

Summer 2011

The Impact of Full Time Versus Adjunct/Part Time Faculty Status on Course Assessments by Hospitality Management Students

Daryl Georger

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Georger, D. (2011). The Impact of Full Time Versus Adjunct/Part Time Faculty Status on Course Assessments by Hospitality Management Students (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/576>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillips@duq.edu.

THE IMPACT OF FULL TIME VERSUS ADJUNCT/PART TIME FACULTY
STATUS ON COURSE ASSESSMENTS BY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT
STUDENTS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Education

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education

By

Daryl V. Georger

August 2011

Copyright by
Daryl V. Georger

2011

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL PROGRAM
FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

by:

Daryl V. Georger

B.S., Hotel Administration, Cornell University, 1981

M.S., Restaurant and Tourism/Business, University of Massachusetts, 1990

THE IMPACT OF FULL TIME VERSUS ADJUNCT/PART TIME FACULTY
STATUS ON COURSE ASSESSMENTS BY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT
STUDENTS

_____, Chair

Thomas F. Staszewski, Ed.D

Dean of Academic Services, Mercyhurst College North East

_____, Member

Gary Brown, Ph.D.

Executive Dean, Mercyhurst College North East

_____, Member

Gilbert Jacobs, Ph.D.

Director of Mercyhurst Graduate Program in Organizational Leadership

_____, Member

Patrick Kelly, M.S.

Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Statistics

Program Director

James E. Henderson, Ed.D.

Professor of Educational Leadership and

Director, Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders

Duquesne University School of Education

ABSTRACT

THE IMPACT OF FULL TIME VERSUS ADJUNCT/PART TIME FACULTY STATUS ON COURSE ASSESSMENTS BY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT STUDENTS

By

Daryl V. Georger

August 2011

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Thomas Staszewski

Over the past most recent decades, one of the most significant changes in post secondary education is the dramatic increase in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members. As there are many potential advantages in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty there are also many possible concerns and disadvantages in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty. In order to balance the use of adjunct/part-time faculty and attempt to fully realize the advantages in using adjunct/part-time faculty while minimizing the disadvantages, it is important to determine what areas of university/college teaching are assessed by students differently between adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty

instruction. The purpose of this study was to examine and compare Hospitality Management student's course assessment summary surveys of courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty at a private four-year post secondary institution. The assessment instrument used in this research was the Student Instructional Report II assessment survey/summary developed and tested by the Education Testing Service. This instrument, first developed in 1972, and revised in the mid 1990's, assesses post secondary faculty in the areas of course organization/planning, communication, faculty/student interaction, assignments, exams/grading, supplementary instructional methods, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, course difficulty, workload/pace, and overall evaluation. Survey summaries were collected from 48 courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and 48 classes taught by full time faculty members. All classes were attended by Hospitality Management students. Means were compared for differences in the areas of university/college teaching and tested for significance. It is hoped that this research will identify possible areas of improvement in university/college teaching needed to be addressed by adjunct/part-time faculty members as assessed by Hospitality Management students. With this research, adjunct/part-time faculty members can adjust teaching methods or techniques which may increase student satisfaction while the college/university can realize the advantages in the use of part-time/adjunct faculty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iv
Chapter 1.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.2 Purpose of the study.....	4
1.4 Research Question Overview.....	6
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	7
1.6 HYPOTHESIS.....	8
1.7 DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	10
Chapter 2.....	11
2.1 Theoretical Framework.....	13
2.2 Review of Relevant Studies.....	14
2.2.1 Increased use of Adjunct/Part/time faculty.....	14
2.2.2 Benefits of adjunct faculty.....	15
2.2.3 Advantage of Less Cost.....	15
2.2.4 Advantage of Flexibility.....	16
2.2.5 Specialized Course Advantage.....	17
2.2.6 Real World Experience.....	17
2.2.7 Ability to Adjust Faculty Numbers to Enrollment.....	17
2.2.8 Disadvantages to employing adjunct/part-time faculty.....	18
2.2.9 Morale Disadvantage.....	18
2.2.10 Teaching Pedagogy Disadvantage.....	19
2.2.11 Omission/Overlapping of Curriculum Objectives Disadvantage.....	19
2.2.12 Less Time for Students Disadvantage.....	19
2.2.13 Disadvantage of little knowledge of student’s abilities.....	20
2.2.14 Accrediting Commissions Negative View of Adjunct/Part-time Faculty Disadvantage.....	20
2.2.15 Fewer Full Time Faculty Members for Departmental, University, Curriculum, Governance, and Student Development Disadvantage.....	21
2.2.16 Less Shared Vision of the Department’s Academic Mission Disadvantage ..	21
2.2.17 Grade inflation Disadvantage.....	22
2.2.18 Reduced Student Learning Outcomes Disadvantage.....	22
2.2.19 Lower Graduation Rates Disadvantage.....	23

2.2.20 The Validity of the Student Evaluation of Faculty	24
2.3 Summary	26
Chapter III.....	28
3.1 Sample.....	28
3.2 Design	30
3.3 Instrumentation.....	30
3.4 Instrument Construct Reliability	31
3.5 Procedure	31
3.6 Data Analysis	33
3.7 Collection of Data.....	34
Chapter IV	35
4.1 Results.....	35
Chapter V.....	44
5.1 Research Question/Hypothesis 1	44
5.2 Research Question/Hypothesis 2.....	45
5.3 Research Question/Hypothesis 3.....	46
5.4 Research Question/Hypothesis 4.....	47
5.5 Research Question/Hypothesis 5	48
5.6 Research Question/Hypothesis 6.....	49
5.7 Research Question/Hypothesis 7.....	50
5.8 Research Question/Hypothesis 8.....	51
5.9 Research Question/Hypothesis 9.....	52
5.10 Limitations of the Study.....	54
5.11 Implications.....	56
5.12 Suggestion for Future Research.....	57
References.....	60
Appendix A.....	65
Appendix B.....	70
Appendix C.....	71
Appendix D.....	73
Appendix E.....	75
Appendix F.....	79
Appendix G.....	80

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Higher Education is at a critical juncture. Due to financial constraints, many colleges and universities have increasingly turned to adjunct/part-time faculty as a strategy to reduce operating costs. Part time faculty members, often called adjunct faculty, are usually paid on a per-course basis, and are not generally entitled to employee benefits. Adjunct/part-time faculty members can provide instruction at considerably lower cost than hiring a full-time faculty member (Kaplin & Lee, 1995). Although there are many positive benefits in using adjunct/part-time faculty, there may be critical negative ramifications to this hiring trend.

The number and percentage of adjunct faculty in postsecondary institutions has increased substantially over the past three decades from 30.2% in 1975 to 48% in 2005 in U.S. degree granting institutions (Marklein, 2008, December 3). During this same period, the use of full time tenured faculty has steadily decreased from 36.5% to 21.8% over the same period (Marklein, 2008, December 3). More specifically, Hospitality Management Programs have shifted to the point where 40% of all Hospitality Management faculty members are adjunct /part-time (Leslie 1998; Sonner 2000). In fact, there are a number of programs which operate with only one full time faculty member teaching the majority of courses offered.

Although I have held a full-time faculty position in the Department of Hospitality Management (HM) at Mercyhurst College for almost thirty years and have been department chairman for eleven of those years, for most of my tenure, the increasing use of adjunct faculty in institutions throughout the nation was not evident in the Mercyhurst College Hospitality Management Department. Adjunct/part-time faculty were rarely used because the Hospitality Management Department's full-time faculty had many years of service, were versatile enough to teach all courses offered, and had enough full-time faculty course load available to teach all scheduled courses. My interest in this area came from actually seeing an increased demand for adjunct/part-time faculty at Mercyhurst College and in other regional institutions. This interest took hold as I noticed more adjunct/part-time faculty members were hired to teach freshman required courses within the College and I wanted to research the effect this trend was having on student satisfaction at Mercyhurst. Also, my interest in this research peaked when I noticed the development of four Hospitality Management programs in the region, all of which hired none or one full time faculty member and filled the curriculum with adjunct/part-time faculty. With possible lower cost Hospitality Management programs in the region, the effects of hiring more adjunct/part-time faculty may need attention so not to lose students to a lower cost institution because of poor student satisfaction. As the department chair, I knew at least one full-time faculty member within the Hospitality Management Department would retire soon and it would be quite possible that the administration would ask the department to consider replacing the open spot with less expensive adjunct/part time faculty. In order to uphold the standards of one of the oldest Hospitality Management programs in the United States, and continue to have a high level of student

satisfaction, the focus of this research became evident for the need to compare what Hospitality Management students' perceive and therefore assess courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty members in comparison to courses taught by full time faculty members.

