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Cibulka, Rose M. *Recommendations for Certifying Adjunct Faculty at WITC*

**Abstract**

The purpose of this paper was to determine best practices for supporting adjunct faculty in completing course requirements toward instructor certification at the Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College (WITC). The study surveyed professional development managers at the technical colleges in Wisconsin to obtain insight into the current practices at the colleges. Data was collected by interviewing the managers over the phone, via video chat, or email. Data was also collected from the college’s learning management system (LMS) vendor to determine the practicality of adding customized course modules to the platform.

The findings included best practices that WITC can adapt in its overall support of their adjunct faculty. Areas of consideration were course content, course delivery methods, credit for prior learning, creating a sense of community for the adjunct faculty, and compensation. Additional research should be conducted in the development of on-demand course modules for the SumTotal Maestro program. WITC should also determine metrics to measure the success of any new processes that they adopt for supporting their adjunct faculty.
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Chapter I: Introduction

The Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College (WITC) is one of 16 colleges in the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS). Its district covers the largest area of all of the 16 colleges and consists of four widely distributed campuses (Superior, Ashland, Rice Lake, and New Richmond), three outreach centers (Hayward, Ladysmith, and Balsam Lake), and a centrally located administrative office in Shell Lake. The college is funded primarily through property taxes, state aid, tuition and fees, and federal aid (Pugh, 2019).

WITC had developed its strategic plan called Twenty-Four by Twenty-One (WITC, 2018). The focus of the plan was to increase student enrollment as well as the number of completed credentials earned by the students (WITC, 2018). This was WITC’s effort in support of a larger initiative called 60 Forward put forth by the WTCS. The goal of 60 Forward was to achieve a statewide postsecondary education attainment rate of degrees, diplomas, certificates, or apprenticeships of 60% by 2027 for people aged 25 to 64 to meet projected labor needs (60 Forward, 2018). As WITC worked toward the goals of its strategic plan, additional adjunct faculty were hired to teach some of the courses.

The WTCS administrative code for the Faculty Quality Assurance System (FQAS) came into effect in 2015 (Wisconsin State Legislature [TCS 3], 2015). It required the college to provide full-time and adjunct faculty with support that included an onboarding process, a professional development plan, a means to evaluate them, and a plan for peer coaching and mentoring. WITC put these processes in place for the full-time faculty and had started to add processes for adjunct faculty. One process that was put into place was the requirement for adjunct faculty to complete the professional development requirements to become a fully qualified instructor. These requirements included seven courses in the areas of teaching methods
and technology, behavioral management, student success, course design, assessment, data and evidence analysis, and embracing diversity. For adjunct faculty the courses were to be completed within five years of the date of employment (TCS 3, 2015).

The WTCS had provided a document that lists the competencies for the seven courses as well as the performance standards for each competency (WTCS, 2019). Each college in the WTCS was allowed to create their own classes and determine assignments and assessments based on these competencies as they saw fit. WITC chose to develop the courses with enough rigor that it could be applied toward college credit for a bachelor’s degree. This level of rigor had been a barrier for some adjunct faculty for several reasons. In some cases, the time required to complete the courses was well over the hours that they spent teaching and therefore they did not see the commitment as justifiable. In other cases, the depth of the course did not match the course responsibility required by the adjunct faculty. In addition, the modality of the course (only face-to-face or only online) did not always work for the adjunct faculty. Some adjunct faculty chose not to complete the requirements and instead planned to teach for only five years. Some that were very good instructors in their content area had been unable to complete the coursework even with additional help and would not be able to teach after the five-year period expires. With the increase in adjunct faculty and the requirement of the WTCS that the adjunct faculty be certified as instructors within five years, WITC needed to develop a system that worked for the college and for the adjunct faculty.

Statement of the Problem

Faculty at WITC were required to complete competencies in seven areas in the form of on-line and face-to-face courses in order to achieve their instructor certification. The adjunct faculty were given five years to complete these competencies. This five-year requirement
presented two somewhat competing issues. One issue was that some adjunct faculty found it difficult to complete the courses within the five-year timeframe. The other issue was that the adjunct faculty were then teaching for five years without the benefit of completing the certification. A condensed and stream-lined process is needed as an alternative format for fulfilling the professional development requirement for the adjunct faculty.

**Purpose of the Study**

The goal of this study was to provide recommendations of how WITC can best provide the coursework and support for adjunct faculty to help them achieve their instructor certification within five years or less. A key desire of this support was to structure the training in such a way as to allow flexibility for the individual adjunct faculty member depending on their responsibilities with the college and their own professional goals, while also being in full compliance of the TCS 3 (2015) directives for professional development.

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Determine the content required by the WTCS for instructor certification in the areas of teaching methods and technology, behavioral management, student success, course design, assessment, data and evidence analysis, and embracing diversity.
2. Determine best practices in methods and modalities for professional development for adjunct faculty.
3. Develop recommendations for the content and delivery modes for the certification areas listed in item 1 above for the WITC adjunct faculty.

**Assumptions of the Study**

The assumptions of this study were that:
1. Every college in the WTCS has a system in place for administering and supporting their adjunct faculty in completing their instructor certification requirements.

2. The professional development managers of the WTCS colleges will be available and willing to be interviewed to discuss their systems.

Definition of Terms

The terms and acronyms used at the college, like any business, are not generally familiar to people working outside of it. The definitions below describe the terms as they are used within WITC and the WTCS.

**Adult basic education.** Adult basic education includes courses at the kindergarten through grade 8.9 levels equivalent to accredited school district courses that build toward the requirements for enrollment at the high school level (Wisconsin Technical College System [WTCS], 2018).

**Certification of personnel requirements and procedures (TCS 3).** Chapter 3 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code for the Technical College System Board (TCS) is the Certification of Personnel Requirements and Procedures chapter. It establishes standards and procedures for the certification of district instructors that teach courses that apply to a degree or adult basic education (TCS 3, 2015).

**Community of practice.** A community of practice is an informal group of people that meet to develop and share information on things common to the group that they feel are important (Wenger, n.d.).

**Credentials.** Credentials include certificates, technical diplomas, and associate degrees earned by the students and awarded by the college.
**Faculty quality assurance system (FQAS).** FQAS is the system used to ensure compliance of Chapter TCS 3 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code for the Technical College System Board (TCS) (TCS 3, 2015).

**Shareable Content Object Reference Model (SCORM).** SCORM is a set of technical standards used when developing eLearning products. The standards define a specific way of constructing a learning management system, training, and course content so that they can be shared with other SCORM compliant systems.

**SumTotal Maestro.** SumTotal Maestro is the learning management system (LMS) used at WITC to track the professional development of the staff and faculty.

**Twenty-four by twenty-one.** Twenty-Four by Twenty-One is WITC’s goal to serve 2,400 full time equivalent students (FTE), 2,400 credentials, and 24,000 students annually by 2021 (WITC, 2018).

**Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS).** The WTCS is the governing body of Wisconsin’s sixteen technical colleges. Its offices are located in Madison, Wisconsin.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study were:

1. The data was obtained from colleges of varying sizes with varying populations of adjunct faculty that were different from WITC.

2. The data available concerning the success of the programs for the adjunct faculty was limited since the systems for administering the FQAS requirements have only been in place for a few years (after 2015).

3. Three of the colleges did not participate so the data was somewhat incomplete.
4. The capabilities of only one LMS (SumTotal Maestro) was considered since that was what the college was currently using.

Methodology

A literature review was conducted to determine trends and best practices in teaching and learning for adjunct faculty in higher education and employees in business. Personality traits of adjunct faculty were also explored in the literature to inform the recommendations for supporting the adjunct faculty.

Data was collected by interviewing the professional development managers from the WTCS colleges individually over a period of four weeks. The LMS vendor was interviewed one month later to determine the capabilities of the software for administrating custom training. The data was then analyzed for trends and best practices with regard to supporting adjunct faculty with completing their FQAS requirements. The sets of information from the literature review and the data were looked at as a whole and synthesized to derive recommendations for WITC in their effort to support the adjunct faculty in completing their instructor certification.
Chapter II: Literature Review

WITC’s adjunct faculty were required to achieve their instructor certification within five years of employment with the college. Achieving certification requires the completion of coursework in seven topics related to teaching. Courses were currently offered online and face-to-face. A system to complete the certification that was flexible in both depth and delivery of content was desired. Areas considered for this system were the current professional development requirements for the adjunct faculty, the current best practices for offering training and support to a diverse, part time workforce, and the general traits of adjunct faculty. Information in these areas assisted in developing the requirements and delivery methods for the certification training so they were as approachable, appealing, and as useful as possible for the adjunct faculty.

Faculty Certification Requirements

The professional development requirements for adjunct faculty in Wisconsin were the same as for full-time faculty except for the time frame (TCS 3, 2015). Until 2015, classes for completing the requirements were required to be taught using the same state-approved curriculum at all 16 technical colleges. The WTCS had since relaxed that rule and now allowed the colleges to create their own curriculum so that it can be customized to the needs of the faculty depending on the program emphasis of the college and the community that it serves.

