
Adjunct Faculty in Developmental Education: Best Practices, Challenges, and Recommendations

Jennifer L. Datray
D. Patrick Saxon
Nara M. Martirosyan

Jennifer L. Datray is a doctoral student in the Developmental Education Administration program at Sam Houston State University.

D. Patrick Saxon is an Associate Professor and Director of the Developmental Education Administration Doctoral Program at Sam Houston State University.

Nara M. Martirosyan is an Assistant Professor in the Developmental Education Administration Doctoral Program at Sam Houston State University.

Adjunct and part-time faculty are an important resource for developmental education programs. Developmental courses and services are developed to serve underprepared, at-risk college students typically near the beginning of their college matriculation. According to Schults (2001), approximately 65% of the faculty teaching developmental education courses at community colleges are adjunct status. In other words, most developmental students are likely to be taught at some point by an adjunct faculty member. Therefore, administrators of developmental programs and services must take care to manage and utilize this resource effectively.

Although the field of developmental education has seen some significant advances in research, policy, and philanthropy over the past decade or so, attention to its greatest human resource has to date, been lacking. A summary review of a few of the latest policy and strategy initiatives from philanthropically funded “think tanks” in the field turned up no mention of the roles, initiatives, or potential contributions of adjunct faculty (Alstadt, 2012; Clancy & Collins, 2013; Complete College America, 2011; Silva & White, 2013). However, it appears that limited initiatives that more completely involve and effectively utilize the adjunct faculty resource emerge from the institutional level under the guidance of committed leadership (Boylan & Saxon, 2006; Levine-Brown, Green, Hess, & Cabral-Maly, 2007). Going forward, perhaps increasing the attention of the extent to which developmental programs rely on adjunct faculty and the challenges inherent therein may increase the awareness needed to improve program outcomes through the development of this resource.

State of the research and the literature on adjunct faculty in developmental education

In spite of the high levels of reliance on adjunct faculty, it is disconcerting to see the lack of research literature available to gauge the efficacy and promote the improvement of this resource. As a result of the scarcity of literature to inform practice in this field, a look at the literature base at a broader level is, perhaps, in order. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has reported that nearly 100% of community colleges have developmental programs (NCES, 2003). It seems intuitive that the literature base on adjunct faculty deployment at the community college level would provide examples and information that may guide practice. It may also be used to promote and expand the investigation of this resource and its usage in developmental education programs. The goal of this research is to examine the literature base on adjunct faculty use in developmental education and on a broader scale, at the community college level. Challenges, best practices, and limitations as reported in the literature are described. From this, recommendations for policy, practice, and research in the field of developmental education will be offered. For the purposes of this work, the terms “adjunct” and “part-time” are used interchangeably.

Review of the Literature

Usage and characterization. The literature discussing part-time faculty impact on developmental education is limited and conflicting. As noted, this presents a problem considering the numbers of part-time faculty employed to teach in higher education. In a follow-up national study of community college developmental programs, Gerlaugh, Thompson, Boylan, and Davis (2007) found “a minor trend toward reducing the percentage of adjunct or part-time faculty used to teach developmental education courses” (p. 3). However, other studies at a broader level show the reverse is true. In the period 1970 to 1997, over a 20% increase occurred in the use of part-time faculty to teach college courses (Fike & Fike, 2007; Schibik & Harrington, 2004). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2005), 68% of faculty are employed part-time. A more recent study utilizing a hierarchical linear modeling sample of California community colleges revealed that over 65% of faculty members at two-year institutions were part-time (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). These studies looked at overall trends in faculty employment status for institutions as a whole, but for developmental education, Boylan (2002) asserts that over 60% of courses are taught by adjunct faculty. And as noted in a national study of two-year colleges, Schults (2001) reported a 65% adjunct faculty ratio for the field. In an earlier national study, Boylan, Bonham, Jackson, and Saxon (1994) reported that 79% of two-year college developmental faculty were part-time. However, they made the distinction that some of these teachers may have been part-time specifically to the developmental education program, though full-time faculty at the institution. Ultimately, it appears that the use of part-time faculty at 2-year institutions is significant, and

there is the likelihood that high reliance on part-time faculty to teach developmental courses is characteristic of the field.