Research shows that there are positives and negatives associated with the employment of adjunct/part-time faculty (Beeken, 1990). Positive benefits include: (a) and increased flexibility in allocating instructional resources, (b) adjunct faculty/part-time help staff specialized courses in advanced technology, and (c) adjunct/part-time faculty provide flexibility to administrators as they attempt to respond to the expansion or decline in student enrollments (Beeken, 1990).

The possible negative effects in using adjunct/part-time faculty members may be realized both in and out of the classroom. In the classroom, adjunct/part-time faculty members are most often visiting professionals, with little knowledge of teaching or learning methodologies, which teach their courses and leave (Schuetz, 2002). Students are unlikely to receive the same quality of instruction from adjunct faculty as they would receive from full-time faculty (Schuetz, 2002). Out of the classroom, adjunct/part-time faculty members usually do not attend regular faculty meetings and receive little if no direction from the HM department chairperson (Smallwood, 2003). Faculty meetings often include curriculum discussions where decisions are made on which courses are responsible for certain topics. Without this critical information, an HM adjunct/part-time faculty member could leave out an important topic which may not be covered in other parts of the curriculum. Based on these negative effects, the quality of learning and

student satisfaction may be compromised. This loss in satisfaction would become evident in student course assessments. For this reason, there is a need to research the Hospitality Management students' assessment of the courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and compare those assessments from courses taught by full-time faculty. This unique research may help determine the parameters of adjunct/part-time faculty use and the adjunct/part-time faculty development needed for student satisfaction in post-secondary Hospitality Management education.

1.1 Statement of the Problem:

This study was conducted to test if there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management students' assessment of course work and instruction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty at a liberal arts college.

1.2 Purpose of the study:

Student satisfaction and quality of instruction is very important in maintaining student numbers at most tuition driven liberal arts institutions. A study by the American Educational Research Association, found that first-year college students are significantly more likely to drop out if their high-stakes "gate keeper" courses are taught by part-time instructors (Glenn, 2008). Also, a study of students pursuing bachelor's degrees in the University of North Carolina system concluded that a student's exposure to adjunct/part-time faculty increased the likelihood of not completing their degree (Marklein, 2008). This is a concern as the use of adjunct/part-time faculty has increased in the past three decades from 30.2% in 1975 to 48% in 2005 in U.S. degree granting institutions, while the use of full time tenured faculty has steadily decreased from 36.5% to 21.8 % over the

same period (Marklein, 2008). With the use of adjunct/part-time instructors on the rise in colleges and universities, student satisfaction may be lost in financially strapped, tuition driven institutions.

With the economy in a slump and unemployment near or over 10 % (Bureau of Labor Statistics December, 2010), liberal arts colleges must consider using more of their endowment proceeds for financial aid instead of salaries and operations. One obvious option to compensate for this reallocation of funds is the increased use of adjunct or part-time faculty. But, this savings through the increased use of adjunct/ part-time faculty could become a two-edged sword as savings in salaries and operational expenses may lead to lower levels of student satisfaction. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to fill the need for research on the impact of full-time versus adjunct/part-time faculty status on course assessments by Hospitality Management students to determine levels of student satisfaction. This research on student assessment and student satisfaction will include the areas of course organization and planning, communication, faculty/student interaction, assignments/exams/grading, supplementary instructional methods, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, course difficulty, course work load, and pace, and the overall evaluation of the course.

1.3 Need for the Study:

This study is significant because it will help determine if the use of part-time/adjunct faculty has an effect on hospitality Students' assessment, and ultimately their satisfaction, of course content or instructional quality. This assessment will include

the areas of course organization and planning, communication, faculty/student interaction, assignments/exams/grading, supplementary instructional methods, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, course difficulty, course work load, and pace, and the overall evaluation of the course. This study comes at an important time as many colleges are offering a hospitality management curriculum using a teaching model of few full time faculty members and many part-time/adjunct faculty members. The significance of this study reaches for valuable information to be used for setting parameters in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty and in developing adjunct/part-time faculty members to insure student satisfaction and the quality of learning.

1.4 Research Question Overview:

Research has shown that hiring patterns of Hospitality Management Departments have shifted to the point where more than 40% of all faculty members are adjunct (Leslie 1998; Sonner 2000). With this increase in the use of adjunct faculty, quality problems inside and outside the classroom have become evident (Schuetz, 2002). Students are unlikely to receive the same quality of instruction from adjunct faculty as they would receive from full-time faculty (Schuetz, 2002). With the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members, Hospitality Management students may lose student satisfaction in their course work. To determine levels of student satisfaction, student assessment based on the components that determine quality of instruction in courses must be reviewed and analyzed. These components are the foundations of the research questions and are the basis of the survey questions indicated in the Student Instructional Report II from the

Educational Testing Service. The components that determine quality university/college teaching include: course organization and planning, communication, faculty/student interaction, assignments/exams/grading, supplementary instructional methods, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, course difficulty/work load/ pace of the course and the overall course evaluation. The purpose of this study's research questions is to determine if there is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in the aforementioned components that determine quality of university/college instruction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. The conclusions of this study may provide valuable research to be used in setting parameters on the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members and in indicating areas of focus in developing competent Hospitality Management adjunct/part-time faculty members.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

- 1 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management Student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?
- 2 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

- 3 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?
- 4 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?
- 5 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?
- 6 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in their course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?
- 7 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?
- 8 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course difficulty, workload, and pace between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?
- 9 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of the overall course evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

1.6 HYPOTHESIS:

The research questions generated the following hypotheses:

- 1 Hypothesis 1:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management Student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.
- 2 Hypothesis 2:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.
- 3 Hypothesis 3:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.
- 4 Hypothesis 4:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.
- 5 Hypothesis 5:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.
- 6 Hypothesis 6:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in their course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty.
- 7 Hypothesis 7:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty.

- 8 Hypothesis 8:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course difficulty, workload, and pace between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.
- 9 Hypothesis 9:** There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of the overall course evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.

1.7 DEFINITION OF TERMS:

To clarify the terms found in this study the following definitions are offered:

HM: Hospitality Management

HTM: Hospitality and Tourism Management

HRIM: Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management

Adjunct/Part-time Faculty: Part-time faculty member teaching less than a normal course load as required by the institution. Not under contract as a full-time faculty member.

Full-time faculty member: A faculty member employed with a full time contract teaching a full load as stipulated by the contract.

SIR II: Student Instructional report II by the Educational Testing Service

ETS: Educational Testing Service

Mean: The average score within a distribution

Standard Error: A computed value based on the size of the sample and standard deviation of the distribution, indicating the range within which the mean of the population is likely to be from the mean of the sample at a given level of probability.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As charitable donations become less frequent, more families in need of financial aid, enrollments on the decline, and competitive government monies become increasingly more difficult to procure; institutions of higher education have been experiencing greater budget constraints and cost reductions in all areas (Roberts, 1995). In order to cut costs in the human resources area, colleges and institutions have increasingly turned to adjunct/part-time faculty as a cost savings measure (Kaplan & Lee, 1995). Adjunct faculty can generally provide instruction at a considerably lower cost than hiring a full-time faculty member (Kaplan & Lee, 1995).

The number and percentage of adjunct faculty in postsecondary institutions has increased substantially over the past three decades from 30.2% in 1975 to 48% in 2005 in U.S. degree granting institutions. During this same period, the use of full time tenured faculty has steadily decreased from 36.5% to 21.8% over the same period (Marklein, 2008,). More specifically, Hospitality Management Programs had shifted to the point where 40% of all Hospitality Management faculty members are adjunct /part-time (Leslie, 1998; Sonner, 2000).

With the increased use of adjunct faculty in departments of hospitality and tourism management, the literature presented did indicate problems both in the classroom and outside the classroom. Adjunct faculty members, most often, have little knowledge of

teaching or learning methodologies (Schuetz, 2002). Inside the classroom, students are unlikely to receive the same quality of instruction from adjunct/part-time faculty as they would from full-time faculty (Schuetz, 2002). Outside the classroom, adjunct /part-time faculty members usually do not attend faculty meetings and receive little, if any, direction from the HM department chairperson (Smallwood, 2003). Without adjunct/part-time faculty attendance at faculty meetings or instruction from the department chairperson, the curricula may become incoherent with overlaps, omissions, and unnecessary redundancy (Roberts, 1995). Without a properly orchestrated curriculum, the quality of learning and student satisfaction may be compromised. These problems, not only caused from the lack of departmental communication, are also often the direct result of poor adjunct/part-time faculty development. Both, the lack of departmental communication and adjunct/part-time faculty development must be addressed and rectified so quality student learning is not compromised (Smallwood, 2003).