State of Wisconsin. The state of Wisconsin requirement for the professional development of faculty, including adjunct faculty, was defined in the TCS 3.05 (2) section of the Certification of Personnel Requirements and Procedures chapter of the Wisconsin Legislative Code for the governing of the state’s technical colleges (TCS 3, 2015). It required that each district maintain a faculty quality assurance system that had a professional development plan for each academic and occupational instructor that included the following:
(a) Identifies how the instructor will complete all director-approved competencies within 3 years of the date of employment if employed full-time or within 5 years of the date of employment if employed part-time.

(b) Ensures the instructor maintains currency to his or her assigned content areas. The district director or designee shall establish a process to maintain currency of academic and occupational instructors.

(c) Fulfills occupational experience requirements within the time period specified by the district director or designee for an occupational instructor hired pursuant an occupational experience exception under s. TCS 3.04 (3).

(d) Complies with all other requirements and policies set forth by the Wisconsin technical college system state board or director. (TCS 3, 2015, p. 8)

**The WTCS.** The WTCS (2019) provided a framework for the professional development requirements for new faculty to the districts. The framework outlined a set of competencies and the corresponding performance standards for each of the seven areas for professional development. The seven areas were assessment, behavioral management, course design, data and evidence analysis, embracing diversity, student success, and teaching methods and technology (WTCS, 2019). The areas and their competencies are shown in Appendix A. Each district was free to implement the training for these areas as they saw fit, if competencies were met.

**Current Training Support**

Professional development for employees at all levels had become important for employee retention (Cloutier, Felusiak, Hill, & Pemberton-Jones, 2015). It showed that the company was committed to the employee, made the employee feel appreciated, and made them more valuable
to the company (Black & La Venture, 2015). In addition, it was shown to help prevent employee burnout (Bello & Chatzinikou, 2015) and may have had a role in increasing employee commitment (Ismail, 2016). Higher education employed over 700,000 part time faculty according to the National Center for Educational Statistics (National Center for Higher Education, 2018). This was over 46% of the total of full time and part time faculty (National Center for Higher Education, 2018). Attending to the needs of this population to improve student learning was key to the success of the graduates and the colleges. Methods used to support adjunct faculty in their professional development are explored below, followed by practices used in business and industry.

**Higher education.** Webb, Wong, and Hubball (2013) suggested that a good framework for giving busy adjunct faculty access to professional development was through a flexible community of practice. Webb et al. (2013) defined the community of practice as a group of adjunct faculty that meets regularly to work through the professional development material together. This community helped the adjunct faculty become involved in the institution and promoted completion of their professional development requirements (Webb et al., 2013). Adjunct faculty were usually at different skill levels regarding teaching experience and expertise when they started teaching, so care was taken to put together cohorts of adjunct faculty with like teaching experience when forming the community.

A scholarly approach to teaching and learning for the professional development of the adjunct faculty was also very important (Webb et al., 2013). This approach included training the adjunct faculty in educational theory, educational practice, and techniques for assessing the students’ work (Webb et al., 2013). The professional development also included training on developing self-directed learners and critical thinkers within the students (Webb et al., 2013).
Drew and Klopper (2014) found that some faculty teaching in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) areas were not that skilled in assessing students work with formative assessment techniques. Formative assessments were techniques used to provide feedback to the instructor and students. This feedback was then used to improve learning while the teaching and learning was taking place. They felt that professional development in techniques for building formative assessment into lectures and labs would help the faculty better use their strong discipline knowledge to benefit the students (Drew & Klopper, 2014). This observation applied to both adjunct faculty and full-time faculty.

Faculty were also expected to develop skills to support an online presence for their courses and even manage a completely online course (Ippoliti, 2019). Ippoliti (2019) suggested that librarians can be a helpful, ongoing support for the faculty and students when working with and developing digital instruction.

The Queensland University of Technology (QUT) in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia identified three factors that they feel were needed for success for their adjunct faculty (Hamilton, Fox, & McEwan, 2013). The factors included providing academic development that is interesting and useful, providing timely access to academic support, and encouraging participation in a community of teachers (Hamilton et al., 2013). QUT developed a series of centrally taught workshops for the academic development component. For the community of teachers, QUT envisioned providing localized, just in time training, academic support, and comradery for the adjunct faculty (Hamilton et al., 2013).

QUT developed experienced adjunct faculty to lead the community of teachers as advisors to provide training for the newer adjunct faculty, address their immediate questions and needs, and keep the group organized and moving forward (Hamilton et al., 2013). These advisor
positions were paid positions where the advisor was given the freedom and responsibility to adjust the training as needed for the adjunct faculty that they were advising (Hamilton et al., 2013). The advisors frequently met with the adjunct faculty so they were able to build on previous training rather than trying to cover all of the topics in one sitting. They also were able to, and expected to, create and deliver any training that was needed on an ad hoc basis. Additional support to the newer adjunct faculty included regular community of teachers meetings where they could work on their professional development together with their peers and also discuss current challenges and problems (Hamilton et al., 2013).

While QUT did not yet have definitive data as to the success of their advisor and community of teachers approach, they did feel that they had made progress in the area of supporting newer adjunct faculty (Hamilton et al., 2013). The adjunct faculty that were trained and then led the communities of teachers were also more satisfied because of having the opportunity of this leadership responsibility that adjunct faculty typically do not have access to (Hamilton et al., 2013).

Adelphi University in Garden City, NY, conducted a survey to determine the needs and problems of their adjunct faculty with the goal of developing policies and procedures to ensure the needs of the adjunct faculty were met while also retaining the quality of the program and program graduates (Forbes, Hickey, & White, 2010). The needs of their nursing adjunct faculty were similar to those of the QUT adjunct faculty.

For their study, Adelphi’s researchers developed a survey that include three sections (Forbes et al., 2010). The first section was designed to determine a background profile of the adjunct faculty, the second section was used to determine the adequacy of the orientation that they received as new adjunct faculty, and the third section was used to gain insight into the
frustrations and obstacles that they had encountered and how they overcame them (Forbes et al., 2010). The researchers obtained responses from 65 of the 132 adjunct faculty that were teaching in their school of nursing (Forbes et al., 2010).

The findings of the study indicated that these adjunct faculty were highly experienced as nursing professionals as the mean for experience as an RN was 23.8 years (Forbes et al., 2010). They were very inexperienced in teaching with 21 respondents indicating that they were in their first semester of teaching (Forbes et al., 2010). For the orientation, most felt that the orientation topics that related to classroom teaching did not apply to them (45 of the 65) and many felt inadequately oriented on the topics that did apply to them (Forbes et al., 2010). Major frustrations and obstacles reported by the adjunct faculty included a lack of material resources, a go-to person, and a lack of involvement with them by the full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty reported getting around these obstacles by asking full-time faculty, office staff, and clinical staff for help, and by simply persevering without help (Forbes et al., 2010).

Based on the survey of their adjunct faculty, along with administrative input, Adelphi University developed five major categories for supporting their adjunct faculty (Forbes et al., 2010). These categories created an overall infrastructure for the adjunct faculty’s needs, formal orientation and support, course coordinators, integrating the adjunct with the full-time faculty, and providing formal course work for adjunct faculty development (Forbes et al., 2010). The infrastructure provided centralization of tracking hiring needs, hiring, and evaluation of the nursing adjuncts with one associate dean, which had not been in place in the past (Forbes et al., 2010). The mandatory formal orientation was expanded from one to three hours each semester. During this expanded time, adjunct faculty could work with their course coordinators and discuss teaching skills (Forbes et al., 2010). The course coordinators were given the responsibility of
attending the orientation, maintaining contact with the adjunct throughout the semester, and ensuring the textbook and technology help were available to the adjunct (Forbes et al., 2010).

Adelphi also made an intentional effort to integrate the adjunct faculty by inviting them to faculty meetings, workshops and pinning ceremonies so they did not feel as isolated (Forbes et al., 2010). In the area of providing formal course work for adjunct faculty, the college developed a formal certificate program in nursing education for the adjunct faculty for those interested in formal coursework. The goal of developing these five categories was to promote job satisfaction and teaching quality for the adjunct faculty (Forbes et al., 2010).

Datray, Saxon, and Martirosyan (2014) recommended that leaders treat adjunct faculty as valuable assets. They agreed with the previous examples that adjunct faculty should be provided orientation and professional development opportunities. Additionally, they suggested that incentives be used to encourage participation (Datray et al., 2014). These incentives could include choices of classes and schedule, stipends, and possibly campus parking and meal cards.

Datray et al. (2014) also stressed that adjunct faculty should be assigned a mentor to help them integrate into the college and support them in the classroom. While compensation for the mentors would be an added cost for the college, it was felt that providing mentors would help retain the adjunct faculty and therefore be worthwhile (Datray et al., 2014). Another idea not mentioned in the previous examples was that adjunct faculty should be supplied with adequate office space. Space was needed for the adjunct faculty to work and to meet with students and other faculty. Having this space would also allow the adjunct faculty to have set office hours that would help them further connect with the students (Datray et al., 2014).