The research examining the usage of adjunct faculty seems to characterize them in conflicting ways. Some studies attempt to define qualities of adjunct faculty that may impact their instructional efforts. For example, Gerlich and Sollosy (2010) present a decidedly negative portrait of the adjunct faculty who, they assert, have no dedication to instruction and have no real need for the job. These assertions were made based on data describing a correlation between student exam scores on comprehensive outcomes assessments and the delivery of instruction by part-time faculty. However, their study was limited to one semester, at one institution. Opposing the subjective claim made by Gerlich and Sollosy (2010) is a more positively framed assertion by the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California (USC) Rossier (2012) which asserts that part-time faculty are committed to teaching and positively impacting student success by bringing a wealth of real-world and professional experience to the classroom. In a qualitative study conducted at a large community college, the conflicting characterization was inherent in the narrative of the report. From the literature, Diegel (2013) noted some possibly denigrating descriptions of adjunct faculty and documented those references. They generally described adjunct faculty as providing a lower quality of teaching and engaging in grade inflation. However, her original research showed the opposite. She discovered that adjuncts participating in the study were generally committed to their teaching, brought practical and relevant experience to the classroom, and were characterized by department chairs as having a strong desire to perform well.

Credentials and efficacy. Another much lauded “fact” concerning part-time and adjunct faculty is that they lack the educational background of their full-time counterparts. Gerlich and Sollosy (2010) claim that adjunct faculty lack the training and background that would enable them to utilize quality instructional practices. Although differing standards may be held at research and doctoral-granting institutions, at community colleges “only one fifth of the full-time faculty possess doctoral degrees” (Jacoby, 2006, p. 1084). So in some cases, the lack of a terminal degree is used as a factor in discussing the efficacy of part-time faculty in delivering instruction; however, at community colleges, the master’s degree is typically considered an appropriate level of academic attainment for teachers. From their survey research of developmental education professionals, Boylan, Shaw, Materniak, Clark-Thayer, and Saxon (2000) reported that, in general, developmental educators were well-credentialed. Though their work was not exclusively on adjunct faculty (they reported that about 45% of their respondents were “temporary”), only 3% of their sample held a degree less than the master’s.

However, a likely valid criticism of adjunct faculty is that their background education and experience may not fully prepare them for teaching developmental education courses. Perhaps many who enter the profession are well-trained content area specialists, but scholarship in a particular content area may have lacked training and development in teaching and in particular, teaching nontra-

ditional and underprepared students (Boylan, 2009). As a result, some adjuncts may enter the profession underprepared for their assignment.

The most important question on which the literature focuses is whether or not utilization of adjunct faculty negatively impacts student success. Jaeger and Eagan (2009) analyzed student and institution-level data of all California community colleges to determine how student exposure to part-time faculty affected their likelihood of earning a degree. Their results were worrisome, as they concluded that “as students’ exposure to part-time faculty members increased, their likelihood of completing an associate’s degree significantly decreased. This effect remained stable across time as students advanced through their academic progress” (p. 186). Specifically, they concluded that a 10% increase in exposure to part-time faculty resulted in a 1% decrease in students’ likelihood of attaining a degree. The study further estimates that due to the average community college student spending more than 50% of their time in adjunct-instructed courses, the high level of interaction actually translates to closer to 5% of students being less likely to graduate. This number admittedly looks small, but causes concern in light of the amount of time students spend in classes staffed by part-time faculty.