Maintaining quality student learning and a high level of student satisfaction are very important components in maintaining student numbers at most tuition driven institutions. In a study by the American Educational Research Association, it was found that first-year college students are significantly more likely to drop out if their high-stakes “gate keeper” courses are taught by part-time instructors (Glenn, 2008). Also, it was found in a study of students pursuing bachelor’s degrees in the University of North Carolina system, that as a student’s exposure to adjunct/part-time faculty increased the likelihood of not completing their degree. (Eagan; Jaegar, 2008)

In order to better understand teaching pedagogy and why problems with student satisfaction, quality of instruction, and quality of student learning may exist, researchers

came up with categories of effective teaching to analyze for correlations. These categories, in most cases, could be applied universally to all faculty members including adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. If students could assess student satisfaction, quality of instruction, and quality of student learning to determine the shortcomings of adjunct/part-time faculty in comparison to their full time counterparts, then administration could set parameters on the use of adjunct/part-time faculty and devise more focused programs for adjunct/part-time faculty development. Ultimately, this assessment/comparison process may lead to higher levels of quality learning and student satisfaction.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The trend in Post-secondary Hospitality Management Programs is to use more adjunct/part-time faculty members. In lieu of the cost savings and the experiences that adjunct/ part-time faculty bring to the college, there may be problems associated with student satisfaction, the quality of teaching, and the quality of learning in classes taught by adjunct/part-time faculty.

Research shows that problems with student satisfaction, quality of teaching, and quality of learning can lead to lower levels of student satisfaction during a time in which most institutions of higher learning cannot financially afford to lose students. This potential loss of revenues from the loss of unsatisfied students can more than offset the financial savings realized through the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members and their lower salaries. The theoretical framework of this study is to determine the deficiencies of adjunct/part-time faculty in the areas of effective teaching through the use of student assessment and comparison to full time faculty using nine categories of effective

teaching. The nine categories, compiled from a list of 21 original categories in *“The superior College Teacher from the Student’s view”* were identified by faculty members, administrators, and alumni in various additional studies compiled and presented in *“A Guide to Evaluation Teaching for Promotion and Tenure”* and *“Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education”*. The nine categories, most of which overlapped between the aforementioned studies, included: course organization, effective communication, faculty/student interaction, fairness in assignments, exams/grading, supplementary instructional methods, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, and course difficulty/workload/pace and overall course evaluation. From the aforementioned studies and the determined overlapping of categories, the Student Instructional Report II (SIR II) was designed. The SIR II has been used extensively for over 25 years. This student driven assessment of faculty members can be analyzed to determine if there are significant differences in the nine categories, theorized as categories of effective teaching, between adjunct/part-time faculty and fulltime faculty. These differences can then be pinpointed and used in decisions concerning adjunct/part-time faculty development, human resource decisions on hiring adjunct/part-time faculty, and most importantly, in maintain high levels of student satisfaction.

2.2 Review of Relevant Studies

2.2.1 Increased use of Adjunct/Part/time faculty

To better understand balancing the use of adjunct/part-time faculty with full time faculty, the trends in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members, the benefits in using adjunct/part-time faculty members, and the shortcomings in using adjunct/part-time faculty members should be discussed. The increase in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty

is occurring across all academic fields including Hospitality Management. The number and percentage of adjunct faculty in postsecondary institutions has increased substantially over the past three decades from 30.2% in 1975 to 48% in 2005 in U.S. degree granting institutions. During this same period, the use of full time tenured faculty has steadily decreased from 36.5% to 21.8% over the same period (Marklein, 2008.). More specifically, Hospitality Management related programs had shifted to the point where 40% of all Hospitality management faculty members are adjunct /part-time (Leslie 1998; Sonner 2000).

2.2.2 Benefits of adjunct faculty

Research shows that there are many advantages associated with the employment of adjunct/part-time faculty. Benefits to using adjunct/part-time faculty include: that adjunct/part-time faculty are less costly than full time faculty, adjunct/part-time faculty offer administration increased flexibility in allocating instructional resources, adjunct faculty/part-time help staff specialized courses, adjunct/part-time faculty members often bring 'real world' experiences to the classroom, and adjunct/part-time faculty provide flexibility to administrators as they attempt to respond to expansion and decline in student enrollments (Beeken, 1990).

2.2.3 Advantage of Less Cost

Adjunct/part-time faculty members are less costly than full time faculty in both salaries and benefits. Adjunct/part-time faculty are paid about one-third of the cost that a full time faculty member would be paid to teach the same course (Twigg 1998). In addition, adjunct/part-time faculty members are rarely promoted to higher-paid, more prestigious positions (Twigg 1998). In one study within a higher education institution

which requires full time faculty to teach 24 credits per year similar to Mercyhurst College, the average salary of a full time faculty member is about \$60,000 per year. In 2009, the institution spent about \$210,000 on adjunct/part-time faculty. At \$667 per credit hour, adjunct/part-time faculty taught the equivalent of about 13.5 full time faculty. To hire 13.5 full time faculty members at the average salary of \$60,000 dollars per year, it would cost about \$810,000. In reality, most entry level full time faculty hires would be paid less than \$60,000 per year. For the sake of being conservative, the total salaries for 13.5 full time faculty members could be adjusted to about \$725,000. In addition, about \$239,250 would have to be added for benefits paid to the 13.5 full time faculty members. The grand total for hiring 13.5 full time faculty would be \$964,250 to teach the same credit hours taught by the adjunct/part-time faculty and paid \$210,000. The difference is a savings to the institution of about \$747,250 through the use of adjunct/part-time faculty (Menger, 2011). This savings of almost three quarters of a million dollars is a very enticing benefit to administration when budget time comes around each fiscal year.

2.2.4 Advantage of Flexibility

The use of adjunct/part-time faculty members offers administration flexibility in allocating instructional resources as they free up course loads of full time faculty. This will often insure that full-time faculty will teach the main required core courses within an academic curriculum. Administrators and department chairs are given the flexibility to keep full time faculty members teaching the core required courses in a curriculum while adjunct/part-time faculty are scheduled to teach the ‘specialized’ elective courses. Elective courses, although important, are not as important as the core learning objectives of the curriculum.

2.2.5 Specialized Course Advantage

Specialized courses, in any curriculum, are much more interesting when practical applications are applied to classroom instruction. Specialists in any field, including Hospitality Management, can be considered an expert in that area and may have many years of focused training and experience. With the many experiences come unique circumstances, and innovative fixes that may never be found in a text book or taught by an individual who is not a specialist in a particular area of a field. Students can benefit a great deal through learning these experiences and innovative fixes.

2.2.6 Real World Experience

Adjunct/part-time faculty often brings “real world vocational experiences” to the college environment (Cline, 1993). In other words, they enrich academic preparation for the professions (Phelan, 1986). Industry professionals teaching in an adjunct/part-time faculty role are often cutting edge in their information, use of technology, use of equipment, use of systems, and are cost efficient. This “real world experience” can bring industry examples which can bring text book theory to life.

2.2.7 Ability to Adjust Faculty Numbers to Enrollment

Finally, the use of adjunct/part-time faculty increases institutional flexibility in matching the demands of varying enrollments (Lankard, 1993:McGuire 1993). Adjunct/part-time faculty members are usually offered contracts at the beginning of each term. If enrollment drops, the numbers of adjunct/part-time faculty are much more easily adjusted by not offering contracts than full-time faculty.

2.2.8 Disadvantages to employing adjunct/part-time faculty

Although, research suggests that the employment of adjunct/part-time faculty offers a number of benefits, many critics of the use of adjunct/part-time faculty insist that the disadvantages outweigh any benefits. Disadvantages include the possible harm to the morale of full time faculty, the failure to incorporate new teaching methods and pedagogy, less communication on what is taught in the classroom often resulting in the omission or overlapping of important curriculum learning objectives, little time for the student outside of the classroom in advising/ office hours, little knowledge of the students in class making the course pace hard to determine, accrediting commissions frown upon the overuse of adjunct/part-time faculty, fewer full-time faculty are responsible for departmental and university governance, curriculum development, and student development, less shared vision of the academic mission of the department, grade inflation, reduced student learning outcomes, and lower graduation rates (Monhollon, 2006).