An additional recommendation of Datray et al. (2014) was to hire adjunct faculty to an adjunct pool before they were needed in the classroom. This was intended to help ensure that the
college had adequate time to select a qualified candidate and to give the candidate time to prepare for their expected teaching assignment. Though the adjunct faculty would likely not be paid during this time, the goal was that they would be ready to start when needed.

The Alamo Colleges viewed faculty engagement as essential to student success (Harrill, Lawton, & Fabianke, 2015). They revamped their professional development to focus on the competencies needed for faculty to teach and engage the students in learning. To help develop the required competencies, they added staff to develop and deliver training for the faculty. Alamo College found that the key element for their success was to leverage the talent and dedication that was already inherent in the faculty (Harrill et al., 2015).

At Hillsborough Community College in Tampa, FL they believed that faculty development efforts should be focused on teaching and learning to improve student success (Bendickson & Griffin, 2010). They created an in-house professional development course to facilitate the faculty in completing requirements for learning about how the community college fits with higher education and for requirements for learning about college teaching. Creating their own in-house course allowed the faculty to work with departments within the college as part of the course work. Working directly with departments from their own college helped them to gain familiarity and insight of their workplace that they would not have had if the course was completed through an external source (Bendickson & Griffin, 2010).

The Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT) in New York, NY, supported training their adjunct faculty by developing their own program called The Adjunct Advocate @ FIT (Maldonado & Riman, 2009). The technologies already in place were integrated into an online faculty development resource, which also incorporated live chat and video conferencing to further serve the adjunct faculty and could be accessed at any time (Maldonado & Riman, 2009).
FIT relied heavily on their adjunct faculty to bring their specialized industry skills to the college and was working to better train these faculty to improve student learning (Maldonado & Riman, 2009).

**Business and industry.** Business and industry were coming to view their employees as assets and view the training of their assets as essential to developing a competitive advantage in the marketplace (Simpson, Shrader, & Borowski, 2015). Simpson et al. (2015) pointed out that while training can be highly effective, it must be coupled with a strategic approach for retaining the employees once they were trained. Newly trained employees wanted to use their new skills and may also be highly desirable by other companies so a plan should be in place to reward the newly trained employees (Simpson et al., 2015). To avoid employee dissatisfaction and turnover upon completion of training, it was recommended that opportunities for the application of the training be timely (Simpson et al., 2015). In addition, any increased compensation related to increased value in the employee due to the training should also be timely (Simpson et al., 2015).

Jang, Kim, and Yoo (2017) found that employees tended to stay at a company longer if they participated in corporate training. In their longitudinal study spanning a five-year period from 2009-2013, they collected data of employees in the job functions of information technology (IT), accounting, and sales support. The data collected included employee participation in job-specific and general training, the employee’s job function, as well as employee retention (Jang et al., 2017). For analysis of the data, they used job duration as their dependent variable with the independent variables being type of training taken (general or job-specific) and current job function (Jang et al., 2017).

When plotting the retention data versus time of employees that participated in the training and the employees that did not, the graph showed that the retention rate decreased over time for
both groups, however the employees that did participate in the corporate training stayed longer than the employees that did not (Jang et al., 2017). Jang et al. (2017) found that participants in the general training had a 66% lower probability to leave and participants of the specific training had a 65% lower probability to leave over the five-year time period. While this data was from only one company, it provided solid empirical data to support the importance of training in efforts to increase employee retention (Jang et al., 2017).

Bellou and Chatzinikou (2015) conducted a study to determine if training and development had an effect on employee burnout when major changes occurred at organizations. They hypothesized that training and development helps prepare employees for changes, thus reducing the gap between their working role and their ability to perform it, and therefore should reduce burnout (Bellou & Chatzinikou, 2015). They developed a questionnaire for a random sample of employees. They obtained 131 responses which was a 44% response rate (Bellou & Chatzinikou, 2015).

They found that their hypothesis indeed was true, with the training organization and training effectiveness having a negative effect on burnout (with \( p < .05 \) for training organization and \( p < .01 \) for training effectiveness). Another finding was that it made a difference to the employees if they felt that there was good support after the training. Positive support after training also had a negative effect on burnout with \( p < .001 \) (Bellou & Chatzinikou, 2015). In addition, each employee’s current skills should be considered to determine if any preliminary training should be completed before the change training (Bellou & Chatzinikou, 2015). This preliminary training should then be completed first so that the employee had the background to take advantage of the change training (Bellou & Chatzinikou, 2015).
This information from business and industry supports the idea that employees desired training and were very open to training. It also indicated that it was perhaps equally as important to give employees a chance to use their training and to support them in putting the training into action. Next we will consider methods for training employees.

Common Training Methods

There were many methods for delivering training. Four common methods used in training were video, online, audio, and face-to-face training (Huang, Strawderman, Babski-Reeves, Ahmed, & Salehi, 2013). Many organizations used e-learning (a combination of video, online, and audio that does not include face-to-face) for at least some of their training and have found it to be effective for compliance training (Dalto, 2017). Many felt that a combination of training methods (referred to as blended or hybrid), where possible, produced the best results for real changes in the trainees’ knowledge and use of training on the job (Dalto, 2017; Huang et al., 2013).

Dalto (2017) determined that “there is no best training delivery method” (p. 28). He found that the best delivery method was one that considers the training (or course) content as well as the abilities and availability of the employees attending the training. Another consideration was to choose a method that allows for proper assessment of the employee. This would be determined by what was to be assessed, such as skills, knowledge, or a combination of the two (Dalto, 2017).

Blair and Serafini (2016) agree that choice of method used must take the content that was to be delivered as well as the capabilities of the employees into account. Some employees may not do well independently or have the motivation to follow through with online training, and so may need face-to-face delivery. Where face-to-face delivery was not possible when employees
were geographically dispersed, online delivery was used (Blair & Serafini, 2016). The expectations of the learner can affect the choice of the best delivery method as well. Younger employees may expect their training to be available online and might resist face-to-face training requirements (Blair & Serafini, 2016).

**Methods for training volunteers.** Trainees must also be motivated to learn, and Haung et al. (2013) found that trainees for volunteer programs required even higher levels of motivation to perform well since there were no direct incentives for them. They set out to determine the effectiveness of the training program for the highway watch program and provide possible explanations for any training problems.

Because of the wide range of participant capabilities and locations, four different training methods were available for taking the program which were video, online, audio, and face-to-face (Haung et al., 2013). The video training was a recorded class session that lasted approximately 70 minutes and was distributed via DVD or cassette tape. The online training was the same recorded session but made available via the internet. The audio training was a 40-minute recorded lecture, distributed via CD or cassette tape. The classroom training was a 60-minute training delivered face-to-face on the same material covered in the other methods but with some flexibility to tailor the program to the trainees (Haung et al., 2013).

A survey was developed to gather information from the trainees regarding demographics, participation information, thoughts on the need to be retrained, and suggestions for the program (Haung et al., 2013). This survey was sent via email to 100,000 trainees that were randomly selected from the 242,581 that had provided an email address. Of the 7,199 that returned the survey, 2,199 were complete and could be used for inferential analysis (Haung et al., 2013).
Haung et al. (2013) analyzed knowledge retention and retraining perceptions as the two dependent variables. Knowledge retention was assessed by the trainees’ score on four scenario-based questions. The independent variables included the training delivery methods of face-to-face, web-based, and video, program participation, and demographic variables. The knowledge retention results related to the training method indicated that trainees completing web-based training performed significantly better on scenario-based questions than those completing the face-to-face training with $p = .037$ (Haung et al., 2013).

Training methods were also compared to program participation numbers (amount of times the drivers called the Highway Watch and/or 911 in response to an incident that they saw on the highway). The results for program participation were very low for all training methods. Trainees receiving online training had a participation of 1.1%, those receiving face-to-face training was 2.4%, and those receiving video training was 2.7% (Haung et al., 2013). Even though participants in the web-based training did better on the scenarios, Haung et al. (2013) determined that the face-to-face training provided more interactions and feedback than the web-based training and so possibly had a positive motivational effect on the participation rate.

**Phase training.** Phase training involved training employees in a step-by-step manner following a checklist that was developed for each phase (Anonymous, 2015). It can be delivered in face-to-face or hybrid form and was found to be effective with onboarding employees in clinics (Anonymous, 2015). In the clinical setting, phases included training in patient care, client service, and practice operations (Anonymous, 2015). Employees were required to complete the previous phase before going on to the next phase. This was proven to be effective in ensuring all training steps were covered and allowed managers to quickly know what employees have been trained on by what phase they were in (Anonymous, 2015).
Providing training support for the adjunct faculty involves more than just offering the courses. These courses must also be useful and interesting. The skills learned in the courses should be provided in order of need so that the adjunct faculty can put them to use immediately. Participation in a community of practice can be a great support for the adjunct faculty to help them move through their certification requirements.

