus)

Am I respected? Yes I am. Certainly I would not feel that way if I didn’t have courses [to teach]. I have always been offered courses here and it’s been multiple directors, so I know I am respected. (Drew, Mountain Campus)

A much less tangible sign of respect seems to come from common courtesies and office pleasantries. Three of the faculty members reported the quality of interactions with staff, whether they are campus directors, academic advisors, administrative assistants or facilities support staff, enhanced the climate of respect. Connor (Lake Campus) offered, “I view respect here through common social courtesy.”

Other respondents tagged respect to the actual quality of support they received from the extended campus administration. On the upper end of the

scale, one faculty member felt respected due to the effort her director expended at improving the facilities at the River Campus. Speaking of her current campus director, “you see things actually happening, like a new computer lab and things like that. Yeah, that makes a big difference.” (Liz, River Campus)

More often, responses were on a less grandiose and less costly scale than major campus improvements. Respect seemed to flow from day-to-day verbal exchanges and timely administrative support actions. The following quote captures the essence of respect for a contingent faculty member while discussing the Lake Campus leadership, she said:

Being regarded as a professional really. That is about it. People not assuming that I have less information, less knowledge, less to give because I am not a full-time faculty member. I always feel appreciated and valued. (Heather, Lake Campus)

Respect is not just the purview of the campus leaders. The faculty interviewed allowed that respect emanated from the administrative process staff too. Here Paul (Lake Campus) offers:

When there is a request that is legitimate, it is responded to, so yeah, that is respect. That happens at almost every place. If you need anything, pencils, markers, something repaired, it gets done right away.

Although geographically separated by great distances in some cases, the contingent faculty interaction with the main campus full-time faculty seems to be an important component of the overall picture of respect. Liz (River Campus) shares an experience:

I expect my opinion to be valued and it has been. To also be able to ask for help and get it and I think I do that and I get that. No punishments for saying your opinions. When I have gone to the main campus and stirred up some stuff about the major field test

[outcomes assessment instrument] and my opinions of it, I wasn't ostracized or told to shut up. It wasn't like don't state your opinion. We want your opinion. I felt respected by that.

### *Academic Freedom*

Academic freedom involves the right of faculty members to freely express themselves during the conduct of their courses and through the publication and presentation of their research activities. In the context of contingent faculty teaching at extended campuses, academic freedom focuses more on the course construction and teaching aspects of the concept.

There was considerable consensus that faculty felt they had complete academic freedom on the campuses I visited. The preponderance of the faculty reported their expectations for academic freedom were completely met. However, three of the respondents expressed some constraint from the university's use of a master syllabus that prescribes a standardized course description, learning objectives and measurable learning outcomes. This degree of standardization is part of the university's measures taken to assure their accrediting body that, even though their campuses are widely dispersed, the curriculum is the same in each location. The three dissenting faculty members shared:

I think the standardization of the program across all of the campuses certainly has restricted the amount of freedom that an individual instructor, like myself, has. I am not saying it is a bad thing. It is different and takes a little getting used to. (Lou, Lake Campus)

I don't feel the freedom here as much as with other schools. I teach at [omitted for confidentiality] University as well and I will say they are a little bit more lenient and free because they don't do evaluations in the same way we do it here and they give a lot of

allowance for you to kind of help to create and to develop the curriculum. (Connor, Lake Campus)

I don't feel constrained about saying what I believe or challenging beliefs. I feel the freedom to do that. I do feel a little constrained by the major field test [nationally normed, standardized outcomes assessment instrument administered in the capstone course of each major]. I don't feel like I can go, into depth the way I might if I didn't have to cover everything that might be on the major field test. That does constrain me. (Liz, River Campus)

Again, most of the faculty expressed they felt little impingement on their academic freedom. Their comments included:

You don't feel hemmed in or oppressed if you will. You feel like you can go in and with a measure of decorum be [yourself] and say what you believe and what you know to be true within the content of your area without any repercussions from the institution. (Reggie, Mountain Campus)

I haven't felt stifled at all. I haven't felt like I wasn't able to teach the things I wanted to or take it in a new direction. I have been encouraged to do so. I don't feel restrained. (Heather, Lake Campus)

I've always considered academic freedom something that carries with it tremendous responsibility so I sort of work both of them together. Yes, this is my classroom that I have been fortunate to be given to teach in, and fortunate to have students who are there and want to learn. But I have a tremendous responsibility in terms of how I handle that and have to be respectful to my institution, my institution's mission and the expectations of the students. If they are in an English class and it is a composition class, I certainly try to follow a tradition there. Break it only to bring a new way to approaching it. I must respect the institution for which I work. (Alice, River Campus)

Even though few participants reported any negatives with regard to academic freedom, some seemed not to grasp the concept of academic freedom in its entirety. Some aspects of academic freedom, such as full latitude in course construction, which might concern more traditional, full-time faculty did not seem

to bother these contingent faculty. Several participants seemed to embrace some of aspects of constraint that others might consider infringements on academic freedom. Their comments included:

Actually, I think there is value in having standardized portions of the syllabus. Accrediting bodies are right in the expectation that there should be learning outcomes. That is not wrong. And in fact, if anything, we should have been doing it a long time ago. (Drew, Mountain Campus)

I do like the fact that we have a master syllabus. A lot of other places I have taught have not had that. It at least gives us some basic parameters. (Calvin, Mountain Campus)

It appeared that most of the contingent faculty felt sufficiently comfortable with the amount of freedom afforded them in the classroom. Even though the university's policies have some infringements on academic freedom in the classic sense, those conditions seem irrelevant to the faculty. The faculty apparently understood that without some degree of standardization an extended campus network would struggle to convince their accrediting body that all their programs were the same. Additionally, the contingent faculty seemed to perceive some measures of standardization as actual tools to help them perform their teaching duties more easily.

### *Equity*

Equity in this context refers to equal treatment in employment practices. Equitable treatment among faculty members does not imply identical treatment. Clearly, in this case, Great Plains University has a set of conditions of employment for their full-time, tenured faculty that differs dramatically from their contingent faculty. However, among all contingent faculty, each faculty member

should be treated fairly. This generally involves a well defined system of notification of contract renewal or termination, equitable compensation, explicit performance evaluation criteria and grievance procedures.

The participants, without exception, were complimentary of the equity among their contingent faculty peers at Great Plains University. They were not so kind when referring to their experiences at other institutions. They shared:

At other institutions there is a pecking order. There definitely is at [omitted for confidentiality] Community College. And not really even between full time and adjunct but even between adjuncts themselves. Some get their classes every time and other people are kind of bumped around a lot or miss a semester [of teaching]. (Calvin, Mountain Campus)

When I worked at [omitted for confidentiality], which is a junior college, there was a lot of politics involved. It was who you know. You always were given the classes at the bottom of the spectrum. You taught the classes nobody else wanted to teach. (Luke, River Campus)

I saw a very egregious case. A new, tenured faculty member had come in and said, thank you, it's been a great 8 years, your services are no longer needed and withdrew the contract. This is like the beginning of the academic year. That is nasty. (Paul, Lake Campus)

I didn't get any classes one summer at [omitted for confidentiality] and they only had a handful of classes because enrollment was down. But the ones they had went to the coordinator's federal buddies, which they are all in their 70s and some of them in their 80s. Here's a guy that's got [number omitted for confidentiality] kids and has got all these things and you would love the extra money. (Reggie, Mountain Campus)

The participants also reported some disparity between their treatment and that received by full-time faculty at the university's main campus. Two had this to say:



We may feel some inequity when we may not have opportunities that are given to people who are more closely associated with home campus. Professional development opportunity is a big one. (Drew, Mountain Campus)

There definitely is a pecking order between the main campus and the adjuncts. (Lou, Lake Campus)

### *Collegiality*

Collegiality refers to an institutional climate wherein faculty members feel they belong to a mutually respectful community of scholars who value each member's contributions to the institution. This sense of personal and professional connection in an institutional community enhances the workplace satisfaction of faculty members who experience it (Gappa et al., 2007). Collegiality contributes to a workplace setting faculty say they value.

With only a couple of exceptions, the participants reported a poor climate of collegiality. This poor rating seems to have nothing to do with the actual people, both other faculty and administrators, but rather it is a function of the environment. The faculty members, for the most part, only come to campus to teach. They have no office space and are pretty much relegated to the classroom they are assigned and any common area space the campus provides. They, like their students, are often in a hurry to get in and get out of the campus to get on with the rest of their lives. That may mean finally getting home at the end of a long day or scurrying off to another teaching assignment elsewhere. There is an acceptance of that is the way things are for contingent faculty at extended campuses, but you can detect a sense of regret. Several shared:

You just don't get to know everybody and I think that is a disadvantage because somebody else may have an idea about

something that I am teaching that I could get from them if I knew they existed. That is one of the things I find lacking. (Marcy, Mountain Campus)

I've been teaching here for about 7 years so you try to meet new faculty, but once your night is over it is 10 p.m., you have worked all day, talked for 5 hours. Pretty much there is no time for chit-chat, it is a mad dash to the door. I would say that there is lacking in relationships with other faculty members. (Helen, Lake Campus)

It is very difficult because of the schedules. There have been a couple of cases where I have been on the same schedules as two or three other teachers and we were able to spend a lot of time on breaks and before classes getting to talk. But then there have been schedule changes and teachers leave so it is almost impossible to develop much of any kind of a relationship. (Luke, River Campus)

It is very difficult unless they [administration] provide some sort of formal meeting. I suppose we could get together outside of work but because most of us maintain full-time positions elsewhere and work here one or two nights a week, it is really difficult to get together. We are pretty much on our own. (Heather, Lake Campus)

The environment at the extended campuses makes collegial relationships challenging. The faculty participants did share their thoughts about both impromptu opportunities to interact with their colleagues and the planned activities provided by the university.

