NON-FULL-TIME COLLEGE PROFESSORS: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO THE
NON-FULL-TIME FACULTY ROLE

By

CHAD DOUGLAS MUNDAY

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education
in fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master’s of Education program

Faculty of Education
Queen’s University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
September, 2016

© Copyright 2016, Chad Douglas Munday
ABSTRACT

The rate of non-full-time faculty members has increased rapidly over the last decade (Louis, 2009; MacKay, 2014; Meranze & Newfield, 2013), as the post-secondary landscape of fluctuating enrolment, fiscal and operational challenges, and the requirement to hire specialized skill sets have required institutions to rely heavily on this demographic. In the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAATs) system, institutions have tried to preserve and enhance educational quality with fewer resources through greater reliance on non-full-time faculty.

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions and experiences of teaching and support of non-full-time faculty at one Eastern Ontario college. Employing a narrative inquiry methodology, data were collected from four participants through their writing three individual letters at the end of each month and participating in one interview at the end of the contract period. The data were analyzed and coded. This analysis revealed five themes: motivation, connection and engagement, compensation, teaching and development, and performance evaluation.

Differences in the participants’ perceptions tended to reflect divergences across career stage: retired versus early career. The compensation package provided to non-full-time faculty was considered inadequate for those in the early career stage, especially comparing it to that of full-time faculty. In addition, the amount of previous teaching experience was an important indicator for the appropriate level of teaching resources and support provided by the institution. The newer faculty members required a higher level of support to combat feelings of role isolation. The temporary nature of the role made it difficult to establish a feeling of a strong connection to the institution and subsequently
opportunities to engage further to deepen the relationship. Despite these differences across participants, autonomous motivators were consistent across all narratives, as participants expressed their desire to teach and share their knowledge to help students achieve their goals. Participants concluded their narratives by sharing future advice for faculty interested in pursuing the role.

The narratives provided areas for improvement that would help increase the level of job satisfaction for non-full-time college faculty members: (a) establishing a more thorough performance evaluation process to align with institutional supports, (b) offering more diverse teaching resources to better prepare faculty and enhance teaching practices, (c) overhauling the compensation package to better recognize the amount of time and effort spent in the role and aligning with the compensation provided to full-time faculty, and (d) including rewards and incentives as part of the compensation package to enhance the level of commitment and availability for the role. These changes might well increase the job satisfaction and improve the retention of non-full-time faculty members.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The main idea for the study came from my involvement working in the Ontario college system. Since 2007, I have worked in the departments of student services and academic management. My work in these different departments has provided me the opportunity to interact with non-full-time faculty in various capacities: from offering assistance to faculty to better support their students to monitoring the human resources elements of the non-full-time faculty role. This work has created a range of interactions and experiences, both positive and negative, with these faculty members.

In 2009, I went back to school and completed the Master’s of Business Administration (MBA) program to better understand the economics of creating a successful organization. The intent of my participation in the MBA program was to return to the public sector and contribute to developing successful staff teams through training and development, thereby supporting the needs of all faculty and staff, including non-full-time faculty members.

After the MBA program, I returned to working in the Ontario college environment and shortly thereafter began teaching on a part-time basis in addition to my full-time academic management responsibilities. These dual roles encouraged me to pursue the Master’s of Education (M.Ed.) program and fed my interest in exploring the work of non-full-time faculty members. The opportunity to continue in these roles while studying provided the platform to design a study focused on the experiences of non-full-time faculty in an effort to better inform policies and procedures designed to support this faculty group.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions and experiences of teaching and support of non-full-time faculty\(^1\) at one Eastern Ontario college. This purpose was originally conceptualized through three research questions:

1. How does the structure of the non-full-time faculty role influence the ability to provide quality instruction to students, as described by four non-full-time faculty members at one Eastern Ontario college?
2. How is professional development and faculty support perceived by these four non-full-time faculty members?
3. How is the practice of teaching and learning perceived by these four non-full-time faculty members?

Employing a narrative inquiry methodology, data were collected from four participants by asking them to write three individual letters at the end of each month and to participate in one interview at the end of the contract period. I also took informal notes about events and situations happening at the college throughout the process to add context to each narrative. All documents were analyzed and coded to summarize in overarching themes. The original research questions helped guide the study, but as the study evolved and I analyzed the data, these overall questions seemed to have less relevance to what the participants discussed and were replaced by emergent themes.

Rationale

Over the last decade, an increased number of non-full-time faculty members have been hired in the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAATs) to respond

---

\(^1\) For the purposes of this study, non-full-time faculty represents part-time (6 teaching hours) or sessional (12 or more teaching hours) contracts.
to increased enrolment and fiscal challenges (MacKay, 2014). Given the career-oriented and applied skills focus of colleges, these new faculty often teach at the college while retaining outside employment. They bring professional skills beneficial to their content knowledge, but tend to lack training in the fundamentals of teaching and learning. Coupled with other competing priorities, like family obligations, many are unable to take advantage of traditional orientation and professional development programs offered by the institution. Literature on non-full-time faculty has noted tensions between the structure of the role and the realities faced by faculty working in this classification. Furthermore, gaps exist between full-time and non-full-time faculty in terms of compensation and institutional support (Field, Jones, Karram Stephenson, & Khoyetsyan, 2014). While the intent has been to close these gaps, a presumed unintended consequence of decreased provincial funding has been the decreased ability for institutions to provide adequate support packages to those teaching in a non-full-time capacity.

The college’s compensation rate may have influenced the study. The impact of the decreased part-time and sessional rate of pay to $50 per teaching hour over 14 weeks, limited use of the unionized partial-load category (7-12 teaching hours with a higher rate of pay), and the expectation that training and development and outside teaching responsibilities were completed at no further compensation collectively shaped the working environment for this group of faculty. In this context, this study was designed to explore narratives of the predicted tension between the work of non-full-time faculty members and the real daily pressures faced, both in their personal lives and on the job.

The demands on new non-full-time faculty to adapt to new technologies and needs of diverse student groups require innovative ways of thinking. There are many
facets to the role that require faculty to learn on the job. A steep learning curve exists with much to acquire in a relatively short amount of time (Rogers, McIntyre, & Jazzar, 2010). Developing an authentic mix of supports for faculty during the life cycle of the role can help with these challenges. Even though the needs of this classification are not greatly different from the needs of full-time faculty members, institutions have not yet responded appropriately as the focus is still on those in a full-time role (Rogers et al., 2010). Given the different levels of support that exist across the CAAT system, further research is needed to help identify and inform administration of the experiences and perceptions of non-full-time faculty members.

My research should help inform colleges in the CAAT system and allow meaningful reflection on the current state of the role. In my initial review, no research was located on the perceptions and experiences of non-full-time faculty in an Ontario college context. According to the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO), further research is needed into the roles and experiences of other than full-time instructors and the implications for quality and student success (Field et al., 2014). My research intends to address this gap by providing data to shape future decisions about the structure and supports of the role.

World Context

An international resolution on precarious academic work has been launched citing, “precarious work is bad for education, unfair to teachers and students, and must be better regulated” (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2015, para. 1). In the United States, part-time faculty members have become an indispensable workforce in American higher education (Stephens & Wright, 1999). The number of adjunct faculty
increased by more than 100% between 2006 and 2009 (Louis, 2009). The percentage of adjunct faculty in the United States has grown from 20% in the 1970s to over 50% in 2014 (Goldstene, 2014) with the National Centre for Education Statistics (2012) estimating that adjunct faculty members represent upwards of 70% of college and university faculty in the United States. In the United Kingdom, adjunct faculty comprises 76% of the academic workforce (Meranze & Newfield, 2013). About half of adjunct professors work more than 50 hours a week, while receiving 26 percent less in compensation compared to tenure-track assistant professors (Monks, 2009).

**Canadian Context**

While most universities are not required to report the number of non-full-time instructors (Jones et al., 2014), it is estimated that a contract faculty member in Canada teaches more than half of all undergraduate students, up from 38% in 2012 (Basen, 2014). The data available signal that there is a reliance on non-permanent positions; however, differences may exist among the provinces and territories (Jones et al., 2014) as well as across program disciplines and departments (Muzzin & Shahjahan, 2005; Rajagopal, 2002). The College Employer Council in Ontario reported that there were 15,400 part-time faculty members in 2015-2016, making up approximately 68% of total academic staff in Ontario colleges. This number represents an increase of 3.5% from 2011-2012. While it is assumed issues faced by non-full-time faculty in Canada are similar to those of their counterparts in the United States, there is surprisingly little recent Canadian research (Jones et al., 2014).
Description of Pilot Study

I conducted a pilot study to better understand the role and professional development needs of three non-full-time faculty members at one Eastern Ontario college to assist in developing meaningful professional development opportunities given the faculty members’ limited availability and competing priorities. A narrative inquiry approach was used to help better understand four research questions:

1) What priorities, unrelated to their position at the college, are having an effect on the participants’ level of commitment to professional development activities related to teaching and learning?

2) How do these non-full-time faculty members understand the relationships among their professional and academic backgrounds, their beliefs about the purposes of college, and their beliefs about being a professor at an Eastern Ontario college?

3) How do these non-full-time faculty members understand professional development at an Eastern Ontario college?

4) What do non-full-time faculty recommend as solutions to support their participation in professional development?

Participants revealed that earlier opportunities in their careers to teach and mentor inspired them to pursue the non-full-time faculty role. They suggested that the institution should continue to offer professional development programs, but develop a model that encouraged greater participation and removed obstacles for non-full-time faculty members. Participants concluded that the institution needed to provide clearer expectations and better define the requirements of the role.
The pilot study had two effects on the current study. First, the pilot study questions captured the participants’ perceptions about professional development, but not other aspects of the role. I incorporated additional questions in the current thesis about performance evaluation, motivation, and social engagement to provoke a more fulsome narrative. Second, I expanded the data collection process beyond one interview to include letter writing. By incorporating the letters, I was able to summarize participants’ narratives throughout the semester, as opposed to just at the end of the contract, and thereby capture richer data.

**Overview of Thesis**

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 introduced the study through detailing my reasons behind pursuing the thesis, setting out its purpose, providing the thesis’ rationale, and describing the pilot study. The literature review in Chapter 2 analyzes the non-full-time faculty role within the Ontario college environment. Five themes are explored: motivation, connection and engagement, compensation, teaching and development, and performance evaluation. Chapter 3 captures the methodology, data collection, and data analysis. The results are the focus of Chapter 4, highlighting each participant’s narratives (James, Keith, Laura, and Sage) across the five themes. Lastly, Chapter 5 synthesizes the themes from the participants with the research literature, before describing recommendations, limitations and directions for future research, and final thoughts.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

There has been an increasing shift from full-time faculty to non-full-time faculty in Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAATs). The literature on non-full-time faculty, sometimes referred to as adjunct, other-than-full-time, or part-time faculty, is, however, limited in Canada. Researchers have primarily focused on American, Australian, and United Kingdom higher education systems. With various definitions, it is also difficult to draw conclusions that apply nationally and globally (Jones et al., 2014). There are no national data on part-time faculty in Canada, and no common definition of employment categories or part-time workload (Jones et al., 2014).

The Role of Non-Full-Time Faculty Members

By definition, the non-full-time role is considered a temporary asset to the college environment, with faculty members hired on a contract basis for specified periods of time. Part-time faculty bring in expertise and experience to the fields in which they teach, fill in temporary teaching gaps, provide for sudden growth in program areas, and save institutions significant funds in times of economic challenges (Eckler, Field, & Goldstein, 2009). Pressures exist “to develop educational policies that attempt to restructure postsecondary educational systems along entrepreneurial lines in order to provide flexible educational responses to the new model of industrial production” (Morrow & Torres, 2000, p. 35). Professionals are generally hired on a part-time basis because they are in the field and are familiar with the latest technologies (Klopper, 2014). Four categories reflect the casual academic workforce: traditional industry expert and professional, freelancer, career-ender (transitioning to retirement), and aspiring academic (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Overall, non-full-time faculty members tend to be dedicated, highly qualified teachers
(Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Field & Jones, 2016; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). However, a defining difference between full- and part-time faculty is the existence of two completely different and separate working conditions (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Arguments exist that advantages exist for both the employer and employee in terms of casualization. Advantages for the institution are: cheaper labour costs, convenience, control, and ease of dismissal (Buchanan, 2004; Campbell, 2001). For the employee, advantages encompass: greater flexibility, work/life balance, and choice (Gottschalk & McEachern, 2010). However, institutions often fall short in supporting part-time faculty in terms of equitable pay and benefits, orientation and mentorship, and professional development and training (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Gadberry & Burnstad, 2005; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Adjunct faculty members are to the community college as migrant workers are to the farms (Cohen, 2003) and see themselves as the fast-food workers of the academy (Hoff, 2014). Faculty can remain in the role for long periods of time with the hopes of securing a full-time teaching position; however, they then run the risk of becoming academically ‘stale’ the longer they are in the position (Chalmers & Waddoup, 2007; Leszinske, Jolley, & Bryant, 2012). Faculty members teaching liberal arts courses are more likely to accept multiple contracts to create a full-time role as opposed to faculty members teaching in business and nursing, who take on a single course to supplement a full-time job (Lewis, 2012). Ultimately, institutions provide very little reason for those in the part-time role to demonstrate their loyalty and improve their teaching skills (Callan, 1997). The more faculty members are engaged and gain familiarity with the institution,
the more opportunities that exist to enhance their teaching skills and improve quality (Hoyt, 2012).

Hoyt (2012) explored predictors of adjunct faculty loyalty. A 48-question survey about faculty characteristics, faculty support, reasons for teaching, teaching methods, satisfaction, and loyalty was administered to 676 faculty members, of which, 358 responded. Most part-time faculty taught for primarily altruistic reasons: their enjoyment of the profession and helping students learn. The position gave them time to pursue other interests and provided an opportunity to perhaps attain a full-time position in the future. Part-time faculty emphasized the need for more training, but had ample opportunities to engage with staff at the institution. Finally, the respondents expressed a very high level of loyalty and overall job satisfaction. The areas for improvement were classroom facilities and honorarium or pay levels.

**Ontario Public College Sector**

The role of part-time faculty members in Ontario public colleges is based on the history of the colleges within the province. The system of Ontario public colleges was established in 1965 by the Government of Ontario to address the need for technical training not then within the scopes of the university and secondary school systems (Hogan & Trotter, 2013). Ontario was one of the first provinces to legislate a community college system to meet this need, and one of the few to choose a technical-education model. The growing complexity of the economy, coupled with the fast-paced development of new technology, threatened to make citizens without skills and knowledge obsolete (Fleming, 1971). The economy was expanding, while immigration from postwar Europe was decreasing, fueling job growth in industries not directly tied to
the university system. Employers needed technically skilled prospects to fill these roles, employees who could keep pace with developing technologies before commencing employment in the industry. Population explosion fueled an urgency to create a flexible, responsive education system to support Ontario (Davis, 1965). The technical-education model created a system to ensure a match existed between current and future employment needs and programs available in the post-secondary education sector.