**Characteristics of Adjunct Faculty**

Who are adjunct faculty and what are their needs and motivations for working as an adjunct? Are they simply waiting for a full-time teaching position, or do they prefer working as an adjunct? What would help them the most in their efforts at the college? Does the decision of the college to use adjunct faculty adversely affect institutional effectiveness? Understanding the answers to these questions can help with determining how best to serve the adjunct faculty in their professional development.

Hoyt (2012) wondered if the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty could be predicted. The knowledge would be useful in creating a more satisfied workforce that would aid in the retention of the adjunct faculty as well as improve teaching in the classroom. Hoyt (2012) developed a survey to collect data based on Herzberg’s model (Herzberg, 1968) for motivating employees. This survey was sent via email with an initial email and three follow-up reminders to all adjunct faculty. Of the 676 it was sent to, 358 responded (Hoyt, 2012).

The results of the study showed that adjunct faculty were very loyal and satisfied with their jobs (Hoyt, 2012). Data showed a mean of 5.4 on a 6-point scale (with 6 being strongly agree) for loyalty indicators that included being willing to recommend teaching at the university, non-preference to teaching somewhere else, and being proud of teaching there. The mean for the job satisfaction indicators was 5.0 using the same scale (Hoyt, 2012). These indicators included
being completely satisfied with their adjunct faculty job, being not dissatisfied with aspects of the job, and feeling that they have an excellent job as an adjunct faculty (Hoyt, 2012).

Questions on how to improve job satisfaction for adjunct faculty yielded comments on salary discrepancies compared to full-time faculty, the need for greater faculty oversight and support, and inadequate classroom facilities (Hoyt, 2012). The adjunct faculty reported that in some cases they were paid differently depending on if they were teaching a day class or evening class, and some were paid less with courses with fewer students. They wanted to see that changed so the pay was the same regardless of the location or number of students per class (Hoyt, 2012). Specific comments on the oversight and support from faculty included the desire to be more involved in department meetings, have a voice in the decision making concerning their teaching area, and to have a designated contact person. They also wanted increased mentoring activities such as help with course content, teaching skills, and classroom observations (Hoyt, 2012). Comments on classroom facilities indicated the desire for room setup options and multimedia equipment that matched the teaching style of the instructor and the content being taught (Hoyt, 2012).

Hoyt (2012) concluded that “honorarium, work preference, quality of students, faculty support, teaching schedule, collaborative research, classroom facilities, and a heavy teaching load were significant predictors of satisfaction” for the adjunct faculty (p.138). These were listed in rank order of importance and indicated that adjunct faculty want to be paid fairly, be able to teach at times convenient to them, be able to work collaboratively with other faculty and deans or department chairs, have adequate classroom space, and be assigned a teaching load that matched their desires for the number of classes they wanted to teach (Hoyt, 2012). Keeping
these satisfaction indicators in mind when presenting the professional development options to adjunct faculty could help with the acceptance of the requirements.

Motivation for adjunct faculty to teach at the community college level also included working within their discipline (78%), the opportunity to work with students (68%), and personal satisfaction (54%) (Pons, Burnett, Williams, & Paredes, 2017). In addition, this survey showed no significant difference in satisfaction depending on years of teaching experience. Recommendations for improving faculty satisfaction included recognition programs similar to programs for full time faculty, inviting them to faculty meetings and other on-campus events, and encouraging full-time faculty to visit their classroom and provide feedback (Pons et al., 2017). Encouraging adjunct faculty to visit full-time faculty classrooms and give feedback was also recommended (Pons et al., 2017). These recommendations were similar to Hoyt’s (2012) and reinforce the need to effectively manage these motivated faculty.

Davis, Perrott, and Perry (2014) worked with the adjunct faculty and supervisors of the University of Technology Sydney Business School, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia, to gain insight as to the views of adjunct faculty in regard to their management and role as adjunct faculty. Their goal was to compare and contrast the perspectives of the adjunct faculty with the perspectives of their supervisors to answer their three research questions (Davis et al., 2014). These questions were “How do the views of the adjunct faculty and their supervisors compare with regard with what is important to the adjunct faculty?,” “How well do they get along?,” and “Do the perceptions of the supervisors and the adjunct faculty that they supervise indicate that the supervisors are exploiting the adjunct faculty?” (Davis et al., 2014).

To obtain data to address these three questions, a separate questionnaire was developed for the adjunct faculty and for the supervisors. The questionnaire for the adjunct faculty was
developed with three main categories. The first category included questions of adequacy of recruitment and support systems, workload and pay, teaching experience, understanding what was required of them, relationship with their supervisor, recognition and involvement, and student evaluations (Davis et al., 2014). The second category included questions on the degree of satisfaction with their teaching job. The third category covered demographic items such as gender, the area they taught in, those who were teaching as adjunct faculty in the hopes of securing a full-time position, duration of employment, and time spent teaching and preparing (Davis et al., 2014).

The questionnaire for the supervisors had two main categories. The first category was analogous to the first category of the adjunct faculty questionnaire only adjusted to get the supervisors opinion of the adjunct faculty. The second category addressed the supervisor’s satisfaction with the adjunct faculty that they supervise, and their satisfaction with their own schedules (Davis et al., 2014).

The respective questionnaires were sent out to all adjunct faculty of the School of Business and supervisors of the adjunct faculty. The response rate of the adjunct faculty was 35%, with 106 respondents. The response rate of the supervisors was 46%, with 64 respondents (Davis et al., 2014). Davis et al. (2014) found that the adjunct faculty and the supervisors agreed on most of the questions from the first category on their questionnaires and had no significantly different views on the items. The adjunct faculty and supervisors agreed that the faculty culture could be more inclusive. The supervisors supported better communication and recognition of the adjunct faculties’ contributions and agreed that it was important for the adjunct faculty to be paid to attend teaching-related training. Davis et al. (2014) also found that the two groups did seem to
get along. A full 85% of supervisors expressed satisfaction, with only 3.5% indicating dissatisfaction (Davis et al., 2014).

The demographic data from the third category in the adjunct faculty questionnaire (which included items such as gender, the area they taught in, those who were teaching as adjunct faculty in the hopes of securing a full-time position, duration of employment, and time spent teaching and preparing) indicated that it was unlikely that the adjunct faculty were being exploited (Davis et al., 2014). About two-thirds of the adjunct faculty were salaried professionals, self-employed, or were semi-retired and were unlikely to be of a group to be exploited (Davis et al., 2014). Of the remaining one-third, 21% were made up of post graduate students that often worked as an adjunct to pay for their education. Career academics made up 10% and could include some that were frustrated on not gaining a full-time position (Davis et al., 2014). Since the overall satisfaction of the teaching experience was found to be high, Davis et al. (2014) concluded that the results seem inconsistent with the idea of exploitation of the adjunct faculty by their supervisors.

Does the decision of the college to employ adjunct faculty negatively affect institutional effectiveness and if so, should institutes of higher learning move away from hiring adjunct faculty rather than toward hiring more? Deem, DeLotell, and Kelly (2015) set out to determine if there was any correlation between having a large adjunct faculty population and decreased institutional effectiveness. They hypothesized that since there was a relationship between institutional effectiveness and the culture of the organization and since adjunct faculty were not necessarily ingrained with the culture and may not have a long-term commitment to the institute, the presence of a large population of adjunct faculty would negatively affect the institutional effectiveness (Deem et al., 2015).
For the study, the adjunct faculty and full-time faculty of an online institution were surveyed (Deem et al., 2015). The adjunct to full-time ratio at the institution was 85%. They received 224 responses for the survey (a 28% response rate). From the data, Deem et al. (2015) found no significant difference between adjunct or full-time employment and the perceived institutional effectiveness ($p = .675$) or the culture ($p = .130$). They concluded that the adjunct faculty did not appear to affect the culture of the institute and thus would not likely affect the institutional effectiveness (Deem et al., 2015).

In summary, the professional development requirements for the adjunct faculty were found to be the same as for full time faculty (TCS 3, 2015). A community of practice was found to be helpful for adjunct faculty to work through the requirements, gain support, and develop a connection to the college (Hamilton et al., 2013; Webb et al., 2013). Having an advisor to the community of practice was felt to be critical (Hamilton et al., 2013), as well as providing a mentor to the individual adjunct faculty (Datray et al., 2014). Providing courses and resources in an online format helped to support busy adjunct faculty (Maldonado & Riman, 2009). Other options for providing courses and delivering training included video, online, audio, face-to-face, and hybrid or blended classes (Dalto, 2017; Huang et al., 2013). The option chosen should depend on the course content and the abilities and availability of the employees attending the training (Dalto, 2017).