Most of the opportunities for collegial interaction occur in the hour or so before classes start, generally late afternoon or early evening. For those contingent faculty members who have time immediately prior to class they often perform last minute tasks such as making copies of handouts or tests. They may meet with students and they may spend the time chatting with their colleagues who are hurriedly arriving for class. The following seem to represent fairly typical contingent faculty relationships at these extended campuses:

There is this gentleman who teaches and I can't even remember his name. He and I have gotten to know each other simply because we teach at the same time and have done so for some time. (Sean, Mountain Campus)

I know the people that teach with me. The people that teach in that room and that room, I know them. We talk in the hall before class or after class. (Calvin, Mountain Campus)

Actually here [Lake Campus] it's not too bad. I happen to know someone and I can talk to them. It is sort of an informal thing and I find the discussions during the breaks with some faculty interesting. I have been here a long time and just bump into them and have gotten to know them and we talk about teaching styles. (Bill, Lake Campus)

The participants also shared their thoughts about activities arranged by the university and how these events foster collegiality. Every faculty member interviewed commented on the value of these planned events. The events consisted of rather traditional faculty meetings, faculty dinners, commencement exercises and an event the university calls "faculty integration conferences." These conferences are opportunities for the extended campus faculty to travel to the university's main campus and meet with full-time faculty and other contingent faculty from the extended campus network. The attendees come on either an academic department or academic discipline basis. The conferences are held on a 2-year rotation (e.g., English faculty attend every other year). The university does not provide a stipend for these events, but all expenses for the contingent faculty participants are paid by the university. The conferences last for a day and a half and are most often held on Fridays and Saturday mornings. Thursday and Saturday are the travel days.

Lou (Lake Campus) shared his insight on the faculty integration conferences:

The faculty meetings help a lot and certainly the faculty integration conferences also help. You have a chance to meet someone from other campuses and spend a little more time with them. They become a resource I can go to and ask what is going on. Some will share materials with you if they taught a class and you are teaching it for the first time.

Others shared their thoughts about various opportunities for collegial contact:

The only time that we really have the ability to talk to each other is at the faculty meetings and those are twice a year. (Luke, River Campus)

Graduation seems to be when we all get together the most. (Tom, River Campus).

I think the faculty meetings and gatherings have helped to bring a sort of cohesiveness. (Alice, River Campus)

### *Flexibility*

Contingent faculty members in my study arrive on the doorstep of higher education from a variety of motivational sources. Some are desperately trying to piece together enough teaching assignments to have an academic career. Some are fully employed in other fields and teach to either supplement income or merely for personal enrichment. Whatever brings them to higher education, they face the same demands as full-time faculty. Whether they are dual income couples or single parents they must balance their worklife with the demands of maintaining a home, raising children and possibly caring for aging parents and other family members.

As mentioned above, many contingent faculty are employed elsewhere. They may be teaching at other institutions, either full-time or in a contingent status. They may be employed completely outside of higher education, either full-time or part-time. The flexibility that appeared important to the contingent faculty I interviewed seemed to center around the willingness of their institution to provide teaching opportunities that would mesh with all their other responsibilities. They stated:

Sometimes my responsibilities collide. I am on the board of directors of a fairly large financial institution. Our board meetings are on Thursday. For me, flexibility means I do not teach on Thursday nights. That just has to be it. (Helen, Lake Campus)

The other aspect is the whole scheduling dilemma and balancing that. Some schools will say I want you to do this at this time. They kind of expect you to deem them your central priority, but you can't always. You're trying to be fair and honest with them on that. Sometimes though, it is not a good time for me, but it is the only time they have offered to teach. I think this has happened at every college I have worked, including this one. (Bill, Lake Campus)

The need for the university to understand that life sometimes gets in the way of teaching commitments was very important. They offered:

My primary employment is something I can control typically. My family I can't always control. My mother lives with me. She is 87 years old. She has had a stroke. I take care of my aunt also. She is 92. Because of those relationships I can't tell when I am going to have an emergency and quite frankly it doesn't matter, my family comes first. (Marcy, Mountain Campus)

Marcy's comments suggest that to demonstrate flexibility an institution needs to not only accommodate personal emergencies at the time they occur, but also not impose any punitive actions that would prevent future teaching opportunities.

Others shared the value of knowing in advance when they would be asked to teach:

Knowing what you are going to be teaching and when you are going to be teaching is very helpful. You know how to manage your time and you know what to expect. (Alice, River Campus)

Providing the schedule in a reasonable time frame is important. They ask me whether I want to teach early or late and which nights. Occasionally they have given me the *lates* and I would prefer the *earlies*. That is the way it worked out and I have to be flexible too. (Tom, River Campus)

Several participants shared the value personal discipline plays in meeting the institution half way on the issue of flexibility:

Personally I try to compartmentalize my time so that I have some dedicated class preparation time. (Lou, Lake Campus)

Define your priorities and learn some time management. There are a lot of people who are not like that. They try to manage three jobs and a family and it becomes overwhelming. (Heather, Lake Campus).

I think it is important I am able to compartmentalize my life. I can compartmentalize so that my teaching doesn't affect the rest of my life that deeply. (Connor, Lake Campus)

Almost a third of the participants mentioned the importance of an understanding spouse or significant other in having the requisite flexibility to meet the demands of balancing life and teaching as a contingent faculty member.

These faculty members shared:

Luckily I have a supportive wife. She knows how much I enjoy teaching. (Carl, Mountain Campus)

My wife knows this is my drug of choice. She knows I get a high from it [teaching]. Otherwise it could be problematic and I'm sure it is for some. (Drew, Mountain Campus)

My husband knows the importance of it [teaching] to me. So I have never really had any issues there. (Helen, Lake Campus)

The best thing is a supportive wife. She knows how much I love to teach. (Luke, River Campus)

There were some additional comments made about flexibility that reflect the faculty members' understanding that teaching in this environment is demanding, but personally rewarding:

I get my motivation because the students we teach are in the same boat. They are working, they are going to school and they have families, just like I do. My motivation kind of runs back and forth. I get a lot from my students and they get a lot from me. There are times when I'm like, man, I don't want to teach tonight, but when I get there and the students are there, all that goes away. (Carl, Mountain Campus)

I don't think this is an issue for the institution. I think it is a personal choice. Our arms are not twisted to be here. We're here because we love what we do. (Drew, Mountain Campus)

It's just like you have to learn how to do it [teach]. I've been doing it so long you learn how to slip into different paths. I'm a teacher here now and tomorrow morning I'm an [omitted for confidentiality] and tomorrow night I am a teacher again. (Luke, River Campus)

### *Professional Growth*

Knowledge in one's academic discipline, knowledge of the diverse students we teach, knowledge of evolving pedagogy and an understanding of how advances in technology impact each of those areas are critical to faculty success. Faculty members must professionally grow to stay abreast of these changes. Because contingent faculty at extended campuses are physically separated from the resources, both human and physical, of the institution's home campus, providing professional growth opportunities for the contingent teaching corps requires diligence on the part of institutional administrators.

Two faculty members described their experiences in reference to

professional growth as “pretty good” (Calvin, Mountain Campus; Bill, Lake Campus). They related that they had opportunities to attend seminars, to participate in a variety of different faculty gatherings and to network with colleagues. They believed all these things contributed to their professional growth. To the contrary, about half of the participants expressed some dissatisfaction with the opportunities for professional growth when teaching at an extended campus.

Drew (Mountain Campus) delivers some fairly harsh remarks about the shortcomings in professional growth. He says:

We need it [professional growth] and, no, our expectations are not being met. It is not just this institution. It's every institution that brings on adjunct faculty. There is very little because we are part-timers. We are not included in the continuous professional development opportunities that are awarded to full-time faculty. I think that is wrong. Having been an adjunct faculty member, not only for this institution, but most of the institutions in [omitted for confidentiality], they all share the same fault. We're not included among the full-time.

Baker (River Campus) adds:

Well this is an extension so we don't have a lot of resources to professionally develop ourselves. If we were on the main campus you would have the human resources and you could share a wealth of knowledge and new ideas. We don't have that advantage here.

