

Contingent Faculty Members: A Just-in-Time Work Force for Universities

Diane Bandow
Troy University

Tish Matuszek
Troy University

Dennis R. Self
Troy University

Virtually no theoretical framework has been developed to enhance understanding of contingent faculty and work behaviors from the individual or organizational perspective. Little is known about this temporary work force increasingly providing education to students, because there is a paucity of research literature to inform scholars, administrators, and other stakeholders of higher business education. Universities cutting costs are relying more heavily on the just-in-time work provided by contingent faculty members. The purpose of this paper is to explicate the profile of contingent faculty as defined by available literature and the multiple issues related to the increased use of contingent faculty.

INTRODUCTION

The profile of post-secondary faculties has changed considerably since the 1970s. The majority of the instructors are now “outsourced” (Ziegler and Reiff, 2006), and the ranks consist of more contingent faculty (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002-2003; American Teachers Federation, 2010). In a recent article published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Schmidt, March 30, 2012) the author writes that “...more than four fifths of the faculties of two-year public colleges, more than two-thirds of the faculties at private four-year colleges, and more than half of the faculty at public four-year colleges” (p. 1, 8) are adjuncts. For the purposes of this paper, the definition of contingent workers provided by Zeidner (2010) will be used. Zeidner’s (2010) definition of contingent workers includes independent contractors and temporary help. The authors acknowledge that there are other positions, e.g. lecturers and instructors, which may share some of the concerns expressed for contingent workers, and while they may not be included in the definition for this paper, they may be mentioned as sharing similar issues.

The proliferation of contingent faculty members (i.e., Wolfinger, Mason and Goulden, 2009) has been increasing since 1975. Feldman and Turnley (2001) note that some universities, e.g. for-profit institutions, rely completely on contingent faculty. Leslie (1998) and Jones (2002-2003) note competing job opportunities which contribute to fewer full time faculty members, where doctorally qualified faculty members can increase earning potential by moving into private industry jobs, so attracting full-time, qualified faculty is not easy. Further, the field of post secondary education is projected to grow by 15% from 2008-2018 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011) indicating continuing pressure to fill empty instructor

positions. Finally, significant numbers of tenured faculty are considering retirement (Jones, 2002-3). Taken together, these factors drive the increasing need to use contingent faculty.

While contingent faculty help absorb increases in enrollment, no evidence is available to indicate that these contingent faculty members are replacing other responsibilities that are considered the work of the faculty, including research and service work (Leslie, 1998). In undergraduate studies, contingent faculty members are committed to teaching; yet, they are less likely to be doctorally qualified, and they spend little time, if any, on research (Leslie, 1998). Unfortunately, this information as well as other available research (Wyles, 1998; Leslie, 1998) is now well over ten years old, and limited research is available to reflect current conditions.

The impact of an aging workforce also impacts the use of contingent faculty. Jones (2002-2003) provided evidence that those teaching are beginning to retire in greater numbers. Bonoan and Viner (2008) explained the impact of Baby Boomer retirements on higher education, not only in the significant numbers of faculty who will retire but also in the loss of continuity and institutional knowledge. With more than a quarter of the American workforce reaching retirement age in 2010, the need for well qualified faculty members has become critical (Bonoan and Viner, 2008).

Although the use of contingent faculty has increased, there is little research that can clarify the impact that the increased use of contingent faculty has created in the classroom. This is a growing concern, because Haeger (1998) suggested most departments do not understand the problems created by the increased use of contingent faculty. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005), for example, find that low graduation rates are associated with the use of large numbers of contingent faculty at public universities. With the current focus on learning outcomes, assurance of learning, accountability, and quality in the classrooms, it is not clear why the academic community is not more interested in examining how the use of contingent faculty, the use of fewer full-time faculty, and the classroom environment contribute to student performance and student learning, and, ultimately, the value they bring to employers. There is, however, some evidence that use of contingent faculty members does not impair overall organizational quality. Richland College, a member of the Dallas (Texas) Community College District, was the first community college to win the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (2005) while using a faculty staffed by 60% contingent members (Baldrige National Quality Award, 2012).