The Ontario college system provides a separate structure within higher education that allows the provincial government to directly intervene in the affairs of the college, something forbidden in the university structure (Hogan & Trotter, 2013). Canada has a decentralized structure that allows each province to govern education. In Ontario, each college has a Board of Governors that oversees the president of each institution. These boards consist of professionals from the community and government and staff representatives. Colleges were meant to be distinctly different from universities in that the purpose was “the separation of knowledge creation and its later commercial application, or the difference between deep specialization and its subsequent synthetic forms in the professions and the workplace” (Considine, 2006, p. 257). A strong link to industry and economic need expanded colleges across the province, whereby today there are 24 colleges in the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAATs). As such, Ontario has developed the largest system of technical colleges in North America (Skolnik, 2010). In 2003, five of the 24 colleges became designated institutes of technology and advanced learning. This designation reflected the changing nature of the programs being delivered. Outside of the college system, two agencies, Ontario Colleges
and the College Employer Council, support and strengthen the system as a whole by providing a collective voice on advocacy issues and collective bargaining, respectively.

The economic downturn in 2008 changed Ontario’s fiscal environment. Coupled with a decline in enrolment, lowered growth projections, and less operating grant funding available for colleges (Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities [MTCU], 2013), Ontario colleges were left to preserve and enhance educational quality with fewer resources. Colleges went from raising 15% to 20% of funds to “raising from 30% to 50% of their total revenues from non-government sources” (Brennan, 2014, no page). In 2015-2016, “grant revenue for all sources accounted for less than half of the college system revenue” (Colleges Ontario, 2016, p. 2).

In 2013, the Government of Ontario launched Ontario’s Differentiation Policy as a primary policy driver for the system to manage institutional cost structures that were then and continue to be under pressure. Colleges and institutes were encouraged to be entrepreneurial and creative when developing initiatives and programming to serve their communities and when implementing cost-recovery training programs for businesses (Brennan, 2014). The introduction of Strategic Mandate Agreements by the Ministry facilitated discussions with CAATs to help articulate unique mandates, strengths, and aspirations. These documents acted as a foundation for the government to direct future funding and ensure coherent decision-making (MTCU, 2013). The government also renamed its Ministry to the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development to reflect the changing nature of education, training, and employment standards in the province. Metrics such as teaching and learning and program offerings formed part of the shift in direction, yet the focus on academic quality did not highlight the direct challenges
associated with the increase of non-full-time faculty. These challenges have dominated
the research literature as heavily relying on part-time faculty ultimately may have an
effect on the students.

**Challenges of Non-Full-Time Faculty Members**

**Motivation**

Traditionally, there have been two types of non-full-time faculty: those who teach
as their main profession and those with other employment who teach a few classes at a
time (Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulden, 2009). Recently graduated students, professionals
seeking a full-time teaching position, and people with family responsibilities are
elements of those who may want a career path in teaching on a part-time basis, albeit
casual employment was not their permanent desire (Chalmers & Waddoups, 2007). The
part-time nature of the role creates challenges to achieve a high level of job satisfaction
and motivation in the role (Cashwell, 2009).

Cashwell (2009) explored the factors affecting part-time faculty job satisfaction in
the Colorado Community College system. Through nonprobability, convenience
sampling, 405 respondents, from a population of 3,250, answered a 31-item survey
electronically. The strongest predictors of overall job satisfaction were related to
workload, authority, salary, benefits, and facilities. The more part-time faculty members
felt valued and fairly treated, the more satisfied they were with the job. Areas of
dissatisfaction included: inadequate job security, poor benefits, and limited healthcare
coverage. Respondents who indicated that they would prefer teaching full-time and
would seek out a position in higher education specified they would teach differently if
they were employed full-time as a result of the additional paid time to improve their courses and level of instruction.

The part-time academic experience is driven by various motivations that influence decisions to take on the role (Bryson & Scurry, 2002; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The rhetoric of non-full-time work is grounded in the ideology of choice, individualism, and flexibility (Burgess, Campbell, & May, 2008). Depending on the life situation and dispensable resources, some individuals teach for the intellectual stimulation and extra income (American Association of University Professors, 2005). The very nature of the temporariness of the role is attractive for these faculty members (Stenerson et al., 2010). The flexibility to take on multiple contracts, remaining available for personal interests and family commitments, makes the role attractive in terms of work-life balance for those who can afford it. Although there is a limited amount of research on specifically why instructors choose to teach part-time in higher education (Vetter, 2006), the joy of teaching, personal satisfaction, and flexible work schedule are consistently found as primary motivators (Ellis, 2013). Part-time faculty members report higher levels of job satisfaction with the intrinsic facets of the job and the work itself, as opposed to extrinsic motivators (Dutton, 2009; Lewis, 2012; Ramsden, 1983; Zink, 1991).

Vetter (2006) examined indicators related to job satisfaction, commitment, and reasons to teach for part-time faculty at four post-secondary institutions in Tulsa, Oklahoma through a 29-item survey, including close-ended questions using a Likert-scale about job satisfaction, open-ended questions about why participants were in the part-time role, and specific demographic information. Of the 1,005 surveys distributed, 223 were returned and analyzed. Financial compensation was the most significant factor predicting
job satisfaction. Other predictors included: personal achievement, working in a collegial environment, and working with students. The model was not statistically significant in terms of predicting the faculty’s level of commitment; however, the responses showed the faculty members were unlikely to discontinue in the adjunct role. Lastly, the analysis of the open-ended questions revealed that a desire to teach, interactions with the students, and schedule flexibility were the most positive aspects to the role. The most negative aspects were future career prospects (opportunity for full-time), job security, and compensation. Similarly, as outlined in the Community College Week magazine, the perception that those in the role are considered second-class citizens, ambiguity about job security, lack of benefits and recognition, and last-minute hiring decisions are consistently found as demotivating factors across the adjunct workforce in the United States (Ellis, 2013).

Remaining on short-term contracts can create practical difficulties, as well as low self-esteem (Bryson & Barnes, 2000), and provoke minimal commitment to the role (Lowry, 1996). The precariousness of the position has been identified as one of the most significant stressors in the role (Reevy & Deason, 2014). Adjunct faculty would like to be seen as educators rather than hired hands, which has an effect on their own self-perceptions (Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013). Despite greater flexibility, in one study focused on low-paid female employees, participants reported suffering scheduling conflicts and having limited control over their work time (Pocock, 2008), creating work/family conflict (Hosking & Western, 2008). Individual and demographic characteristics, including age and marital status (Schulz, 2009), academic discipline (Palmer, 2002), desire for full-time employment, level of income (Lewis, 2012), and
psychological factors (Hagedorn, 2000) have an effect on the level of satisfaction with the role (Reevy & Deason, 2014).

**Connection and Engagement**

Non-full-time faculty feel most connected to an institution where opportunities exist for them to have a voice (Rhoades, 2008). Connection arises through active engagement. Engagement includes approaches institutions employ to incorporate faculty into institutional processes (Rhoades, 2008). Although non-full-time faculty participation is welcomed in institutional governance and departmental meetings, it is not actively sought in other cases (Mahon, 2008). However, engaging adjunct instructors in college affairs not only generates valuable input but also raises the stature and self-worth of the individuals involved (Wickun & Stanley, 2011). The view colleagues have of part-time faculty has an effect on their self-perception (Dolan et al., 2013).

Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, and Martinak (2013) analyzed the results of a survey conducted by the Maryland Consortium for Adjunct Faculty Professional Development. A questionnaire was administered to 1,645 adjunct faculty members focusing on their opinions about professional development as well as demographic information. Professional development had many important facets, like orientation and mentoring. Professional development was seen as an organizational strategic activity, tailored to specific employee groups. Although the respondents thought professional development was important, less than half of them suggested implementing a mandatory professional development program for adjunct faculty members.

Adjunct faculty members are unlikely to participate in college governance, departmental activities, and committee initiatives (Callan, 1997; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).
They are frequently hired in the summer period, which challenges their ability to become acquainted with curriculum, student culture, campus, and teaching and learning requirements (Cassebaum, 1995), as they have competing priorities that make participation difficult. Considering most adjunct faculty members are not involved in institutional processes, the effectiveness of these initiatives is questionable (Leszinske et al., 2012). The lack of consultation and participation means that there is an invisible group on campus with institutional knowledge, that is, for the most part, remaining silent (Rogers et al., 2010).

Institutions fail to address the impact of the adjunct population on student success. Low faculty engagement and retention are problematic for colleges, especially when retention is linked to students’ connectedness to faculty (Leszinske et al., 2012). These faculty members are less accessible to the students and are less integrated into the campus culture (Christensen, 2008; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Schuster, 2003; Umbach, 2007). Adjunct faculty members frequently work alone and are not able to interact with permanent staff and benefit from networking and being in the communication loop (Gottschalk & McEachern, 2010).

Gottschalk and McEachern (2010) explored the traditional profile of casual employment at a regional Australian university. A questionnaire and in-depth interviews sought to identify the experiences of casual staff on a number of variables related to employment, income and job security, reasons for teaching in a casual capacity, and general attitudes about work and work/life balance. From 600 possible respondents, 196 surveys were collected, with 15 of these respondents interviewed. The desire to build a career was an important motivator. Casual staff expressed frustration with the few
opportunities that existed to gain more secure work and build a career at the university. The authors summarized four distinct groups of staff pursuing the casual position: young mothers, career development, early careerists, and late career transitioners.

Isolation results in higher levels of dissatisfaction with employment conditions. Non-full-time faculty members tend not to feel part of or included in college affairs (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). There is very little opportunity for them to engage with colleagues, share best practices, and embrace contemporary approaches to teaching and learning (Lydon & King, 2009; Vaughan, 2004). Perhaps as a consequence of this limited connection by part-time faculty members with the institution, graduation rates tend to decrease as the proportion of part-time faculty increases (Astin, 1999; Jacoby, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980). However, although the proportion of part-time faculty has been negatively related to the average institutional commitment, it has been found to have little to no influence on quality instruction (Umbach, 2007). Still, as a majority of large introductory classes are being taught by non-full-time faculty, “theoretical implications can be identified where students pay the same tuition…irrespective of class size or the status of the instructor” (Puplampu, 2004, p. 175).

Jacoby (2006) analyzed graduation rates from a national data set from 2001, encompassing all two-year colleges in the United States. Increases in the ratio of part-time faculty at community colleges had a highly significant and negative impact upon graduation rates. While the study was not able to identify the specific mechanism, it was implied that these negative effects were the consequences of multiple disincentives inherent in the part-time contract. The results also showed that, “although some schools do add additional faculty resources by increasing the part-time faculty ratio, this does not
appear to be sufficient to offset the negative effects inherent in relying upon a faculty employed largely on a part-time basis” (p. 1098).

To support the voice of non-full-time faculty members, various colleges and universities around the world have unionized. In the college structure in the United States, many adjunct groups have unionized (June, 2009). In Canada, while some collective agreements include non-full-time faculty, others exclude them, which creates many different models of representation (Jones et al., 2014). An increase in non-full-time faculty unionization signals the need for this group to establish a collective presence and voice in the organization, leading to greater connection and engagement. Motivated to seek better working conditions, benefits, and college rights similar to those of full-time faculty, this group then can vie for stability rights and job security through the union and support a seniority-based rehire to help with reassignment each semester to the teaching preferences of each faculty. The seniority-based hiring decisions combat the instability and lack of connection that part-time faculty experience (Eckler et al., 2009).

Compensation

Hiring non-full-time faculty provides institutions with the financial flexibility to manage cash flow (Cohen, 2008; Schuster & Finklestein, 2006). Non-full-time faculty are less expensive, have few employment benefits, and often are paid on a per class-hour basis, even though the expectations are similar to full-time faculty (Callan, 1997). Conditions of work, access to promotion, professional development, inequality of opportunity, insecurity, uncertainty, and precariousness are major concerns for non-full-time faculty, highlighted as common themes across research studies in a review by Bryson (2013). Bryson (2013) reviewed efforts over the last decade to develop and
support the increased proportion of sessional staff members in the United Kingdom. While most “initiatives have quietly disappeared” (p. 12), significant change was seen as most likely to occur at the institutional as opposed to the national level.

Part-time faculty members overall tend to be paid 25%-35% less than full-time faculty with the differences in pay based on surrounding economic conditions rather than qualifications (Wallin, 2004). Furthermore, adjunct faculty members are rarely compensated with pay increases factoring in their length of service (Wallin, 2004). This lack of increase creates a greater discrepancy in faculty pay, setting adjunct faculty increasingly behind in compensation. Non-full-time faculty members also receive fewer outside benefits than do their full-time counterparts (Jolley, Cross, & Bryant, 2014). They are thus considered to be “second class citizens in almost every respect” (Wolfinger et al., 2009, p. 1596). The longer these faculty members stay in their positions, the more removed they become from direct industry experience, the experience that often represents their best asset. They become “weakly connected everywhere, central to nothing” (Johnson, 2008, p. A10).

The uncertainty for non-full-time faculty regarding permanency coupled with lower wages requires faculty to often retain outside employment, which can make it difficult to participate in available activities related to teaching and learning and promotion. They remain in that unstable employment position for prolonged periods with the institution re-employing these positions over many semesters (Klopper & Power, 2014). Klopper and Power (2014) investigated the casualization of university academics at one Australian university. The researchers reported on a teacher development program using a 20-item questionnaire, capturing demographic details and obtaining a measure of
self-efficacy. Of 65 part-time faculty members, 22 participated in the program. Part-time faculty members reported feeling effective as university teachers, yet their heavy workloads, other employment commitments, and lack of time hindered their ability to participate in ongoing professional development. The facets of job instability beyond lack of promotion include feelings of alienation and devaluation (Peckham & Hammer, 2010).

With very little knowledge about the future of their teaching position after a semester has come to an end, faculty members often leave for other opportunities (Leszinske et al., 2012), highlighting a large turnover effect that prevents institutions from having a stable faculty group to benefit from the advantages of institutional commitment. Many faculty members are seen having to work at multiple institutions or jobs to earn enough to live. Prioritizing their commitments means faculty do not have the motivation or time to truly connect with students and promote learning through the cultural lens of the institution (Leszinske et al., 2012), further limiting the ability for these faculty members to become engaged in the institutional affairs and to form an integral part of the college environment in which they work (Rifkin, 2000; Stenerson et al., 2010).