2.2.9 Morale Disadvantage

In today's economic situation, most full time faculty members often look to supplement their incomes with additional courses taught for overload pay. With the increased use of adjunct/part time faculty, critics argue that adjunct/part-time faculty may lower full time faculty morale by taking away full time positions and extra pay for course overloads (Twigg, 1989). Also, full time faculty members feel less secure with the increases use of adjunct/part-time faculty members (Kirk, Spector, 2007).

2.2.10 Teaching Pedagogy Disadvantage

Full time faculty members often have access to faculty development seminars and information on the newest methods in teaching pedagogy. Full time faculty members are often evaluated on their use of new methods of learning and teaching in the classroom. Research suggests that adjunct/part-time faculty members often fail to incorporate new methods of teaching (Digranes & Digranes, 1995)

2.2.11 Omission/Overlapping of Curriculum Objectives Disadvantage

Adjunct/part-time faculty members are not expected to have a deep knowledge of the college's values nor a clear sense of their personal role in the overall curriculum. Adjunct/part-time faculty members do not regularly attend departmental meetings so the department's curriculum may be incoherent to them. Although adjunct/part-time faculty members teach mostly introductory courses, they are not usually included in curriculum design discussions. This may lead to a lack of curricular coordination, the omission of important material that may cause gaps in a student's education, the overlapping of material causing inefficiencies, or adjunct/part-time faculty having an unclear relationship of how sequential courses relate to each other (Pannapacker, 2000).

2.2.12 Less Time for Students Disadvantage

Because of full time employment in another job or having to teach four or five courses a semester (typically 120 to 150 students) in order to earn about \$ 20,000 a year with no benefits, adjunct/part-time faculty cannot give individualized attention to students. Often, it is nearly impossible to remember student names. Moreover, adjunct

faculty members are not paid for holding office hours; it is not in their interest to hold office hours (Pannacker, 2000). In short, a part-time contract means part-time availability to students (Carroll, 2003).

2.2.13 Disadvantage of little knowledge of student's abilities

Many adjuncts have only short term relationships with institutions or are employed concurrently at multiple institutions; as a result, they are not likely to advise students competently about educational resources when advising opportunities present themselves in or out of the class room. In addition, adjunct/part-time faculty members are not available to write recommendations which are very important for admission into graduate and professional schools, and, when they do, those recommendations carry little weight since they are written by a faculty member with only short term knowledge of the student (Pannacker, 2000).

2.2.14 Accrediting Commissions Negative View of Adjunct/Part-time Faculty

Disadvantage Most all of the disadvantages are picked up by accreditation requirements. From student outcomes, grade inflation and equitable assignments, including adjunct part time in curriculum design. Some accreditation agencies have set standards recommending that adjunct/part-time faculty teach about 10% but no more than 20% of courses. The feeling behind setting standards on the use of adjunct/part-time faculty by accrediting agencies drives colleges and universities to examine closely their use of adjunct/part-time faculty through the process of adhering to accreditation standards. This process, and standards set on the use of adjunct/part-time faculty, would force colleges and universities to pay closer attention to the impact of adjunct/part-time

faculty on the integrity of the curriculum, and if the integrity of the institution's mission and goals is being compromised (Monhollon, 2006).

2.2.15 Fewer Full Time Faculty Members for Departmental, University, Curriculum, Governance, and Student Development Disadvantage

Academic departments always have administrative requirements to complete. A partial list of administrative requirements may include scheduling of classes, accreditation reports, course catalog revisions, and applying for grant monies. With fewer full time faculty members, departmental administrative duties may be left unfinished or just simply eliminated. Also, since adjunct/part-time faculty are expendable and may not be renewed for making the slightest waves, adjunct/part-time faculty cannot safely lobby for curricular reform, support unpopular causes, or even challenge students.

(Pannacker, 2000)

2.2.16 Less Shared Vision of the Department's Academic Mission Disadvantage

Adjunct/part-time faculty members have limited connections with the institutions at which they teach, and they cannot be expected to have a deep knowledge of an individual college's values nor a clear sense of their personal role in the overall curriculum. Adjunct/part-time faculty members are not usually involved in departmental meetings or governance. As a result from adjunct/part-time faculty members not being included in department meetings or college governance, many departments lack in curricular coordination as courses become disjointed because of little communication between faculty members (Pannacker, 2000).

2.2.17 Grade inflation Disadvantage

Although grade inflation is not a new problem, it may be worsening as universities increase their reliance on adjunct/part-time faculty members. Adjunct/part-time faculty members, hired on a term-by-term basis are easily replaced. To retain their teaching position, many adjunct/part-time faculty members face serious pressure to earn good evaluations by students. Keeping students happy may mean giving higher, inflated grades. In one study at a small public university, the study compared the grades given by adjunct/part-time faculty members and full time faculty members over a two year period. The results suggested that adjunct/part-time faculty members give higher grades than their full time counterparts (Sonner, 2000). In another study, at a small private college in the north east region of the United States, the results showed that grade inflation existed and exhibited a linear trend over a 20-year period. The research found that grade inflation was related to faculty status with significant differences occurring between mean grade point averages of students taught by tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, and adjunct faculty. The research found that average grades given by adjunct faculty were higher than those of either tenured or non-tenured faculty. It was concluded that the results indicated that the increased use of adjunct faculty increases grade inflation in higher education (Kezim, Pariseau, 2005).

2.2.18 Reduced Student Learning Outcomes Disadvantage

Studies suggest that adjunct/part-time faculty members are not as actively involved in scholarship, knowledge acquisition, or professional development (Clery, 1998: Freeland, 1998: Rifkin, 1998) and fell less responsibility and obligation to maintain academic integrity in the classroom (Freeland 1998: Rifkin, 1998). This may be the reason why some research concludes that adjunct/part-time faculty members are less

effective teachers than full time faculty members (Spangler 1990). Further research indicated that students taught by full time faculty members in their accounting principles classes, a courses of study required by many Hospitality Management curriculums, performed at a significantly higher level than students taught by adjunct/part-time faculty members in their sequenced finance courses, indicating that learning outcomes may not have been met in the accounting principles classes taught by adjuncts (Kirk; Spector, 2007).

2.2.19 Lower Graduation Rates Disadvantage

Many adjuncts have only short term relationships with institutions often resulting in the inability to advise students competently about available educational resources. In a study by Jaeger and Eagan, the summary of the findings showed that in an institution similar to Mercyhurst, with every 10 % increase in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty instructors a 7 % decrease in first year student retention was realized (Inside Higher Education, 2010). Another study concluded that students taught by adjunct/part-time faculty members in their first accounting course were less likely to choose accounting as a major or concentration (Kirk; Spector, 2007). This may be detrimental since some Mercyhurst Hospitality Management students choose to combine coursework with accounting to focus on the comptroller area of the Hospitality Industry, undergraduates, particularly freshmen, who need the most experienced advisors, are often forced to make their own way (Glenn, 2008). Undergraduates often confide in or ask their current professors about their problems or dilemmas. When problems are left unchecked, undergraduates may decide not to continue with their course of study. In a study by the American Educational Research Association, it was found that first-year college students

are significantly more likely to drop out if their high-stakes “gate keeper” courses are taught by part-time instructors. (Glenn, 2008)

2.2.20 The Validity of the Student Evaluation of Faculty

Student ratings of faculty instruction are commonly used in evaluating full-time and adjunct/part-time faculty members. Quantitative student ratings of teaching are used more than any other method to evaluate teaching performance (Cohen, 1981). The most common method of evaluating teaching adjunct/part-time faculty is through the use of student evaluations forms (Jackson, 1986). In the 600 liberal arts colleges that Seldin, first surveyed in 1973, it was reported that 29% used instructor evaluation surveys, by 1983 that number had more than doubled to 68 %. More recently, 86% used this method of faculty evaluation (Seldin, 1999). Many faculty members question the qualifications or competency of students in evaluating faculty. The research indicates that students are competent in evaluating their instructors. Many reasons have been offered for questioning the validity of student evaluations of faculty teaching performance or for the minimizing their importance in decisions of faculty performance in decisions of faculty promotion and tenure. However, judging by the views of those scholars who have most thoroughly considered these evaluations, including Centra, Cohen, Costin, Greenough and Menges, Feldman, McKeachie, and Murray, and especially by the recent review of the subfield by Marsh, few of these objections represent important challenges to the validity of student instructional ratings (Koon, and Murray, 1995). Based on the available research, it can be safely said that student evaluations of instruction are a valid index of instructional effectiveness (Cohen, 1981). Also, the reliability of student ratings is generally robust (Marsh; Dunkin, 1997).