FINANCIAL PRESSURES

Leslie (1998) indicates that financial need accounts for the use of contingent faculty and that part of the financial problem is caused by an increase in enrollments without an accompanying increase in institutional income. This creates a need for more faculty positions without providing funding for full faculty level salaries. Instead, it drives the need for lower salaries with no benefits to be paid to contingent faculty. Wallin (2004) concurred with the issue of financial stress in higher education, noting 1) the increase in enrollments and 2) how the use of contingent faculty allows administrators to react quickly to environmental demands. More recently, Hemaida and Hupfer (1994/1995) explained how cutbacks at the federal and state government levels have created budget issues in state-supported higher education; costs, faculty and staff compensation, quality of teaching, and making higher education more available for everyone has been noted as an issue since the early 1970s.

Ziegler and Reiff (2006) concurred that financial pressures are behind the increase in usage of contingent faculty. These included financial or fiscal pressure and the push for expansion or development of new markets. Using contingent faculty in new programs or while expanding markets also provides flexibility and resource preservation where more expensive full-time faculty do not have to be assigned, because future demand is not yet known. Commitments can be made to the program without creating long-term obligations by dedicating tenured faculty. Financial issues were also identified by Haeger (1998) in explaining the situation at Towson University. He noted that budget constraints and that budget reduction through attrition of full-time faculty was a strategy, and the salary savings were reallocated as operating funds.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) (n.d.) has shown that the number of tenure-track positions is declining as institutions seek flexibility in dealing with financial matters - as previously noted by other literature - and changing student interests. Institutions are relying more heavily on limited-term contracts and contingent faculty members, thus shrinking the total pool of tenured faculty. Limited-term contracts, typically for two to five years, may be terminated or extended when they expire and generally do not lead to the granting of tenure. In addition, some institutions have limited the percentage of the faculty that can be tenured.

THE CONTINGENT FACULTY PROFILE

The AFT (2010) survey on contingent faculty reported that 57% of the faculty surveyed said they teach because they enjoy it. Overall, approximately 50% preferred part-time work, and approximately 47% prefer full-time work. Yet, for those over 50, 60% would prefer full-time work. While 62% overall are mostly satisfied with their jobs, those in four-year public institutions were less satisfied. Fifty-seven percent agreed that their salaries fall short and insurance was an issue while 28% have health insurance and only 39% say they have retirement benefits (AFT, 2010). Overall, 52% are male, 48% are female; 33% are in the age range 18 to 44; 31% are 45-54, and 36% are 55 and over. The satisfaction levels at two-year colleges show 68% are very satisfied with overall job conditions as are 67% at private four-year institutions. However, only 50% at four-year universities were satisfied, and those who would prefer to work full-time are less satisfied with working conditions (AFT, 2010). When asked what improvements they would like to see, the faculty members (29%) first noted an improvement in healthcare benefits, and 22% wanted more job security (AFT, 2010); about 29 % of postsecondary teachers worked part time in 2008.

Leslie (1998), in discussing community colleges, identified a disproportionately large number of women were serving as contingent faculty, because nearly half the women employed were contingent workers rather than full-time employees. This was a significantly larger number than their male counterparts; males were more likely to be full-time instructors. Markey, Hodgkinson, and Kowalczyk (2002) found that this feminized workforce does not enjoy the same level of opportunities for employee participation and has a lower sense of empowerment. Wolfinger et al. (2009) found that fewer women were earning tenure-track appointments than men. These differences indicate that women are less likely to have input into work issues even though they provide a significant amount of the workforce. However, contingent faculty received tenure-track positions more frequently than those who left academia altogether (Wolfinger et al, 2009). One can conclude that a contingent position appears to provide an opportunity for any eventual full-time appointment because of the consistent ties to education.

A forecast from The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS, n.d.) 2010-11 regarding the outlook for postsecondary teachers (see Figure 1) provided future predictions on what can be expected in post-secondary education. Community colleges, career education programs and similar institutions will offer a considerable number of part-time and renewable appointments; this should provide opportunities for those with master's degrees. However, Nealey (2008) noted that there are not enough younger faculty members to replace the faculty who have recently retired and will be retiring. More than 54% of full-time faculty members in the US in 2005 were older than 50 and only 3% of faculty members who are at age 34 or younger are in positions that typically lead to tenure-track or tenured positions (Nealey, 2008).