Teaching and Development

Non-full-time faculty members are often employed across the post-secondary system to bring the latest knowledge and expertise to the program. The lack of competency and experience in the classroom are defining characteristics of many non-full-time faculty (Wallin, 2004). In Australia, a concern has been raised regarding the poor teaching quality and the lack of professional development of these faculty members (Lazarsfield-Jensen & Morgan, 2009). It is more expedient to re-employ current faculty
members than to attempt to attract new ones (Klopper, 2014). However, this flexibility and searching for industry ‘experts’ to help ensure the training is practical, relevant (disciplinary-related), and up-to-date is not sufficient (Fink, 2013). Professional resources are required to support continual changes in the industry and the way teaching meets these requirements (Mizell, 2010). Teaching quality ranges depending on the instructor, but, for the most part, adjuncts are practice-based teachers bringing in valuable experiences from industry (Magner, 2009). Although they are often less experienced and educated than full-time faculty, they employ the same mix of teaching methods as full-time; no studies have found a significant difference in the quality of instruction between full-time and non-full-time faculty members (Wallin, 2004).

Wallin (2004) discussed four issues central to understanding the adjunct faculty experience in the United States: (1) increased reliance on hiring part-time faculty, (2) reasons to teach part-time, (3) competency and compensation issues, and (4) opportunities for professional development. Adjunct faculty members often bring a diversity and enthusiasm for teaching. They tend to be committed to the students and their classes. The real-world perspective, “that many full-time faculty, long removed from business and industry, if they ever were involved, may lack” (p. 377), is a vital link between the community and the college. Wallin recommended that a more adequate compensation structure, including increased compensation and benefits as well as professional development opportunities, should be further examined.

As institutions become increasingly reliant on non-full-time faculty, understanding the needs of this classification of faculty in terms of professional development is critical. While they may have well-rounded educations and a wealth of
practical experience, they often lack the teaching experience in the classroom (Wickun & Stanley, 2011). The lack of resources available for curriculum development make the role difficult for some to fulfill (Stenerson et al., 2010). Compared to full-time professors, part-time faculty members were found to use less challenging instructional methods (Benjamin, 2002). These faculty members are also rarely given resources ahead of time and no orientation handbook or guide, just some friendly advice from college personnel (Wickun & Stanley, 2011). Most non-full-time faculty members lack opportunities to participate in professional development (Rogers et al., 2010).

Professional development can act as a means for colleges to monitor quality in teaching and learning. The College Educator Development Program exists for all new full-time faculty members from six western regional colleges in Ontario (Conestoga, Fanshawe, Lambton, Mohawk, Niagara, and St.Clair) (http://cedp.mohawkcollege.ca/); however, most professional development programs in the CAAT system have not introduced mandatory, formal, credit courses including formal assessment for new non-full-time faculty (Rodgers et al., 2014).

Rogers, Christie, and Wideman (2014) explored the effectiveness of introducing a required faculty development program at Durham College, Oshawa, Ontario. The program, consisting of five courses, aimed to develop new teachers’ skills and knowledge and promote a student-centred approach to teaching. A multi-methods approach, combining surveys, semi-structured interviews, and focus groups, was used to examine the program’s effectiveness. While not all of the participants completed the five courses, the researchers felt confident that completing the program increased teacher self-efficacy and influenced novice teachers’ approach to teaching with a student-centred approach.
Although this study did not specifically address the professional development needs of non-full-time faculty members, it is significant because it outlines a unique faculty development program at an Ontario college, especially as there has been limited other research on the Ontario college system.

There are frequently insufficient or no funds available for professional development, conference attendance, or enrollment in advanced coursework for adjuncts (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Wallin, 2004). Adjunct faculty are not only overlooked in terms of development opportunities, but many report feeling unsure about where to go or who to ask for support; one faculty member stated support was so minimal that she believed adjuncts fell into the “out of sight-out of mind” category on college campuses (Rogers et al., 2010). The needs of adjunct faculty are not greatly different from the needs of full-time faculty; however, institutions have seemingly not responded or recognized the adjunct population (Rogers et al., 2010).

Rogers, McIntyre, and Jazzar (2010) described four primary needs of an effective mentoring program for educational leadership adjuncts teaching online. Researchers interviewed adjunct faculty about the dynamics involved in online instruction. Four cornerstones were developed: professional development, effective communication, fostering balance of work and non-work related activities, and forming relationships. Professional development programs provided part-time faculty members with skills to overcome barriers such as course planning, working with students, and integrating technology. Adjuncts preferred to communicate using the telephone, as it increased the feeling of connectedness to the institution and colleagues. Adjuncts felt that they must set realistic and meaningful expectations to develop balance in the role. The ability to
develop a network of colleagues and work as part of a team, while still maintaining balance, made professional isolation less likely to occur.

Teacher development programs must be designed with appropriate formal and informal developmental activities to help improve the overall quality of instruction (Marits, 1996). Initiatives that enhance knowledge and skills ultimately improve student outcomes through improved teaching practices (Guskey, 2000; Helleve, 2010). Faculty members benefit greatly from professional development when activities are presented concurrent to one another and are designed to allow time for personal reflection (Bouwma-Gearhart, 2012). Activities must engage faculty and require them to be proactive in both formal and informal contexts (Helleve, 2010). Professional development should be continuous, ongoing, and increasingly challenging to recognize that faculty members are always progressing in terms of their practice (Cowan, George, & Pinheiro-Torres, 2004). Faculty members are often encouraged to participate in various courses and/or workshops; however, time restrictions make short training courses the main option, such courses having little impact on teaching and learning (Wilson, 2010). Developing a mix of meaningful opportunities, both discipline- and institution-specific (Leszinske et al., 2012), to support faculty is imperative to maintaining a high degree of academic quality.

Leszinske et al. (2012) explored the effects of relying on adjunct faculty members in the higher education system, specifically through the assessment practices of teaching. This exploratory paper gathered data on feedback adjunct faculty received about their teaching. Faculty assessment was tied closely to faculty development. Additional faculty assessment practices and professional development opportunities were recommended to
better monitor quality, improve accountability, and examine the overall impact on student learning outcomes.

Institutional missions committed to professional practice should support these activities and provide a reasonable time frame to allow change to occur (Bouwma-Gearhart, 2012). Time to implement is important as most often faculty members teach as they were taught (Bouwma-Gearhart, 2012) and do not necessarily retain the techniques and strategies delivered through professional development opportunities. Even the best-intentioned faculty members are resistant to change and maintain preconceived notions of how to teach even in the face of widely accepted better teaching practices (Nicholls, 2005). Professional development programs must integrate institutional values to actively engage adjunct faculty (Easton, 2009). These opportunities must be aligned to the vision of the institution, with an ultimate goal of preparing faculty members to deliver quality teaching practices (Rogers et al., 2010). As all faculty members are required to meet the academic standards outlined by the institution, part-time faculty members are put at an immediate disadvantage by not being provided the basic tools of teaching (Jolley et al., 2014).

**Performance Evaluation**

Adjunct faculty members are expected to meet the standards of academic rigour set forth by the institution and through mandated curriculum. These evaluation and review standards and processes must be developed and practiced to facilitate quality improvements in non-full-time teaching practices (Klopper & Power, 2014). The systematic gathering of information about faculty effectiveness, competency, and
instructional quality helps improve student learning, and helps ensure the delivery of a quality education (Grieve & Worden, 2000; Jolley et al., 2014).

Jolley, Cross, and Bryant (2014) explored the challenges of teaching for part-time community college faculty members with a particular emphasis on their experiences with performance evaluation processes. A nonrandom convenience sample was selected to attract participants from around the United States. Three researchers interviewed 20 current and former part-time professors over the phone using a 16-item research protocol. The narratives of these faculty members showed that they felt unimportant and invisible. They revealed an overall lack of institutional engagement and meaningful performance evaluation policies or procedures. There was a clear difference between how institutions supported full-time compared to part-time faculty members. The researchers concluded that the low level of engagement shown by the part-time faculty members might explain their perceptions of low or nonexistent evaluation practices.

In some cases, where renewal of a teaching contract is dependent upon student evaluations, part-time faculty have tended to be easier graders in an attempt to improve such evaluations, which can have a direct impact on teaching quality (Christensen, 2008; Halcrow & Olsen, 2008). However, these faculty members have been put at an “immediate disadvantage as they are not provided with the basic tools of teaching” (Leszinske et al., 2012, p. 13), so institutions must inform faculty members about the performance and mentoring standards to establish performance expectations and outcomes (Stenerson et al., 2010). Overall, a gap exists in the literature for any conclusive study on the support adjuncts receive, including assessment of their work and
the impact on the quality of the student experience (Jones, 2013; Leszinske et al., 2012; Muzzin, 2009).

**Summary**

Overall, the increased proportion of part-time faculty poses challenges for post-secondary institutions. The autonomy for each institution to incorporate different levels of support and compensation creates difficulties in examining the role system-wide. The level of motivation, connection and engagement, compensation structure, resources available for teaching and development, and performance management processes are themes throughout the literature. Researchers have found different levels of job satisfaction for part-time faculty members, given these inconsistencies in the role across each institution.

A deep desire to help students and the love of teaching are consistently documented as primary motivators for part-time faculty. Their limited inclusion in college affairs and inadequate compensation structure are seen as barriers with respect to their contribution to the college. Part-time faculty members are often overlooked and the temporary nature of the role makes it difficult to develop a meaningful connection to the institution. They vary in their level of commitment to the role, depending on their career stage and outside responsibilities, like family and work obligations. These other commitments create obstacles for part-time faculty who would like to be more engaged and available to both the institution and students.

The relationship between having more part-time faculty on staff and its effects on student success and academic quality remains inconclusive. More professional development is needed for part-time faculty members. Professional development
enhances teaching practices and ultimately benefits both the faculty member and the students. As colleges hire more part-time faculty with industry-specific skills and abilities, but not necessarily from teaching backgrounds, the inadequate professional development provided has consequences for student success. These consequences are not immediately apparent, in that the high degree of autonomy in the part-time faculty role, combined with inadequate performance management processes, tends to mask the effects of part-time faculty members on student and institutional success.
CHAPTER 3: METHOD

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions and experiences of teaching and support of four non-full-time faculty members at one Eastern Ontario college. The following research questions guided this study:

(1) How does the structure of the non-full-time faculty role influence the ability to provide quality instruction to students, as described by four non-full-time faculty members at one Eastern Ontario college?

(2) How is professional development and faculty support interpreted by these four non-full-time faculty members?

(3) How is the practice of teaching and learning interpreted by these four non-full-time faculty members?

Research Paradigm

This qualitative research study used the process of narration to develop a better understanding of the experiences of non-full-time faculty members. This qualitative research paradigm employs an “interpretive, naturalistic approach” (Creswell, 1998, p. 15) to collecting data that is built on theory and practices that are interwoven throughout all stages of the research process (Chase, 2005; Riessman, 1993, 2008). The purpose of employing this narrative framework was to benefit from the participants’ natural impulse to tell stories about past and present experiences and help gain a greater understanding about the relationship between participants’ experiences and their environment (Schram, 2006).

This study used the personal narrative to prompt stories about the non-full-time faculty role. This approach is new to research involving the non-full-time faculty group
as previous studies in this area have primarily focused on using the survey method coupled with semi-structured interviews. However, outside of the non-full-time faculty role, scholars have made narrative inquiry a central element in their research about teacher knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995, 2000; Doyle, 1997; Elbaz-Luwisch, 1997). Researchers originally used narrative inquiry to document personal and professional challenges about teaching experiences in Kindergarten to Grade 12 as well as highlight lived solutions to empower teachers to reflect on personal professional knowledge to teach with more constructive foresight (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998). Teachers’ knowledge is found within their narrative experiences, so the narratives themselves become educative (Ciuffetelli Parker, Pushor, & Kitchen, 2011). This method has expanded to collect data about any transformational or potentially significant events (Chase, 2005). The person is the focus of analysis (Josselson, Lieblich, & McAdams, 2003).

**Narrative Inquiry**

Narrative inquiry is a qualitative research framework that assists in understanding the nuances of educational experiences (Craig, 2011). Narrative research is grounded in the philosophy that human beings organize their experiences of the world into narratives and present these narratives based on their past and present experiences, noting the participants’ values, the audience, and the tone that occurs in the narratives (Moen, 2006). A narrative approach supports relativism, pluralism, and subjectivity (George & O’Neill, 2011). In the post-secondary environment, using narrative inquiry is critical to better understand the context of the non-full-time faculty role. Narrative inquiry provides a platform for understanding experiences in context, as it includes setting, action, and
resolution as well as sub-narratives within narratives for the researcher to analyze (Riessman, 1993). Narrative research provides a method to focus on the meaning that individuals place on their experiences through storytelling (Kirsh & Welsh, 2003; Moen, 2006). The participants’ life experiences that are significant and meaningful are organized into stories based on their values (Moen, 2006). The reflection throughout the narrative and learning becomes directly proportional – the more reflection, the more learning (Dewey, 1938). Through narrative accounts, people naturally reveal their personalities and identities (George & O’Neill, 2011). Recounting multiple experiences (or events) enables exploration of how the events are integrated into the everyday lives of the participants, capturing both the individual and the context (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Moen, 2006; Murray, 2003; Riessman, 1993).

There are various approaches within the narrative framework related to the depth of the story, the number of voices represented, the format (oral or written), and the author of the story (Riessman, 1993). The multitude of voices present within an individual’s story becomes relevant in different contexts, making it open to several interpretations (Moen, 2006). The framework allows the researcher to become immersed in the process, which fosters collaboration, relationships, and on-going reflection with the participants (Firestone, 1987; Josselon & Lieblich, 2003). This reflexivity prompts the researcher to engage with the participants and create an environment where themes can be learned from the process of storytelling. Storytelling promotes self-discovery and assigns new meaning to experiences (Moen, 2006). It can increase awareness and connect the gap between lived experiences and how those experiences are communicated to others (Riessman, 1993). Stories naturally contain a beginning, middle, and end, yet the
meaning of the narrative can be completely altered depending on the audience and where an individual begins and ends the story (Lieblich et al., 1998; Riessman, 1993). The researcher can then draw themes by better understanding the context and relationship to the environment.

All of the data collected were analyzed holistically. This process allows the researcher to draw themes that incorporate the participant’s entire narrative. The data can then be analyzed in a number of ways by focusing on the participant’s narration, style of speech, structure, motives, and attitudes (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). By capitalizing upon the participants’ natural ability to tell stories, the researcher interprets these stories as data and places them in a context to compare them with other stories (Patton, 2002). The exploration of inner, subjective experiences reveals how past actions, not only as individuals, but also as communities and societies, influence situations (Riessman, 1993). Through re-storying, the researcher and participant co-construct an interpretation of the participant’s experiences (Barton, 2004). However, this interpretation is limited as there is no direct access to primary experience (Riessman, 1993). The interview is a conversation, negotiated text whereby understandings are grounded from specific interactional episodes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The participants share the stories that fit with the identity they wish to present to the audience (George & O’Neill, 2011). The researcher is the primary instrument to challenge this issue in narrative research (Moen, 2006). This challenge is why narrative analysis must be viewed as the researcher’s interpretation of the text (Josselson, 2007).
Data Collection

Research Site and Participant Selection

The participants of the study were invited through purposive sampling from the part-time classification system at one Eastern Ontario college. A recruitment email was sent individually to eligible part-time faculty members outlining the study in December 2015. This time period was selected to recruit participants before the winter semester started. The first four participants who indicated their interest were selected. A total of seven faculty responded of the first 14 individual email requests sent to the first department within the college. The high response rate coupled with using a first-come, first-serve approach resulted in the participants being selected from one department. Selected participants were provided with a Letter of Information and Consent Form that outlined the purpose, type and level of involvement, and the risks of participating in the study (Appendix A). A profile sheet was also sent outlining demographic information and their personal and professional background (Appendix B). Participant-selected pseudonyms were used to conceal identities. The researcher received ethics clearance to perform the study from both Queen’s University and the college (Appendix C).