Business and industry had seen that employees that participated in professional development tended to stay longer with the company (Jang et al., 2017). They have also found that training by itself was not enough, employees want to be able to use their training and be rewarded for it (Simpson et al., 2015). Adjunct faculty also looked for professional development as well as a connection to the college and support from the college (Hoyt, 2012). Adjunct
faculty were found to be very loyal and satisfied with their jobs and were interested in being involved with the faculty and the campuses where they teach (Hoyt, 2012). So how do we bring them into the fold of the college? What are other colleges doing in this area to implement the FQAS requirements? The study that follows may help answer these questions.
Chapter III: Methodology

WITC had developed a system for the support of faculty according to the FQAS requirements of TCS 3 (2015). The system allowed the adjunct faculty up to five years to complete the requirements for instructor certification. An issue with this system was that some adjunct faculty found it difficult to complete the requirements in five years. Another issue was that the adjunct faculty were not benefiting from the teachings of the certification right away in their adjunct responsibilities. WITC was working to condense and streamline their system for the professional development requirements for the adjunct faculty. To aid in determining best practices for supporting adjunct faculty, the professional development managers at the other colleges in the WTCS were interviewed on their current practice for supporting their adjunct faculty fulfill their FQAS requirements.

Subject Selection and Description

The professional development managers at the technical colleges were selected to be interviewed to obtain information on how the FQAS requirements were being met at their individual colleges for the adjunct faculty. These managers were responsible for the implementation of the professional development system used by their college, which includes finding qualified instructors to teach the professional development courses, scheduling the courses, and maintaining records of the completion of the courses.

The vendor of the SumTotal Maestro program was also interviewed to determine the program’s capabilities for supporting custom training modules. The SumTotal Maestro program was used by WITC for assigning and recording completion of the FQAS requirements for the faculty and other employees and also had some course material. It was felt that this could possibly house the FQAS courses as well.
**Instrumentation**

Individual interviews were determined to be the best way to gather information. Since the sample size was small at 17 (16 managers and one LMS vendor), it was felt that the time involved for individual interviews was reasonable.

**Manager interview.** The professional development managers at 13 of the 16 colleges in the WTCS system agreed to be interviewed. They were interviewed over a four-week time frame. Interview questions were used to gather information on the current practices of supporting adjunct faculty at these colleges in order to identify best practices (Appendix B). For the three that did not participate, one sited that their IRB (Institutional Review Board) would not allow it because they did not feel it could be anonymous, one reported that they could not participate, and one did not respond to the email requests.

**LMS vendor interview.** The WITC’s LMS vendor was interviewed to gather information on the capabilities of the SumTotal Maestro software program for supporting different training methods and modalities and custom training programs (Appendix C). This data helped to identify options and possibilities for WITC in delivering the professional development content.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data was collected from the technical college professional development managers by interviewing them via telephone, Skype meeting, and email correspondence. Implied consent was obtained from the managers before the interview by virtue of them participating in the interview. Privacy was ensured by aggregating the data and not including the names of the colleges in the reporting.
The managers were sent an initial request for the interview via email. The email included a description of the project with explanations of the seven competency areas and the interview questions. A second email was sent out two weeks after the initial email to any manager that had not replied to the first email. The interviews were held during a four-week time frame. Once the data was collected from the managers, it was put into table format in random order so that the answers to each question from the different colleges could be viewed as a whole for analysis.

Data was collected from the LMS vendor once the data from the manager interviews was reviewed. An initial request for an interview with the LMS vendor was sent via email. The vendor was interviewed via telephone. The possibility for incorporating the different modalities and trainings reported by the managers were considered during the interview. This data was put into a table format for further analysis.

**Data Analysis**

The data was analyzed for trends and best practices with regard to supporting adjunct faculty with completing their FQAS course requirements. The responses to each interview question were analyzed individually.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study were:

1. The data was obtained from colleges of varying sizes with varying populations of adjunct faculty that were different from WITC.

2. The data available concerning the success of the programs for the adjunct faculty was limited since the systems for administering the FQAS requirements have only been in place for a few years (after 2015).

3. Three of the colleges did not participate so the data was somewhat incomplete.
4. The capabilities of only one LMS (SumTotal Maestro) was considered since that was what the college was currently using.

Summary

The professional development managers interviewed were very open to offering information and insights into their current systems for supporting their adjunct faculty and also what they would like to see happen in the future. Since the interview questions were open-ended, the interviews yielded a rich set of data, although it was difficult to quantify the responses across the 13 colleges for some of the questions.
Chapter IV: Results

WITC had developed a system for the support of faculty according to the FQAS requirements of TCS 3 (2015). The system allowed the adjunct faculty up to five years to complete the requirements for instructor certification. An issue with this system was that some adjunct faculty found it difficult to complete the requirements within five years. Another issue was that the adjunct faculty were not benefiting from the teachings required for the certification right away in their adjunct responsibilities. WITC was working to condense and streamline their system for the professional development requirements for the adjunct faculty.

Data was obtained from the professional development managers at 13 of the 16 colleges in the WTCS. The data obtained from the professional development managers was varied. Most felt that they had good systems in place. Some noted areas where they would like to improve. The SumTotal Maestro vendor was also interviewed to determine the possibility of incorporating the FQAS instructor certification courses into the software suite. This appeared to be a viable undertaking.

Demographics

The professional development managers (managers) at the technical colleges were interviewed to obtain information on how the FQAS requirements were being met at their individual colleges for the adjunct faculty. These managers were responsible for the implementation of the professional development system used by their college, which included finding qualified instructors to teach the professional development courses, scheduling the courses, and maintaining records of the completion of the courses. The vendor of the SumTotal Maestro program was also interviewed to determine the program’s capabilities for supporting custom training modules.
**Item Analysis**

The data was analyzed for trends and best practices with regard to supporting adjunct faculty with completing their FQAS course requirements. The responses to each interview question were analyzed individually.

**Professional development manager interview data.** For the 13 managers interviewed, the average adjunct faculty population as compared to the full-time faculty was 64% (median = 65%, mode = 61%) with a range of 33% to 74%. WITC’s adjunct faculty population to full-time faculty population was 61% with 157 full-time faculty compared to 245 adjunct faculty.

In the area of their system for supporting the FQAS Professional Development for their adjunct faculty, the managers unanimously reported that they covered all of the course competencies that were presented in the FQAS Competency Framework. Most offered seven courses for the seven individual areas of competencies (61%), while others combined some of the courses into one course (23%), and others taught the competencies individually to fill gaps identified in a prior learning assessment (8%).

Classes were offered online, blended, and face-to-face, with 38% of colleges offering both online and face-to-face, 23% offering online and blended, and another 23% offering online only courses. In addition, 8% offered blended only, and the remaining 8% offered all three modalities that included online, blended, and face-to-face. Most colleges offered classes several times throughout the year to accommodate the schedules of the faculty, with 23% of the colleges offering the online courses continuously.

The time commitment required for the adjunct faculty to complete these courses varied widely from college to college. Some colleges used units of hours and some used units of weeks, with the times varying from 24 to 134 hours and 35 to 47 weeks. Courses were graded
on a pass/fail basis, with the requirement that all activities and assignments be completed. Completion rates varied between 50-90%, with the non-completion occurring only because the participant either dropped out or did not complete the work. Those that did make an effort to complete the work had a 100% completion rate. A majority of the colleges (62%) provided a physical space for the completion of these courses.

In general, colleges did not provide compensation to the adjunct faculty for the time required for completing their FQAS course work. Many linked the completion of the FQAS course requirement to a raise in pay, however, with 53% providing a pay increase at the completion, and 8% providing an increase halfway through and then another upon completion of all of the courses.

SumTotal Maestro was the most common LMS used by the managers for tracking the FQAS requirements completion for the adjunct faculty, with 70% of the colleges indicating that they were using it now or will be using it within the next year. The remaining managers either used a spreadsheet, a Smartsheet, PeopleSoft, or a homegrown database.

Several (54%) of the managers were eager to share the materials they were using to communicate and support their adjunct faculty in their FQAS course requirement completion. Content shared included professional development guides that explained the course requirements and timeline, a calendar of courses offered, and their standard welcome email that was sent to the adjunct faculty outlining the FQAS course requirement. Most colleges did not use a textbook in their courses (62%) and instead relied on online college-developed content, LinkedIn Learning, and online educational resources (OER).

The metrics used by the managers to determine the success of the system for supporting the FQAS professional development for the adjunct faculty were limited to satisfaction surveys.
and/or completion for most colleges (77%). Other measures included looking at the number of adjuncts who were qualified (11%) and classroom observations (15%) as part of their overall success measurement. A few of the colleges had no metrics to determine their success (23%).

When asked what the percentage of adjunct faculty completed their FQAS course requirements within the five-year timeframe, the managers in general did not have much data. Since the FQAS requirements only came into place five years ago (in 2015), the managers were just coming up on the first five-year deadline. The managers that were willing to estimate (46%) gave a range of 60-100%. One reported a value of 13% but stressed that the deadline was this year (2020) so they were expecting many more to complete.

When asked to describe any differences in their system for supporting the FQAS professional development for adjunct faculty compared to that provided for full-time faculty, 46% of the managers reported that theirs was the same except for the five-year vs the three-year time frame. Another 46% provided an academy type format for at least a portion of the FQAS courses for the adjunct faculty. The remaining managers (8%) offered the same content but in a contextualized version for the adjunct faculty.