Contingent Faculty Employment Issues

Fulton (2000) explained that although administrations are blamed for the poor treatment of contingent faculty, i.e. low salaries and poor benefits, in reality, the administrations are responsible to other stakeholders including taxpayers, state government, parents, and students to maintain low tuition levels and provide competitive salaries for tenured, full-time faculty. The balancing act of fulfilling fiduciary responsibilities while maintaining a fully functioning university continues to drive employment of contingent faculty, a trend that is being felt throughout many areas. However, there are numerous issues that are associated with employment of contingent faculty, including: 1) contingent faculty members not

being included in department meetings or on committees even though some issues are relevant to contingent faculty; 2) there was an absence of support, equipment offices and telephones as well as the 3) lack of computer resources, 4) inadequate compensation, 5) lack of benefits and 6) no systematic approach to notification of teaching opportunities for contingent faculty (Haeger, 1998; Schinerov, 2003; Colorado Commission on Higher Education, 2007). There was also a lack of guides and handbooks on services, expectations, policies and calendars to provide important dates (Haeger, 1998; Wallin, 2004). Research by Feldman and Turnley (2001) provided areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for contingent faculty as well as attitudinal differences based on age. Satisfiers included but were not limited to schedule flexibility, coworkers, job autonomy and challenging work. Elements that were dissatisfying where the quality of supervision which included a perception of second-class citizenship as compared to tenured faculty, poor pay and fringe benefits, a lack of advancement opportunities and no job security.

Wallin (2004) explained that contingent faculty typically cover multi-section courses or act as replacements for full-time faculty until they return. Contingent faculty members are usually hired for their expertise and experience in specific areas, and they bring fewer complications related to the politics of academia as well as increased industry experience, an important contribution to the classroom (Leslie, 1998).

Other issues need to be considered with contingent faculty. These faculty members are less likely to understand institutional policies and procedures, they may lack basic knowledge of pedagogy, and they may be unaware of appropriate teaching techniques (Wallin, 2004). Contingent faculty may not understand the mission of the institution, characteristics of students or what purpose their courses serve in the overall curriculum. Contingent faculty may feel isolated and may lack necessary connections with full-time faculty and administration; this could make them feel unappreciated and marginalized. This was supported by Bethke and Nelson (1994) who explained how contingent faculty perceive that their lack of status contributes to isolationism, being unappreciated and, in some cases, rejection. Full-time faculty may even avoid getting to know them, thus reinforcing the perception that nobody cares.

The New Mexico Higher Education Department (2007, House Bill 384) identified a high turnover rate in contingent faculty with only 9% remaining since 2000. Hiring practices may partially explain the turnover rate. Only one institution in New Mexico maintained a policy that specifically notes a preference to hire contingent faculty for full-time positions, although this practice varied by disciplines.

Schinerov (2003) referred to contingent faculty as the "underclass". He noted that increasing numbers of contingent faculty could be perceived as a threat to tenure, because academic freedom relies on tenure, and with fewer tenured positions academic freedom could become a moot point. Leslie (1998) described an overriding concern that the shared governance, academic freedom and curriculum in general are possibly at risk, because faculty members are becoming more transient and fragmented. With more non-tenure-track faculty members teaching courses in higher education, Schinerov (2003) questioned how the academic traditions related to freedom to experiment, security, continuity, and support professional development along with adequate resources could be preserved when contingent faculty rarely have access to such resources.

RIGOR AND QUALITY IN THE CLASSROOM

An on-going concern in universities has been maintaining academic rigor in the classroom. Contingent faculty members are usually less experienced in teaching and not as involved in student advisement or research, and this may adversely affect student achievement. There is also concern that contingent faculty may reduce rigor in the classroom to create better student evaluations of their teaching which would, in turn, result in more employment opportunities (Pisani & Stott, 1998; Sonner, 2000; Kirk and Spector, 2009).

Haeger (1998) expressed concerns about how extensive use of contingent faculty affects the quality in both graduate and undergraduate programs. Kirk and Spector (2009) compared the achievement of accounting students taught by contingent faculty and students taught by full-time faculty. Results indicated that students taught by full-time faculty performed at a significantly higher level than those

taught by contingent faculty, and there was some evidence of contingent faculty assigning systematically higher grades than those assigned by full-time faculty to students.