In a small qualitative study, sample size is often based on the point when redundant results occur and no new information is noted in the patterns and relationships (Creswell, 1998). The sample size should be reflective and representative of the sample with a quantity of data that is manageable. Sample size is not a straightforward determination as participants each bring something unique and produce new data (Josselson & Lieblich, 2000). Understanding the process of selecting the appropriate
sample size was an important part of the study (Mason, 2002). These factors contributed to the decision to have four participants.

**Procedure**

The first part of the study involved data collection with these four faculty members (John, Laura, Keith, Sage) through letter writing to the institution. Within the context of narrative inquiry, data can be collected in the form of field notes, journal records, interview transcripts, observations, storytelling, letter writing, autobiographical writing, document analysis, and pictures (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). Participants wrote letters at the end of January, February, and March, which encompassed the first four, eight, and twelve weeks of the semester, including their orientation experiences. I asked the participants to write specifically about their thoughts and feelings:

As you reflect on your overall experience so far, including past teaching experiences at this point in the semester, think about any documents, conversations, personal research and training opportunities to help guide your thinking process. In addition, consider your goals and aspirations for this position. Please formulate your notes into a letter. Think of the reader of your letter as a person or team of people that are genuinely interested to hear about the position and what has influenced your thoughts, feelings and emotions about the position and teaching. There is no specific letter template to follow or word count (length) to achieve. Remember to use pseudonyms where names are required.

The objective for participants was to reflect on all parts of the position and document their experiences each month. I contacted the participants via email each month to ask follow-up questions about what they had written to better understand their letters.
The next part of the study involved conducting a semi-structured interview with each participant, lasting approximately 60-90 minutes, at the end of the contract period in mid-April at various locations in the college. An interview guide with a series of structured questions was presented to the participants at the interview (Appendix D). The research questions were developed after reviewing various studies that aimed to better understand part-time faculty perspectives (e.g., Brown, Kelder, Freeman, & Carr, 2013; Bryson, 2013; Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013; Hoyt, 2012; Jolley et al., 2014; Klopper & Power, 2014). The interviews involved communicating past experiences, successes, and challenges (Preston, Ogenchuk, & Nsiah, 2014) within the position and at the institution. A semi-structured format was selected to benefit from an interview always being a negotiated text, a conversation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The flexibility to explore and ask probing questions enriched the data collected and allowed for unanticipated (spontaneous) responses to emerge. The broad nature of the questions facilitated open narrative responses (Reissman, 2008). The questions encouraged the participants to reflect on personal and professional challenges related to the role and teaching (Clandinin, 2006). The questions in the interview sought to discover the participants’ final impressions and their perspectives on memorable experiences throughout the role during the previous semester. Prompts and probes were used to focus the interview when necessary and encourage deeper reflection (Patton, 2002). The participants were encouraged to refer back to any reflection notes that they might have taken throughout the semester as reminders to help formulate their responses and to provide detailed examples for grounding their narratives. These reflection notes assisted the participants’ memory to provide greater context in the interview.
Over the course of the study, I encouraged the participants to make reflection notes in a journal to record memories, experiences, and reflections to help shape their letters and specific experiences. These social artefacts enrich the collection process and help to build sets of relevant data (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998). The participants incorporated their notes regularly, which helped strengthen their stories in the letters. I also recorded field notes throughout the semester to act as prompts when analyzing the data. Anecdotal remarks were jotted down during the interviews and at different points in the semester to assist with the richness, nuance, and intricacy within the narratives (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998). These data were incorporated into my analysis to provide more context about the teaching environment. I additionally conducted a review of the college’s teaching and learning website to better understand the current slate of professional development and orientation workshops to strengthen the results in terms of current supports available and to triangulate what participants were saying.

**Data Analysis**

Data were collected from four sources: background profile questionnaire, letter writing, interviews, and informal observations at the interviews. The data on the questionnaires were used to generate profiles for each participant. This information was used to understand the demographic variables to better interpret each data source.

The participants submitted their letters electronically at the end of each month. The letters were reviewed individually. After every submission, I sent a response asking further questions about certain components of the letter. The participants’ responses to these questions were then filed with the letter to be incorporated into my analysis after the interviews. Examples of these questions were: (1) Please describe your orientation
experience. Reflect on your first contract as well as subsequent ones; (2) Can you comment on the use of Blackboard from both a faculty and student perspective? These questions helped identify overlapping patterns and themes in the narratives.

I audiotaped and transcribed the interviews (Riessman, 1993). I listened and re-listened to the audio recordings to transcribe the interviews verbatim into complete sentences and thoughts, removing verbal tics (e.g., “ums” and “ahs”) to improve readability. Once the interviews were transcribed, I shared the transcribed notes with the participants for review in an effort to confirm their agreement with my interpretations and strengthen the trustworthiness of my study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Participants had the ability to revise or remove responses that they did not feel comfortable having reported. After reviewing the notes, none of the participants removed any responses.

An open coding approach guided my analysis of both the letters and interviews to identify themes, patterns, and relationships that arose from the data. I developed the code names. I started by reviewing each letter by month and highlighting key phrases and words that best defined an overall theme. After reviewing all 12 letters, I went back and took notes on the topic and how many times it arose in the letters. This approach helped guide the formation of the overall themes that tied the narratives together. I moved from the letters and reviewed each interview transcription. I highlighted key words and phrases and made notes that matched what I found in the letters. If there was a topic that was different, I put a circle around it to revisit it after the initial review. Once completed, I used these notes as I went back and forth through each transcript to help guide my analysis (Hays & Singh, 2012; Patton, 2002) to ensure the initial themes identified in the letters captured the notes made throughout the interview transcriptions.
I juxtaposed the letters, interview transcripts, and reflection notes to identify themes. Examples of codes included “dissatisfaction,” “motivator,” “professional development,” “advice,” “feeling unappreciated,” “enjoyment,” “engagement,” “performance management,” and “compensation.” This process enabled reflexivity and better articulation of patterns, narrative threads, and tensions in the data (Iannacci, 2007). I summarized similar codes into larger themes based on the premises of that specific narrative. I imagined the context behind each one to better focus on why the participant was sharing that experience. An example included “student feedback was an important component of job satisfaction.” This statement could have fallen under “motivation” or “performance evaluation.” Looking at the narrative holistically as well as the informal notes I made, I was able to better specify the appropriate theme. Thematic analysis was compared across cases to ensure intent and meaning were consistent and appropriately captured (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998). For cross-case analysis, interpretations relied on three areas: experiences, connections, and engagement, each of which was inductively drawn from the data (Frankland, 2010). The process took approximately one week, which yielded five themes: Motivation, Connection and Engagement, Compensation, Teaching and Development, and Performance Evaluation.

The informal notes provided observations about the academic environment where participants taught (Patton, 2002). These notes were categorized into the broader themes identified from the letters and interviews. Ultimately, these notes provided deeper insights into the social and political contexts of the teaching environment. By incorporating these notes and my insights from having personal experience as part-time faculty, the data collection process captured a more holistic narrative.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The results of the study are detailed in this chapter. The narratives from each participant are described under the five themes that emerged from the data analysis: motivation, connection and engagement, compensation, teaching and development, and performance evaluation. The following coding system applies. The participants are first identified as James (J), Keith (K), Laura (L), and Sage (S). Then the source of each quotation is indicated: letter (L with 1, 2, or 3 for the first, second, or third letter) or Interview (I). Thus JL1 represents James’ first letter, while SI refers to Sage’s interview.

James

James is a 46+ year-old retired administrator from the post-secondary system. He now acts as a consultant, while teaching at the college on a part-time basis on the side. James has prior experience teaching at various levels on both a full-time and part-time basis. Educationally, James has a doctorate and post-doctorate degree that align with his teaching interests. His commitment to teaching and life-long learning has led him to complete various professional development workshops.

James was a jovial participant. He easily opened up about his prior experiences, both teaching and professionally. His immense knowledge of different post-secondary systems around the world enriched his reflections on his current teaching experience at the college. He was a natural storyteller, making for good dialogue. His positivity throughout the interview brought an appreciative tone when he was highlighting specific aspects of the teaching role and how to be successful in it. Throughout the letters and interview, James showed a clear interest in focusing on the students. In general, “there appeared to be a lack of discipline from the students…a majority simply did not
demonstrate a desire or level of motivation expected of a college level student” (JL3). This lack of discipline motivated James to continue in the teaching role to help students remain focused and passionate about learning.

**Motivation**

James’ experience in the post-secondary sector provided him with the confidence he needed to be successful in the role. These experiences caused him to not need to engage in professional development activities through the college network. James shared that, “as far as professional development, I’m confident in my abilities to teach and have participated in a number of workshops over the years” (JI). James spoke almost exclusively about his motivation to teach in the college setting. He focused mostly on intrinsic motivation; however, this intrinsic motivation was bolstered by his interactions with students, with whom he found the most inspiration.

James’ primary motivation to teach was intrinsic. When asked why he chose to pursue a part-time teaching position at the college, James stated, “I’ve always taught, somewhat, dating back years, I’ve probably taught through con-ed or part-time prior to joining the college system” (JI). James had “taught at a number of colleges. I’ve taught for a lot of the colleges part-time. I just love it. I got into the teaching side when I was working in industry” (JI). Even from his first letter, it was clear that James enjoyed the role.

First let me say that my interest and motivation for wanting to teach part-time might well be very different from many other part-time faculty members. Being recently retired, my desire to teach part-time comes from my love of the academic community, the pleasure I receive from seeing students, especially at graduation,
enter the working world and realize their dreams of graduating from their chosen college. (JL1)

James was in both a personal and financial position to continue in the part-time teaching role after retirement, which helped him to maintain a positive outlook on the experience as the role was pursued under his own terms. The structure of the role fit with his lifestyle. His previous experiences provided the necessary background to assume the role with no reservations.

Although James’ primary motivation was intrinsic, his motivation was enhanced by positive comments he received from the students. James garnered feedback from the students to ensure he remained connected to the students: “The student feedback was the positive response I needed and wanted for how I felt about my course delivery” (JI). James took student feedback seriously. “Certainly, how the students felt about the course, and how they feel about my teaching and my interaction and involvement with them is the priority” (JI).

James’ perceptions of feeling valued thus came from his students rather than from the institution. He had “always felt valued in the role. I usually do my own evaluation survey right near the end of the course. I do my own teaching and learning survey. That tells me how the students feel” (JI). James’ general tone and the substance of his responses indicated there would be nothing the institution could do directly to increase the degree of value he felt to motivate him to do more in the role.

James’ responses to questions about motivation were very succinct because of his previous experiences in the profession. These experiences had provided him ample opportunity to reflect and remain focused on his teaching. They gave him clear
expectations and guidelines to remain positive and consistently deliver what was expected of him from the role. James also knew his limits to teaching in order to successfully balance the other components in his life, recognizing that certain elements in his teaching contract were particularly burdensome (“putting together a brand new course was a time consuming venture” [JI]). James understood that he “wouldn’t want to do a lot of teaching” (JI). Given his extended experience, James had found a way to maximize his gains from college teaching, while minimizing its drawbacks. “It was the right mix for me personally. This teaching gig is not a bad deal” (JI). In the end, James “really enjoyed it. It’s fun to do. You’re not in it for the money, there’s no money in it, but you do it for fun. Make contacts and build a network” (JI).

Connection and Engagement

James discussed his perception of the overall connection to the institution throughout the semester. The degree of commitment he felt to the role was different than the degree he felt to the institution. James additionally reflected on the differences between being an experienced faculty member and being a new faculty member and how this distinction could influence the connection needed to the institution to be successful.

James clearly did not feel a great connection to the institution. His ability to socialize at the college and build a network with colleagues at the institution was minimal. “There wasn’t very much social interactions other than with the students. My social engagement was generally with the students, done through email and personal discussions” (JI). James’ main focus was on the students rather than using the role as an opportunity to engage with the institution. “There was no connection, only that it housed the classroom I was in and provided the students” (JI). James appeared unconcerned that
he had no collegial ‘touch points’ as his expectations before entering the role were very clear. James felt that, “it is difficult at any Ontario college to create a sense and feeling of the collective, and the feeling that we are academic leaders and CEOs of the classroom” (JL3). The part-time nature of the role in terms of time spent on campus as well as having other priorities outside of the role, like consulting, made for a limited amount of time to be on campus and for James to engage with his colleagues.

James emphasized the need to focus on the degree of experience the faculty member brings in terms of the connection needed to the institution. James’ perspectives on being new compared to having experience in the role indicated the different level of importance of feeling connected to the institution. “From a part-time teaching perspective, if you were new at it, you would feel isolated. But for me having taught over the years, I was used to it” (JI). Because of his lengthy experience, James “didn’t expect there to be massive social engagement, meeting with people, going to meetings” (JI), although, given he taught a course that was sectioned, “opportunities could have existed for me to engage with faculty teaching other sections of the same course, but I hardly spoke to them” (JI). He concluded that, “the role is rather impersonal. I would have to say again that you have to watch out for that for someone who is new coming in the door” (JI).

Compensation

For James, compensation should not be given too much weight, although “there will always be the issue of compensation for part-time faculty, especially for those who seek full-time teaching positions” (JL1). James’ past experiences had shown that “the fiscal focus does seriously detract from everyone’s ability to concentrate on quality
teaching” (JL1). Furthermore, “those who are in the game for the money are the same people who will likely become problem faculty if hired full-time” (JL1). Faculty should look at the bigger picture. “We simply can't lose sight of the major purpose for which we exist in any college role and that is the betterment of students leading to a more prosperous economic state in Ontario” (JL1).

Teaching and Development

Two aspects of teaching tended to be most problematic for new teachers and therefore required additional resources: “Using the learning technology and finding contacts” (JL1). “For someone new at it, making sure that they understand how things work, like the technology and not just say look at the Blackboard directives and lectures on the system” (JI). To help with the technological issues, “a session is needed to engage with the technology. I’m even still facing challenges putting grades on Banner, the other technology platform” (JI). However, despite “the endless drive to integrate technology into the learning process, with the best of intentions in the use of technology to aid student learning, fundamentally one still needs to learn and apply excellent teaching practice” (JL1). In the end, best teaching practice “may or may not involve the use of technology. There must be a balance in this integration but that does not seem to always be the case. Everything in life must be a balance” (JL1).