A second study, Schibik and Harrington (2004), which focused on only one institution, also found that part-time faculty are responsible for a preponderance of freshman-level courses and were frequently the first point of contact for many students entering college. They explain why their results showed a negative correlation between part-time faculty teaching and student retention rates. The data show that, “holding academic preparation constant, exposure to part-time faculty at levels above 50% during their first semester on campus has a direct and significant negative impact on student retention into the second semester” (Schibik & Harrington, 2004, p. 5). Specific to developmental education, in a study of Texas college developmental program outcomes, efficacy was related to the ratio of the deployment of adjunct faculty. Boylan and Saxon (1998) reported that at colleges where 70% or more of developmental courses were taught by adjuncts, significant numbers of these courses yielded unacceptably low pass rates on a state-mandated exit exam. In summary, these studies indicated that the use of part-time faculty negatively impacts student success.

Conversely, Rossol-Allison and Beyers (2011) conducted a more thorough study of an entire fall 2005 cohort of undergraduates at a two-year community college and found entirely opposite results. Their data revealed that “students who were mostly enrolled in part-time faculty-taught classes were just as likely to graduate or transfer as their peers who enrolled in full-time faculty-taught classes for the majority of their course-work” (p. 10). Another study of 1,318 students at an urban Texas community college also found that faculty status was not a factor in student success (Fike & Fike, 2007). This study focused exclusively on developmental math courses and was longitudinal in that it tracked the participants through the entire developmental sequence. This is particularly relevant as it is one of the few studies focused exclusively on part-time faculty use in developmental education programs. Finally, a national study of developmental education (as

cited in Levine Brown et al., 2007) found there was no significant difference in student outcomes when taught by full-time versus part-time faculty.

The differing results that appear in the extant research require closer inspection. It is unlikely that outcomes are associated with but one variable. In fact, Johnson (2006) studied the retention rates of degree-seeking students at a large university and examined the differences in student enrollment patterns as they correlated to enrollment in adjunct-faculty taught courses. The results were that when studies do not control for student enrollment status (full-time as opposed to part-time) that “a negative correlation between exposure to part-time faculty and reenrollment is rather a statistical artifact caused by the way the index was constructed” (Johnson, 2006, p. 10) in previous research. Johnson (2006) claims that when studies control for varying student characteristics, the negative associations between exposure to part-time faculty and student retention disappears in two out of three studies.

Jacoby’s (2006) widely cited review of the National Center for Educational Statistics data on community college graduation rates from 2001 revealed data suggesting a direct causation between exposure to part-time faculty and reduced student graduation rates. However, perhaps this study attempts to prove causation where only correlation exists. Jaeger and Egan (2009) reexamined Jacoby’s data and found it utilized only institutional-level data and disregarded other variables, such as student enrollment status. Their work examined these other variables, suggesting the reduction in “graduation rates likely has more to do with individual student exposure to part-time faculty members than it does with the overall proportion of part-timers employed by a community college” (Jaeger & Egan, 2009, p. 188). In other words, the issue may be the lack of institutional integration of part-time faculty (which may impact student exposure to those faculty), rather than the lack of qualifications or competence of the individual faculty members.

Boylan and Saxon’s (2006) study of five high performing developmental education programs in Texas also addressed the individual versus institutional concern. Adjunct faculty ratios were not reported in these case studies. However, it was apparent that program and college leaders relied on and valued adjunct faculty as highly skilled, contributing members of successful programs. In other words, they trusted that adjunct faculty selected through quite deliberate hiring practices were effective teachers. The leadership commitment for effective deployment was to promote their integration into the campus mainstream through support, mentoring, development, and systematic communication processes.

Student access and support concerns. An obvious factor confounding adjunct faculty effectiveness is the lack of access students have to supplemental support from these faculty. Jaeger and Egan (2009) find “students sense that they receive little support and guidance from part-time faculty members, who may lack the time and perhaps the necessary knowledge needed to assist their students in navigating the academic terrain at their respective institutions” (p. 187). In some cases, there is no designated space on campus for adjunct faculty. They may not

have standard office hours, and students cannot meet with them as easily on an informal basis (Schibik & Harrington, 2004). The literature points to this as a reason adjunct faculty are a detriment to student success; however, the problem is perhaps not the fault of the faculty member but of the institution which fails to provide adequate resources and training for them.