Several participants reflected that most of their professional development came within their own discipline and they pursued it on their own. They offered:

Most of the development I get is in my own professional field. I got some certificates in [field omitted for confidentiality]. (Luke, River Campus)

I do workshops and things like that in my field. I try to stay well read, up to date on the new textbooks and the new techniques. (Liz, River Campus)



In terms of opportunities that I have been given I mostly have to say they were initiated on my own. I have taken coursework and certifications in certain areas. (Alice, River Campus)

The participants shared some of the professional growth opportunities they wished were available to them. Almost a third of them felt just the opportunity to interact more often with both full-time faculty and fellow contingent faculty was a valuable professional growth aspect. Their requests included:

A little bit more interaction with others. Swapping how they are teaching a specific class, what aids they are using and what guest speakers. (Reggie, Mountain Campus)

From a professional development standpoint you would like to at least talk with other colleagues and see how they handle different things. (Marcy, Mountain Campus)

Beyond the collegial sharing and networking, the participants offered some specific examples of other opportunities for professional growth they wished they had. They offered these insights:

Maybe offer on a yearly basis an evening conference call or web access event to discuss major topics. (Sean, Mountain Campus)

Some institutions will offer various seminars; they are pretty good. (Bill, Lake Campus)

Drew (Mountain Campus) and Alice (River Campus) allowed that the opportunity to take additional college “coursework” would enhance their professional development. Heather (Lake Campus) advocates for the use of mentors for professional growth. She shared this experience:

One of the schools I work for assigns you a mentor. I don't have a mentor here. The mentor definitely fields my questions and if they don't have an answer they will find someone who does. So they are very helpful in that manner.

Just as they did when discussing collegiality, the participants identified the campus' faculty meetings and the university's faculty integration conference system as a source of professional growth. Their comments included:

The twice a year faculty meetings are really good. There is never one of those meetings that I have been to and not taken something valuable away. (Connor, Lake Campus)

I enjoy the interaction with other teachers. When you bring us to [state name omitted for confidentiality] every other year is a critical piece of professional growth satisfaction. (Sean, Mountain Campus)

In terms of professional development I think what I see as the big thing are the faculty integration conferences. I have not been able to attend as many as I would like, but the ones I have attended have been very good and worthwhile. (Tom, River Campus)

The best thing I have done for me is that [campus director's name omitted for confidentiality] sent me to the main campus. That was awesome. That really made me feel a part of the faculty. Going there and meeting other faculty and doing some training, it was really, really worthwhile. That connection to the main school I think was probably the most important thing I've done. (Carl, Mountain Campus)

Although only one of the participants mentioned it, Connor (Lake Campus) shared his perspective on the professional growth value of student evaluations that are conducted by Great Plains University for every course, every term:

Even if you are with Great Plains University for 5 years and you are doing a good job, every class you have they still evaluate you. It really helps us to stay on top of our own development and to make sure that we are prepared and that is a good thing.

The faculty members interviewed also shared some specifics about the type of information they would like to see in professional growth programs. Luke (River Campus) mentioned the value of training on student evaluation techniques such as the use of "rubrics." Alice and Tom from the River Campus and Carl from

the Mountain Campus advocated for professional growth events that focused on providing training on “new technology” for faculty. Reggie (Mountain Campus) and Liz (River Campus) encouraged more programming on “classroom techniques.” Marcy (Mountain Campus) promotes more discussion on style, both student learning and teaching. She shared:

We need more on different learning styles and teaching styles because not everyone learns or teaches the same. What works best and how do you determine what works best and where that fits your own style.

A perspective shared by Lou (Lake Campus) was not reflected in any of the other responses, but it is noteworthy. Although not letting the university completely off the hook for professional growth, Lou allows that the contingent faculty member bears significant responsibility for their own development. He said:

One of my former companies always made sure we sent people to seminars to keep their technical skills up to date and introduce them to new technology. That is an investment that is hard for the university to make. Personally I feel like it is up to me to stay up to date and read as much as I can and attend some classes on my own.

### *Emergent Categories*

Beyond the framework of the *Essential Elements of Faculty Work*, three additional categories emerged from the data: teaching, salary and benefits and support.

*Teaching.* Although most mentioned the fiscal need to have additional income through college teaching, all but two of the participants specifically

expressed their passion for the classroom and the interaction with students.

These faculty shared:

I really enjoy it [teaching] because I'm dealing with students who want to learn. (Sean, Mountain Campus)

I enjoy the chance to teach. It is really neat when you make a difference in someone's life. (Lou, Lake Campus)

It is a great experience, gratifying and rewarding. That for me supersedes some of the daily struggles, the late nights, the preparation for classes. The good that I perceive myself doing, and the fact that I have always desired to give back in this fashion makes it all worthwhile. (Lou, Lake Campus)

I have found teaching to be a very challenging and worthwhile endeavor in the sense that I have had the opportunity to work with working adults and that has been very gratifying to me. (Alice, River Campus)

Related to a commitment to quality teaching was the need to integrate technology in the classroom. Of those who mentioned the importance of classroom technology, Drew (Mountain Campus) captures the general sentiment best when he says:

I would say the issue of equipment, it is a modern world and we probably need to do more in making sure that we are up to speed in our classrooms. We have two classrooms, maybe three now, and I always get assigned one of those because they [campus administration] know I love technology, but I think we need to do more in our classrooms. Sometimes I think the extended campuses don't get the same technology that is afforded to the home campuses. I have seen that at other institutions as well, not just here, but in all institutions and I have taught in most of them.

*Salary and benefits.* Another theme that emerged was the lament caused by the lack of employment benefits and compensation afforded to contingent faculty. At Great Plains University, the only benefit for contingent faculty is the offer of tuition free courses for the faculty member and their family

commensurate with the amount the faculty member teaches. There are no medical or retirement benefits. Only a few participants mentioned this shortcoming and Heather (Lake Campus) best captures their feelings when she says:

Obviously the one gripe I do have is there are not full-time benefits. I love working here and I get along very well with everyone here. I love the students here, but I will never see a full-time job here. I will never be offered that. So, in order to maintain working here I also have to keep a full-time job somewhere else. That is the downside, but that is the game we have to play these days because the full-time positions are so rare and competitive.

Almost a quarter of the participants mentioned the need for competitive compensation for part-time teaching. In speaking of the importance of their teaching opportunities and how they are compensated for them, they said:

I think we have here for us who are contingent faculty a better deal than what we could get at public or large institutions. This institution is number one pay wise and in terms of course load it is way better and that is a big, big plus. We get paid better per course here, whether face-to-face or online, than we do at the community college and that is important to me. The money is important. I would never deny that. I think teaching is a great thing but I need to be able to make enough money to support my family. (Calvin, Mountain Campus)

I like working here. Certainly I would love to get more money than I do for individual classes. The time and the payback thing doesn't really equate, but I also understand that most of the adjunct faculty do it because we enjoy it and not because of the money. (Lou, Lake Campus)

I can do what I do here only because, here is a big secret, my wife has a full-time job. She has a very good full-time job with excellent benefits and a retirement program. (Paul, Lake Campus)

Drawing an analogy from her background as a firefighter and paramedic, Helen (Lake Campus) continues:

I was a volunteer [firefighter/paramedic] and it is a little different from being full-time, but the fire is just as hot, whether you get paid full-time or not. And that is the same thing with being adjunct faculty.

*Support.* The participants were also asked who they go to for advice and support of their teaching duties. The importance of the extended campus director was evident from their responses. Virtually all of the faculty interviewed indicated that the campus director was their primary source of assistance and counsel.

Their comments included:

Mainly I go to the director. She's been good. Good as a sounding board. (Sean, Mountain Campus)

Our director is my go to person. (Helen, Lake Campus).

The administrators, director and assistant director. They have a great staff here that bends over backwards for us. (Luke, River Campus).

Others mentioned assistant directors, fellow contingent faculty members, administrative support staff members, faculty colleagues at other institutions and full-time faculty at the main campus as supportive resources. Unlike the campus director, all of these sources were only mentioned sporadically. The importance of the campus director in the life of the contingent faculty members at these campuses was clear.

### *Summary*

In this chapter I tried to accomplish two objectives. The first, due mainly to the dearth of research and general information on extended campuses, I attempted to develop a picture of that higher educational environment.

To do that, I used the social science method called mapping the field (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989; 2001). I provided a social map describing the kinds of people encountered at an extended campus, and its organizational structure and an overview of the activities in which the people engage. I developed a spatial map to provide a picture of the physical facilities at extended campuses. And finally, the temporal map captured the culture and tempo of life on these campuses.

The second objective was to identify the patterns that emerged from the data. I described the findings from my *Essential Elements of Faculty Work* framework by presenting the thoughts and insights of my interview participants on the elements of respect, academic freedom, equity, collegiality, flexibility and professional growth (Gappa et al., 2007). Additionally, I presented data on three themes that emerged outside of the framework. These themes involved topics such as: teaching, both the faculty members' joy of teaching and their perceived need for classroom technology to keep pace; salary and benefits, primarily a reporting of the shortcomings of the compensatory aspects of contingent faculty life; and support, essentially an affirmation of the campus director as the central figure in the contingent faculty member's worklife at extended campuses.

In the next chapter, *Discussion and Conclusions*, I will discuss the findings from Chapter 4 in light of the theoretical framework and extant literature, suggest implications for practice, recommend avenues for future research and draw conclusions.

## Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

### *Introduction*

In this chapter I discuss my findings and their relationship to Gappa et al.'s (2007) framework and other scholarly literature. Also, in my implications for practice I have tried to supply leaders in higher and continuing education with my thoughts on actual applications of this research and an assessment framework to determine the quality of worklife of their contingent faculty at extended campuses. Finally, I identify future research that was prompted by my findings.

I used the *Essential Elements of Faculty Work* (Gappa et al., 2007) as my initial analytic categories, and as described in the previous chapter, three additional categories that emerged from my participants' responses. My challenge in this chapter was to set aside what I know or believe I know, genuinely consider what my participants actually told me and make meaning of it all. In the reflective analysis phase, I relied on my years in the field of higher education, especially non-traditional higher education, to inform what I had learned in the interpretational analysis phase. I present the results of this analysis in the *Implications for Practice* section.