To compare fulltime faculty with adjunct/part-time faculty, one of the most widely used student course evaluation instruments is the Student Instructional Report Two or SIR II. The SIR II has been used by nearly one million students in more than 65,000 two year and more than 117, 000 four year college courses nationwide. The SIR II is a course evaluation survey that determines students' perceptions of their coursework, instruction, and classroom experiences in higher education. The SIR II survey has helped faculty and administrators improve teaching effectiveness and learning quality for more than thirty years. The SIR II survey can provide reliable insights into students' perspectives on eight dimensions of college instruction in addition to providing the student's overall evaluation of the course (www.Ets.org/SIRii/about). Reliability coefficients for consistency are about .70 or higher when more than 10 raters are surveyed on well-known rating forms such as the Student Instructional Report (SIR) (Centra, 2005). All courses surveyed in this research had more than ten raters in both the adjunct/part-time faculty data and the full time faculty data gathered.

Mirroring the multidimensional nature of college instruction, the SIR II survey takes a structured, comprehensive approach to faculty and course evaluation. Survey questions are designed to gather data on eight dimensions of college instruction and on overall course evaluation. The eight dimensions include:

1. Course organization and planning
2. Faculty communication
3. Faculty/student interaction
4. Assignments, exams and grading

5. Instructional methods and materials
6. Course outcomes
7. Student effort and involvement
8. Course difficulty, workload and pace
9. Overall course evaluation

Students take the in class survey with pen and pencil. There are 45 questions covering the eight dimensions of college teaching and 10 optional questions which can be designed for institutional specific questions. The faculty member is required to leave the room while the anonymous survey is administered to students. The survey is then collected by an appointed student, sealed, and deposited in a secured location. The surveyed faculty member never has access to the finished survey, only the summary of results after they are tabulated.

2.3 Summary

As the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members continues to increase, it is important to understand the advantages and disadvantages in employing adjunct/part-time faculty members for delivering instruction. It seems that the largest advantage of saving money may not override the possible disadvantages including that adjunct/part-time faculty members appear to be overall less effective teachers as assessed by their students.

To arrive at this conclusion, student assessment instrument called the Student Instructional Report II, which has been used for almost forty years and can be considered reliable, was the instrument used to measure how effective Hospitality Management student's perceived their college instruction. Being the most widely used instrument in determining the quality of university instruction, the Student Instructional Report by the Educational Testing Service has been in existence since 1971. This survey tool and research results obtained through its use is a reliable indicator of the quality of university teaching and is one of the finest instruments available to compare the teaching of adjunct/part-time faculty members with fulltime faculty members and how that teaching is perceived by hospitality management students. With a good comparison, faculty development programs could be designed or adjusted, a faculty development checklist/training program be designed to eliminate shortcomings in adjunct/part-time instruction, and the use of adjunct/part-time faculty could be more focused on upperclassmen and specialized courses in order to maintain or increase quality learning and student satisfaction .

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

An ex post facto research methodology was used in this study. Adjunct/part-time faculty members and full time faculty members employed by Mercyhurst College, all instructing Hospitality Management students, were compared to determine if Hospitality Management students perceived a significant difference in eight categories of effective university teaching between adjunct/part-time faculty members and full time faculty members. The student survey results and summary evaluation data used in this research was from courses taught from 1999 to 2009 and included two year and four year students. An independent t-test was used as the statistical test to determine if there were significant differences in the Hospitality management student's perceptions of the eight categories of effective university teaching.

3.1 Sample

The Hospitality management Program at Mercyhurst College has been implementing the SIR II instrument for more than thirty years. Mercyhurst College is a Catholic liberal arts college in Northwestern, PA founded by the Sisters of Mercy and Mother Borgia Eagan in 1926. According to Mercyhurst Office of Institutional research, approximately 59% of students are female and 41% are male. Including international students, the diversity rate at Mercyhurst College is approximately 11%. The majority of

students come from the tri state area (NY, PA, and OH). Family incomes indicate a middle class background is typical. These same demographics represent the student demographics of the Hospitality Management Department housed in the institution. .Mercyhurst College is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and offers two year programs, adult programs, undergraduate programs, and graduate programs. Mercyhurst College has ranked among the top 10 comprehensive colleges in the north by U.S. News and World Report and named by the Princeton Review as one of the best northeastern colleges (www.Mercyhurst.edu).

All survey results for adjunct/part-time faculty members and full time faculty members are collected, analyzed, and filed immediately following the term when the evaluated courses were taught. The department director of the Hospitality Management Program, by right of position, has access to the results of the SIR II survey given for faculty who instruct Hospitality Management students. From that pool of SIR II survey results, the survey results were separated into groups of full time faculty members and adjunct/part-time faculty members. All identification information was covered on each survey result. Once the identification information is covered, the piles were shuffled and 48 full time faculty survey results and 48 adjunct/part-time faculty survey results were selected randomly. All survey result data was recorded in a spreadsheet based on the faculty status of adjunct/part-time faculty members or full time faculty members. The spreadsheet does not have information on the identification of any survey result. After the necessary data was collected, the survey results were then be replaced in the faculty files. No copies were made of these survey results. This was the procedure recommended by the ETS for this research topic.

3.2 Design

This study was designed to determine if there significant statistical differences in eight dimensions of teaching and the overall course evaluation between adjunct/part-time faculty members and full time faculty members. The eight dimensions of university teaching includes course organization/planning, communication, faculty/student interaction, assignments/exams/grading, supplementary instructional methods, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, and course difficulty/workload/pace. For over thirty years, Mercyhurst College has implemented the Education Testing Service Student Instructional Report II Survey in courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty members and full time faculty members. The courses required to implement the survey are chosen by the department director before the end of each term.

3.3 Instrumentation

The original Student Instructional report (SIR) was first published in 1972 by Education Testing Services (ETS) and based on what was then known as effective college instruction. The Student Instructional Report was then updated in 1994 to include new dimensions of effective college instruction which had been determined over the 22 years that original SIR was in place. This updated instrument became the Student Instructional report II. The SIR II Is given out to each student registered in an SIR II evaluated course asking each student to evaluate the instructor based on course organization and planning, communication, faculty/student interaction, assignments/exams /grading, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, and course difficulty/workload/pace. Also, there is an overall course evaluation question for the survey participant to summarize. There are 45 questions covering the aforementioned 8

categories and an overall course evaluation. Each question is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 5 and “non applicable”. The rating scale runs from 1 to 5, with 1 rated as ineffective to 5 being effective. Based on the research, the SIR II is a well respected, fair, and valuable feedback instrument used at many two year and four year institutions. A ‘t’ test will be used on the means of each of the 45 questions to determine if there is a statistical difference in the Hospitality Management students’ evaluations, of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. Once again, all faculty identifiers will be removed before proceeding with data collection. This will protect the privacy of all faculty results.

3.4 Instrument Construct Reliability

There is little evidence of bias in the studies and analyses that have been done with SIR II results (Centra, 2005). The content, criterion, and construct validity of the SIR II used in this research was established by the Educational Testing Service (Centra, 2005). The coefficient alphas for the SIR II ranged from .89 to .98 indicating a high degree for the SIR II per the Educational Testing Service (Centra, 2005). As indicated in the development of the SIR II of the SIRII by the Educational Testing Service, The SIR II is a reliable and valid scale for measuring student’s perception of effective college teaching.

3.5 Procedure

The SIR II implementation procedure is has been designed with confidentiality as a priority. The procedure allows students to evaluate faculty members with complete anonymity so students may answer with complete honesty. The procedure begins with assigning a student the task of implementing the SIR II to the class. The student opens the sealed envelope, reads the student instruction sheet (appendix B) and hands the instructor

the instructor's cover sheet for the survey (appendix C). The student proceeds to write the survey number on the board. The instructor must leave the room at this point. Next, the survey is handed out to all students in the course. Each student must copy the survey number onto their survey and proceed with answering the student survey questions (appendix D). The instructor's portion of the survey and the student surveys must be filled out in pencil so the faculty member must make pencils available. The student in charge then collects the surveys and pencils from the students, next, the faculty information sheet is collected from the faculty member, and all parts are placed in the envelope and sealed. The faculty member is then allowed to re enter the classroom. The student in charge delivers the sealed envelope to the Office of Academic Affairs. The surveys are sent to the Educational Testing Service. The survey is processed, compared with national averages, and summarized in a summary survey (appendix E). The copies of this summary are sent to the Office of Academic Affairs, the department's director, and the faculty member. The summary is reviewed by the department director and the faculty member. Here both positive points and negative points are discussed.