An additional question for the managers was whether they felt resistance from the adjunct faculty regarding the FQAS requirements. While 62% of the managers reported hearing comments like “this is a lot” concerning the requirements, only 31% reported having adjunct faculty that refused to complete them. The most pushback was felt with emergency medical services (EMS), fire, law enforcement, and certified nursing assistant (CNA) adjunct faculty that were only hired for skill drills, and also from these adjunct faculty that already completed extensive training in their field in order to be allowed to teach at all. Pushback was also felt for those adjunct faculty teaching only one to two courses per year.
Some managers found that the adjunct faculty were happy to have the training. They found they had less pushback when the requirement was introduced up front and the importance of it was stressed by the adjunct faculty’s supervisor. Some managers were considering credit for prior learning for the training required for the EMS and CNA instructors.

The managers reported many areas that were working well with their system for the adjunct faculty. These areas included the courses themselves, the delivery methods for offering the courses, and increased communication with the adjunct faculty and within the college concerning the adjunct faculty.

For the courses themselves, managers felt that their courses were well put together. Some offered contextualized coursework which they felt was greatly appreciated by the adjunct faculty. Courses offered in a variety of formats seemed best to the managers, since they wanted to be flexible and consider the outside schedules of the adjunct faculty. Special events for the adjunct faculty were also felt to be working well, such as in-services specifically for the adjunct faculty, and get-togethers at the beginning of the semester for the adjunct faculty to talk with their peers and to prepare for their upcoming classes. Providing mentors for their adjunct faculty for one semester if it was requested was also felt to be working well.

Managers found that offering a variety of delivery methods was helpful to find a fit for the adjunct faculty. One manager also found that offering a workshop format was welcome, as well as blended courses that included some face-to-face with the remaining online.

Increased communication that was working well included notification from the human resources department immediately upon hiring of an adjunct faculty to the professional development manager so that they could follow up and provide FQAS information. Suggestions were also made to adjunct faculty to continue to monitor their emails even when they were not
actively teaching to ensure that communication regarding the FQAS course offerings and deadlines was not missed. Actively promoting the FQAS courses and setting up a plan for the adjunct faculty to complete the courses had also helped with completion rates. Having intermediate deadlines and being proactive with notifying them of five-year deadlines approaching had helped.

The managers also reported many areas where they felt improvements could be made in their system for the adjunct faculty. One felt that a more robust orientation to teaching and learning should be done prior to the adjunct faculty being in the classroom. Another felt that the contextualization for the courses should be specific to the division, regional center, and building where the adjunct faculty would be teaching. One felt that a simpler version of the course work should be offered to those teaching only in the clinical setting. Another that did not provide a compensation increase upon completion of the FQAS instructor certification requirements felt that they should be offering something. One felt that the FQAS instructor certification requirement was not communicated uniformly, depending on who was doing the hiring.

Additional comments that managers provided concerning the FQAS course completion support for adjunct faculty were varied. Some expressed concern with how their courses were structured, feeling that they needed to improve their offerings, structure, and timelines so that more adjunct faculty would complete them. The managers of some colleges that were not offering a pay increase upon completion of the FQAS courses reported that they were considering it. One would like to have stipends for the adjunct faculty for completing the classes.

Some managers expressed the desire to pull out the competencies separately to make them be more useful to the adjunct faculty, while some have already done that. Some argued for
contextualized classes just for adjunct faculty, others advocated for the same courses for both adjunct faculty and full-time faculty so that no rework would be required if the adjunct faculty moved into a full-time position. Still others resisted changing the content from that offered by the WTCS so that adjunct faculty could take the WTCS course offerings if needed. Additional comments were that online offerings were popular and intermediate deadlines helped the adjunct faculty make steady progress.

**LMS vendor interview data.** The SumTotal Maestro vendor was able to confirm that third-party course content could be added to the options available within their system. The requirement of the third-party content was that it be in the form of a SCORM file. Training was available through SumTotal for adding the SCORM content to the system. Content may need to be uploaded again with new revisions of Maestro but was reported to usually not be a complex process.

SumTotal Maestro had many third-party vendors that they already successfully partner with, including Skillsoft, LinkedIn Learning, Udemy, Inc, HealthStream, Inc., and Casino Essentials LLC. Fifteen percent of the WTCS colleges were already using LinkedIn Learning. The vendor also reported that many were using at least some of the SkillSoft modules that were available.

SumTotal had a SCORM authoring tool called DominKnow that was available through their platform. This can be used for course creation that can then be included in the SumTotal Maestro offerings.

Looking at the interview data and the literature, five topics surfaced as items for WITC to focus their initial efforts in supporting the adjunct faculty through their instructor certification requirements. The five topics were course content, delivery method, credit for prior learning,
community, and compensation. These topics and recommendations to WITC are expanded upon in the next chapter.
Chapter V: Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation

WITC had developed a system for the support of faculty according to the FQAS requirements of TCS 3 (2015). The system allowed the adjunct faculty up to five years to complete the requirements for instructor certification. An issue with this system was that some adjunct faculty found it difficult to complete the requirements in five years. Another issue was that the adjunct faculty were not benefiting from the teachings of the certification right away in their adjunct responsibilities. WITC was working to condense and streamline their system for the professional development requirements for the adjunct faculty.

The professional development managers (managers) from the WTCS colleges were interviewed to gain insight as to how they were supporting their adjunct faculty in the completion of their FQAS requirements, with the goal to determine best practices. The SumTotal Maestro vendor was also interviewed to determine the capabilities of the program for supporting any FQAS instructor certification course offerings under its umbrella.

Five topics surfaced from the interviews and literature as items for WITC to focus their initial efforts in supporting the adjunct faculty through their instructor certification requirements. The five topics that stood out were course content, delivery method, credit for prior learning, community, and compensation.

Discussion

Of the 16 managers at the WTCS colleges, 13 were open to offering information and participated in the interviews. They provided helpful insights into their practices. When reviewing the survey data, five topics surfaced as items for WITC to focus their efforts. These included course content, delivery method, credit for prior learning, community, and
compensation. These five topics also had support in the literature and would be a good starting point for WITC for supporting their adjunct faculty.

**Course content.** The WTCS provided a framework, the FQAS Competency Framework (Appendix A), for the professional development requirements for new faculty for all technical colleges within the system. The framework outlined a set of competencies and their performance standards in seven areas including assessment, behavioral management, course design, data and evidence analysis, embracing diversity, student success, and teaching methods and technology (WTCS, 2019). The WTCS allowed colleges to create their own curriculum to implement the teaching and performance standards assessment as they saw fit.

All of the managers interviewed reported that they covered all of the course competencies that were included in the FQAS Competency Framework. Most offered seven courses for the seven individual competency areas, some combined some of the topics, and some taught competencies individually to fill any gaps with what the adjunct faculty already knew. WITC had implemented the framework as it stands with seven courses, one for each competency area.

Some managers surveyed felt that a robust orientation to teaching and learning should be done prior to the adjunct faculty being in the classroom, in addition to these courses. Some felt that contextualization of the courses should be done and should be specific to the division, regional center, and building where the adjunct faculty will be teaching. Some managers pulled out the competencies separately from the seven areas and taught them in a different order so that the adjunct faculty were learning topics that they needed right away in their teaching.

While contextualizing the courses for the adjunct faculty seemed like a plus, not all managers felt the same. Some wanted the same courses for adjunct faculty and for full-time faculty so adjunct faculty could move to a full-time position more easily. In addition, some
wanted their courses to line up with the WTCS offerings for the FQAS courses so the WTCS courses could be used as an option for the adjunct faculty if the offerings from the college did not fit with their schedules.

Webb et al. (2013) felt that a scholarly approach to teaching and learning for professional development of adjunct faculty was important. Webb et al. (2013) described this scholarly approach as training them in educational theory and practice, assessing student work, and developing self-directed learners and critical thinkers within the student. Forbes et al. (2010) also felt that formal coursework should be provided for adjunct faculty development. By requiring all of the adjunct faculty to complete the same courses as the full-time faculty, WITC had ensured that they receive training in all of these areas and that a scholarly approach had been followed.

When developing content, it was felt that the content should be focused on teaching and learning to improve student success (Bendickson & Griffin, 2010). It should provide academic development that is interesting and useful (Hamilton et al., 2013). To aid new technical faculty that have little experience in teaching, especially in the STEM areas, an emphasis should be placed on techniques for building formative assessment into lecture and labs (Drew & Klopper, 2014). And finally, a formal orientation should be mandatory (Forbes et al., 2010).

**Delivery method.** Courses at WITC were offered online and face-to-face. Each course was offered at least once a year. The courses took six to eight weeks to complete, for a total of 44 weeks to complete all seven courses. Other managers that were interviewed offered the courses in varying formats including online, blended, and/or face-to-face. Most managers offered courses several times throughout the year to accommodate the schedules of the faculty, with 23% offering the courses in a continuous online format. The time commitment required to
complete the courses varied from college to college, from 24 to 134 hours and from 35 to 47 weeks. Courses were graded on a pass/fail basis at all colleges.