### *Discussion*

#### *Respect*

Virtually every one of the participants stated that respect was critically important to them. Without respect, their association with any higher education institution was undermined from the start. This compares favorably with the findings Gappa et al. (2007) shared about the original Baxter Healthcare studies,



on which their *Essential Elements of Faculty Work (EEFW)* were based. Respect was seen as an *entitlement* and is foundational to any professional relationship

Although the participants spoke favorably about the level of respect at Great Plains University, several of them shared their disappointment with other institutions and the lack of respect to which they were subjected. Their comments were reminiscent of what you see in the contingent faculty literature, such as Berry's (2005) militant, *Reclaiming the Ivory Tower: Organizing Adjuncts to Change Higher Education* and the seminal work of Gappa and Leslie (1993), *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-timers in Higher Education*.

There are volumes written about the plight of contingent faculty. Berry's (2005) work cited above is a good example. Likewise, Dubson's (2001), catalogs the mistreatment of contingent faculty. However, the participants in my research paint a different picture. Their treatment at institutions with well established, full-time faculty was often poor. At an extended campus where only contingent faculty were employed, they were well treated and respected.

From the participants' statements, the sources of respect were varied and often subtle. Although in some cases the participants found the very overt action of re-hiring them for a subsequent academic term as a sign of respect, many times respect was associated with less evident signals like: hallway pleasantries and common courtesy, small tasks accomplished in a timely manner and genuine interest in comments and suggestions provided by the contingent faculty. These appear to be signs of a culture of respect for contingent faculty. A particular culture in higher education, either positive or negative, often finds its source in the

leaders of the institution (Birnbaum, 1988; Clark, 1987, 1997). And in the case of Great Plains University, the academic leadership has established a culture of respect for these contingent faculty.

### *Academic Freedom*

There is a chance that the full depth and breadth of academic freedom was lost on the participants in this study. A few of them come from traditional academic backgrounds but most of them teach part-time only for Great Plains University or some combination of other institutions, either in a traditional setting or at another extended campus. According to Rudolph (1990), the bare essentials of academic freedom are the latitude to conduct research and teach assigned courses with very few limitations. Since there are no expectations for research for the faculty at extended campuses, that aspect of academic freedom is less relevant to them. They all do have teaching assignments and as several of them expressed, their freedom is somewhat constrained as it relates to course construction and delivery. Great Plains University uses a master syllabus system that requires all faculty members, not just contingent ones at the extended campuses, to use a standardized course description statement and teach to a standardized set of course objectives and measurable learning outcomes. Faculty members must, in good faith, address the objectives and measurable learning outcomes prescribed in the master syllabus, but they have the freedom to add to that list as they deem appropriate. Great Plains University believes this measure of standardization is necessary to satisfy its accrediting body's desire for uniformity across a fairly large extended campus network.

Beyond a lack of understanding that their full measure of academic freedom may be constrained, the participants were generally indifferent on the subject of academic freedom. Gappa et al. (2007) placed high value on academic freedom among the faculty members they studied. The majority of the participants in my research seemed content with the level of academic freedom afforded them and several went so far as to express their gratitude for the constraints placed on them and the direction those constraints provided.

Additionally, when balancing a new teaching assignment with other life demands, this curricular constraint may give these contingent faculty some advantages regarding the time it takes to prepare a new syllabus. They may not want the level of prescribed instruction that is often required of course facilitators at for-profit institutions, but for many of the contingent faculty in my study (Tierney & Hentschke, 2007), a little institutional hand-holding was comforting.

In general, contingent faculty in my study want the latitude to express themselves as subject matter experts in their disciplines. Beyond that, they seem satisfied to address a prescribed amount of content in their courses to conform to the wishes of their institution. This level of contentment is possibly a by-product of faculty surmising that without a certain level of conformity, they will not be hired to teach in the future. This implicit level of coercion must not be allowed to develop into overt, explicit coercion. If that was to occur, the bonds of mutual respect between the campus director and the contingent faculty would undoubtedly break down. Further, it is also possible faculty contentment stems from a lack of knowledge about academic freedom. They may be socialized as

faculty in very different ways than those in full-time appointments and do not know any other way than what they have experienced teaching as a contingent faculty member.

### *Equity*

Great Plains University again received high marks from the participants in the area of equity at the extended campuses. They reported being treated fairly in all aspects of their relationship with the institution at the local level. However, as previously mentioned, several of the participants bristled when describing their own treatment and the treatment of contingent colleagues at other institutions. Sharing their experiences from other institutions, they related incidents of campus “politics” in the hiring process. They shared stories of a complete disregard for the fiscal impact on contingent faculty when capricious decisions are made on who is employed for a specific academic term and who is not.

Additionally, when comparing their own treatment with that of the home campus faculty, the participants were not complimentary of Great Plains University. When describing the EEFW framework, Gappa et al. (2007) state equitable treatment does not mean identical treatment. They suggest equitable treatment means each faculty member is treated fairly after differences among faculty appointment types are taken into account. Tenured faculty members should be treated fairly with respect to other tenured faculty members and contingent faculty members should be treated fairly with respect to other contingent faculty members. The participants of my study, however, seem somewhat at odds with Gappa et al.'s definition of equity. At least on some level,

they believe they should be treated the same as their tenured and tenure-track colleagues on their home campus. Although only a few of the participants addressed it, there was a perceived “pecking order” between home campus faculty and faculty at the extended campuses. This pecking order manifested itself in two areas. The contingent faculty believed their voice in curricular matters was not equitably considered, which is also related to compromises on academic freedom previously discussed. In addition, they perceived considerable differences in professional development opportunities.

Regarding equity among contingent faculty, contingent faculty would agree that seniority at a campus is an acceptable criterion for hiring decisions (Baez & Centra, 1995; Gappa et al., 2007; Mallon, 2001). Beyond that, they would expect a system of meritocracy. Participants in this study raised some concerns about fairness in hiring from semester to semester. For example, they questioned whether teacher quality was taken into consideration. Even seniority loses its luster if teaching excellence is not an attribute of a seasoned colleague, particularly for faculty who invest so much in teaching.

### *Collegiality*

Gappa et al. (2007) define collegiality as an institutional climate wherein faculty members feel they belong to a mutually respectful community of scholars who value each other’s contributions to the institution. This climate of collegiality enhances the academic workplace and faculty place great value on its presence. My research supports these assumptions. Every faculty member I interviewed placed value on the construct of academic collegiality and workplace

camaraderie. As I witnessed firsthand in more than 2 decades of military experience, challenging missions and adverse conditions create a desire of strong bonds among the participants. I suggest the same is true with contingent faculty at extended campuses. They often teach late into the evening after having spent a full day at their “real” jobs. They often teach in out of the way places separated from their homes and their daytime workplaces. They teach a diverse body of mostly adult students who demand excellence from their instructors. These challenges create a need for a community of colleagues.

Virtually all of the contingent faculty I interviewed gave a failing grade for the climate of collegiality at Great Plains University. Their poor marks for collegiality did not stem from any overt actions on the part of extended campus leaders or their home campus counterparts. Instead, the lack of collegiality seemed to come from inaction. The participants felt that institutional leaders could do more to enhance collegiality.

To be fair to the institution, the participants acknowledged that much of the impediment to collegiality was the result of the physical and operational environment of the extended campus, somewhat beyond the control of the university’s administrators. They could provide enhanced facilities for the contingent faculty in terms of office and leisure space that could lead to more opportunities for collegial interaction, but to what end? Contingent faculty, like their students, often race into the extended campus just in time to setup for their class and depart just as hurriedly when class is over (Bash, 1999; Digranes & Digranes, 2000; Smallwood, 2001). They, most often, are not required to

maintain classic faculty office hours, nor are they compensated for time beyond that spent in the classroom teaching (Conley & Leslie, 2002; Digranes & Digranes, 2000). These barriers to collegiality notwithstanding, my participants believed that more could be done to facilitate collegiality.

The faculty in this study praised the faculty integration conferences (FIC) as a good example of an activity that fosters collegiality. The FIC puts the whole institution into perspective. Attendees see that the home campus is a vibrant place in its own right and that they have colleagues from all over the extended campus system with whom they share a common bond, reinforcing the importance of collegiality in the lives of these faculty.

### *Flexibility*

For the purposes of this research, flexibility means allowing contingent faculty to enter, exit and reenter into teaching assignments without penalty or loss of status in relation to other contingent faculty members (Gappa et al., 2007). It might seem logical to consider this element of faculty worklife as irrelevant for contingent faculty. After all, it could be assumed they have infinite flexibility since they can choose to accept teaching assignments or not (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; 1997). Considering most contingent faculty teaching opportunities range from 5 to 16 week academic terms (Fulton, 2000; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001), contingent faculty can choose a teaching term that works best for the other elements of their lives.

However, there are other aspects of flexibility to consider that may be more subtle. For example, contingent faculty often have commitments with their

full-time or other part-time employment. They may have to work at other jobs during times when college administrators would like them to teach. Additionally, contingent faculty members' commitments with their children's school programs, youth athletics, their church, philanthropic groups and a wide variety of other activities all have firm dates and times for events that inhibit flexibility during evenings when classes are scheduled.