The concern about quality in the classroom when using contingent faculty was further supported by Sonner (2000) who collected data from a small public university that relied heavily on contingent faculty. This study found that contingent faculty awarded higher grades to students than did full-time faculty. Sonner (2000) noted that it was reasonable to conclude that contingent faculty members who work on a term-by-term basis are reluctant to give lower grades, because this could generate student complaints and result in the contingent faculty member not receiving subsequent offers to teach. Unfortunately, beyond the direct impact of grade inflation, the awarding of higher grades by contingent faculty would pressure full-time faculty to award higher grades, because this could become a student expectation.

However, other studies found no differences in teaching outcomes. Using eight different academic departments, a survey of undergraduate students examined grade distributions and teaching outcomes with demographics (Landrum, 2008). One conclusion was that it is surprising that contingent faculty do as well as they do considering the lack of resources. Another conclusion was that there is no real difference between the outcomes of contingent and full-time faculty; yet, institutions may come to rely on contingent faculty more, because they can accomplish the same with fewer resources. Landrum (2008) expected full-time to perform better than part-time but found no significant differences. Wallin (2004) also noted no differences in the quality of instruction between full-time and part-time faculty members in community colleges.

Kirstein (2009) investigated relationships between faculty qualifications and classroom performance; factors included degree levels, professional experience, scholarship and academic experience. These factors were then compared across student ratings on the effectiveness of instruction on the course evaluations as well as the performance assessment from the primary supervisor of the faculty member. There did not appear to be any correlation between the student survey scores and the number of years of instructor teaching experience. However, Fulton (2000) recommended that part-time faculty should not be teaching core courses and that contingent faculty should be used for specific specialty areas.

Another crucial issue is attitudinal differences between full and contingent faculty members as it relates to cheating in the classroom with contingent faculty members less likely to sanction students who were found to be cheating and less likely to educate students about cheating. Hudd, Apgar, Bronson, and Lee (2009) found that contingent faculty members were more likely to believe that high schools had adequately prepared students to avoid cheating behaviors and that contingent faculty members were less likely to perceive cheating in the environment or to take preventive measures. This study noted the potential for contingent faculty members to undermine a culture of integrity, because there is not a systematic and unified response to the problem of cheating.

SUGGESTIONS FOR MANAGING CONTINGENT FACULTY

Most institutions understand the need to orient contingent faculty whereby contingent faculty members receive instruction on organizational policies, procedures and expectations; however, development of contingent faculty should be an ongoing process (Parsons, 1998). Wallin (2004) notes that the development of contingent faculty members is an investment in the future. For this reason, higher education needs to systematically integrate contingent faculty members into the institution instead of treating them as permanent "outsiders".

There are many possible suggestions to guide institutions that seek to improve the conditions under which contingent faculty are employed. West (2004), Bethke and Nelson (1994), Feldman and Tunley (2001), and Wallin (2004) provide general lists of areas that need to be considered, including providing mentors and professional development opportunities, improving communication and contact between contingent faculty and full-time faculty, providing recognition such as titles and awards for contingent faculty, encouraging participation in meetings, providing facilities such as areas or offices where they can meet with students, obtaining office supplies, and providing access to IT training, orientations and a faculty directory. Opportunities for contingent faculty to provide suggestions in areas such as curriculum

development should also be considered (West, 2004). One important aspect of engaging contingent faculty is to use them for their creativity and ideas, as they can bring both a fresh perspective and recent industry experience. This is especially important in business education where current business practices are an essential element of instruction and are changing to accommodate a hyperturbulent environment. Many of these suggestions are noted in an American Association of University Professors (AAUP) report (2006; n.d.a).

Bethke and Nelson (1994) also suggest a training program for all new contingent faculty members which includes how to write syllabi in addition to a review of program policies and assigning mentors to new contingent faculty members. Communication with contingent faculty can be improved by forming a contingent faculty committee. This committee can include monthly meetings and social events as well as a contingent faculty bulletin board. Ziegler and Reiff (2006) explain how the contingent faculty mentoring program developed at Lesley University. This program emphasizes academic integrity and supports effective teaching and sustained professional collaboration while addressing immediate concerns about adherence to policies and procedures. A mentoring program should also address some of the issues focused on more accountability as well as improved quality and efficiency in the classroom. One specific suggestion from Bethke and Nelson (2004) is to make selections for full-time faculty from contingent faculty. Accepting temporary assignments with the hope of obtaining a permanent appointment appears to be an expectation of contingent faculty, yet there is no information to indicate if this systematically occurs. Leslie (1998) noted earlier that this is often an expectation of contingent faculty, and Wolfinger et.al. (2009) also indicates that chances of being hired into a full-time position are more likely if the candidate maintains ties to academia.