Another detrimental factor is the low amount of professional development offered to adjunct faculty. Sandford, Dainty, Belcher, and Frisbee (2011) state that because part-time faculty are by their very label temporary employees, it discourages investment in their professional development. In developmental education, this may be considered neglect on the part of administration as professional development is cited as a best practice that is essential for program success (Boylan, 2002). However, part-time faculty are often left to fend for themselves when it comes to professional development opportunities. Instead, “developmental education faculty should be encouraged to attend conferences and read current developmental education literature to help them become more knowledgeable and stay current with issues and trends in the field” (Fike & Fike, 2007, p. 8).

Positive results have been seen with some structured attempts to provide professional development. A study was conducted at a two-year community college in New Mexico that created a pilot program aimed at all part-time faculty where incentive was promoted by offering a Distinguished Teaching Chair award (Bramhall & Buyok, 2009). Adjunct faculty attended four seminars on various pedagogical matters and were paid a stipend of \$150 for successful completion. They were also given a certificate of completion by the director of the program. Buy-in was created by competition among staff to win the award. Student retention rates for those courses taught by 29 adjunct faculty between 2005 and 2006 showed an increase of 7%. In another example of adjunct faculty support and development, an initiative was implemented at a Florida community college where adjunct faculty training was designed around research-based best instructional practices. Participants in the program were modestly compensated. Though instructor efficacy data were not examined, the participants reported satisfaction with the training (Levine-Brown et al., 2007).

Discussion

Developmental education, which is practice devoted to the service of underprepared and nontraditional college students, is rife with negative connotations. It is intuitive that the negativity spills over to, and is perhaps compounded for its primary faculty base—that is, adjunct and part-time teachers. In addition to the stigma associated with serving underprepared college students, adjunct faculty are disadvantaged in the sense that, for whatever reasons, they typically are not fully engaged in the academic and social communities of the institution. Furthermore, even the literature produced in the field regarding part-time faculty seemingly marginalizes and stigmatizes them. Common language used in the literature in reference to adjunct faculty includes terms such as “the problem,” “negatively influences,” “inferior quality,” “exposed to,” and “disengaged.” A cur-

sory review of the studies reviewed in this work showed that 85% used these terms in their descriptions of part-time faculty. Even research showing positive outcomes from adjunct faculty involvement in instruction tends to convey negativity with the use of particular terminology. As this is common in the literature, perhaps this is reflective of typical discourse regarding adjunct faculty.

It appears that the teaching outcomes of adjunct faculty as described in some of the literature are mixed. Some studies describe adjunct faculty as achieving lower outcomes in terms of student performance; others describe no difference in outcomes relative to that of full-time faculty peers. Perhaps the differences lie in the dynamics of individual teaching skills, commitment, supportive institutional leadership, resources, and campus climate.

Therefore, a change in the consideration and prioritization of adjunct faculty as a profession resource is perhaps in order. The field needs direction and colleges need leadership that recognizes rather than marginalizes the potentially valuable contributions that can be made by adjunct teachers. Roueche and Roueche (1999) identified several characteristics that faculty should have in order to effectively teach developmental students. It is asserted that “attitude and competence” (Levine-Brown et al., 2007, p. 1) are more important than faculty status and it appears that the characteristics listed by Roueche and Roueche lend themselves quite well to informed choice. That is, informed choice on the part of program administrators as to who would be teaching developmental students, and informed choice as to how best to support and develop this resource.

The field of developmental education is also in an era of sweeping change. Several redesign and policy initiatives are being pitched in the field. In some states, these initiatives are being mandated. Among these include accelerating the delivery of the developmental education curriculum, rethinking which students are placed into developmental courses, and contextualizing the content specifically toward student academic and career goals. The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO; 2013) cites faculty support as a primary mechanism for implementing instructional and curricular change. However, it should be noted that support for changes to teaching styles, accommodating new course delivery models, rests predominantly with adjunct faculty. And as noted, no current philanthropic or research initiatives have identified this resource as a target of opportunity for development.