The research participants commented about their own responsibility regarding scheduling and flexibility. They mentioned the need to "compartmentalize" their lives so that they had time to properly attend to their full-time jobs, their families and their part-time teaching responsibilities. They rather bluntly suggested their colleagues should define their priorities and learn some time management. This perspective creates a tension in that it assumes the contingent faculty must "fit" into the existing model, rather than considering ways the existing model might be able to be more flexible.

Although a minority, there is a subset of the contingent faculty corps who is trying to create full-time employment out of part-time teaching assignments (Hoyt et al., 2008). These "aspiring academics" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993) may have much less flexibility than their colleagues who have full-time employment elsewhere. For this group, their options may be limited as they combine teaching appointments at several colleges and universities together into a potentially inflexible schedule. Out of fiscal necessity they are forced to accept teaching assignments when they present themselves (Fulton, 2000). When talking about



flexibility, the participants in this group, had a desperation in their voice that the others did not have.

### *Professional Growth*

As they did in the area of collegiality, the participants gave Great Plains University and the other institutions where they teach as contingent faculty only mediocre marks for their efforts in providing professional growth opportunities. They believe there are numerous ways in which their professional growth could be enhanced. The participants in this study wanted the same professional growth opportunities that are in place for their full-time, main campus faculty.

They also indicated that any opportunity for contingent faculty interaction was a valuable opportunity for professional growth. Several of the participants mentioned their own efforts to develop themselves. They personally sought out and paid for a variety of programs to improve their abilities as faculty members. It appeared that most often, but not exclusively, these efforts were toward developing knowledge in their discipline rather than in matters of pedagogy.

Participants indicated the need to learn more about current practices and ideas about teaching and learning. Many of the contingent faculty in this study attended college when "lecture" was the predominant mode of college teaching (Nilson, 2003). Schwartz suggests (as cited in Lyons, 2007) because new faculty tend to teach "the way in which they have been taught themselves," without some professional growth activities to discuss pedagogical techniques such as active learning, uninitiated contingent faculty may merely perpetuate the use of lecture-only instruction (p. 244). From my experience of observing dozens of

contingent faculty in the classroom, clinging to this teaching style can be particularly painful for both faculty and students in evening delivered, adult learner programs where class periods may run from 2 to 5 hours in length. In addition, it is inconsistent with research on how adult students learn best (Mezirow, 2009).

### *Teaching*

Despite the lack of professional growth opportunities related to teaching, teaching itself emerged as an unanticipated theme. The category of teaching had two main aspects. The first was the love of their craft, the art of teaching. The participants, regardless of any fiscal motivation for teaching, addressed the personal satisfaction derived from being a college faculty member. They felt that were able to “give back” to their community by teaching. This attitude toward teaching undergraduates reinforces what Rhoades (2006) found among “core contingent” faculty, who were teaching the preponderance of courses in their institutions. Rhoades found these faculty prefer teaching and engage primarily in teaching, rather than being focused on their research agenda. The participants in the current study also addressed the personal intellectual stimulation they gained by interacting with adult students.

The second aspect of the teaching category reflects the participants’ interest in classroom technology. Some of their comments were specifically about the classroom equipment itself. They expressed their appreciation for the tools that Great Plains University had provided. They also recognized that classroom technology was a dynamic field and administrators needed stay

abreast of changes. By doing so, contingent faculty would be able to continuously improve their instruction through the use of technology.

### *Salary and Benefits*

While they could be considered as an aspect of respect and equity (Gappa et al., 2007), my findings demonstrate that salary and benefits was a salient category on its own. Much of what has been written about contingent faculty is an attack on higher education over the poor treatment of contingent faculty, particularly as it relates to salary and benefits (Berry, 2005; Bob, 1998). My participants were no different. Several flatly stated they wish they were better compensated.

In addition, participants regularly mentioned the benefit packages of a spouse as the only way they could afford to teach. For those without a partner or another job that provides benefits, this puts them in a very precarious position, especially as it concerns health and wellness.

### *Support*

The campus director was the central figure at each of the extended campuses that I visited. All three of these campuses were large enough that their staffing model included an assistant director and other academic advising and administrative positions. However, the campus director, at least for the faculty, was their primary source of information and support. This suggests the critical importance of hiring high quality campus directors. It is beyond the scope of this research to delve into the variety of skills needed to be a competent campus director. Certainly that position requires enough insight to understand the needs

of contingent faculty, including those identified through this study, and the requisite interpersonal skills to balance those needs with the fiscal realities of operating a small college campus. At the campuses in my study, the directors possessed the abilities described above. I believe those abilities contributed significantly to the overall success of those campuses and the satisfaction the contingent faculty expressed regarding their jobs.

### *Implications for Practice*

Prior to this section I have tightly clung to the Essential Elements of Faculty Work and the lived experience shared by my participants as a framework for discussion. In this section I will provide additional interpretations informed by my experience as a practitioner to identify tools for higher and continuing education leaders to assess the work-lives of and provide better support for contingent faculty at their extended campuses.

### *Respect Implications*

Not surprisingly, respect seemed to be foundational to the contingent faculty – higher education administration relationship. The challenge for administrators will be to determine what actions on their part will engender respect. Common courtesy and attentiveness to bona fide needs are likely a good place to start. My research participants mentioned both these areas. Consulting contingent faculty on their opinions on campus matters should also lead to a feeling of respect. Simply applying the *Golden Rule* (treat others as you would like to be treated) in most cases should foster a culture of respect. The truly difficult part for busy institutional administrators is taking the time to critically

assess the current climate of respectfulness at their campus, determine what needs to be done to remedy any shortcomings and then take action. Those who take the time to accomplish the steps listed above will move their organization forward in establishing a respectful relationship with their contingent faculty.

#### *Academic Freedom Implications*

For administrators at institutions who utilize contingent faculty at extended campuses, the best practice is to assess the experience level of new contingent faculty and provide the appropriate amount of direction. For seasoned teachers, that may mean providing them nothing more than the course title, depending on the policies of the institution. For rookie teachers, that may mean providing example copies of previous syllabi and a great deal of coaching on textbook selection, student evaluation plans, attendance policies and other aspects of course delivery and classroom management. Regardless of the experience level of the faculty member, campus directors should be explicit with their contingent faculty members on faculty rights regarding academic freedom.

#### *Equity Implications*

Equity should be an area where college and university administrators receive high marks. If their equitable treatment policy statements are any evidence, colleges and universities take significant measures to provide protection for all groups. However, on the micro-level, which certainly includes extended campuses, campus leaders can fall short in practice to what they preach in public. Most campus directors would take issue with the suggestion that they show prejudice or discriminate in their hiring practices. They would be

quick to provide examples where their contingent teaching corps included an appropriate gender mix and that all local racial and ethnic groups were represented within their faculty. However, in my experience, extended campus directors often have great latitude in their faculty hiring decisions and can easily fall prey to the human weaknesses of cronyism and nepotism. As my participants expressed, these practices can quickly destroy a culture of equity and damage an institution's ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty. College and university administrators should remain vigilant to these inequitable practices.

At the institutional level, administrators should do all they can to treat contingent faculty the same as they treat their tenure-track faculty whenever possible. This does not imply identical treatment. Leaders should celebrate and publicly value contingent faculty. Their contributions to the institution's success should be perceived as on par with full-time faculty and those contributions should be recognized at every opportunity.

### *Collegiality Implications*

Collegiality is an area that received low marks from my research participants and from their comments about other places they teach and the extant literature, it seems a poor climate of collegiality may be widespread across many institutions that employ contingent faculty. Because of the very nature of the extended campus environment, improving collegiality will remain a challenge. The fact that faculty often come into the facility just prior to class, teach their class and then depart without speaking to another college employee is difficult to change and that is detrimental to collegiality. All that said, my findings support

creating measures that would reduce barriers and enhance collegiality. In general, extended campus directors should take or make every opportunity to get contingent faculty members together.

Faculty gatherings can be either purposeful or social or a mix. Most institutions likely have a faculty meeting system of some type. Campus directors may only need to expand on the system they have in place to enhance opportunities for collegiality. Administrators should choose carefully when deciding whether to make attendance at faculty meetings voluntary or mandatory. There may be meetings wherein the administrative and academic content to be shared are so crucial that compulsory attendance is truly warranted. However, that type of meeting should be the exception rather than the rule and campus directors should offer a diverse slate of faculty events where faculty are encouraged to attend but are not required to do so. There is a fine balance between improving attendance by making participation mandatory and the damage done to administrator – faculty relations by compulsory events. To increase the number of faculty meetings or social events is not revenue neutral. In addition to the staff time to plan and host these events, there is the direct cost of things such as food and beverages, productions of handout materials and honoraria for guest speakers. However, the return is enhanced collegiality that can improve workplace morale and faculty recruiting and retention.

Administrators need to be creative when planning these events. If the events further complicate the lives of their contingent faculty by competing with other employment or detracting from family time, then the events will be

unpopular, not perceived as beneficial and will likely be poorly attended. Campus leaders should use technology to keep all contingent faculty informed of outcomes of meetings and other events. Campus directors should vary the days of the week faculty events are offered. Some can be during the week between academic terms and other events can be scheduled on weekends. Administrators should consider, when appropriate, including family members in the events.