Courses offered in a variety of formats seemed best to the managers, since they wanted to be flexible considering the outside schedules of the adjunct faculty. In-service opportunities designed specifically for the adjunct faculty and get-togethers at the beginning of the semester were working well to welcome adjunct faculty and get them started on their FQAS requirements. Some colleges provided an academy format for the adjunct faculty.

Dalto (2017) felt that there was “no best training delivery method” (p. 28), it depended on the trainer and trainees involved. The best training method was one that considers the content of the course and the abilities and availability of the trainees (Blair & Serafini, 2016; Dalto, 2017). The method must also be able to properly assess the trainee (Dalto, 2017). Some employees do well with online, some need face-to-face to maintain motivation (Blair & Serafini, 2016). Also, the expectations of the learner must be considered when deciding on the delivery method (Blair & Serafini, 2016).

When participants have a wide range of capabilities and were located at a wide range of locations Haung et al. (2013) suggested that institutions should consider providing different training methods such as video, online, audio, and face-to-face. WITC had a very large district and remote campuses, and its adjunct faculty came to the college with a wide range of teaching experience, so this suggestion was quite applicable to them. Phase training (training following a checklist for each phase) was another format of training that can be delivered face to face or blended (Anonymous, 2015) and could be a good format to follow for the adjunct faculty onboarding. Many organizations felt that blended or hybrid produced the best results for real change in knowledge and use on the job (Dalto, 2017; Huang et al., 2013).
Organizations also used e-learning and found it to be beneficial for compliance training (Dalto, 2017). Teaching facilities used e-learning and combined technologies into an online faculty development resource that incorporates live chat and videoconferencing that can be accessed around the clock (Maldonado & Riman, 2009). It was found that WITC had e-learning hosting capability in the SumTotal Maestro program that WITC and many of the other colleges used for faculty professional tracking. This program had the capability to add third-party course content and could be used as an e-learning platform for their FQAS courses. This content must be in the form of a SCORM file. There was a SCORM authoring tool available via SumTotal called DominKnow that could be used to create the FQAS courses. These courses could then be included in SumTotal Maestro offerings and would provide adjunct faculty with an e-learning option.

**Credit for prior learning.** WITC allowed credit for prior learning on a course level. At the other colleges, some of the managers interviewed allowed credit for prior learning while others did not. One manager assessed the prior learning of the individual competencies and required the adjunct faculty to only get instruction on individual competencies to fill gaps that were identified. Another manager preferred that faculty complete all of the courses no matter what prior learning they may have had, as these courses were specific to their college.

Some managers that did not allow credit for prior learning felt pushback from EMS, fire, law enforcement, and CNA adjunct faculty in the amount of work that was required to complete the FQAS courses. Some of these adjunct faculty were only hired for skill drills and they did not see the use of these courses. Some had to complete extensive teaching training already and felt they were repeating competencies that they already knew. Some managers were considering
credit for prior learning for the EMS and CNA instructors and were developing crosswalks to identify where credit for prior learning could be given to address these complaints.

**Community.** Many of the managers found that communication was a key component of forming a community for the adjunct faculty to thrive. To help adjunct faculty complete their FQAS requirements, some managers have increased communication with human resources and professional development upon hire of the adjunct faculty so that FQAS information can be provided to them right away. Additional communication provided by the managers to the adjunct faculty included professional development guides that explained the course requirements and timeline, calendars of courses currently being offered, and welcoming emails. Some have asked supervisors of the adjunct faculty to set up a plan for the adjunct faculty for completing the courses and found that this helped with completion rates. Including intermediate deadlines in these plans and sending out timely reminders to attend classes had also helped the adjunct faculty make steady progress. In addition, some managers provided mentors for their adjunct faculty for one semester as a resource to them.

Communication solicited from the adjunct faculty included feedback in the form of satisfaction surveys for the FQAS classes. Managers also looked at completion rates for the FQAS courses as feedback to measure course success. Managers plan to use the five-year deadline as a metric as well; adjunct faculty have five years to complete the FQAS instructor certification courses and this first deadline was looming.

What else can managers do to welcome and support the adjunct faculty in their FQAS completion? Hoyt (2012) found that professional development, a connection to the college, as well as support from the college was desired by the adjunct faculty. An overall infrastructure should be developed to provide this support (Datray et al., 2014). Participation in a community
of practice should be encouraged as part of this infrastructure (Hamilton et al., 2013; Webb et al., 2013). The community of practice was a good framework for giving busy adjunct faculty access to professional development by having a group that meets regularly to work through the professional development material together (Webb et al., 2013). To provide leadership to this community of practice, experienced adjunct faculty could be developed as paid advisors to the newer adjunct faculty (Hamilton et al., 2013).

This infrastructure should also include assigning a mentor to the adjunct faculty to help them integrate into the college and support them in the classroom (Datray et al., 2014). Mentoring would include the areas of course content, teaching skills, and classroom observations (Hoyt, 2012). Providing mentors would help retain the adjunct faculty and therefore would be worth the added cost to the college (Datray et al., 2014). Course coordinators should also work closely with the adjunct faculty by attending the orientation, maintaining contact throughout the semester, and ensuring textbook and technology help were available for the adjunct faculty (Forbes et al., 2010).

Another piece of the infrastructure would be for supervisors to be inclusive with adjunct faculty and provide better communication and recognition of the adjunct faculties’ contributions (Davis et al., 2014). They should provide opportunities to integrate the adjunct faculty with the full-time faculty by inviting them to faculty meetings, workshops, and pinning ceremonies so they do not feel as isolated (Forbes et al., 2010; Pons et al., 2017). Full-time faculty can also be encouraged to visit their classroom and provide feedback and adjunct faculty can be encouraged to visit full-time faculty classrooms and do the same (Pons et al., 2017).

**Compensation.** Colleges did not provide compensation to the adjunct faculty for the time required to complete the FQAS course work. Many linked the completion of the FQAS
courses to a raise in pay however. Most provided the increase once all seven competency areas were completed, while others provided an increase when four of the seven were completed. In some cases a stipend was available for completing a portion at an event or workshop, however stipends were not consistent.

Davis et al. (2014) felt that it was important for the adjunct faculty to be paid to attend teaching-related training. If an actual monetary form of pay was not available, one way used to encourage participation was by providing incentives (Datray et al., 2014). Incentives could include choices of classes and schedule, stipend, and possibly campus parking and meal cards (Datray et al., 2014).

In the private sector, it was found that newly trained employees want to use their new skills (Jang et al., 2017). Opportunities for application of the training and increased compensation related to increased value in the employee due to the training should be timely to avoid employee dissatisfaction and turnover (Simpson et al., 2015). Training must be coupled with a strategic approach for retaining the employees once they were trained (Simpson et al., 2015). Adjunct faculty will be applying their new skills immediately if they are teaching. If they are working through their FQAS course but not currently teaching, opportunities should be found for them to apply their new teaching skills, such as at faculty in-services or other events.

Conclusions

The five topics of course content, delivery method, credit for prior learning, community, and compensation were found to be a good starting point for WITC to focus their efforts to improve the support of their adjunct faculty in completing their FQAS instructor certification requirements. WITC had provided support in some of these areas, however support could be
increased by incorporating some suggestions from the readings and best practices from the other colleges. Recommendations for WITC are given below.

**Recommendations**

Steps for WITC to take for improving the support of adjunct faculty in the five areas of course content, delivery method, credit for prior learning, community, and compensation are given below. Completing these steps is expected to improve the completion of the FQAS courses by the adjunct faculty. In addition, an increase in job satisfaction of the adjunct faculty by increasing a feeling of community and increased confidence in teaching is expected to be a byproduct of completing the steps outlined below.

**Course content.** WITC must continue to include all of the competencies required by the WTCS in their FQAS course content. Since WITC is a smaller college with limited resources for the teaching and managing of the professional development of the adjunct faculty, they should use the same courses for the adjunct faculty as they use for full-time faculty. This will also ensure that the adjunct faculty are prepared to step into a full-time position should the opportunity and desire arise. WITC should contextualize the courses by providing alternate assignments and/or alternate readings specific to the adjunct faculty within the course, while still ensuring the proper rigor.

Customization for the adjunct faculty should also be provided by changing the order that the classes are taken as needed for each adjunct faculty so they are learning what is most useful to them first. The managers should ensure the sequencing of the courses reflects what the adjunct faculty need when they need it so they will get the most out of the course work as they are gaining teaching experience.
Courses should be revamped so they do not require the six-week time frame to complete. WITC should investigate what other colleges have done to condense the time frame. WITC should aim for content and course work that the adjunct faculty can complete in three years to ensure that they can be using the competencies taught in the FQAS classes as early in their tenure as possible.

**Delivery method.** WITC should continue to provide online and face-to-face courses so that adjunct faculty can choose what works best for them. WITC should also leverage the online courses offered by the WTCS as another option for the adjunct faculty to complete course work, and consider these offerings when developing the professional development plan with the adjunct faculty.