Recommendations

Given that the field of developmental education is primarily staffed by adjunct faculty receiving varying levels of support and exhibiting an uneven range of outcomes, it is suggested that administrators and policy makers contemplate the important role of adjunct faculty in their developmental programs. The following are recommendations provided to assist leaders to make deliberate, informed decisions on how to develop and utilize adjunct faculty as valuable assets.

Maintain an appropriate balance. Boylan (2002) reported that the more successful developmental programs held less reliance on the use of adjunct faculty in their programs. He cited studies showing that colleges deploying adjunct faculty at rates of 50% or less showed more satisfactory student outcomes than colleges utilizing higher levels. It is therefore recommended to maintain an appropriate balance between full- and part-time faculty. Furthermore, as the ratio of adjunct to full-time faculty rises, it increases the challenges of offering the support that adjunct faculty need to be successful teachers.

Choose adjunct instructors wisely. The selection of quality teachers is a key contributing factor for the success of developmental education (Boylan & Saxon, 2006; Boylan & Saxon, 2012). Some of the key attributes cited as important in faculty candidates are teaching experience, commitment to working with underprepared students, and appropriate fit with the institutional culture. Boylan and Saxon (2012) emphasized the importance of selecting qualified developmental education instructors and offered suggestions that may assist in doing so. They recommended including successful developmental education faculty members in adjunct hiring committees, assessing candidates for positive attitudes toward developmental education and underprepared students, and requiring candidates to perform teaching demonstrations. They also recommended that high-ranking administrators be involved in the interview and teaching demonstration process. This would help in assessing candidate's teaching skills and deciding whether the candidate would be a good fit to work with underprepared students.

Provide training to new adjunct faculty. Though development for adjunct faculty is not considered a priority in many institutions (Levine-Brown et al., 2007), Boylan and Saxon (2012) state that "providing training to adjunct faculty teaching developmental courses is probably one of the most cost-effective investments community college administrators can make" (p. 45). They suggested that adjunct faculty should be offered orientation and training opportunities, and that they are incentivized to participate. Colleges that adhere to best practices offer training manuals and orientation sessions to new faculty members. Longer term, Colorado Mountain College (2008) found that orientation programs for adjunct faculty were important for retaining adjunct faculty. In other cases, colleges encouraged and rewarded adjunct faculty for serving in advising and learning laboratories (Boylan & Saxon, 2006). This served to increase faculty involvement with staff and college support services and increase the time spent on campus and working with students. To encourage participation in training, a range of incentives may be offered including stipends, campus perquisites such as parking or meal cards, and choices of teaching assignments and scheduling.

Provide professional development opportunities. Adjunct faculty should also be offered professional development opportunities. Diegel (2013) described how a community college designed their Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (FCTE) to provide support and professional development specifically for adjunct faculty. The FCTE proved invaluable to the support, development, and work satisfaction of adjunct faculty. Boylan and Saxon (2006) described some of the

professional development options offered to adjunct faculty at institutions with high-performing developmental programs. These options included funding for adjuncts to take graduate-level courses and to attend conferences and workshops. Some colleges initiated local workshops, hired instructional specialists as consultants and speakers, and created and disseminated newsletters and other resources that supported effective teaching. Other, lower cost methods of development included regular meetings of faculty for the purpose of discussing specialized instruction-related topics and the resourcing of books and other media on teaching and learning. When limited funds were available for travel, faculty attending development events were asked to share what they learned and experienced with others who were unable to attend.