Hueger (1998), Wallin (2004), AAUP (2006) and Bethke and Nelson (1994) provide numerous suggestions to guide institutions who want to provide better support to contingent faculty members. The expectation is that improved support will translate into improved classroom environment and, ultimately, improved student performance. Some of these suggestions include 1) a training program for all new contingent faculty members about writing syllabi and a review of program policies as a condition of employment, 2) establishing and using a mentoring process, 3) introducing new contingent faculty to full-time faculty and experienced contingent faculty members faculty early in the term, and 4) establishing office hours as required to both meet students and learn more about the institution by being present. Pisani and Stott (1998) recommend faculty development for contingent faculty members as fulfilling the educational mission of the university to provide ongoing education to all stakeholders.

Administrators should encourage teaching observations between contingent faculty members and full-time, provide opportunities for contingent faculty members and full-time faculty members to discuss professional issues, and create a faculty directory that includes both full-time and contingent faculty. Morale could be improved by establishing an office and phone for contingent faculty members; institutions could also consider offering service awards and create titles for contingent faculty who have been with the institution for many years and for those who have demonstrated exemplary teaching. Contingent faculty members also need opportunities to interact with full-time and opportunities to participate in decision-making. Basic office supplies for contingent faculty members could also improve morale. Finally, institutions should provide an contingent faculty members faculty handbook; information specific to the location is necessary if the institution has multiple locations. The handbook should also contain “teaching tips,” grading standards, instructional techniques, discipline policies, emergency procedures, library resources, and examples of a course syllabus (Wallin, 2004). Wallin (2004) suggested that many institutions may have provided one or two, or even a few of these suggestions but few institutions have a comprehensive approach to managing their contingent faculty. In addition to many of the areas already noted, West (2004), specifically noting business contingent faculty members, concurred with these suggestions and added recommendations to have contingent faculty visit classrooms, have midterm evaluations and attend an effective teaching seminar. Administration should also conduct surveys with contingent faculty, especially follow-up surveys to determine what can be changed or improved to enhance their performance and then acting as appropriate on the results including communicating back to the contingent faculty about what will be done as a result of the data collected.

Maldonado and Riman (2008-2009) provide an example of the online faculty development program at the Center for Excellence in Teaching at SUNY. This program includes material that is accessible online including, but not limited to, video discussions, conferencing and printable material. Bershbeck (2010) recommends that teaching internships be required for graduate business students who plan to go into teaching. Early preparation of potential instructors would benefit both the hiring institution and the new business instructor. Yantz and Bechtold (1994) provide an example of the development of a college teaching center that is open to the community. The teaching center includes roundtable discussions with topics which relate to the college and various software programs. The target audience for the teaching center is full-time and contingent faculty at the community college and K-12 educators in the community. A master teacher certificate can be earned based on professional development curriculum and salary increases are based on completion. There are also teaching excellence awards for contingent faculty members. For those completing the master teacher curriculum, it is possible to earn a \$100 honorarium and to serve as a mentor. This also makes those completing the curriculum eligible for a \$500 honorarium and a teaching excellence award.

DISCUSSION

While many of the suggestions from the available literature can guide institutions in their quest to improve relations with and understand contingent faculty members, most suggestions are couched in terms that make them far too broad to be truly helpful. For example, prescribing that an institution “improve communication” is tautological and does not serve to truly inform actual ways to improve communication with contingent workers. Further, the suggestions often overlook the reality of working with contingent faculty members, many of whom are not focused on the life of the university. Contingent faculty members often hold primary positions in other industries or may hold contingent positions at multiple institutions. Anecdotal information indicates that the contingent faculty member may see him/herself as “temporary help” or see the contingent position as less important than a full position. Further, while mentoring is often cited as a means of socializing and developing contingent faculty, there are few examples of well designed programs with measurable outcomes to guide such programs. Coupled with growing workloads for many members of the full faculty in business schools, mentoring is not likely to be a priority for many business professors.