Although only mentioned by one of my research participants, the use of mentors is bound to have a positive influence on collegiality. There are many models in use with traditional, full-time faculty that could be adapted to contingent faculty at extended campuses (Zutter, 2007). Providing mentors may be able to be done on a volunteer, no-cost basis, but a successful program might involve some modest stipend for the mentor. Again, the decision whether to make a mentorship program voluntary or mandatory should be done with care. In cases where the mentor-to-protégé pairing is a good fit, the benefits to the faculty and campus can be considerable (Nolan et al., 2007; Zutter, 2007).

The research participants consistently praised Great Plains University's practice of hosting their faculty integration conferences (FIC) as a measure of building collegiality. The FICs involved periodically bringing extended campus contingent faculty to the home campus to meet with their full-time faculty colleagues and faculty from other extended campuses. These events generally included a gathering of from 30 to 60 faculty members. Due to the all-expenses-paid nature of these events, the FICs are costly. However, the affinity created



between the contingent faculty members and the institution appears to be substantial. This affinity should translate to pride in teaching for the institution and retention. These gains, of course, must be weighed against the significant cost.

Because programs like the FICs can be expensive and they may not occur as often as desired, local campus directors should consider hosting similar, but less costly alternatives. These may be accomplished by pooling resources and faculty members from nearby campuses where the cost of travel may be reduced. They may consider bringing a select group of full-time faculty from the home campus to attend these regional events. Contingent faculty with recognized teaching skills or deep experience in their academic discipline may be invited from across the extended campus network to enhance the local programming.

#### *Flexibility Implications*

It is critically important that college and university administrators, especially the extended campus directors, understand the complex lives of their contingent faculty. Without this understanding, administrators will find themselves often at odds with the needs of the faculty members. This is not to say that campus directors should subjugate the needs of their institution and their students for those of their faculty, but a proper balance should be struck. The best way to approach this is through early and open communication. Great Plains University administrators prepare their term schedules up to a year in advance try to combat these conflicts so that their contingent faculty are aware of when

they will be asked to teach. The farther out a campus director can communicate their teaching needs to their faculty members the better. This serves both sides. A campus director is able to find out whether a faculty member is able to teach and will have adequate time to make arrangements to find someone else if necessary. For the faculty members, if a conflict exists between the proposed teaching assignment and another demand in their lives, they have more time to possibly schedule around the conflict.

Additionally, the more open the communication channels are between administrator and faculty member, the better the situation (Greive & Worden, 2000). This is especially true in cases where a faculty member must turn down a teaching opportunity. If this is the case, faculty members should clearly explain why they cannot teach and they should express that this situation has no bearing on their future interest to teach. Campus directors should understand this is the nature of operating a higher education institution with a contingent faculty force and not discriminate against the faculty member in future hiring decisions. My research participants regularly alluded to the contingent faculty fear of potential punitive actions if they turn-down a teaching assignment and campus directors should take great care to make sure their future actions are not perceived in that manner.

### *Professional Growth Implications*

The greatest challenge for administrators at both the institutional and extended campus level is the acquisition of fiscal resources to support professional growth program (Gappa, et al., 2007; Greive & Worden, 2000). In

some cases, local campus director energy and creativity can be converted into improved professional growth activities, but most often additional funds will be required to make significant gains. On the less expensive end of the spectrum, campus directors should make the most of their current faculty meetings.

Opportunities to “breakout” into groups by their academic and professional disciplines during faculty meetings and discuss relevant and current issues in their cognate areas should be provided. These are also opportunities to grow the contingent faculty as teachers with discussions of pedagogy. The amount and quality of the academic content of these gatherings should be optimized. They suggested conference calls and webinars could be employed to economically deliver some aspect of professional growth. Additionally, the research participants promoted the use of more advanced technology, such as video-conferencing.

Campus directors should make sure they get the most professional growth benefit possible from their student evaluations of faculty. Instead of merely delivering a copy of the evaluation in faculty members’ boxes or mailing it to their home, the campus director should meet with them personally to discuss any areas that may need improvement.

On the more fiscally demanding end of the scale, administrators should provide opportunities for their faculty members to attend professional growth activities beyond the boundaries of their institution. These may be on a full-cost or cost-sharing basis. The events may include additional graduate coursework, seminars or conferences dealing with topics within the faculty member’s

academic discipline or activities that address college teaching techniques and methods. Opportunities for contingent faculty at extended campuses to visit the institution's home campus and interact with full-time faculty and other contingent colleagues are excellent professional growth opportunities, just as they are opportunities to build collegiality. This type of event is particularly expensive, but appears to provide significant return on investment.

Administrators should do all in their power to reduce the perceived inequities between professional growth opportunities for full-time faculty and the contingent faculty. As much as possible, the contingent faculty at the extended campuses should be consulted on what professional growth opportunities they would prefer. Once consulted, campus directors should make every effort to deliver on those preferences.

### *Teaching Implications*

My participants' responses suggest they truly enjoy their teaching assignments. Knowing this, campus directors should beware when faculty members, by word or deed, express their dissatisfaction with teaching, but persist in spite of the dissatisfaction. The faculty member may be academically qualified to teach and possess the general teaching skills, but if they do not derive pleasure from the craft, they may not be a good fit. For those faculty who do enjoy their work and are a good fit, campus directors should genuinely laud their service at every opportunity. Most forms of recognition cost little and only require a modicum of effort. As an example, campus directors could recognize a

faculty member's length of service and/or teaching excellence in the campus newsletter, at commencement or at a faculty dinner.

Regarding classroom technology, administrators should be aware of the current trends. Beyond providing the standard package of classroom equipment, they should ask contingent faculty about specific needs in their academic discipline. The campus director will seldom be conversant on the details of teaching devices and computer software to support all curricula. Once the classroom technology is in place, administrators should, as the participants stressed, provide the requisite training to use the equipment to its full potential. Administrators should provide the training often and with a variety of attendance options. This may include Saturday mornings, Friday evenings or midweek lunch times. They should provide times that do not conflict with faculty members' teaching schedule if at all possible.

#### *Salary and Benefits Implications*

From my experience, there is often little a local extended campus director can do about the salary scales and benefit packages available to their contingent faculty. These areas of compensation are generally set at the institutional level. What the campus director can do is keep their finger on the pulse of what other local institutions are paying their contingent faculty and the benefits they are providing and report this information back to the main campus administrators and advocate for their faculty. It is quite possible that the local economic situation at an extended campus is far different from that at the main campus. This disparity may require administrators to consider and employ some cost-of-living

adjustments based on local conditions. Failure to be sensitive to these fiscal nuances could significantly impair the campus director's ability to recruit and retain the best contingent faculty.

Regarding benefits, although expensive, certain aspects of benefit packages are likely not beyond the fiscal means of colleges and universities. Examples would be allowing contingent faculty, on a pro-rata basis, to participate in institutional group plans for healthcare, dental care and retirement programs. For their part, the contingent faculty members should expect to get benefits on a cost-sharing basis.

### *Support Implications*

The centrality of the campus director in the lives of the contingent faculty at extended campuses in my study cannot be overstated. Based on this, college administrators should choose carefully extended campus directors. Interpersonal communications skills, knowledge of higher education culture and integrity are all qualities that extended campus directors should possess. Beyond skills and knowledge, my participants reported that certain affective qualities established the director as the "go to" person on campus. These qualities generally involved a sensitivity to the complicated lives and fiscal plight of contingent faculty. Respected directors understand that the economic well-being of their faculty is in their hands and they take that responsibility seriously. The affective qualities also include caring. Campus directors should show genuine interest in getting to know the faculty as people beyond the workplace.

The following table provides campus directors and other institutional administrators a summary of the implications for practice discussed above. Additionally, Table 7 serves as a ready reference to assess and improve the work-lives of contingent faculty at their extended campuses.

Table 7

Assessment Framework & Checklist for Action

Category	Action
Respect	Assess respectfulness of climate at campus
	Promote common courtesy between staff and faculty
	Attend to faculty support needs
Academic Freedom	Assess faculty experience level
	Ensure faculty understand their academic freedom rights
	Provide maximum freedom for those with college teaching experience
	Provide as much teaching assistance as necessary for new faculty
Equity	Assess the equity climate at the campus
	Promote the value of faculty wherever they teach
	Eradicate any perception of nepotism, cronyism or favoritism
Collegiality	Assess the opportunities to support and promote collegiality
	Adapt facilities to support collegial interaction
	Schedule and promote activities for collegial interaction
	Advocate for additional resources to expand collegial opportunities
	Include faculty family members (spouses, etc.) in campus activities
Flexibility	Assess the flexibility needs of each faculty member
	Provide long range course schedules
	Maintain an open line of communication with contingent faculty
Professional Growth	Assess the professional growth needs and wishes of

	faculty
	Promote participation in professional growth activities
	Provide convenient, multi-opportunity professional growth events
	Secure resources to expand internal professional growth activities
	Secure resources to fund external professional growth activities
Teaching	
	Assess the teaching satisfaction level of contingent faculty
	Recognize faculty contribution to campus success at every chance
	Provide classroom technology training and support
Salary and Benefits	
	Assess current salary and benefits against other local institutions
	Request additional resources if disparity exists
	Advocate for novel approaches to providing benefits
Support	
	Assess the campus director to contingent faculty relationship
	Understand centrality of campus director and hire accordingly
	Provide professional development for campus directors

### *Recommendations for Future Research*

If I was to conduct similar research in the future, I would more narrowly define both the academic freedom and equity categories from the Gappa et al. (2007) framework to reflect the nuances of contingent faculty. To the remaining elements, respect, collegiality, flexibility and professional growth, I would add the emergent categories of teaching and salary and benefits thereby creating a revised framework.