As the Director of the Hospitality Management Department over the past eleven years, I have had access, by right of position, to the results of all faculty SIR II surveys taken by Hospitality Management students. Randomly, I personally collected 48 survey results from classes taught by part-time/adjunct faculty members and 48 survey results from classes taught by full-time faculty members over the past ten years. All survey results were from classes attended by Hospitality Management students. No faculty names or identification information were used in this research. All exposed names and

identification information were kept covered and confidential. I personally inputted all data and did not copy any original survey result.

3.6 Data Analysis

An Excel spreadsheet was designed where all questions from the eight categories of student assessment /teaching and overall course evaluation were listed. Separately, forming two groups, the means from the 48 adjunct /part time faculty survey results and the means from the 48 full time faculty survey results were listed for each question. Using the Statistical software SPSS, the grand means for each of the questions using the data from the adjunct/part-time faculty group and the full-time faculty group were calculated. The grand means were tested and compared using an independent t-test. To determine whether the magnitude of the comparison was substantial, the effect size was then calculated on each of the results of the independent t-tests and labeled small, medium, or large effect size. A small effect size is indicated by $r = 0.1$ to 0.23 . A medium effect size is indicated by $r = 0.24$ to 0.36 . A large effect size is indicated by $r = 0.37$ or larger. The effect size or the r value is calculated by dividing the t test value between the full-time faculty data and the adjunct/part-time faculty data by the degrees of freedom (Field, 2009).

Conclusions from this data will include an analysis and determination if there are significant differences in student assessment and satisfaction in the areas of: course organization and planning, communication, faculty/student interaction, assignments/exams/grading, supplementary instructional methods, course outcomes, student effort/involvement, course difficulty/workload/pace, and a final overall evaluation of courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. The

attorneys from the Educational Testing Service have approved the use of the SIRII instrument and results for this research. See attached documents ‘ETS Approval’, ‘SIR II Instructional Report’, and ‘Student Questionnaire for SIR II Instructional Report’ (appendix F). Also, the Dean has authorized his administrative assistant to randomly choose adjunct/part time and full-time SIR II results from the college files (Appendix G). All identifying data will be covered while data collection is in progress. All SIR II results will be returned to the college files.

3.7 Collection of Data

From the pool of SIRII survey results of faculty members which have instructed Hospitality Management students, I randomly chose 48 SIR II results from adjunct/part time Hospitality Management faculty and 48 SIR II results from full-time hospitality management faculty. All names and identification data was covered. All surveys were returned and results were secured to provide anonymity. No copies were made of any survey results. I personally inputted all data since, as department director, I have clearance to receive and access to interpret such data.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

4.1 Results

Mirroring the multidimensional nature of college instruction, the SIR II survey takes a structured, comprehensive approach to faculty and course evaluation. There are 45 survey questions designed to gather data on eight dimensions of college instruction and an overall course evaluation category:

- 1 Course organization and planning
- 2 Faculty communication
- 3 Faculty/student interaction
- 4 Assignments, exams and grading
- 5 Instructional methods and materials
- 6 Course outcomes
- 7 Student effort and involvement
- 8 Course difficulty, workload and pace
- 9 Overall course evaluation

From these eight dimensions of college instruction and the ninth category of overall course evaluation, the following research questions were developed to compare adjunct/part time faculty members and full time faculty members in each dimension. The data and statistical analysis were developed and completed to answer each research question. After each of the following research questions, the result from that research question's completed research is presented.

- 1 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management Student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management Student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed higher in course organization and planning (M = 4.56, SE = .034) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in course organization and planning (M = 4.28, SE = .060). This difference was significant $t(94) = -4.11, p < .05 (.000)$ as the difference represented a medium effect size of .39.

Course Organization and Planning		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	4.56	4.28
P = .000		
Effect Size – Medium (.39)		

Table 1

- 2 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed higher in faculty to student communication (M = 4.64, SE.023) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in faculty to student communication (M = 4.38, SE .047). This difference was significant $t(94) = p < .05 (.000)$ as the difference represented a medium effect size of .46.

Faculty to Student Communication		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	4.64	4.38
P = .000		
Effect Size – Medium (.46)		

Table 2

- 3 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-

time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed higher in faculty/student interaction (M = 4.72, SE .026) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in faculty/student interaction (M = 4.38. SE.060). This difference was significant $t(94) = p < .05 (.000)$ as the difference represented a medium effect size of .47.

Faculty/Student Interaction		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	4.72	4.38
P = .000		
Effect Size – Medium (.47)		

Table 3

- 4 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of course assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of course assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed higher in course assignments, exams, and grading (M = 4.52, SE .028) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in course assignments, exams, and grading (M = 4.15, SE .069). This difference was significant $t(94) = p < .05 (.000)$ as the difference represented a medium effect size of .46.

Course Assignments, Exams, and Grading		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	4.52	4.15
P = .000 Effect Size – Medium (.46)		

Table 4

- 5 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed higher in supplementary instructional methods (M = 4.49, SE .039) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in supplementary instructional methods (M = 4.03, SE .081). This difference was significant $t(94) = p < .05$ (.000) as the difference represented a medium effect size of .46.

Supplementary Instructional Methods		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	4.49	4.03
P = .000 Effect Size – Medium (.46)		

Table 5

- 6 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in their course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed higher in course outcomes (M = 4.16 SE .043) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in course outcomes (M = 3.66, SE .069). This difference was significant $t(94) = p < .05 (.000)$ as the difference represented a large effect size of .53.

Course Outcomes		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	4.16	3.66
P = .000 Effect Size – Large (.53)		

Table 6

- 7 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There was a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed slightly higher in student effort and involvement (M = 3.80, SE .051) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in student effort and involvement (M = 3.62, SE .057). This difference was significant $t(94) = p > .05 (.020)$ as the difference represented a small effect size of .24.

Student Effort and Involvement		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	3.80	3.62
P = .020 Effect Size – Small (.24)		

Table 7

- 8 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of course difficulty, workload, and pace between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There was not a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of course difficulty, workload, and pace between courses taught by

adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed slightly lower in course difficulty, workload, and pace ($M = 3.20$, $SE .066$) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in difficulty, workload, and pace ($M = 3.24$, $SE .049$). The difference was not significant $t(94) = p > .05 (.65)$ as the difference represented a small effect size of .05.

Course Difficulty, Workload, and Pace		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	3.20	3.24
$P = .65$ Effect Size – Small (.05)		

Table 8

- 9 Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of the overall course evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Result

There is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student’s assessment of overall course evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. On average, the full time faculty were assessed higher in the overall course evaluation ($M = 4.31$, $SE .039$) than the adjunct/part-time faculty were assessed in the overall course evaluation ($M = 3.84$, $SE .072$). This difference was significant $t(94) = p < .05 (.000)$ as the difference represented a large effect size of .51.

Overall Course Evaluation		
	Full-time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty
Mean	4.31	3.84
P = .000 Effect Size – Large (.51)		

Table 9

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS/DISCUSSIONS

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in eight dimensions of university teaching and overall course assessment between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. Data was collected, analyzed, and results were determined following to attempt to validate answer the following research questions and their corresponding hypotheses. After each research question/hypothesis, a conclusion and discussion, based on the research results, will be presented for interpretation.

5.1 Research Question/Hypothesis 1

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management Student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis 1: There is a difference in the Hospitality Management Student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.

Null Hypothesis 1: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management Student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty.

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course organization and planning between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. Although the full time faculty had a significantly higher mean score and fell into the 'effective' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty also fell into the 'Effective' category (See Table A). Since both the adjunct/part-time faculty and the full time faculty fell into the 'Effective' category, an implication of the results could be said that teaching performance of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty were both assessed as being 'Effective' and the use of less the expensive adjunct/part-time faculty is justified. All of this being true, the research results failed to support the null hypothesis.

5.2 Research Question/Hypothesis 2

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis 2: There a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis 2: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by

adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty to student communication between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. Although the full time faculty had a significantly higher mean score and fell into the 'Effective' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty also fell into the 'Effective' category (See Table A). Since both the adjunct/part-time faculty and the full time faculty fell into the 'Effective' category, an implication of the results could be said that faculty to student communication of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty were both assessed as being 'Effective' and the use of the less expensive adjunct/part-time faculty is justified. All of this being true, the research results failed to support the null hypothesis.