Policies on providing priority consideration to those who have been contingent faculty members when hiring for full-time positions may be a possibility that institutions in higher education wish to pursue because this appears to be a perception, or even an expectation, of some contingent faculty. Such a policy may create a higher level of commitment between a contingent faculty and the institution. An appropriate approach is to conduct systematic surveys with contingent faculty to understand current issues and to address those problems which positively impact the classroom. Although IT issues have been identified as a challenging aspect for contingent faculty in terms of access and training, IT alone will not solve the problems, because the social aspects such as relationship development, contact with other faculty members, and knowledge about policies and procedures are essential knowledge for contingent faculty. A needs assessment will also be part of a systematic approach to addressing the needs of contingent faculty. Accrediting bodies are looking for evidence of research and performance improvement relative to outcomes, and where faculty members are involved, that also means student performance, assurance of learning and test results will be critical aspects in higher education.

One starting point is to work with the positive perceptions of contingent faculty that have been identified earlier in this paper, using the challenge of the work and relationships with professional colleagues as building blocks to begin a more effective collaboration. Another opportunity can be found in working to change the perception that contingent faculty members are second-class citizens within the university by highlighting areas of expertise and by emphasizing the good work of their students. Through the systematic applications of the suggestions provided by research, perceptions will begin to change.

FUTURE RESEARCH

As noted in the abstract of this paper, there is no apparent theoretical underpinning to enhance understanding of contingent work, workers, or work issues. All work behaviors and issues are addressed according to theory that arises from full time work behaviors and issues. As a result, most work in this field studies contingent workers as nothing more than a comparator for full time workers. The underlying assumption of this approach is that the study of contingent work and full time workers is fully informed by an understanding of full time work and workers; however, there is no evidence to support this assumption. Conversely, there is virtually no theory or empirical evidence that suggests that contingent work and full time work are equivalent. A starting place to address this notable gap in the literature is to use a grounded theory approach to building a framework to inform contingent work in all industries, and, especially, higher education, because of the drastic change in the faculty profile. Research needs to investigate other aspects of the increased usage of contingent faculty. Multiple examples have been provided that address only the negative aspects such as poor salaries and the lack of health benefits which are unlikely to change in the near term. A more evidence-based approach to address stakeholder interests is necessary before schools of business can make informed decisions about the future. Rather than looking at what has been lost, it would be more productive to look at the how universities can more effectively balance their needs and wishes with current realities.

CONCLUSION

With the looming shortage of individuals with terminal degrees, fewer tenured positions available, and heavy competition for those that do exist, contingent faculty members are here to stay. There is no indication that the numbers will be reduced. Conversely, a growing body of evidence indicates that industries, including higher education, are moving toward a greater use of contingent workers as a means of controlling costs, increasing strategic flexibility, and acquiring much needed expertise in a speedy manner (Zeidner, 2010). They are, effectively, creating a just-in-time work force to carry out the daily operations of organizations. Consequently, administrators need to consider more effective ways of integrating contingent faculty into the institution. Integration will require engagement and commitment of all stakeholders who are necessary to improve quality. The challenge is to develop a systematic approach to integration such as that suggested by the Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence (2012). Integration would also include developing approaches to engage contingent faculty that would indicate that their input is valued and that they are not going to be ignored.

Although current economic and budget issues may prevent an immediate improvement in healthcare benefits and job security, the continual call over the last two decades to improve the conditions of contingent faculty indicates the need to review and improve current conditions. Further, the growing use of contingent faculty members creates an immediate need for more empirical research about this labor sub-population.

Training and professional development are areas that cannot be ignored. Because training and development are expected to have a significant impact in the classroom, administrators may want to consider dedicating funds to support contingent faculty. In some institutions this is already available. Accreditation standards (i.e., ACBSP and AACSB) require faculty development to assure that faculty members are well prepared within discipline as well as in effective teaching methods, thus providing an optimal learning environment in the classroom.