Finding contacts was the second area where resources were needed. Issues arose that required James to access personnel in service departments. Unfortunately, “some of the staff were helpful, but certainly could learn more about customer service and how to support faculty, especially the part-time ones who are not making any money doing this” (JI). Furthermore, the college focused more on providing handouts as opposed to
facilitating collaboration where content experts, both inside and outside the college, were made available. The college should consider “any opportunity to bring in those professional academics who have already crossed over to action learning for students as an opportunity” (JL1).

The faculty orientation program failed to provide resources in these two areas. It was short in duration and focused more on important dates and semester timelines rather than taking a fulsome approach to all aspects of the role. While resources were made available, “they weren’t necessarily easily accessed or streamlined, which made it difficult to refer back to” (JL1). The orientation program “lacked in the area of action-based learning and practice, where faculty are exposed to strategies to enhance their teaching” (JI). Moreover, “there is a need to share more details concerning administrative processes in terms of access and support, such as performance management” (JL2).

The college needs to look at the “topics covered in professional development as continuous learning events rather than periods of time” (JL3). A well-designed orientation session “makes faculty feel more valued” (JI). Given the rate of compensation, “you’re not paying them the money, so give them something that they can use instead of standing up in a session and talking about important dates. Give them something they can use later on” (JI). For more incentive, “the college should document completion of professional development sessions attended to build a connection with the institution, which can aid opportunities for promotion” (JI). However, “in my experience, I find the college system lacking in serious effort to mentor and grow good faculty and discipline and terminate bad faculty” (JL1). This lack creates a very small pool of qualified part-time faculty who are ready to step up into a full-time role.
Given his overall focus on students, James additionally spoke of the limited resources to improve faculty teaching and student learning. James had generally observed over the course of his career that “colleges are not doing nearly enough to: facilitate out of the room activity for student learning, to develop a keen desire to use all materials, especially textbooks” (JL3). While orientation touches on the basics, the college needed “a program that would help faculty develop understanding and more applied methods for classroom structure.” (JL3). A redesigned orientation program “would contribute greatly to many aspects of a graduate’s character” (JL3). Furthermore, “a more robust professional development program would also help faculty understand the needs of today’s student. Students today must be mobile, interactive, engaged openly and simply ‘off their rear ends’ in order to keep them engaged” (JL3). James’ concerns stemmed from his experiences outside of the college sector and what employers would be looking for in new graduates. A stronger emphasis “on improving ethical and emotional maturity levels as well as overall literacy and numeracy skills” (JL3) would help ensure a stronger graduate profile.

**Performance Evaluation**

The importance of communicating how and when a faculty member would be evaluated, in James’ opinion, was imperative to an authentic and transparent process. “The assessments weren’t clear from the beginning and that led to some confusion over roles and expectations” (JI). Assessing with the intent to improve in one year, especially for part-time faculty, could be challenging because of the short duration of the contract; however, “timely feedback from student surveys and even a quasi performance 360 can help assist to generate an overall picture of performance” (JI). From a hiring perspective,
“It’s important that a faculty member not just bring a particular skill base to deliver the content, but also the softer skills that can’t always be taught” (JI). The assessment could capture those soft skills in addition to how students felt about the course. Unfortunately, “other than a few positive comments from my supervisor after an in-class visit, I received no other feedback” (JI). Moreover, “I administrated my own hard copy in class anonymously to generate immediate feedback, so when it came to completing the institution’s, I don’t think any of them took it seriously” (JI).

The sheer volume of faculty teaching on a part-time basis made it difficult to ensure quality teaching through performance management. According to James, “it’s important for supervisors to come in on a more regular basis….the autonomy of the role allows faculty to essentially do whatever they want” (JI). Furthermore, “for someone new, they would be looking for more regular feedback/observations/problem-solving analysis” (JI), as the flexibility of the role could make it challenging for someone looking for more structure.

**Future Advice**

For James, a component of successfully supporting faculty was their learning about challenges in the role. Documenting these experiences helped new faculty reflect on how they would position themselves in similar situations. “I probably had one or two sessions where the topic area ended up being too challenging based on the background knowledge of the students” (JI). It was important for James “to regroup shortly after and assess the course holistically…I had to revert back to more basic information to set them up better” (JI). Flexibility was key to incorporating these adjustments and shaping the
course that still met the learning outcomes, but supported the knowledge base of the students.

For new faculty looking at the role for compensation purposes, James advised “don’t do it because you want to make money” (JI). If faculty were more intrinsically motivated, “the role can help you in your own career, personal life and community reputation...there’s all kinds of benefits that are not monetary” (JI). Based on past experiences, “those who were in it for the money, were those who were wrong for the role to begin with…it all comes down to attitude” (JI). It was important to not “just have the skill base in a subject discipline area, but also have a personality, character, emotional maturity, and intelligence” (JI). These qualities were what made a good faculty member. James concluded, “it’s important that they bring these skills because it might be too late in their life to teach these parts of the role” (JI).

Keith

Keith is a 46+ year-old retired teacher and nurse. He holds a degree in nursing and has taken various professional development courses over the years to enhance his teaching practices. He teaches part-time at the college to remain connected to the profession and “work with younger people to stay invigorated…sharing knowledge has kept me on my toes” (KI). Keith had taught at the college previously on a part-time basis in courses related to his field of study.

Keith is someone who “asks himself how he can do better” (KL1). This reflective nature caused Keith to clearly express his thoughts about his teaching practices. With so much experience, “even the best lesson can fall flat…the hope is just that the students don’t fall asleep or become disinterested” (KI). Keith discussed various changes that had
occurred in the classroom over the years, especially compared to when he was a student. One of the largest changes was the incorporation of technology into the classroom learning experience. The adoption of “the learning management platform has been interesting and is probably just one step ahead of distance learning” (KI). Keith developed a comfort with the technology over the years, but “it took a lot of time and trial-and-error to get to that point” (KL2).

Keith was passionate about dedicating time to supporting his students. Being retired, he felt he probably had “more time to devote to this than someone who is younger and also working another job” (KI). Keith spent the extra time on his teaching position because it was important “to develop and prepare the classes in a way that supported where the students were at…I don’t think they have a lot of time, so I try and make the course flexible, available and provide assignment extensions when needed” (KI). As a faculty member, he saw that his “students are very stressed out…I’ve never forgotten what it’s like to be a student” (KI). Having a background in nursing, Keith felt “there are certain things that are important in life…if you miss a deadline, that’s not one of them…how you cope with your difficulties and stress is what counts” (KI). Keith applied this philosophy to the part-time faculty role in terms of prioritizing various components over the semester.

**Motivation**

Keith described experiences that helped maintain his high level of motivation. To remain committed, he “had to use initiative by staying interested in the material I was teaching” (KI). The reality was his “motivation comes from the students, they provide great feedback…I make my courses student-centred rather than teacher-centred” (KI).
The design “helps develop a rapport with the students rather than focus on what others outside the classroom think” (KI). However, despite this intrinsic motivation, Keith still thought, “It’s always nice to get a pat on the shoulder from someone outside once in a while” (KI).

Keith reflected on how motivation also affected the goals of the students in his classes. For some students, “they emphasize marks more than others…it depends on what they hope to get out of the class, which can affect how well they respond to the material and methodologies used” (KI). In one of Keith’s classes, “a student came up to me and said that they wouldn’t think so much about this topic before coming to my class” (KI). This interaction provided “a good measure for how I was doing” (KI). Checking in with students “motivated me to continue re-developing and facilitating content…I found myself energized when I could stimulate worthwhile class discussions” (KL1). However, “when a class is scheduled between 4-6pm on a Friday afternoon, it can be difficult to engage the students no matter the modalities used” (KL1).

**Connection and Engagement**

There were times that Keith “had to be persistent and well organized to keep up with what was happening at the college” (KI). Based on the part-time nature of the role, Keith “kept in touch via Internet as I didn’t have a private office” (KI). Lack of office space made it difficult to work with students and interact with colleagues. With respect to the level of socialization with colleagues, it “depends also on the class schedule and how much time you spend in the hallways…unless you’re here on a regular basis, it’s difficult” (KI). However, “even as short as the conversations were, I did find it worthwhile commiserating with peers” (KL1).
The norms of the part-time role made it difficult for Keith to establish a strong connection to the institution. There was a time “that I was offered a course two weeks before it commenced, which is a stressful situation, especially when one wants to deliver a quality course” (KI). For someone new, this situation would have created “an even more difficult environment for the employee to connect with the institution given the steep learning curve to deliver a successful course” (KI), in that the very nature of the role “is independent in terms of setting up a course, creating the learning materials and assessments…I had to be comfortable with this aspect of it” (KL1). The nature of the role didn’t facilitate a feeling of community or the chance to develop a deep bond with the institution. Furthermore, “initiative can only go so far…it can be difficult establishing partnerships/friendships with others when there is a clear temporary nature to the role” (KL1).

Compensation

In Keith’s view, the economic challenges of today made “the part-time situation a reality as employment is not as steady as it used to be” (KI). Although, for Keith, “we can’t overlook the wage differences between part-time and full-time faculty…there’s a disparity in the salaries, which is quite obvious” (KI), at his stage in life, “finances aren’t as important as they would be for someone younger” (KI). Still, even in his past roles, “money hasn’t motivated me…I’m the kind of person that has always went beyond the call of duty” (KI). Furthermore, Keith felt “that I owe something to my students and the employer” (KI).

The faculty role had many aspects that went far beyond the part-time nature of the contract. Faculty members were “asked to attend certain meetings and be involved in
different committees without any compensation” (KI). This level of involvement remained “at the faculty members’ discretion as it’s considered extra work beyond an already busy role preparing, evaluating, and submitting on-going paperwork” (KI).

Additionally, part-time faculty members were “not compensated for sick time, vacation pay and the work is very much the same as someone teaching full-time” (KL1). As a result, Keith concluded, “the administration expects a lot for a minimal salary scale” (KL1). In general then, to remain motivated, part-time faculty couldn’t “look at every minute or second as being worth an amount” (KI).

**Teaching and Development**

Keith provided a comprehensive overview of his teaching career and his opinions on professional development. He solicited a variety of teaching resources and tools to help develop his courses. Keith engaged “other faculty members who were great resources as well as utilized what the library had available” (KI). At times, he “even came in on the weekends to use the library and collect resources…this helped to create a repertoire of information” (KI). The teaching and learning office “also had great materials to help develop strategies to cope with student engagement and the learning management platform” (KI). When Keith was new to the college, he “wasn’t sure how I was going to get used to the technology…it’s a lot of work to learn it and use it well” (KI). To navigate successfully, Keith “frequently used the staff services…unfortunately it had to be done over email most of the time rather than in person” (KI). This way of communicating was a change for Keith as he preferred to deal with people in person.

Keith attended different kinds of professional development workshops over his time teaching at the college. Keith reflected that, “the orientation session at the beginning
proved useful as well as having a good administrative contact to answer any questions throughout the semester” (KL3). In terms of the various workshops offered, “the workshops were helpful, but after you have attended a few, you start to see many similarities” (KI). While they were helpful, Keith “also had the time to invest in these kinds of unpaid opportunities, which for a younger faculty member, may not be likely” (KI). This time commitment placed pressure on faculty members who had competing interests, as time restrictions limited their ability to engage in professional development. Attending the sessions helped Keith “to make changes, which was a necessary component when developing or re-teaching a course” (KI). Through past teaching experiences, Keith “had shaped the methods used and strengthened the ability to deliver a good lesson” (KL3). The workshops supported Keith so that he could “better ensure that these improvements would help with the overall quality of the course…which has a direct impact on the students” (KI).

**Performance Evaluation**

Keith had many experiences across his career to assess his performance as a teacher. He identified a few challenges of which supervisors must be aware in terms of giving performance feedback. Based on Keith’s previous experiences teaching in other countries, “the feedback from both supervisor and faculty needs to be interpreted correctly to ensure clarity” (KI). Although a general review could be performed, Keith stated that, “there’s no measuring stick to say how I’ve really succeeded” (KI). In Keith’s experience at the college, “there was a time that I had a classroom visit, but it’s not something that I thought a lot about because I tended to continually evaluate myself” (KI). Additionally, because of the terms of the part-time nature of the role, Keith was
“not sure that a yearly evaluation was necessary unless there are complaints…our supervisors are very busy and wouldn’t be able to monitor everyone in a way to provide a meaningful written evaluation” (KI).

**Future Advice**

Keith reflected on his experiences in the role and what he could offer to prospective faculty. Teaching techniques and personal motivation were two themes that emerged. In terms of technique, Keith discussed four areas that a new faculty must factor into the role. First, a faculty member “needs to be sensitive to others’ needs…and manage the class so you’re aware of the engagement level” (KI). Second, Keith felt that, in some cases, “you may have a lesson planned, you present it but there’s still a lot of time left over…so you need to adlib, which means you have to feel comfortable as a teacher” (KI). Third, Keith believed that teaching on a “part-time basis requires a certain degree of creativity and accommodation” (KL1). The ability to deal with the unexpected was what made a great professor. Finally, in the college environment, “students will question the material and what you say…it’s certainly not the environment where what the faculty says is assumed correct, which can push a faculty outside of their comfort zone” (KI).

Ultimately, engaging students and incorporating technology into the classroom were two of the most important strategies that new faculty must learn to do the job well.

Keith felt that situational factors influenced the motivation level of a new faculty member. Keith indicated that, “the experience a potential faculty hopes to have depends on the course, number of hours, and how much time they want to commit to the profession” (KI). For Keith, it was important to “really enjoy teaching…it’s not just about the teaching, but everything that comes before and after…all the preparation and
marking” (KI). Given there were “a lot of hours to put in for which you didn’t get any compensation... as long as one possesses a mature, positive attitude, is adaptable and accommodating, success is certainly possible” (KL3).

**Laura**

Laura is a 26-35 year-old employee of the college who teaches part-time. She has previously taught courses at the college related to her personal interests. Laura holds a college diploma in journalism along with some university level courses completed towards her bachelor’s degree. She has attended various professional development sessions hosted by the college that have helped shape her professional practice.

Laura discussed various opportunities and challenges with the role. Her employment position with the college made it sometimes difficult to look at the position through the eyes of someone who was only teaching at the college: “It’s hard to know what I should know as a part-time faculty” (LI). The dual role meant that Laura was exposed to a lot more elements of the college compared to someone who solely taught on a part-time basis. Laura’s interest in teaching “came from a place of wanting to learn more about the college system through the faculty perspective” (LI). Moreover, “the professional development opportunity to also teach where I work, was exciting” (LI). For Laura, “working at the college means having a goal of student success…that’s why we do what we do…that’s why we are here” (LI). Laura was passionate about the students and wanting to support them wherever possible. She invested time in ensuring she was available and aware of the students’ needs but found “that there is a fine line between accommodating students to support success and maintaining academic quality…at some point there is an imbalance that needs to be examined” (LL2).
Motivation

Laura discussed her passion to teach and bring her life experiences into the classroom. The ability to facilitate opportunities for personal growth kept her focused. Laura reflected that she had “students tell her that they would use the knowledge to personally grow to move forward in their lives” (LI). These comments “kept me motivated…it’s the most valuable thing when you’re making an impact on the students…this will have long-term benefits” (LI). These benefits were most seen in courses that Laura had taught before. Laura “was more confident with the content of some of the courses, which allowed me to focus on the activities to engage the students” (LL1). Re-teaching a course “helped me to update curricula and incorporate student feedback from previous years…it’s motivating to see your course develop over time that serves the best interest of the students” (LL1).