An orientation or boot camp should be developed for the adjunct faculty that includes key competencies pulled from the courses for the adjunct faculty to complete before they begin teaching or shortly after. Only items that the adjunct faculty will need right away should be included. This orientation should be tailored to the specific adjunct position and experience of the adjunct faculty as needed to aid in their success as they begin teaching. Completion of the orientation should be given a due date to ensure timely completion.

**Credit for prior learning.** WITC should allow credit for prior learning on a competency basis for experienced adjunct faculty coming in to the college. An assessment or interview form should be developed to aid in determining what the adjunct faculty have already received training in or where they already have experience. The assessment should include a crosswalk for the EMS and CNA positions and other positions where extensive teaching training is already required before being allowed to teach. This assessment should be completed by the adjunct faculty’s supervisor or the professional development manager upon hiring. The information
should then be used to customize their orientation and to create a plan for completing the FQAS courses. This plan should include intermediate deadlines for the courses to keep focus on their completion. When adjunct faculty do take the FQAS courses where they received credit for prior learning for some of the competencies, they should be exempt from the course work required for those competencies.

**Community.** WITC should create a “community of practice” for adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty should be encouraged to join this “community of practice” for support to help them complete their FQAS instructor certification requirements. The communities should be led by an advisor. Advisors should be provided by creating an advisor position for seasoned adjunct faculty and training them on how to lead the communities. The supervisors of the adjunct faculty could also serve as advisors. Stipends should be provided for advisors that are adjunct faculty. The communities should meet once or twice a month to work on their FQAS requirements together, receive just in time training from the advisor, and receive academic support and comradery.

To enhance the community feel, support documents should be developed by WITC for the adjunct faculty that communicate the FQAS requirements for the adjunct faculty. Every adjunct faculty should receive these documents upon hiring and they should be reviewed with the adjunct faculty by their supervisor. The documents should include professional development guides that explain the course requirements and timeline, checklists for working through the requirements, calendars of courses currently being offered, and lists of adjunct faculty resources and contact information.

**Compensation.** WITC should continue providing a pay increase to the adjunct faculty once the seven FQAS instructor certification courses are completed. This pay increase should be
divided in two parts, with an interim pay increase of 50% of the total planned increase given once four of the courses are completed and the remainder given when all seven of the courses are completed. This would reward the adjunct faculty for their efforts earlier and should help to keep them motivated, which may add to their completion rates and overall satisfaction.

**Additional Research**

As WITC continues to improve the support of the adjunct faculty in completing the FQAS courses to achieve instructor certification, there is still additional work that can be done. One item would be to develop on-demand courses that can be administered out of Maestro directly, allowing this FQAS course work to be housed in the same LMS as the compliance training. This will make the completion of these courses more straightforward, rather than using other LMS software, and the on-demand feature will allow adjunct faculty to complete courses as they fit into their own personal schedules. Another item would be to develop metrics to assess the success of the changes being made so resources can be put to the best use.

**Online on-demand courses.** WITC should consider developing online on-demand FQAS courses for the Maestro platform. Online on-demand courses have been proven to be popular with adjunct faculty at other colleges as it provides a flexible option for completing the FQAS coursework. WITC should first determine if developing FQAS course modules for Maestro would be feasible and worth the cost for the amount of adjunct faculty served. They should investigate forming a consortium with like colleges in the WTCS to offset the costs and share talent. They should consider leading the consortium effort that determines the content and then work with the programmer using DominKnows to create the content. Perhaps a grant could be obtained to facilitate this work or at least the purchase of the module and the work of the software developer. Care should be taken to ensure the members of the consortium have the
same ideas as to what they want in the course modules, as many of the colleges’ current means for supporting the adjunct faculty in the FQAS completion efforts are quite diverse.

**Metrics.** Meaningful metrics should be determined to assess if the support for the adjunct faculty is indeed making a difference for them. It will be important to know if the changes made are helping or hindering, so that efforts can be put where they are needed. These metrics could include FQAS course completions and five-year completions of adjunct faculty, as well as periodic surveys to assess the satisfaction of the adjunct faculty in the support they receive from the college. Student completion rates of the classes that the adjunct faculty teach compared to the full-time faculty might also be considered to determine where gaps might exist in the FQAS trainings and adjunct faculty supports. The results of student satisfaction surveys may also be a source of insight as well.
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### Appendix A: FQAS Competency Framework (WTCS, 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Assessment**                | Create a performance-based assessment plan  
Employ a variety of formative assessment strategies  
Employ a variety of summative assessment strategies  
Communicate assessment results to promote student learning  
Use assessment results to improve instruction |
| **Behavioral management**     | Examine the factors that affect the behavior of the multi-generational learner  
Demonstrate professional behaviors to support teaching and learning  
Utilize varied strategies for managing the learning environment  
Evaluate college resources and services available to support teaching and learning |
| **Course design**             | Examine performance-based learning course design concepts  
Designate exit learning outcomes and external standards  
Develop competencies that describe intended learning outcomes  
Create a performance-based plan for a course  
Create performance assessment tasks  
Write learning objectives for each competency  
Design a learning plan  
Prepare a syllabus  
Utilize a quality review process to validate curriculum |
| **Data and evidence analysis**| Explore a variety of data analysis tools  
Analyze data from teaching and learning experiences  
Use data to inform decision making about the teaching and learning process |
| **Embracing diversity**       | Assess your effectiveness in embracing diversity based on the lenses through which you view yourself and your students  
Examine the impact of college, community, and student demographics on teaching and learning  
Examine your college’s plans, policies, and strategies that support diverse learners  
Create an inclusive, effective learning environment that addresses barriers and provides reasonable accommodations |
| **Student success**           | Promote a culture of continuing student success  
Implement strategies to promote learner persistence  
Demonstrate learner-centered communication  
Examine instructor role in student career development  
Develop scaffolded strategies to meet the developmental needs of multi-generational learners  
Analyze the impact of personal factors and life circumstances on student success  
Analyze the legal and ethical roles of the counselor, the advisor, and the instructor in facilitating the academic, career, and personal development of learners  
Analyze available student support services |
| **Teaching methods and technology** | Explore instructional strategies  
Analyze learning theories and models/cycles |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create a plan for learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise teaching practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Professional Development Manager Interview Questions

Professional Development Manager Interview Questions

1. Select the name of your college:

- Blackhawk Technical College
- Fox Valley Technical College
- Lakeshore Technical College
- Mid State Technical College
- Moraine Park Technical College
- Northcentral Technical College
- Southwest Wisconsin Technical College
- Western Technical College

2. How many full-time faculty teach at your college?

3. How many adjunct/part time faculty teach at your college?

4. Describe your system for supporting the FQAS Professional Development for adjunct faculty:

   a. What courses do you offer for each of the seven professional areas?
   b. What competencies are covered in each course?
   c. What are the requirements to meet the competencies of each course?
   d. What timeframe is needed/allowed to complete each course (such as 8 hours, 2 days, 1 week, 8 weeks, and so on)?
   e. How are courses offered – online, face-to-face, other?
   f. How many times is each course offered in a given year?
   g. What time of day are face-to-face courses offered?
h. What are the first-time completion rates for the courses?

i. How do you manage the administration of the system (such as an LMS or spreadsheet)?

j. What else would you like to add?

5. What materials that you use for supporting the adjunct faculty in their professional
development would you be willing to share with WITC?

6. What books or textbooks do you use in your training, if any?

7. What metrics do you use to determine the success of your system for supporting the FQAS
   Professional Development for adjunct faculty?

8. What is the percentage of adjunct faculty completing their FQAS requirements within the
   five-year timeframe?
   - 0-20%
   - 21-30%
   - 31-40%
   - 41-50%
   - 51-60%
   - 61-70%
   - 71-80%
   - 81-90%
   - 91-100%
   - Unknown
   - Not willing to share

9. Describe areas that have worked well in your system for adjunct faculty:

10. Describe areas where you have felt resistance from the adjunct faculty regarding these
    requirements:
    
    a. Are the adjunct faculty commenting that they aren’t willing to complete the
       requirements?
    
    b. Are they commenting something similar to “This is a lot.”?
    
    c. What other areas would you like to add?

11. Describe areas where you feel improvement could be made in the system for adjunct faculty:

12. Describe any differences in your system for supporting the FQAS Professional Development
    for full-time faculty as compared to adjunct faculty and the reason(s) for those differences:

13. What else might you add?
Appendix C: LMS Vendor Interview Questions

LMS Vendor Interview Questions

1. Can third-party content be added to the course options in Maestro?

2. What are some examples of third-party content that has been successfully added?

3. Is training available for the person that would be adding content?

4. With new revisions of Maestro, does the third-party content still work or does it need to be reconfigured, added in again, and so forth?

5. What colleges have used this capability of adding third-party content?

6. What degree of success are you seeing with colleges adding third-party content?

7. What else might you add?