Recently, one of the authors enjoyed a conversation with a manager who is dedicated to training and development for his employees. When asked by other managers why he would allow employees to waste time and money in training when employees are constantly looking for, and receiving, transfers and moving to different positions, the manager replied, "What happens if I don't train them, and they stay?" This also holds true in higher education where faculty training and development has significant ramifications for accreditation status, student accomplishment, and student employability. Improving the

status and skill sets of contingent faculty members speaks to a school's commitment to provide exceptional resources for students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

REFERENCES

- American Association of University Professors (n.d.a). *Employment Policies and Requirements for Training and Integration of Part-Time Faculty*. Retrieved February, 17, 2011 from <http://aaup.org-AAUP.comm.rep/HenryTab2.htm?PF=1>.
- American Association of University Professors (n.d.b). *Definitions and Requirements for Public Identification of "Part-Time Faculty"*. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://aaup.org-AAUP.comm.rep/HenryTab2.htm?>.
- American Association of University Professors (2008). *Looking the other way? Accreditation standards and part-time faculty*. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://aaup.org-AAUP.comm.rep/accredpt.htm?PF=1>.
- American Association of University Professors (2006). *Contingent appointments in the academic profession*. AAUP Policy, tenth, Ed. 2. 98-114. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://aaup.org>.
- Berschbak, R. (2010). Everything that new and contingent faculty members business faculty member should ask about teaching, but don't know enough to ask. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 7, (5), 13-23. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://old.library.georgetown.edu/newjour/j/msg04877.html>.
- American Federation of Teachers (2010). A national survey of part-time/contingent faculty members faculty. *American Academic*, 2. Retrieved from <http://www.aft.org/>.
- Bethke, R. & Nelson, V. (1994). *Collaborative efforts to improve conditions for contingent faculty members faculty*. International Conference of the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development on Teaching Excellence and Conference of Administrators, Austin, Texas (Report No. ED 373 822). Retrieved February, 17, 2011 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.
- Bonoan, M. and Viner, N. (2008). Baby boomer retirements impact higher education. *San Gabriel Valley Tribune*, West Covina, California. September 13. Retrieved from http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=list&p_topdoc=11.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (n.d.). *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2010-11 Edition*. Retrieved February, 17, 2011 from <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos066.htm>.
- Colorado Commission on Higher Education (January 12, 2007). *Contingent faculty members Professor Benefits Study*. 1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 1200, Denver, Colorado. Retrieved February, 17, 2011 from <http://cospl.coalliance.org/fez/view/co:1257>.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *Journal of Human Resources*, 40, (3), 647-659.
- Feldman, D. & Turnley, W. (2001). A field study of contingent faculty members faculty: The impact of career stage on reactions to non-tenure-track jobs. *Journal of Career Development*, 28, (1), 1-16. Retrieved February, 17, 2011 from <http://jcd.sagepub.com/>.

Fulton, R. (2000). The plight of part-timers in higher education. *Change*, May/June, 38-43. Retrieved from <http://www.changemag.org/>.

Haeger, J. (1998). Part-time faculty, quality programs, and economic realities. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 104, 81-88. Retrieved February, 17, 2011 from <http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-HE.html>.

Hemaida, R. and Hupfer, M. (1994/1995). A multiobjective model for managing faculty resources. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 11, (1), 24-29.

Hudd, S. S., Apgar, C., Bronson, E. F., & Lee, R. G. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full- and part-time faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 2, 146-177.

Jones, E. (2002-2003). Beyond supply and demand: Assessing the PhD job market. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*, Winter, 22-28. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.bls.gov/opub/ooq/2002/winter/art03.pdf>.

Kirk, F., & Spector, C. (2009). A comparison of the achievement of students taught by full-time versus contingent faculty members faculty in business courses. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 13, (2), 73-81. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.alliedacademies.org/public/AffiliateAcademies/ael.aspx>.

Kirstein, K. (2009). Screening for highly qualified contingent faculty members business faculty: Which attributes correlate to faculty performance? 1-13. (Report no. ED 506 653). Online Submission. Retrieved March10, 2011 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Landrum, R. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time in part-time faculty? *College Teaching*, 57, (1), 23-26. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/journal.asp?issn=8756-7555&linktype=1>.

Leslie, D. (1998). Part-time, contingent faculty members and temporary faculty: The new majority? (Report No. 422 771). Report of the Sloan Conference on part-time and contingent faculty members faculty. Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, New York, New York. Retrieved March10, 2011 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Maldonaldo, E. & Rimai, J. (2008-2009). The contingent faculty members advocate@ FIT: Bringing part time faculty into the mainstream. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 37, (3), 327-333. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.salt.org/salt.asp?ss=l&pn=jets>.