Laura invested many hours into preparing and re-developing materials. Her commitment to the role came through when reflecting on the semester and how the students responded to various elements of the course. This semester, Laura “had a number of students who didn’t start actively participating until half way through the course…they ended up submitting excellent assignments, which was all based on the materials I posted online” (LI). The ability for “these students to be able to submit that kind of work made me feel good because of the immense effort I put into my lessons to ensure the students could use the materials successfully” (LI). The final product “showed that the information they needed to do the assignments well was being provided to them” (LI).
Connection and Engagement

Laura felt somewhat disconnected from the rest of the college. In general, she “didn’t always feel like I knew what’s going on with the college” (LI). As an employee working at the college, “I try and take off that hat when teaching, so I can really reflect on what I think I should know because of the role” (LI). Laura felt more connected to the institution because of her other role, which required her to be on campus more. For other faculty just teaching, it “would be difficult to find the time to be connected into the institution…especially those working elsewhere…there’s not a lot of hours in the day” (LI). As a part-time faculty, “we do get lots of messages over email, but they’re fairly sporadic, which makes it hard to always feel looped in” (LI). There were times that Laura “personally reached out to another part-time faculty member because she was new and I wanted to make sure she had what she needed and felt supported…but that was my own initiative…touch points throughout the semester are fairly limited” (LI). Laura concluded, “the role itself doesn’t have a lot of these touch points built into it compared to a full -time faculty member, so it can be isolating at times” (LI).

For Laura, most of the connection actually came from time spent with the students. At different points in the semester, Laura “had students open up about faculty in other classes and the stress that they experienced with their workloads” (LL2). The ability for students to open up to Laura kept her feeling connected in the role, albeit not directly to the institution.

Compensation

Laura felt strongly about the challenges related to compensation and the amount of work required to perform well in the role. She examined multiple perspectives and felt
that “the rate of pay is a downfall, depending on how you look at it” (LI). For Laura, “putting the positives aside, it does occur to me that the compensation doesn’t necessarily reflect the time and effort put into my courses” (LL1). Even though Laura’s “motivation is not strictly financial, I find it challenging sometimes to maintain a positive attitude” (LL1). The amount paid, after deductions, made it difficult for Laura to see the extrinsic incentives, especially “when you’re only paid for your time in the class” (LI). This challenge was especially true when comparing the wages to that of a full-time faculty member. The issue didn’t just lie with Laura, as she had “talked with other faculty who had the same complaints about the lack of compensation and strained resources…it’s a real issue at the college” (LL1).

Teaching and Development

Laura felt comfortable with most components of delivering a successful course. Although she didn’t have a professional teaching background, she completed a lot of independent learning. Generally, Laura “didn’t have much challenge with the technical side of things, but I know other areas of growth that I would like to invest in but I just don’t have the time” (LI). Over the past few years, she had “been participating in professional development little by little on my own, but not using institutional resources” (LI). In most cases, “the resources are available to read, but I don’t have the time to also meet with people outside of an already busy schedule to discuss implementation and best practices” (LI). For Laura, “time goes by much too quickly…in order to access the resources meaningfully, I would need to review them when I’m not in the middle of teaching” (LL1). As for online resources, “it was semi-helpful…the challenge was navigating the site and knowing how to apply the materials found” (LI). Specifically,
there were times “when I had accessibility requests from students…this is something that I wasn’t familiar with…more training could be focused around how to deal with all the special requests that a part-time faculty member may encounter” (LL2).

Another area that was challenging for Laura “was teaching international students material that was designed using a North American perspective” (LI). Many times Laura “tried to get these students to participate in an active way…I would check-in with them, but they weren’t particularly forthcoming with information or involvement” (LI). The differences between how some international students learned and domestic students added another complexity to the traditional classroom environment. Overall, “it seemed like a struggle to deliver content that mattered to them” (LI). At various points in the semester, Laura “tried connecting with the different supports for these students, but received no responses” (LI). In this case, Laura “was very disappointed with the level of service provided, especially when I expressed my concerns” (LI). The lack of follow-up “meant I had to go into the situation alone…where you’re in that sort of situation and under a time crunch, you don’t think outside of just getting the work done” (LI). More dedicated supports to part-time faculty would be beneficial to supporting their teaching practices, with specific attention to teaching international students.

**Performance Evaluation**

Laura had very few experiences over her various teaching contracts where performance was measured. A few times, Laura “had positive feedback from the students and once from my supervisor” (LI). According to Laura, it was important to “have the students’ points of view in order to better facilitate the opportunity for them to be successful” (LI). Laura discussed two institutional methods to collect feedback. She
“filled out a faculty reflection form, but it had not been revisited…I also participated in the student survey process, which I’ve also not received any feedback from” (LI). The performance evaluation process was not considered responsive as it took too much time to assess the data and provide meaningful feedback. The difficulty with these performance evaluation measures was being able to reflect what actually happened in the classroom. For example, Laura’s “challenge was grading 40+ assignments and not defaulting to robotic feedback…this is not something that would be clearly identified throughout the process” (LL1). However, Laura “took the initiative to make sure I’m giving constructive feedback, but without speaking to the students directly, I’m not sure how this would come out on a performance evaluation” (LL1).

Future Advice

Laura was thoughtful in her approach to providing advice for future faculty. In general, Laura felt “it was a really good experience, but it was a lot of work” (LI). To make it worthwhile, “you have to want to be there…it was not an easy job and it required a lot of time” (LI). Depending on the motivating factors, “it was certainly a rewarding role, but you need the initiative to make it rewarding” (LI). Laura concluded, “You have to be an independent worker because the resources are there to support you, but it was a bit of a web to untangle” (LI).

Sage

Sage is a 36-45 year-old former consultant and teacher from the private sector. She now is employed as a sessional faculty member as her primary source of income. Sage has prior experience teaching at various levels on a part-time basis. Her background provided her with “a desire to teach…I feel very naturally inclined as a teacher” (SI).
Moreover, “there is a real art to teaching…I feel I do it well” (SI). Sage holds a bachelor’s degree in international development and has a passion for community interests. Her experience as a teacher has led her to take advantage of many professional development workshops throughout her career to support her teaching practices.

Sage provided thorough responses that often highlighted a number of key issues with the role. She was detailed in her approach and provided in-depth stories to help me better understand her experiences. This response style made for good dialogue. Sage had taken on a very ambitious contract, teaching over 15 hours a week, which provided many opportunities to reflect on the tiring moments. Throughout the letters and interview, Sage showed a passion for teaching and students. “They are the ultimate end-user of the system – the reason for its existence…I see it as my responsibility to serve them to the best of my ability” (SL1). The opportunity to “work with students on a daily basis and learn a lot right alongside them was why I loved the job” (JL3). Sage successfully avoided having any negative aspects of the role affect her relationships with the students. The ability to “write so candidly in the letters provided an outlet because the rest of the time I would just bite my lip and try very hard to shoulder my frustration and exhaustion alone” (SL2). Providing a quality learning experience was the main priority.

The biggest challenge “was maintaining balance in life…the workload is insane, if you’re doing the job well” (SI). Most times, “I found myself running through my ‘to-do’ list just to stay one step ahead of my students…which at times meant that I didn’t meet their expectations” (SL1). The hardest part “was being absent from my family and friends during really important times because they saw how many hours I had to work outside of a regular workday” (SI). Sage would be up late at nights thinking, “When will
I sleep over the next three weeks…when will I plan my best friend’s baby shower…or play with my kids?” (SL2). Especially “with the additional elements of not only doing in-class teaching, but posting content online, answering emails, where students expect an immediate response, and posting marks almost instantly…it’s just way too much pressure to put on a teacher” (SI). Sage concluded, “I didn’t prioritize my personal life because I felt so compelled to not let my students down” (SI). By the middle of the semester, “I was physically and emotionally exhausted…never having worked harder in a job…I felt I could never take a break for the fear that the hole of preparation and marking would just get bigger and bigger” (SL2).

**Motivation**

Sage remained motivated as a professor through her interactions with her students. Sage enjoyed “learning from the hard things in life and inspiring others to be the best they can be” (SI). The opportunities that being a faculty member provided “in facilitating certain ‘aha’ moments in students, and getting them excited and engaged helps them think in different ways” (SI) were motivating for her. These experiences “get me excited when I know people have been impacted by one of my lessons” (SI). One of the best feelings for Sage occurred when “students come up to me and say that I was hands down their favourite teacher…or when they take the time to write me an email to thank you for the lesson” (SI). These memories kept Sage focused on her vision to provide a quality learning opportunity for her students. When tough moments arose, “I instead played the role of cheerleader…using affirmations, positive self-talk, and thinking about the end of the semester at 3 a.m. when my body was shutting down and my lecture wasn’t ready for the next day” (SL1).
Sage described experiences in the classroom that built strong memories that kept her motivated. In one exercise, “I pushed their comfort zones, which for some of them seriously impacted their lives” (SI). For this experience, “it was one of those moments where it wasn’t just about teaching” (SI). Sage had facilitated an experience that had an impact on the students’ overall well-being. In another example, “a student remarked after a lesson on the life changes they will be undergoing because of something they had learned in the class” (SI). This lesson took teaching beyond the classroom and gave the student something tangible to use in the future. In these moments, “I felt I was doing a good job, which continued to motivate me” (SI). Sage concluded, “I was excited about what we were going to talk about…maybe it’s maturity, accepting that this is something I’m good at…the nervousness just wasn’t there because I enjoyed the topics I was teaching” (SI).

**Connection and Engagement**

Sage reviewed her experiences in the role and the various connection points with the institution. For a majority of the time, “the connection was with the students” (SI). For colleagues, “a select few of us worked several days a week, so we would talk in between classes” (SI). In those conversations, “there were many who were struggling with the teaching role and how the institution has structured it…there were definitely a few commiserating conversations” (SI). Opportunities existed to “engage with faculty teaching other sections…but I didn’t have enough time to check in” (SI). This failure to grab these opportunities created the potential for inconsistent delivery of topics and content throughout the semester.
The institution planned various social activities outside of the workplace, “but I just didn’t have the time in this role to go deeper into relationships other than those physically around me” (SI). Furthermore, feeling connected to the institution was difficult given the “unfair exchange in the employment relationship” (SI). Feeling connected required commitment and trust from the employer, “and there seems to be a wide-spread complicity about the structure of the role” (SI). At different points in the semester, “I would hear that it’s just the way the college system works...I have a hard time with just accepting that” (SI). In life, “how do things ever change if we don’t try and think of a new way of doing things...why wouldn’t the institution want to be innovative in their approach to the role and building a stronger connection with faculty?” (SI).

Overall, “this really affects people’s morale, especially when the morale is low among the employees” (SI). This feeling was perpetuated, “when you don’t see anybody above you making an effort to change things, it certainly doesn’t help increase morale” (SI). When employees “just stay complicit, nothing will change, the institutions will just keep seeking those who will work hard for free and do nothing about it” (SI). Sage concluded, “It seems to me that there has to be a better way...to continue with a system that burns out and turns away disillusioned employees is unbelievably short-sighted” (SL1).

**Compensation**

The compensation for the role “is such a shame...I don’t understand how we can remunerate high school teachers to $95,000 a year, but we can’t pay part-time faculty at a college above the poverty line in the college system” (SI). Sage emphasized, “You can’t have a part-time faculty who is a professional educator making $23,000 a year and teaching more hours than a full-time one who is making $110,000 doing the exact same
job, that’s just so wrong” (SI). Part-time teachers were being “remunerated for only the hours they stand in front of the students…one cannot help but feel taken advantage of” (SL1). To remain motivated, “I don’t allow myself to think on a daily basis about the compensation in order to survive in this climate and position” (SL1).

To combat questions around compensation, the college highlighted more intrinsic reasons for teaching. For Sage, “I don’t think it’s fair for an employer to communicate a ‘give back to the profession’ philosophy to the employee” (SI). The idea that someone taught as an opportunity to train future leaders could not solely drive the professional relationship. “I’m not aware of many other places of employment like the college system” (SI). Even given the “challenging economic times where part-time employment is becoming more of the norm, the fact that there’s a culture and ethos here where the institution is using the ‘give-back philosophy’ as the main reason for teaching…someone to exploit, is unfair” (SI). The institution “is trying to find the person who will work hard for them because they care so much, but are not willing to treat the employee with the respect they deserve for the work they’ve done” (SI). In reality, “that’s a lovely kind of employee, but looking for that is wrong on so many levels” (SI). The fact that “the institution looks down on those who aren’t willing to do that, even when they’re excellent at what they do, is morally and ethically not OK” (SI). The college had “motivated part-time employees that work hard and care, but because they’re not willing to work for free, the institution can just watch them walk out the door because the college is not willing to care enough about the fact that the relationship is so inequitable” (SI).

As a faculty member, Sage “was tasked with delivering the highest quality product to our students (customers)… I develop, deliver, assess and collect professional
knowledge to be a better faculty member, and yet, somehow, I’m utterly and completely replaceable. It’s disheartening and hurtful to say the least” (SL3). The employees who were left at the college were “the people who are willing to say that it’s unfair and exhausting work behind closed doors, but then apologize, hoping that one day it will get better” (SI). The fear-based climate at the college was “one of secrecy and a hush nature of the labour conditions, which has created a culture where employees are dishonest with themselves” (SL1). The worst part of this system for Sage was that part-time instructors were “then ’rewarded’ by allowing them to keep their job for next semester…there are no other rewards or recognitions given by the institution” (SI).

**Teaching and Development**

For Sage, there was more of a role that the college could play in terms of teaching and learning. Sage discussed the need to improve the orientation program for new faculty. Knowing the expectations and general flow of the semester “made an incredible difference to my stress level” (SL1). Thinking back as a new faculty, Sage “was somewhat in over my head right from the beginning…the reality was that I was only handed a course outline, not ‘teaching materials’ as I was led to believe” (SL1). More attention to ensuring teaching materials were available on a consistent (semester) basis would help improve courses.

Given Sage’s previous experiences, she “didn’t look up anything as I had collected my own materials for years” (SI). She felt, “there’s really not much other than the college provided a textbook…in an ideal world they would give more, or at least pay for some of the development that some courses require” (SI). She thought “supporting faculty through teaching and learning is lovely… I would have wanted to take advantage
of it and doing professional development, but I’m not being compensated for it” (SI).

Sage was “not even being compensated for the training modules on safety that need to be completed before the role or submitting the grades after the contract ends” (SI).