5.3 Research Question/Hypothesis 3

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis 3: There a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis 3: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's

assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of faculty/student interaction between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. Although the full time faculty had a significantly higher mean score and fell into the 'Effective' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty also fell into the 'Effective' category (See Table A). Since both the adjunct/part-time faculty and the full time faculty fell into the 'Effective' category, an implication of the results could be said that faculty/student interaction of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty were both assessed as 'Effective' and the use of the less expensive adjunct/part-time faculty is justified. All of this being true, the research results failed to support the null hypothesis.

5.4 Research Question/Hypothesis 4

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis 4: there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's

assessment of assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of assignments, exams, and grading between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. Although the full time faculty had a significantly higher mean score and fell into the 'Effective' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty also fell into the 'Effective' category (See Table A). Since both the adjunct/part-time faculty and the full time faculty fell into the 'Effective' category an implication of the results could be said that assignments, exams, and grading of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty were both assessed as being 'Effective' and the use of the less expensive adjunct/part-time faculty is justified. All of this being true, the research results failed to support the null hypotheses.

5.5 Research Question/Hypothesis 5

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis 5: There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of supplementary instructional methods between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. Although the full time faculty had a significantly higher mean score and fell into the 'Effective' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty also fell into the 'Effective' category (See Table A). Since both the adjunct/part-time faculty and the full time faculty fell into the 'Effective' category an implication of the results could be said that supplementary instructional methods of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty were both assessed as being 'Effective' and the use of the less expensive adjunct/part-time faculty is justified. All of this being true, the research results failed to support the null hypothesis.

5.6 Research Question/Hypothesis 6

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in their course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis 6: There is a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in their course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment in their course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course outcomes between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. The full time faculty had a significantly higher mean score and fell into the 'More Than Most' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty fell into the lower 'About the Same as Others' category (See Table A). An implication of the results could be said that courses taught by full time faculty had more student learning, more progress towards achieving course objectives, more of an increase in student interest, more help for the student to think independently, and the students were more actively involved in what they were learning than the courses taught by the adjunct/part-time faculty. All of this being true, the research results failed to support the null hypothesis.

5.7 Research Question/Hypothesis 7

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis 7: There a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct /part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is not a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of student effort and involvement between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. The full time faculty had a slightly higher mean score and fell into the 'About the Same as Others' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty also fell into the 'About the Same as Others' category (See Table A). Since both the adjunct/part-time faculty and the full time faculty means fell into the 'About the Same as Others' category, an implication of the results could be said that student effort and involvement of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty courses were both assessed as being 'About the Same as Others' and the use of the less expensive adjunct/part-time faculty is justified. All of this being true, the research results failed to not support the null hypothesis.

5.8 Research Question/Hypothesis 8

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course difficulty, workload, and pace between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis: There a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment

of course difficulty, workload, and pace between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course difficulty, workload, and pace between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is not a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of student course difficulty, workload, and pace, between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. The full time faculty had a slightly higher mean score and fell into the 'About the Same as Others' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty also fell into the 'About the Same as Others' category (See Table A). Since both the adjunct/part-time faculty and the full time faculty means fell into the 'About the Same as Others' category, an implication of the results could be said that course difficulty, workload, and pace of adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty courses were both assessed as being 'About the Same as Others' and the use of the less expensive adjunct/part-time faculty is justified. All of this being true, the research results failed to not support the null hypothesis.

5.9 Research Question/Hypothesis 9

Is there a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of the overall course evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Hypothesis: There a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of the overall course evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Null Hypothesis: There is not a difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of the overall course evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty?

Conclusion/Discussion

The findings of the research and results lead to the conclusion that there is a significant difference in the Hospitality Management student's assessment of course overall evaluation between courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty and full time faculty. The full time faculty had a significantly higher mean score and fell into the 'Effective' category on the Student Instructional Report II, the mean score of the adjunct/part-time faculty fell into the lower 'Moderately Effective' category (See Table A). An implication of the results could be said that courses taught by full time faculty are assessed higher in the quality of instruction as it contributed to student learning than courses taught by adjunct/part-time faculty. All of this being true, the research results failed to support the null hypothesis.

Table A

Results Summary

Category	Effect size	Student Ratings
Course Organization/Planning	Medium	Both "Effective"
Faculty Communication	Medium	Both "Effective"
Faculty/Student Interaction	Medium	Both "Effective"
Assignments/Exams/Grading	Medium	Both "Effective"
Instructional Methods/Materials	Medium	Both "Effective"
Course Outcomes	Large	Full Time - "More than Most" Adjunct - "About the Same as Others"
Student Effort/Involvement	Small	Both - "About the Same as Others"
Course Difficulty/Workload/Pace	Small	Both - "About the Same as Others"
Overall Course Evaluation	Large	Full Time - "Effective" Adjunct - "Moderately Effective"

5.10 Limitations of the Study

A limitation or major threat to external validity may be considered because of the

research sample. Because of legal issues regarding teaching assessments, privacy and the non-willingness of other hospitality management programs sharing their SIR II results, this research was conducted only within the Hospitality Management Department at Mercyhurst College only. Mercyhurst College is a Catholic liberal arts college in Northwestern, PA. Also, According to the office of Institutional Research, approximately 59% of students are female and 41% are male. Including international students, the diversity rate at Mercyhurst College is approximately 11%. The majority of students come from the tri state area (NY, PA, and OH). This demographic may also limit external validity in applying this research to Hospitality Management Departments in other public or private institutions.

Another limitation or major threat in external validity may be considered based on the research subjects as the possible choices for adjunct/part-time faculty were limited to Erie Pennsylvania and its surrounding communities. Erie Pennsylvania shifts between the third and fourth largest city in Pennsylvania and is about a two hour drive to Buffalo, New York, Cleveland, Ohio, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Erie has a strong representation of hospitality facilities including, but not limited to: restaurants, hotels, private clubs, foodservice in educational facilities, health care, senior living. Adjunct/part-time faculty choices that offer industry experience are available, but not in the numbers that are available in larger metropolitan areas such as programs in New York City, Houston Texas, or Los Angeles California. With all this being true, Mercyhurst may fare much worst, or better, than Hospitality Management programs that are located near more, or less, populated metropolitan areas.

Another possible limitation in external validity is that there are no demographics

researched about teaching experience, personality, hospitality industry experience levels, gender, or physical presence of either the adjunct/part-time faculty or full time faculty assessed. Further research should attempt to find if these faculty demographics affect student assessment.

Finally, Mercyhurst College has recently offered an information session for adjunct/part-time faculty. Although this information session is valuable since it provides the adjunct/part-time faculty with information about available college resources the session's limited time dictates that the one day session covers little, if any, of the 9 categories of university teaching researched in this study. This is an external validity limitation as some Hospitality Management Departments in other colleges or universities may be housed in divisions that provide a larger measure of information and instruction to adjunct/part-time faculty.

5.11 Implications

As noted in the research, the more exposure freshmen have to adjunct/part-time faculty, the higher the attrition rate for those freshman and the less likely that they will make it to graduation. In a study by Jaegar and Eagan, the summary of the findings showed that in an institution similar to Mercyhurst, with every 10 % increase in the use of adjunct/part-time faculty instructors a 7 % decrease in first year student retention was realized (Adjuncts, 2010). There may be many reasons for this and this area should prompt future research. One reason for student attrition may be implicated by the results of this study. Attrition can be devastating to tuition driven institutions with low endowments as these institutions in particular cannot afford to lose students in this difficult economy. Of the nine student assessment research questions surveyed, 7 of those

questions had a significantly lower difference in the student assessment average mean of adjunct/part-time faculty in comparison to the average student assessment mean of full time faculty. Lower student assessments can be implied that the students may feel that their course work is not up to the quality that is expected. When quality is not where it is expected, often this leads to a loss in the constituents using that service as shown in the chapter three of this research. To look at this implication in actual dollars, if a liberal arts institution with a retention rate of 80 percent has 650 incoming freshmen and loses a conservative 5 percent because of adjunct/part-time faculty/student interaction, at a conservative \$35,000 potential revenue lost per student, the institution stands to lose \$1,137,500 that year, not to mention revenue lost in years two, three, and four. It would be well advised and financially motivated for each institution to conduct future research in comparing savings from the use of adjunct/part-time faculty with potential lost revenue from lower freshmen retention. Also, it would be prudent research to determine what courses adjunct/part-time faculty members should be hired for in order to minimize courses taught to freshmen.