Markey, R., Hodgkinson, A., & Kowalczyk, J. (2002). Gender, part-time employment, and employee participation in Australian workplaces. *Employee Relations*, 24, ½, 129-150.

National Center for Educational Statistics (2003-2004) Careers/Technical Education (CTE) Statistics. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ctes/tables/P62.asp>.

Nealy, M. (2008). Who will fill their shoes? *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 20, (1) 26-28. Retrieved March10, 2011 from www.diverseeducation.com.

New Mexico Higher Education Department (2007). *The Report on part-time faculty compensation and salary survey House Bill 384*. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.hed.state.nm.us/>.

Parsons, M. (1998). *How the other 2/3 live: Institutional initiatives for part-time faculty assimilation in America's two-year colleges* (Report No. ED 417 793). Retrieved March10, 2011 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Pisani, A. M. & Stott, N. (1998). An investigation of part-time faculty commitment to developmental advising. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 2, 121-142.

Ryesky, K. (2003). *Bringing contingent faculty members faculty into the IT fold*. Monograph. Presented at the second annual CUNY IT conference, Institutional/information Technology in CUNY: Issues, innovations, integration. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://media.centerdigitaled.com/cuny-casey/Ryesky-CUNY.doc>.

Schmidt, P. (March 30, 2012). Accreditation eyed as a means to aid adjuncts. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 58, (30), A1, A8, A10.

Schneirov, R. (2003). Contingent faculty: A new social movement take shape. *Working USA*, 40, (4), 38. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=1089-7011>.

Sonner, B. (2000). A is for contingent faculty members: Examining grade inflation and higher education. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76, (1), 5-8. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t914957652>.

Virginia State Council of Higher Education (1998). *Study of policies regarding the use of contingent faculty members faculty: Response to item 156.H.*, Chapter 1, Special Session 1. (Report No. 460 728). Retrieved March10, 2011 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Wallin, D. (2004). Valuing professional colleagues: Contingent faculty members faculty and community and technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28, 373-391.
Doi:10.1080/10668920490424087

West, E. (2004). Care and feeding of contingent faculty members business professors: Strategies for improved performance. Allied Academies International Conference. *Academy of Educational Leadership. Proceedings*, 9, (1), 115-119. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://alliedacademies.org/Public/Default.aspx>.

Wolfinger, N, Mason, M. & Goulden, M. (2009). Stay in the game: gender, faculty formation and alternative life trajectories in the academic life course. *Social Forces*, 87, (3), 1610-1621. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://socialforces.unc.edu/>.

Wyles, B. (1998). Contingent faculty members faculty in the community college: Realities and challenges. *New Directions For Higher Education*, 104, 89-93. Retrieved March10, 2011 from <http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-HE.html>.

Yantz, P. and Bechtold, C. (1994). *Part-time faculty: Here today, not gone tomorrow, or professional development of part-time faculty and the changing role of division chairpersons*. (Report No. ED 369 428). International Conference for Community College, Chair s, Deans and other Instructional Leaders. Phoenix, Arizona. Retrieved March10, 2011 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Zeidner, R. (2010). Heady debate: Rely on temps or staff? *HR Magazine*, 55, (2), 28-33.

Zeigler, C. and Reiff, M. (2006). Contingent faculty members mentoring, a vital responsibility in a changing educational climate: the Leslie University contingent faculty members mentoring program. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 14, (2), 247-269. Doi: 10.1080/13611260500493667

APPENDIX A

**TABLE 1
EMPLOYMENT**

Post-secondary teaching positions in 2008. Business teachers held 85,400 in 2008.

Graduate teaching assistants	159,700
Health specialties teachers	155,300
Vocational education teachers	120,200
Art, drama, and music teachers	93,800
Business teachers	85,400
English language and literature teachers	74,800
Education teachers	70,200
Biological science teachers	64,700
Nursing instructors and teachers	55,100
Mathematical science teachers	54,800
Engineering teachers	40,600
Psychology teachers	38,900
Computer science teachers	38,800
Foreign language and literature teachers	32,100
Communications teachers	29,900
History teachers	26,000
Philosophy and religion teachers	25,100
Chemistry teachers	24,800
Recreation and fitness studies teachers	21,000
Sociology teachers	20,300
Postsecondary teachers, all other	298,000

<http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos066.htm>, Retrieved June 22, 2011