Sage understood, “if I was a salary employee, I would have taken advantage of the sessions…I did when I taught here for the first time” (SI). Sage had attended any professional development sessions at that time offered because she mistakenly “thought that if I did all of this and worked hard at my job and proved that I’m good at it, that I would someday be full-time in the role” (SI). However, she “quickly realized that that’s never going to happen…it’s clear that one can’t possibly be rewarded for extra effort with job security or better pay…without any appreciation for one’s efforts, how can the college expect the best out of people?” (SL2).

**Performance Evaluation**

For Sage, the evaluation process was very relaxed. “This is the most hands-off professional job that I’ve ever had” (SI). Even though “no one likes to be micro-managed as a professional, when you’re doing the job well, you do expect some form of recognition” (SI). Moreover, “the acknowledgement should be even higher when everyone knows you’re not being paid fairly for the number of hours you work” (SI).

Considering most of the ‘touch points’, Sage felt “there’s not much knowledge about what goes on in the classroom…how can there be given the large number of employees reporting to them” (SI). The reality of the situation raised the question of: “Where the assurance is in the system that at the end of the day, the students are getting what they paid for?” (SL3). Sage reflected, “To be frank, it bothers me that the employer has absolutely no idea of the level of effort I put in…with no engagement check-ins, no
meetings, no accountability” (SL2). At one point in the semester, Sage “did have a visit from the supervisor, but nothing else. Quite frankly, I could have been teaching wrong material and no one would know, unless a student complained” (SI). In discussion with other faculty, Sage “heard them marking and answering emails during class time because they’re not paid to do these activities outside of class time” (SI). However, “preparation is a huge factor for me…I couldn’t fathom walking into the classroom and being unprepared” (SI). Furthermore, Sage realized her “lessons could be prepared in less time, but students deserve well-thought out, engaging, and hands-on lessons rather than the lazier approach of showing a long video or going to the library to research to eat up class time” (SL1). These factors needed to be considered in a performance-related review.

**Future Advice**

Sage would recommend to new part-time “Type A: faculty that, if they were “going to stress if you’re not able to prepare well, not keep up with marking, or communicate as often as you want to with the students, this isn’t the role for you” (SI). If faculty were “more laid back and can rationalize everything you need to do in your mind independently of the compensation, do what you can and feel OK with it” (SI).
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This chapter synthesizes the experiences and perceptions shared by the four non-full-time faculty members in the light of current research literature, as exemplified by five themes: motivation, connection and engagement, compensation, teaching and development, and performance evaluation. The chapter continues with implications for policy and practice, and study limitations and recommendations for future research. It concludes with my final thoughts.

Thematic Analysis

Motivation

All participants had previous teaching experiences, which shaped their core beliefs about the profession and their motivation with respect to being non-full-time faculty members (Vetter, 2006). Their integrated motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000) placed student learning as a core value and motivator. Although this motivation shifted somewhat as participants became more comfortable in the college system or with a particular course, it remained relatively stable. Motivational differences across participants tended to reflect divergences across career stage: retired versus early career.

There were similarities across the participants with respect to their focus on autonomous motivation and their changing motivation as they grew more comfortable in the role and with a particular course. Consistent with the literature, autonomous motivators captured their primary motivations (Feldman & Turnley, 2004). Autonomous motivation came from participants’ desire to teach and share their knowledge; the opportunity to interact with students and help them achieve their goals was satisfying (Hoyt, 2012; Vetter, 2006). Their motivation increased upon receiving positive and
constructive student feedback. This student feedback was sought out independently and was incorporated into the classroom and materials in real time to ensure students felt heard. By incorporating student feedback, participants were able to feel good about the quality of their teaching and overall contributions to the course, and therefore remain motivated and satisfied when delivering curricula.

As faculty members remained in the system, their motivation tended to shift. For example, participants felt that the newer faculty would require different attention compared to faculty who had been teaching in the college system previously. This attention included: orientating the faculty comprehensively, providing more teaching materials and resources, training faculty on expectations and timelines, and liaising with the faculty throughout the semester to ensure that they had the necessary supports (Hoyt, 2012; Rowh, 2014). Similarly, there were different motivators when teaching a course for the first time versus repeating it. The more confident participants felt about delivering the course content, the more motivated they were to deliver meaningful lessons and want to continue teaching. Personal achievement provided the necessary motivation to perform well in the role (Vetter, 2006).

Participants recognized the demotivating aspects of the role: unrealistic role expectations, limited resources, and inadequate compensation (Ellis, 2013; Vetter, 2006). However, the retired participants did not express these areas as having an effect on their level of motivation. For the other two participants (Sage and Laura), the structure of the role had created difficulties in terms of maintaining any work-life balance. Despite these demotivating aspects, Sage and Laura did not identify minimal commitment to the role as an aspect they felt defined them. Their positive self-talk and the opportunity for
professional experience helped keep their motivation level high to remain committed throughout the semester. This commitment level might be explained from the contracts themselves having a certain degree of irrevocability, which the faculty members entered into willingly and remained in to seem consistent and justify “the wisdom of their choice” (Lowry, 1996, p. 73).

Like Keith and James, increasingly, people have taken on the non-full-time faculty member role at a semi-retired or retired phase of life (Klopper & Power, 2014). The part-time nature of the role allows retired participants to remain involved in education, at a level of commitment that works best for them without worrying about their career development (Gottschalk & McEachern, 2010). As such, Keith and James underplayed the significance of the role’s demotivating aspects, preferring to focus on giving back to the profession. Conversely, Sage resented the college’s attempts to encourage part-time faculty members’ motivation by appealing to their sense of professional duty, rather than compensating them for their time and expertise.

**Connection and Engagement**

All participants felt little to no connection to the institution, as there were limited opportunities to have a voice in college affairs (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Rhoades, 2008). Their connection was felt to the students, with whom they spent the most time while on campus. The limited amount of time available to spend on campus, outside of supporting students, prevented participants from engaging with the institution in other capacities. Furthermore, all participants expressed the differences between being a new and a returning faculty member in terms of the desired level of engagement; the participants were more actively involved on campus when they taught for the first time. Finally, the
inadequate level of communication between the college and part-time faculty members prevented them from feeling engaged and included in college affairs.

All participants expressed that the temporary nature of the role made it feel like an isolating experience. There were few ‘touch points’ for connection throughout the semester. When opportunities for connection did arise, they were unpaid. These unpaid invitations to activities and events were difficult to accept because of competing priorities, like family responsibilities and other employment commitments, especially for the early career participants (Laura and Sage). While these opportunities were encouraged, Sage found it hard to justify putting in any additional hours when the employment relationship was so unfair, and the hours for which compensation was received were far below the number of hours required to do the role well. Even for the retired participants (James and Keith), who were able to commit more time to the role, the economics of the role provided very little “incentive to be present or highly involved in the workings of their institution” (Jacoby, 2006, p. 1085). The isolating nature of the role failed to meaningfully engage part-time faculty with full-time colleagues to build relationships and remain connected (Gappa, 2000; Gottschalk & McEachern, 2010; Hoyt, Howell, & Eggett, 2007).

All participants discussed the differences between being a new and returning faculty member in the college system. New faculty members might be looking for more opportunities to engage with the institution. However, three of the four participants (Sage, Laura, and Keith) had already taught at the college and participated in various activities other than teaching. They came to realize there were limited, if any, benefits to further investing their time, so they became more disengaged from the institution. For
example, once Sage realized participation in college events was not going to increase her chances for full-time employment, attending on her own time was not justifiable. The drive to become full-time faculty acts as a motivator for some part-time faculty to get connected to the college (Hoyt, 2012). Once this motivator is seen as untenable, the connection tends to decrease.

Communication with the institution was limited. Participants reflected on their first teaching experience and how difficult it was to navigate and interact day–to-day with the college. Laura and Keith discussed that, other than mass emails, there was no interaction with the institution. Through their own initiative, they inquired about what supports and activities were available. Additionally, part-time faculty members were not included in consultations about upcoming plans or faculty meetings, which limited their voice in the organization. This feeling of being invisible and unnoticed (Jolley et al., 2014) increased their level of dissatisfaction of not feeling included in college affairs (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). The more faculty members feel connected and valued, the more satisfied they are with the role (Cashwell, 2009). In a pilot study I completed in Fall 2014, I found a similar result. A participant in that study said:

I’m a necessary part of the organization, but I don’t feel that there is a lot of relationship between myself and the college. There is not an on-going dialogue that promotes this kind of (valued) relationship. The majority of communication that goes out is task-oriented, which doesn’t promote the type of relationship that says I’m valued as an individual or that I bring something to the team that is different than someone else could. (Katie)

With limited communication, the relationship with the college was challenging.
It’s really difficult. There are a lot of things that come with time being at a place of employment, a lot of things happen by osmosis, you absorb the understanding of a culture and environment, and I’m not able to do that in the same time frame that I think I might be able to do that if I were a full-time faculty member. (Katie)

However, even with these feelings of disengagement, the faculty members in the current study and my previous independent study still felt a passion to teach and support students to achieve their goals. These findings are in line with previous published research. Part-time faculty members tend to pursue the profession and engage in the work, even while being largely disenchanted with their roles (Valadez & Antony, 2001). The work is what keeps part-time faculty connected and engaged to the role (Vetter, 2006). One possible benefit of being disconnected relates to stress. The more connected faculty members feel to the institution, the more likely they are to perceive stressors; the psychological attachment to the institution makes them more susceptible to stressful events (Reevy & Deason, 2014).

**Compensation**

All participants identified the inadequate level of compensation, recognizing the amount of time required to do the role well. Economic conditions, both in terms of the college’s ability to sustain an academic program and of individuals finding full-time employment, contributed to this level of compensation. However, the extent that the compensation had an effect on satisfaction depended on the participant’s career stage.

There was an inadequate level of compensation for part-time faculty, despite having similar workloads to full-time faculty. Unlike part-time, full-time faculty members in the college system are compensated for preparing materials and evaluating
student performance. All participants expressed the obvious disparity in the salaries between full and part time, even though money was not a primary motivator for two of the participants (Keith and James). The salary discrepancy between full- and part-time faculty positions is a common issue among part-time faculty (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999; Hoyt, 2012). Working beside full-time faculty while teaching similar loads has been cited as a predictor of job dissatisfaction (Hoyt, 2012). An equitable working condition, establishing consistent compensation and benefit policies, is one of the five essential components for job satisfaction in academic work (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2006).

The institution expected part-time faculty members to participate in other non-teaching-related duties with no additional compensation. Adequately compensating for these other duties is a request of part-time faculty members (Cashwell, 2009); participating in meetings, curriculum development, student advising, committee work, and other informal tasks are all components of non-teaching responsibilities (Service Employees International Union, 2014). In addition, there are no benefits, vacation time, and sick time; faculty members are only paid for the hours they teach. All participants expressed difficulty in willingly including these commitments as part of their role given the compensation structure.

The participants were not surprised that the college relied on part-time faculty. The economic context of the job market meant fewer full-time jobs were available in the community. For those earlier in their careers (Sage and Laura), not thinking of the role in terms of an hourly wage helped them remain motivated, even though they relied on this role as a source of income (Gottschalk & McEachern, 2010). All participants were not
concerned with job security, given the inadequate level of compensation. A permanent contract would not have changed their level of motivation. Despite the literature, job security was not seen as a dimension of compensation that sustained their motivation (Jacoby, 2006). The compensation structure is an indication of how appreciated and respected part-time faculty members feel by their institutions; a component tied to their overall self-worth (Bogert, 2004).

**Teaching and Development**

All participants discussed teaching and development in regard to their experiences with orientation, on-going training seminars, and teaching resources. The participants expressed different needs for professional development, depending on their prior experiences in the teaching profession. The biggest challenge for all participants, however, regardless of experience, was learning the technology platforms. Greater institutional support was needed to encourage faculty to take advantage of the offerings as well as recognition to encourage part-time faculty to engage in professional development activities.

The orientation and on-going training provided were limited in their design and were often repeated over the course of each teaching contract. The sessions offered were introductory topics rather than topics that allowed faculty members to continue building their knowledge and skills. A majority of the sessions were geared to full-time faculty over the months of May and June; months where the status of part-time faculty was unknown. The sessions offered to part-time faculty during the semester were in the evenings and during study break weeks; times in the semester that were difficult to attend because of inadequate compensation, especially for Sage and Laura, who both had family
commitments. The design of the professional development program was not appropriate to the part-time nature of the role (Lazarsfeld-Jensen & Morgan, 2009). Greater attention is needed to improve orientation, integration, and socialization for part-time faculty (Bogert, 2004). Furthermore, implementing formal and informal activities throughout the semester, instead of just the beginning, helps faculty improve the overall instructional quality of the courses they teach (Marits, 1996).

Sage, Laura, and Keith participated in professional development sessions when they first started teaching at the college. However, the time spent improving their practice was not recognized by the college. The lack of institutional support, through documentation of such activities, compensation, or recognition, deprives faculty from remaining apprised of the latest trends in teaching and deprives students from benefiting from these practices (Cashwell, 2009). Job satisfaction increases when professional development is supported (Hoyt, 2012; Vetter, 2006).

Unlike what the literature has suggested, participants in the study were confident in their ability to provide quality instruction and remain available to the students (Cross & Goldenberg, 2003; Elman, 2003; Schuster, 2003). Despite this confidence, the effects of the learning environment (i.e., job instability and inadequate level of compensation for the actual number of hours worked) are still issues of quality (Field & Jones, 2016). Their previous teaching experience made the participants’ professional development needs different than someone bringing in a specific set of skills and abilities without the capacity and experience of being an educator. For example, James’ and Keith’s years of practice and acquiring resources influenced their ability to teach and incorporate new methods of instruction. All participants employed various teaching techniques in the
classroom to engage students. While they tended to feel that professional development was important, most of the sessions at the college were difficult to attend based on competing commitments, like family obligations and other employment. Similar to the participants in this study, faculty members overall engage in professional development differently, progress at different rates, and put different amounts of energy and time into it (Ambrose et al., 2010).

The expectation to integrate technology into the courses took a considerable toll with respect to time devoted to learning about technology. While some resources existed for technology use, accessing and implementing these resources was difficult. The staff resources were somewhat helpful, but resource constraints made it difficult to promptly assist faculty. Faculty members were not provided enough time to learn the technology before beginning the contract. The increased stress level and uncertainty created a difficult work environment. Anxiety increases while trying to understand the newness of the organizational structure and environment (Harrison & McKeon, 2008).

**Performance Evaluation**

All participants agreed that very little oversight was present in the role. Even with a formalized model, very little supervisory feedback was given to influence their teaching practices. Student feedback collected by the participants was the primary method used to assess their performance. Overall, the college provided no resources to build a performance management process that incorporated professional development.