As stated several times, there has been very little written about the extended campus environment in general and almost nothing about the lives of contingent faculty at those campuses. Therefore, much remains to be examined.



Additionally, since my research was exploratory, by its very nature it leaves many avenues open for future research. Some of my suggestions for future research follow.

I believe valuable research could be conducted on the stability of contingent faculty wherever they teach. The conventional wisdom is that contingent faculty are itinerant and may lack institutional loyalty. My experience would suggest this is not true. Contingent faculty may teach at more than one institution, but their stability at quality colleges and universities may be much greater than most, inside or outside academe, would suspect.

The advent of online delivered courses has changed the face of extended campus operations. I have seen dramatic shifts in the behavior of extended campus students as they move from taking traditional in-seat courses to selecting the online version of the same course. These shifts in enrollment patterns have created new challenges for extended campus directors and their leaders at the main campuses. An in-depth look at how these changes in student behavior are influencing the roles and opportunities for contingent faculty at extended campuses would be worthy of research.

My research was conducted at an institution that could clearly be seen as successful in the extended campus market. The institution's growth, in both total student body and numbers of extended campuses over the past decade, as well as their leadership in the military extended campus market, are signs of that success. The contingent faculty I interviewed were predominately very happy with their association with Great Plains University. However, during the interview

process the faculty participants often spoke pointedly or at least alluded to their dissatisfaction with teaching at other institutions. These areas of dissatisfaction spanned all elements of my research framework. Further research with institutions whose extended campus operations seem to be less successful or research with disaffected contingent faculty may produce results that are quite different from my findings.

My findings show the extended campus director is the linchpin in the organization. Everything the campus does or fails to do runs through the campus director's office. A detailed look into the qualities and traits of successful extended campus directors may provide valuable information to college and university administrators charged with selecting the correct person for the job.

### *Conclusions*

There are hundreds of extended campuses across the United States (Fonseca & Bird, 2006; Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). At those campuses, there are thousands of contingent faculty. The intent of my research was to examine how these contingent faculty perceive their environment at extended campuses. The questions guided by each element of Gappa et al.'s (2007) framework elicited passionate responses from my participants on the different aspects of their worklife. Of course, each participant's experience was unique; however, themes converged that provide meaningful suggestions for both current practitioners and future researchers. The same was true for the emergent findings. From the data in Chapter 4 and the discussion in Chapter 5, both higher education researchers, as well as continuing education practitioners, can get a

much clearer picture of the life of contingent faculty members at the extended campuses. This enhanced picture informs future research and can aid college and university administrators as they develop policies and practices for their extended campus networks.

It is my sincerest hope that my research has done two things. First, I hope that this exploratory research will be springboard for others to examine the neglected arena of extended campuses. Thousands of students receive some or all of their college education at these campuses and they deserve this attention (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001). Finally, it is my wish that continuing education practitioners will use this research to improve the working conditions of and relationships with their contingent faculty. The contingent faculty corps in higher education is a growing body. Each year they continue to shoulder more of the teaching load of for the next generation of college graduates (Rhoades, 2006). The quality of our academic programs is directly related to how well we understand and react to the needs of our contingent faculty colleagues.

## Appendix 1

### Interview Protocol

Tell me what it is like to be a contingent faculty member at this extended campus location.

Collegiality: Describe the relationships you have with other faculty members. How did you develop those relationships?

Professional Growth: How do you define professional development as a contingent faculty member? What opportunities have you had at this campus for professional development? What are those like?

Academic Freedom: Describe the role academic freedom plays in your work.

Respect: How do you define respect in an academic setting? Describe how your expectations for respect at this campus are or are not met.

Equity: What constitutes equitable treatment in an academic environment? Describe how equity is or is not adequately addressed at this campus.

Flexibility: Contingent faculty members must often manage competing demands on their time. How do you juggle multiple responsibilities related to your role as a contingent faculty member?

Who do you go to for advice and support related to your position?

Is there anything else about the work-life of a faculty member at this campus that you would like to share?

## Appendix 2

### Contingent Faculty Observation Worksheet

Date:

Time:

Faculty Member(s) observed (by pseudonym):

Location

- Administrative Area
- Faculty Work Space
- Classroom
- Campus Common Area
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Mapping

Social Map (Describe the numbers and kinds of people, a description of the organizational structure and the activities in which the people engage):

Spatial Map (Describe the location, the facilities and any specialized services provided):

Temporal Map (Describe the culture and tempo of organizational life, the schedule of activities and unwritten routine)

Behavior & Activity Descriptions:

## Bibliography

- Adams, W. (1974). The state of higher education: Myth and realities. *AAUP Bulletin*, 60, 119-125.
- Alstete, J. W. (2000). Post-tenure faculty development: Building a system for faculty improvement and appreciation. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports*, 27, 1-114.
- Anonymous. (2005). Integrating adjuncts into the community through professional development and support. *Academic Leader: The Newsletter for Academic Deans and Department Chairs*, 21, 1 & 6.
- Anthony, J. S., & Valadez, J. R. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26, 41-56.
- Baez, B., & Centra, J.A. (1995). *Tenure, promotion, and reappointment: Legal and administrative implications*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University Press.
- Balch, P. (1999). Part-time faculty are here to stay. *Planning for Higher Education*, 27 (Spring), 32-41.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Baron-Nixon, L. (2007). *Connecting non full-time faculty to institutional mission*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Bash, L. (1999). *Adult learners in the academy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berger, A. R., & Kirshstein, R. J. (2001, November). "Careerists" and "moonlighters": Recognizing the diversity of part-time faculty. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, VA.
- Berry, J. (2005). *Reclaiming the ivory tower: Organizing adjuncts to change higher education*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2008). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A roadmap from beginning to end*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Blumenstyk, G. (2006, July 7). The military market [Money and Mangement]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A25.
- Bob, T. (1998, July 12). Will teach for food. *Chicago Tribune Magazine*, pp.10-17.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Burnstad, H. (2000). A comprehensive faculty development program. In D. E. Greive & C. A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium*. (pp. 9-17). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.
- Burnstad, H., & Gadberry, J. (2005). Retention of part-time faculty. In D. L. Wallin (Eds.), *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers* (pp. 113-126). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Carnegie Foundation. (2005). *The Carnegie classifications of institutions of higher education*. Retrieved August 23, 2007, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp>
- Carnevale, D. (2007, April 6). Nonprofit institutions could make gains in online Education [Information Technology]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A30.
- Caison, A. L. (2003). Tenure trends in public, four-year colleges and universities. *Planning for Higher Education*, 31, 15-25.
- Cataldi, E. F., Fahimi, M., & Bradburn, E. M. (2004). 2004 National study of postsecondary faculty: Report on faculty and instructional staff in fall 2003. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 7. Retrieved August 22, 2007 from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol\\_7/1\\_2/5\\_11.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol_7/1_2/5_11.asp)
- Chait, R. P. (2002). Gleanings. In R. P. Chait (Eds.). *The question of tenure*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- Church, R. A. (2000). A vision of the future – From the CEO. In D. E. Greive & C. A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new*. (pp. 9 – 17). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.

- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, B. R. (1997). Small worlds, different worlds: The uniqueness and troubles of American academic professions. *Daedalus*, 126, 21-42.
- Conley, V. M., & Leslie, D. W. (2002). Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think. *Education Statistics Quarterly*, 4. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol\\_4/4\\_2/4-2.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol_4/4_2/4-2.asp)
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, E. R. (1999). Adjunct faculty at extended campus locations: Call for serious attention. *Adjunct Info: A Journal for Managers of Adjunct and Part-time Faculty*, 7, 3-4.
- Diaz, D. P., & Cartnal, R. B. (1999). Distance learning class and equivalent on-campus class. *College Teaching*, 47, 130-135.
- Digranes, J. L., & Digranes, S. H. (1999). Communicating with adjunct faculty working at a branch campus. *Adjunct Info: A Journal for Managers of Adjunct and Part-time Faculty*, 7, 1.
- Digranes, J. L., & Digranes, S. H. (2000). Branch and off-campus sites. In D. E. Greive & C. A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct and part-time faculty for the new millennium* (pp. 207-220). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.
- Drucker, P. (1997). The future has already happened. *Harvard Business Review*, 75, 20-24.
- Dubson, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Ghosts in the classroom: Stories of college adjunct faculty and the price we all pay*. Boston: Camel's Back Books.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1993). Academic values and faculty rewards. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17, 43-68.
- Finkelstein, M. J., & Schuster, J. H. (2001). Assessing the silent revolution: How changing demographics are reshaping the academic profession. *AAHE Bulletin*, 54, 3-7.