Assign adjunct faculty to mentors. Adjunct faculty mentoring is somewhat easy to implement and has strong support in the literature. “Best-practice” institutions in developmental education provided mentoring for their part-time faculty (Boylan, 2002). Diegel (2013) found that mentoring was among the most important factors for acclimating adjunct faculty to the institution, and for supporting their work and retaining them as teachers for the long term. It is therefore recommended to assign senior faculty and administrators as mentors to adjunct faculty to assist their integration into the college and support them in solving classroom or instructional challenges (Boylan, 2002). Providing mentoring might be the least costly initiative that colleges can implement, through the expertise of their own faculty.

Programs like those described by Bramhall and Buyok (2009) and Levine-Brown et al. (2007) offer examples by which institutions may improve program quality through comprehensive orientation, training, and mentoring of adjunct faculty. These types of programs are also likely to enhance adjunct faculty satisfaction and advance their status.

Provide institutional resources and include adjunct faculty in resourcing and strategic initiatives. Some institutions fail to provide adequate resources for adjunct faculty (Boylan & Saxon, 2012; Bramhall, & Buyok, 2009; Landrum, 2008). However, such a significant contributing resource to program efficacy must be a priority for colleges when it comes to resource allocation. Adjunct faculty members need adequate office space in order to meet with students, prepare courses, and consult with other faculty and staff. Devoted office space and designated office hours makes faculty members more accessible to students and would likely further engage them in the campus culture. The need for office space becomes even more crucial on campuses where adjunct faculty outnumber full-time faculty. In these cases, there is a smaller number of full-time faculty available to advise students (Boylan & Saxon, 2012).

Adjunct faculty should be considered and invited to participate in the strategic resourcing and planning of the developmental program. It is important that they are not overlooked in this process. This ensures that their voices are heard when it comes to program, instructional, and student needs. An inclusive

approach to resource allocation may enhance communication and promotes satisfaction among the ranks of adjunct faculty.

Encourage and support the use of diverse instructional techniques. Boylan (2002) has noted that many developmental students have not responded well to traditional instructional techniques. It is important that the faculty teaching them must apply varied instructional techniques as such to motivate and interest students, as well as engage them in active and experimental learning. Boylan and Saxon (2012) believe that college administrators should insist on the use of diverse instructional strategies when teaching developmental students. They state that this should have “a dramatic and positive impact on the success of developmental education” (p. 27). They provide examples of instructional techniques which have proven to be successful with developmental education (e.g., collaborative learning, learning communities, classroom and laboratory teaching, etc.). And as noted, many college teachers may be well versed in discipline content, but need training and support in learning about diverse instructional strategies and various teaching methods (Boylan & Saxon, 2012).

Integrate adjunct faculty into the institutional mainstream. College leaders and faculty mentors should make a concerted effort to integrate adjunct faculty into the daily happenings of the college. Adjunct and part-time faculty should be invited and encouraged to participate in departmental meetings and campus events (Boylan, 2002; Boylan & Saxon, 2012). Diegel (2013) found that adjunct faculty held the desire to interact regularly with chairs, mentors, and other faculty. These are their communication lines for college happenings and teaching advice. It makes them feel important and connected to the college. A Colorado Mountain College (2008) study found that a campus culture that included communication, evaluation, and feedback for adjunct faculty was more likely to support the retention of those faculty.

Consider the needs and contributions of adjunct faculty when engaging in course redesign initiatives. The GAO (2013) reported that all community colleges visited in a brief study of developmental education were redesigning the delivery of the developmental curriculum in some way. A common issue cited in this report was garnering “. . . faculty support for unproven reforms” (GAO, 2013, p. 9). These new teaching reforms will include compressing courses, contextualizing content, and integrating support mechanisms into courses. All of this requires changes to traditional instructional methods and styles. Adjunct faculty, being the predominant resource teaching developmental education, will need to contribute on two fronts – from their “buy in” to implement these reforms, to participating in the support and scholarship to gauge the efficacy of them.