Three formalized methods—standardized student forms, supervisor in-class evaluations, and self-analysis evaluations—were used to evaluate the participants. Results from the standardized teaching forms and feedback from the faculty self-analysis, which
was optional for part-time faculty to complete, were not shared with the participants. The performance review measures required faculty to indicate future plans to help support their teaching practices. Failure to follow up with part-time faculty about these plans might have an effect on their level of commitment to the role, in that commitment is linked to the goal setting process (Franken, 2002), which, in turn, is strongly related to performance (Locke & Latham, 1990). The non-responsive process indicated a lack of resources to be able to monitor part-time faculty and support their development.

Participants discussed the influence of performance management on quality teaching practices. Participants felt that, even without engaging in a meaningful and documented performance management process, they demonstrated a high level of performance in the role based on the positive student feedback they sought out independently. All participants had had one in-class visit from the supervisor, but had no further feedback after that visit. Keith, Laura, and Sage had the visit during their first teaching contracts, but not during any subsequent ones. Laura described that the performance management process only captured what the supervisor witnessed in the class, not the preparation process or student evaluation methods. The inadequate feedback provided by the supervisor might pose a risk to the overall quality of instruction, as previous studies have found that part-time faculty members perform at lower levels (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Liden, Wayne, Kraimer, & Sparrowe, 2003; Pearce, 1993) and assign higher (easier) grades compared to full-time faculty (Cashwell, 2009; Christensen, 2008; Fedler, 1989; Johnson, 2011; Sonner, 2000). Overall, institutions have failed to assess part-time faculty professionally, beyond student evaluations, which are often the only method used to evaluate teaching performance.
(Jolley et al., 2014). Stronger evaluation processes are recommended to improve job satisfaction levels (Bogert, 2004; Jacobs, 1998).

All participants discussed the influences of student compared to supervisor feedback. The longer faculty members had taught, the less likely they felt supervisor feedback would impact their teaching performance. They felt confident in their delivery and were able to work with a high degree of self-efficacy. Although participants felt that supervisor feedback was a meaningful part of the performance evaluation process, they were unlikely to be highly motivated just by receiving positive comments. The independent nature of the faculty role would require the supervisor to be present many times throughout the semester to fully examine the performance of a faculty member; something almost impossible in the college system due to resource constraints.

The part-time faculty role provided no recognition or incentives to link professional development to performance. Sage suggested that recognizing and rewarding part-time faculty for their efforts would increase morale in the organization and build a stronger sense of connection to the college. James felt that incorporating meaningful professional development, as part of the total compensation package, would increase morale about compensation. An employee’s professional growth should be measured when considering college quality, beyond student learning outcomes (Gibson-Harman, Rodriguez, & Howarth, 2002).

**Recommendations for Policy and Practice**

Based on my analysis of the literature, the results of my pilot study, and the findings from the current study, I have four recommendations for policy and practice. First, the college should develop a professional development program that incorporates
the needs of part-time faculty. Second, the province needs to provide sufficient funds so that colleges can create a compensation structure that more accurately recognizes the time and effort required by part-time faculty members to do the role well. Third, the college is encouraged to implement a mentorship program where experienced part-time or full-time faculty mentor newer faculty members. Finally, it is recommended that the college establish an authentic performance management process for part-time faculty tied to professional development that helps monitor the quality of instruction provided to the students.

A rigorous professional development program is needed for part-time faculty: one that captures the different professional and educational backgrounds of those in the role. Beginning from the hiring process, part-time faculty need to feel engaged at the college. An increased connection through professional development creates a higher level of engagement that has a positive effect on performance. A model that tracks participation can be used as an incentive for future career opportunities. Barriers to participation, like other employment obligations and family commitments, must be factored into the design to better accommodate part-time faculty. The different combinations of skills and abilities brought to the role require the institution to offer a diverse set of program offerings; returning faculty members also need to benefit from professional development to facilitate continuous learning.

Provincially, the province must re-examine its funding so that the total compensation package offered to part-time faculty adequately reflects their contributions. Even in difficult economic conditions, the role requires a comparable level of compensation consistent to full-time faculty. If a higher hourly rate is not feasible,
incorporating other elements and incentives into the role, like professional development opportunities, paid committee work, and consultation in the curriculum design process, can facilitate greater part-time faculty engagement with the college community and change the overall perceptions about the inadequate level of compensation. Furthermore, recognizing number of years taught at the college either by increasing the hourly rate or by implementing an employee recognition program could further engage part-time faculty and strengthen their commitment to the institution, especially for those in the earlier stages of their careers.

To better support part-time faculty, the institution could develop a mentorship program to help strengthen the connection felt to the college. Mentorship opportunities would help move the current one-day orientation program to one that promotes on-going conversations and a level of deeper engagement. Experienced faculty would help new faculty navigate challenges, share ideas, and provide feedback.

The college must look to develop a more rigorous performance management process that monitors part-time faculty’s performance over the entire duration of the contract. Additional methods of data collection, like reviewing evaluation practices and course preparation plans, should be included for a more holistic performance evaluation. The feedback collected must be shared with faculty to help them create goals and objectives that enhance their teaching practices. This stage helps not only faculty to feel more valued, but also increases the likelihood of quality instruction and meaningful assessment practices being provided to the students.
Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research

There were four limitations to the study with respect to lack of diversity in the sample, focus on a single institution, the use of a narrative inquiry methodology, and my own biases working at the sample institution.

While I intended to capture participants from a wider range of program disciplines, the design of my recruitment process prevented my reaching this goal. I sent individual emails to potential participants in one program discipline, not expecting immediate responses. I received four responses indicating agreement to participate before I completed sending all the individualized emails to the first program discipline. In the future, personalized emails sent simultaneously would likely capture a wider audience. When I created the study, I also didn’t realize the implications of not including any qualifiers for the recruitment of participants and relying on first-come, first-serve. As a result, I had two male retired and two female early career participants, all of whom were teaching professionals with knowledge of teaching in different capacities, such as, formal teacher training programs and working at higher education institutions. Further research could examine a more heterogeneous group of participants by outlining specific criteria for recruitment during the research design process and using a technique for selection other than first-come, first-serve.

The study was conducted at one institution and therefore is specific to its context. Although the experiences and perceptions shared by part-time faculty members can be applied beyond this environment, the structure of the part-time role is specific to this institution. I chose to conduct the study at one site because of the time pressures of a master’s program. In the future, incorporating additional institutions might provide more
meaningful results. Researchers could also compare implementing a new compensation model at one institution that incorporates different recognition incentives (tuition subsidy program; financial remuneration to participate in professional development) for part-time faculty with a second institution receiving other recognition incentives and examining differential effects on job satisfaction, retention rates, and student satisfaction.

The narrative inquiry methodology provided the framework to collect data; however, the participants’ responses failed to incorporate different events and scenarios playing out in their everyday lives. As a result, the research was more like semi-structured interviews in many respects than narrative inquiry. More story-telling would have increased the richness in their narratives to better inform the discussion and recommendations of this study. Incorporating further questions about experiences outside of the role or designing a study that involves the participants in more personal and familiar settings could help achieve a more enriched narrative.

Lastly, my role at the college increased my biases, as I knew specific information about policies, practices, and discussions not normally privy to non-full-time faculty members. I consciously refrained from incorporating these biases into my study to respect the views and opinions shared by the participants. In addition, I had to be mindful that, during the research ethics process, the college requested I not invite participants from the department for which I worked (and still work), as there was potential for a conflict of interest. In the future, selecting a different research site might benefit the study, as participants might well share their experiences and opinions differently knowing I had no direct connection to the institution.
Final Thoughts

Over the course of this master’s program, I started a family, worked full-time at the college, and moved to another city. As a result, I needed to establish balance, just as the participants in my study did. My own struggles with balance shaped the way I understood what it would mean to be employed in a part-time capacity. It influenced my perspective on the part-time faculty role and caused me to reflect more on my motivations for pursuing my own part-time student role. As a researcher, I had to try to withhold my biases and continually reflect on my thoughts to ensure I conducted the study with a high degree of objectivity. My own situation of trying to juggle multiple roles (husband, father, full-time administrator, part-time faculty member, part-time student) complicated my endeavours to do so.

My role as an administrator at the college also shaped my perspective. College policies and procedures incorporate both fiscal and quality metrics. Unfortunately, too often our decisions are influenced by the financial cost rather than future qualitative benefits. Notwithstanding, these benefits may have a long-term positive effect to the bottom line. More proactive decision-making requires planning and development. However, the college funding model restricts the amount of planning that can occur because of uncertainty of future funds. Despite the challenges, the future looks optimistic. The government has begun consultations to review the current funding model. A higher funding model may result in institutions re-examining their compensation for part-time faculty members; if not from a higher hourly wage, a more comprehensive compensation package that acknowledges the skills and abilities of those in the role. It is my hope that these changes may make many of the points I raise in this thesis moot.
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APPENDIX A: LETTER OF INFORMATION/CONSENT FORM

Letter of Information
“Non-Full-Time Professors: A Narrative Inquiry into the Non-Full-Time Faculty Role”

This research is being conducted by me, Chad Munday (Master of Education, Candidate,) under the supervision of Dr. John Freeman in the Faculty of Education at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. I am the Academic Manager, School of Media, Arts + Design & International Recruitment, which provides leadership to the day-to-day operations of the portfolio. I also have a partial role in the Department of General Education and teach one course in the School of Business. I have no supervisory responsibilities in General Education or the School of Business. The international recruitment portfolio has no faculty members attached to it.

What is this study about? The purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions and experiences of teaching and support of non-full-time faculty at XXXX College. The study will require you to complete a brief profile sheet (no more than 10 minutes), write three letters (end of each of January, February, and March) reflecting on your experiences in the role, participate in short follow-up discussions each month and participate in one audio-recorded interview (end of contract period) lasting approximately 60-90 minutes in the conference room in the Digital Media Centre or over the phone. The use of pseudonyms will be used for the profile sheet, the interviews and the letters being written. The nature of the questions will encourage reflection about personal and professional challenges related to college teaching through past experiences. You, as a participant, will have an opportunity to reflect on your teaching practices prior to and during the course of the interview. This type of reflection may lead to a sense that your teaching practices need modification, or that they are inadequate in some way. Participating in this study carries a minimal risk that you could feel worried or embarrassed after you reflect on your teaching practices. As there may be a perceived power imbalance because of my position in the School of Media, Arts + Design, faculty members from this School will not be eligible to participate.

Is my participation voluntary? Yes. Although it be would be greatly appreciated if you would answer all questions as frankly as possible, you should not feel obliged to answer any question that you find objectionable or that makes you feel uncomfortable. You may also withdraw at any time with no negative consequences. If you withdraw from the study, you may choose to have your data removed. To withdraw, contact Chad Munday at the email below.

What will happen to my responses? We will keep your responses confidential to the extent possible. There is the potential of disclosure based on your comments or responses; however, only my supervisor and I will have access to this information. All electronic files will be password protected. Paper and audio files will be secured in a locked cabinet. I will maintain copies of the transcripts for a minimum of 7 years and may use the data in subsequent research. To help ensure confidentiality, please do not put your name on any of the research study answer sheets or use people’s real names in the three letters or the interviews. Pseudonyms will be used to protect your identity, although your identity will be known to me, Chad Munday, as the researcher. The data will be published in my master’s thesis and may be published in professional journals or presented at scientific conferences, but any such presentations will not breach individual confidentiality. Should you be interested, you are entitled to a copy of the findings.

Will I be compensated for my participation? No.

What if I have concerns? Any questions about study participation may be directed to Chad Munday at cmunday@XXXX or 613-969-1913 ext. 2293 or his supervisor, Dr. Freeman at freemanj@queensu.ca or 613-533-6000 ext. 77298. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081 and the Chair of the XXXX College Research Ethics Board at kholder@XXXX.
Again, thank you. Your interest in participating in this research study is greatly appreciated.

This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's and XXXX policies.

Consent Form
“Non-Full-Time Professors: A Narrative Inquiry into the Non-Full-Time Faculty Role”

Name (please print clearly): __________________________________________

1. I have read the Letter of Information and have had any questions answered to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that I will be participating in the study called < Non-Full-Time Professors: A Narrative Inquiry into the Non-Full-Time Faculty Role >. I understand that participation in this study will entail completing: a profile sheet (maximum 10 minutes), writing three letters (end of each of January, February, March), and participating in one audio-recorded interview at the end of the contract period (lasting from 60-90 minutes).

3. I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time. I understand that every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of the data now and in the future. I understand that, if I withdraw from the study, I may choose to have my data removed. I understand that the data will be published in Chad Munday’s master’s thesis and may be published in professional journals or presented at scientific conferences, but any such presentations will not breach individual confidentiality. Should you be interested, you are entitled to a copy of the findings.

4. I am aware that if I have any questions, concerns, or complaints, I may contact Chad Munday (613-969-1913 X2293); cmunday@XXXX; his project supervisor, Dr. John Freeman (533-6000 x 77298); freemanj@queensu.ca; the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board (533-6081); chair.GREB@queensu.ca at Queen’s University; or the Chair of the XXXX College Research Ethics Board at kholder@XXXX.

I have read the above statements and freely consent to participate in this research:

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________________

____ I agree to being audio recorded (please initial)

PLEASE KEEP ONE COPY OF THIS CONSENT AND RETURN THE OTHER COPY TO CHAD MUNDAY.

If you would like a copy of the findings, please provide your email:

____________________________________
APPENDIX B: PROFILE SHEET

What is your age?
__25 or under
__26-35
__36-45
__46+

What is your gender?
__Male
__Female
__Other
__Prefer not to say

If employed elsewhere, how long have you been employed?
__Not employed elsewhere
__Less than 1 year
__1-3 years
__4-6 years
__7 years or more

Is this your first time teaching at a College?
__Yes
__No

Is this your first time teaching at XXXX?
__Yes
__No

What teaching classification are you in at XXXX?
__Sessional (13+ hours)
__Partial load (7-12 hours)
__Part-time (6 or less hours)

Does your current/previous employment align with the course(s) you teach?
__Yes
__No
What best describes the highest level of education you have completed?
  __ High school or equivalent
  __ Some college
  __ College certificate/Diploma/Advanced diploma
  __ Some university
  __ Degree
  __ Master’s
  __ Doctorate
  __ Post-Doctorate

Please list any supports and professional development sessions you have been involved in related to teaching.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please think of a Pseudonym to represent you in the study.

I certify that the information on this survey is complete.

PSEUDONYM’S SIGNATURE _______________________ DATE _____________
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Dear Mr. Munday,
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APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

What events in the past have drawn you to want to teach at the college?

What challenges do you face in being a non-full-time faculty member?

Can you describe an experience where you felt valued in the role?

Tell me about your social interactions at work.

Can you tell me a story where you felt positive about your course delivery in terms of meeting the learning outcomes? FU: What about where you didn’t feel so positive?

What motivates you to achieve what you want to achieve in the role?

How would you describe the resources made available to you, both personal and institutional?

How would you describe the evaluation and assessment practices put in place for your role?

If someone was asking you advice about taking on the non-full-time faculty role, what would you tell them?