- Fogg, P. (2004, April 16). For these professors, practice is perfect [The Faculty]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A12-A14.
- Fonseca, J. W., & Bird, C. P. (2006). *Under the radar: Branch campuses take off*. Presentation at the National Association of Branch Campus Administrators. Madison, WI.
- Fulton, R. D. (2000). Plight of part-timers in higher education. *Change*, 32, 38-43.
- Gabor, S. C., & Heggan, J. P. (1995). *The off-campus center: Extending the reach of higher education*. Washington, DC: National University Continuing Education Association.
- Gaff, J. G., & Simpson, R. D. (1994). Faculty development in the United States. *Innovative Higher Education*, 19, 167- 176.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Pearson.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2005). Rethinking academic work and workplaces. *Change*, 37, 32-39.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1997). *Two faculties or one? The conundrum of part-timers in a bifurcated work force*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Garli, B., & Petersen, N. J. (2005). Adjuncts happen: Strong faculty; weak system. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 9, 285.
- Geiger, R. L. (1993). *Research and relevant knowledge: American research universities since World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Golden, D. (2006, May 9). Degrees@StateU.edu. *Wall Street Journal*, pp. B1, B4.
- Graham, S., & Donaldson, J. (1996). Assessing personal growth for adults enrolled in higher education. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 44, 7-22.

- Greive, D. & Worden, C.A. (Eds.) (2000). *Managing adjunct & part-time faculty for the new millennium*. Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.
- Hart, J.L. (2010, in press). Non-tenure track faculty women: Opening the door. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 4 (1). Manuscript accepted for publication.
- Hirt, J. B. (2006). *Where you work matters: Student affairs administration at different types of institutions*. New York: University Press of America.
- Hoyt, J. E., Howell, S. L., Glines, L. J., Johnson, G., Spackman, J. S., Thompson, C., & Rudd, C. (2008). Assessing part-time faculty job satisfaction in continuing higher education: Implications for the profession. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 56, 27-38.
- Hudgins, S. (2000). *Never an ivory tower.: University of Maryland University College the first 50 years*. Adelphi, MD: UMUC.
- Huer, J. (1991). *Tenure for Socrates: A study in the betrayal of the American professor*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Kasworm, C. E., & Pike, G. R. (1994). Adult undergraduate students: Evaluating the appropriateness of a traditional model of academic performance. *Research in Higher Education*, 35, 689-710.
- Katz, S. N. (2006, October 6). What has happened to the professoriate? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B8-B11.
- Keast, W. R., & Macy, J. W., Jr. (1973). *Faculty tenure: A report and recommendations by the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Keller, G. (2001). The new demographics of higher education. *Review of Higher Education*, 24, 219-235.
- Kennedy, K. (2006, Nov/Dec). Opting off the tenure track: Why some faculty choose a different path. *Adjunct Advocate*, 26-29.
- Kimball, R. (1990). *Tenured radicals: How politics has corrupted our higher education*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kimball, R. (1998). *Tenured radicals: How politics has corrupted our higher education*. (Rev. ed.) Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Kime, S. (2003). *Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOC) 1972-2003*. Washington, DC: SOC.

- Leedy, P. D. (1997). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lenzner, R., & Johnson, S. S. (1997, March 10). Seeing things as they really are. *Forbes*, 159, 122-128.
- Lyons, R. E., McIntosh, M., & Kysilka, M. L. (2003). *Teaching in the age of accountability*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lyons, R. E. (Eds.). (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Mallon, W. T. (2001). *Tenure on trial: Case studies of change in faculty employment policies*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- McArdle, E. (2002, December). The adjunct explosion. *University Business*, 25-29.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1989). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Longman.
- Meister, J. C. (1998). *Lessons in building a world-class work force*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meister, J. C. (2001, February 9). The brave new world of corporate education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B10 – B11.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (2009). *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace and higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Millis, B.J. (1994). Faculty development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72, 454-464.
- National Survey for Student Engagement. (2009). *Annual Results 2009*. Available from National Center for Student Engagement website, <http://nsse.iub.edu>
- Nickerson, M., & Schaefer, S. (2001). Autonomy and anonymity: Characteristics of branch campus faculty. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 12, 49-59.

- Nilson, L.B. (2003). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Nixon, J. C., Helms, M. M., & Williams, A. B. (2001). Succeeding in the education accountability environment: Tenure and total quality management. *Catalyst for Change*, 30, 10-15.
- Nolan, G., Siegrist, C., & Richard, N. (2007). A mentoring network for adjunct faculty: From proposal to pilot to five-year plan. In R. E. Lyons (Eds.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Olswang, S. (2003). The future of tenure. *Change*, 35, 36-37.
- O'Meara, K., Kaufman, R. R., & Kuntz, A. M. (2003). Faculty work in challenging times: Trends, consequences & implications. *Liberal Education*, Fall 2003. Retrieved December 28, 2005, from <http://www.aacu.edu/liberaleducation/le-fa03feature2.cfm>
- O'Meara, K., & Rice, R. E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ormrod, J. E. (1999). *Human Learning* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Toole, J. (1994). Tenure: A conscientious objection. *Change*, 26, 79-87.
- Pearson, W. (2004). Supporting adult student persistence to the baccalaureate degree. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 52, 23-36.
- Pelikan, J. (1992). *The idea of the university: A reexamination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Plater, W. M. (2001). A profession at risk: Using post-tenure review to save tenure and create an intentional future for the academic community. *Change*, 33, 53-57.
- Rasmussen, R.K. (Eds.) (2001). *Mark Twain: His words, wit and wisdom*. New York: Gramercy Books.
- Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rhoades, G. (2006). The higher education we choose: A question of balance. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29, 381-404.

- Rhoades, G. (2008). The centrality of contingent faculty to academe's future. *Academe*, 94, 12-15.
- Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. New Pathways Working Paper Series, No. 7. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Sandeen, S. (2004). The new majority: Confronting the changes in our students, our reach, and our institutions. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 68, 147-162.
- Schmid, J. M., & Herman, D. M. (2003). Introduction: The changing identity of academic labor. In J. M. Schmid & D. M. Herman (Eds.), *Cogs in the classroom factory: The changing identity of academic labor*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Schneider, J. M. (2004). Employing adjunct faculty from an HR perspective. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 84, 18-20.
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smallwood, S. (2001, August 3). Jill Carroll, a proud part-timer, thinks many adjuncts need a new attitude [The Faculty]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A12.
- Smith, P. (1990). *Killing the spirit: Higher education in America*. New York: Viking.
- Snyder, D. A. (2008). *The new traditional: Adult learners and higher education marketing*. Aspen, CO: July Press.
- Snyder, T. D., Tan, A. G., & Hoffman, C. M. (2004). *Digest of Education Statistics 2003*, (NCES 2005-025). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

- Snyder, T. D., Dillow, S.A., & Hoffman, C. M. (2008). *Digest of Education Statistics 2007*, (NCES 2008-022). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Stake, R. E. (1997). Case study methods in educational research: Seeking sweet water. In R. M. Jaeger (Eds.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 401-422). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stoops, S. L. (2000). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in a process for effectiveness. In D. E. Greive & C. A. Worden (Eds.), *Managing adjunct and part-time faculty for the new millennium* (pp. 221-246). Elyria, OH: Info-Tec.
- Sykes, C. J. (1988). *ProfScam: Professors and the demise of higher education*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analyses types and software tools*. New York: Falmer.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Hentschke, G. C. (2007). *New players, different game: Understanding the rise of for-profit colleges and universities*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Todd, J. G. (2004). Adjunct faculty: A crisis of justice in higher education. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 84, 17-19.
- Trends in adult learning: A 2006 snapshot* (2006). New York: The Aslanian Group.
- Tuckman, H. P. (1978). Who is part-time in academe? *AAUP Bulletin*, 64, 305-351.
- Van Alstyne, W. W. (1994). Tenure: A conscientious objective. *Change*, 26, 88.

- Wallin, D. L. (2004). Valuing professional colleagues: Adjunct faculty in community and technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28, 373-391.
- Wehlburg, C. M., & Chadwick-Blossey, S. (Eds.). (2003). *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Wilson, R. (1998, July 24). For some adjunct faculty members, the tenure track holds little appeal. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A9.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. (2003). Accelerated learning in colleges and universities. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 97, 5-15.
- Wolfe, J. R., & Strange, C. C. (2003). Academic life at a franchise: Faculty culture in a rural two-year branch campus. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26.3, 343-362.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Zutter, C. (2007). Mentoring adjunct instructors: Fostering bonds that strengthen teaching and learning. In R. E. Lyons (Eds.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

## VITA

Eric Cunningham was born in southeastern Kansas in 1953 and spent most of his childhood in southwestern Missouri, graduating from Webb City (MO) High School in 1971. Following high school graduation he attended the United States Military Academy, West Point, NY. After graduation from West Point in 1975, Eric served an initial Infantry tour before attending Army helicopter flight training. During twenty years of active duty Eric served in a wide variety of command, staff and teaching assignments in both Infantry and Army Aviation to include service in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Armored Cavalry Regiment during Operation Desert Storm. Eric's extensive military education includes the Army Ranger course, the basic parachutist course and the regionally accredited Command & General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, KS.

During his military career, Eric participated in off-duty education and earned a Master of Science in Personnel Management from Troy University (AL). After retiring from the Army in 1995 Eric joined the staff at Columbia College (MO) and has worked in the college's Division for Adult Higher Education to the present. During this time, Eric completed a Master of Arts in Higher and Adult Education from the University of Missouri and currently serves on the Board of Directors for the Association for Continuing Higher Education (ACHE).