Retain qualified adjunct faculty. It is in the best interests of college administrators to examine the rate at which adjuncts are retained at their institutions. If college leaders are willing to take measured steps to choose from among the most qualified adjunct teachers and invest in their development, then it makes sense to engage in efforts to retain those faculty. Colorado Mountain College (2008) listed several financial and opportunity costs associated with adjunct

faculty turnover. The goal of adjunct faculty retention in their college was to achieve student success outcomes equal to that of full-time faculty. The retention program was designed to make many of the training, development, and communication aspects of being a faculty member similar for both part- and full-time faculty. Boylan (2002) recommended that when possible, fill the ranks of full-time faculty with those who had worked as adjuncts. This secures the investment of the college in the faculty member and may be a motivating factor for adjuncts looking to advance their careers.

Hire in advance. Though there are sometimes unforeseen circumstances that require urgent hiring, it is recommended that colleges should hire their adjunct faculty well in advance of the start of their teaching assignment. Some of the recommendations here require more time and consideration in the hiring process; however, they increase the chances of selecting qualified instructors. Hiring well in advance also ensures that instructors will have adequate time to prepare for teaching, and to attend training and orientation sessions provided by the institution.

Include adjunct faculty in policy and grant initiatives. Going forward, it seems important that adjunct faculty become part of the discourse when discussing policy and improvement initiatives. As noted earlier, philanthropic activity in the field has generally overlooked adjunct faculty as an area of focus. Initiatives need to be designed with the forethought that in many cases, adjunct faculty will be relied on to implement them. It is likely that there are also initiatives that could focus exclusively on the improvement of the teaching of adjunct faculty with the goal of improved student outcomes.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research

This work examined the challenges related to the use of adjunct faculty in developmental education and provided a number of recommendations on how to utilize these faculty as valuable resources in a college. The role of adjunct faculty in developmental education cannot be underestimated. In general, the role of quality teachers is often emphasized by scholars and entrepreneurs. For example, Bill Gates (TED, n.d.) is quoted as saying:

A top-quartile teacher will increase the performance of their class based on test scores by over 10 percent in a single year. That means that if the entire U.S. for two years, had top-quartile teachers, the entire difference between us and Asia would go away. (Speakers Bill Gates: Philanthropist section, para. 4)

Going forward, it will be important to implement these recommendations and initiate evaluation procedures to determine the efficacy of those efforts. Ultimately, program administrators and adjunct faculty need to be aware of the outcomes of their students. Collecting simple measures of student completion, suc-

cess, and matriculation for the purposes of program improvement would serve to engage adjunct faculty in self-study and likely build commitment to continuous improvement. At the scholarly level, such endeavors may also serve to promote and establish a research agenda as more attention is devoted to enhancing and developing adjunct faculty as a vital developmental program resource.

References

- Alstadt, D. (2012). *Ahead of the curve: State success in the developmental education initiative*. Retrieved from http://www.jff.org/sites/default/files/AheadOfTheCurve_120312.pdf
- Boylan, H. R. (2002). *What works: Research-based best practices in developmental education*. Boone, NC: National Center for Developmental Education.
- Boylan, H. R. (2009). The mistakes we make and how we correct them: What I've learned as a consultant. *NADE Digest*, 4(2), 1-8.
- Boylan, H. R., Bonham, B., Jackson, J., & Saxon, D. P. (1994). Staffing patterns in developmental education programs: Full-time/part-time, credentials, and program placement. *Research in Developmental Education*, 11(5), 1-4.
- Boylan, H. R., & Saxon, D. P. (1998). *An evaluation of developmental education in Texas colleges and universities*. Austin, TX: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.
- Boylan, H. R., & Saxon, D. P. (2006). *Affirmation and discovery: Learning from successful community college developmental programs in Texas*. Retrieved from <http://ncde.appstate.edu/sites/ncde.appstate.edu/files/TACC%20Final%20Report.pdf>
- Boylan, H. R., Shaw, G., Materniak, G., Clark-Thayer, S., & Saxon, D. P. (2000). What we know about developmental educators: Report of a NADE survey. *Research in Developmental Education*, 16(2), 1-4.
- Bramhall, D. D., & Buyok, A. (2009). Adjunct faculty professional development: Small investment, high yield. *Enrollment Management Journal*, 114-123.
- Clancy, M. C., & Collins, M. L. (2013). *From innovation to transformation Texas moves to reform developmental education*. Retrieved from http://www.jff.org/sites/default/files/FromInnovationToTransformation_040113_0.pdf
- Colorado Mountain College. (2008). *Adjunct faculty retention*. Retrieved from http://www.coloradomtn.edu/File/aqip/Adjunct_Faculty_Retention.pdf
- Complete College America. (2012). *Remediation: Higher education's bridge to nowhere*. Retrieved from <http://www.completecollege.org/docs/CCA-Remediation-final.pdf>
- Diegel, B. L. (2013). Perceptions of community college adjunct faculty and division chairpersons: Support, mentoring, and professional development to sustain academic quality. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37, 596-607.
- Fike, D. S., & Fike, R. (2007). Does faculty employment status impact developmental mathematics outcomes? *Journal of Developmental Education*, 31(1), 2-11.

-
- Gerlaugh, K., Thompson, L., Boylan, H., & Davis, H. (2007). National study of developmental education II: Baseline data for community colleges. *Research in Developmental Education*, 20(4), 1-4.
- Gerlich, R. N., & Sollosy, M. (2010). Predicting assessment outcomes: the effect of full-time and part-time faculty. *Journal of Case Studies in Accreditation and Assessment*, V(1), 1-9.
- Government Accountability Office. (2013). *Community colleges: New federal research center may enhance current understanding of developmental education*. Retrieved from <http://gao.gov/products/GAO-13-656>
- Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1081-1103.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K., Jr. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review*, 36(3), 167-194.
- Johnson, I. Y. (2006). Examining part-time faculty utilization and its impact on student retention at a public research university. *Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research*. Chicago, IL: Association for Institutional Research.
- Levine-Brown, P., Green, D., Hess, J., & Cabral-Maly, M. (2007). Laying the foundation for student success: A training program for adjunct and part-time faculty teaching developmental courses. *Research in Developmental Education*, 21(1), 1-4.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2003). *Remedial education at degree-granting postsecondary institutions in Fall 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004010.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2004* (NCES Publication No. 2006005). U.S. Department of Education.
- Rossol-Allison, P. M., & Beyers, N. J. A. (2011). The role of full-time and part-time faculty in student learning outcomes. *Paper presented at the Annual Forum for the Association for Institutional Research*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Association for Institutional Research.
- Roueche, J. E., & Roueche S. (1999). *High stakes, high performance: Making remedial education work*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges Press.
- Sanford, B. A., Dainty, J. D., Belcher, G. G., & Frisbee, R. L. (2011). Perceptions of the willingness of part-time instructors in community colleges in the U.S. to engage in professional development opportunities and the best method(s) of delivering these experiences. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 26(1), 48-61.
- Schibik, T., & Harrington, C. (2004). Caveat emptor: Is there a relationship between part-time faculty utilization and student learning outcomes and retention? *AIR Professional File*, 91, 1-10.
- Shults, C. (2001). *Remedial education: Practices and policies in community colleges* (Executive summary, Research Brief AACC-RB-00-2). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

-
- Silva, E., & White, T. (2013). *Pathways to improvement using psychological strategies to help college students master developmental math*. Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/sites/default/files/pathways_to_improvement.pdf
- TED. (n.d.). Speakers Bill Gates: Philanthropist. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/speakers/bill_gates.html
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2013). *Community colleges: New federal research center may enhance current understanding of developmental education*. (GAO-13-656). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/657683.pdf>
- USC Rossier. (2012). *The changing faculty and student success*. Los Angeles, CA: Author.

Copyright of *The Community College Enterprise* is the property of Schoolcraft College, and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted on a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.