5.12 Suggestion for Future Research

Because this research was of one institution in Western Pennsylvania this study should be replicated in other institutions, with different demographics, in different areas of the country. Different area demographics may have an effect on the number or quality of the hospitality management adjunct/part-time faculty available to a hospitality management program. Also, this study should be replicated in institutions with significant adjunct/part-time faculty development programs to determine if the development programs are working. Institutions with adjunct/part-time faculty developmental programs

should continually replicate this study to adjust their programs to continually strengthen the areas of teaching which students feel there is a weakness.

For institutions without an adjunct/part-time faculty development program this research should be replicated to develop and research a faculty developmental program which can insure the quality of teaching by the adjunct/part-time faculty members. With this research, institutions may find that adjunct/part-time faculty members may need to become more actively involved in departmental meetings, may need to be able to choose their own text books to fit their teaching methodologies, may need to be taught teaching methodologies, may need to be introduced to the variety of resources available to faculty including library resources just to name a few of the potential research findings. An adjunct/part-time faculty checklist should be developed. An example of an adjunct/part-time faculty developmental checklist is presented in (appendix A).

Each institution should research retention rates of freshmen and look for a correlation between the use of adjunct/part-time faculty and the loss of freshmen. This research can be done using student assessments as used in this research and through exit interviews of students leaving the institution without graduating. Exit interviews should question the student's experiences with coursework taught by adjunct/part-time faculty so any shortcomings in this area could be addressed by administration. Also, this research can then lead into a financial model which can show savings through the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members and correlate the use of adjunct/part-time faculty to the loss of revenue through the loss of students from student dissatisfaction because of the use of adjunct/part-time faculty members. Then, the financial model can compare the savings with the loss in revenue to balance the use of adjunct/part-time faculty. In addition to a

financial model, an adjunct/part-time faculty member developmental checklist should be researched and developed to insure the quality of teaching.

Since faculty student evaluations are so private with the potential of legal issues to surface, each institution would almost have to do this research internally, as was done in this study, as it would be difficult to obtain the data needed in these research areas from a large sample of non-related institutions of higher education.

References

- About the Product. (2011). Retrieved March 28, 2011, from http://www.ets.org/sir_ii/about.
- Adjuncts and retention rates. (2010). Retrieved July 10, 2010, from <http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2010/06/21/adjuncts>.
- Bawane, J., & Spector, M. (2009). Title needed. *Distance Education*, 30(3), 83-397.
- Beeken, L. (1990). Preface. *Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Development of Part-Time Occupational/Technical Faculty*. (pp. i-ii). Berkeley, California: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED326294.pdf>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010). *Regional and state employment and unemployment summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/laus.nr0.htm>.
- Carroll, J. (2003). Do adjuncts have time for student? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(46), C4.
- Centra, J. A. (2005). The development of the student instructional report II. Retrieved from <http://www.ets.org/Media/Products/283840.pdf>.
- Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39(7), 3-7.
- Clery, S. (1998). Faculty in academe. *NEA Higher Education Research Center Update*, 4(4). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Cline, L. (1993). Work to school transition: Part-time faculty bring expertise, challenges to college. *Vocational Education Journal*, 68(2), 26-27, 49.

- Cohen, P.A. (1981). Student ratings of instructions and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(3), 281-309.
- Digranes, J.L., & Digranes, S.H. (1995). Current and proposed uses of technology for training part-time faculty. *Vocational Education Journal*, 19(2), 161-169.
- Eagan, K., & Jaeger, A. (2008). Closing the gate: Part-time faculty instruction in gatekeeper courses and first-year persistence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 115, 39-53.
- Feldman, K. (1976). The superior college teacher from the student's view. *Research in Higher Education*, 5, 243-288.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3 ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Freeland, R. (1998). Adjunct faculty in the community college. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED424899.pdf>.
- Glenn, D. (2008). Keep adjuncts away from intro courses. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(30), A1.
- Jackson, E. J. (1986). A comparative study to determine the effectiveness of adjunct faculty in the Business Division of Fayetteville Technical Institute. (Doctoral dissertation, Nova University). Retrieved from ERIC database (ED294622).
- Jaschik, S. (2010, June 21). Adjuncts and retention rates. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/06/21/adjuncts>.
- Kaplan, W., & Lee, B. (1995). *The law of higher education*. (3rd ed.). New York: Jossey-Bass.

- Kezim, B., Pariseau, S. E., & Quinn, F. (2005). Is grade inflation related to faculty status? *The Journal of Education for Business, 80*, 358-364.
- Kirk, F. R., & Spector, C. A. (2007). A comparison of the achievement of students taught by full-time versus adjunct faculty in business courses. *Proceedings Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, Reno, NV, 12*(2).
- Koon, J., & Murray, H.G. (1995). Using multiple outcomes to validate student rankings of overall teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Higher Education, 66* – 81.
- Lankard, B.A. (1993). Part-time instructors in adult and vocational education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Research and Improvement. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED263797).
- Leslie, D.W. (1998) Part-time and Temporary Faculty: The New Majority? Report of the Sloan Conference in Part-time and Adjunct Faculty. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED422771).
- Marsh, H. W., & Dunkin, M. J. (1997). Students' evaluations of university teaching: a multidimensional perspective. In R. Perry and J. Smart (eds.). *Effective Teaching in Higher Education: Research and Practice*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Marklein, M. B. (2008, December 3). Colleges use more 'contingent faculty'. *USA Today*, 11D.
- Marklein, M. B. (2008, December 4). Studies examine impact of part-time college faculty. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com>.
- Mercyhurst History. (2006). Retrieved on July 1, 2006 from <http://www.mercyhurst.edu>.
- McGuire, J. (1993). Part-time faculty: Partners in excellence. *Leadership Abstracts, 6*(6), 1-3.

- Menger, D. (2011). Budget realities and adjunct hiring. [Online Blog]. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/onhiring/budget-realitiessadjunct-hiring/7325>.
- Monhollon, R. (2006, May). Adjuncts and accrediting commissions: Unlikely allies? *AHA Newsletter*, 34(2), pp. 19, 23.
- Pannapacker, W. (2000). The adjunct rip-off: 10 reasons why the use of adjuncts hurts students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Adjunct-Rip-off-10/46365/>.
- Phelan, A. (1986, June). Boundary-spanning professionals: Value-adding roles for part-time faculty. Paper presented at a conference sponsored by Empire State College on Value-Added Learning: New Strategies for Excellence in Education and Training, Sarasota Springs, New York.
- Rifkin, T. (1998). Differences Between the Professional Attitudes of Full and Part Time Faculty. Paper presented at the American Association of Community Colleges Convention, Miami, FL. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED417783).
- Roberts, H. (1995). *Academic initiatives in total quality for higher education*. Milwaukee, ASQC Quality Press.
- Schuetz, P. (2002). Instructional practices of part time and full time faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118, 39-46.
- Seldin, P. (1999). *Changing practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to improved faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. Bolton, MA: Jossey Bass.
- Smallwood, S. (2003). United we stand? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(24), pp. A10, A11.

Sonner, B.S. (2000). A is for 'Adjunct': Examining grade inflation in higher education.

Journal of Education for Business, 76(1). 5.

Spangler, M.S. (1990). Part-time faculty: Recognizing an unprotected minority.

Retrieved from ERIC database (ED321793).

Twigg, H. P. (1998, November). Uses and abuses of adjunct faculty in higher education.

Paper presented at the National Conference of the Community College

Humanities Association, Washington, D.C.

Appendix A

Example of Adjunct/Part-time Development Checklist

WHO	Completed Date	ACTION	NOTES
Department Chair First Week		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome to school. 2. Discuss regulations concerning, adjunct/part-time contracts, pay periods and teaching assignments 3. Give out adjunct handbook and discuss major points 4. Tour campus. 5. Introductions to administrators. 	
Department Chair First Week		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give out and discuss: a copy of college mission statement and the student handbook 2. Discuss newly contracted faculty member's resume and the manner in which the information in this document can help in classes 3. Explain and explain the process behind this Adjunct/part-time faculty development checklist 4. Discuss special administration procedures: reporting adjunct or student absenteeism, policies on leaves of absence, workshops, instructional needs, etc. 5. Introduce the adjunct to librarian, senior faculty, counselors, student activities director, AV/ IT coordinators, student counsel advisor and the athletic director 	
First Department Meeting		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome the adjunct/part-time faculty member to the department. 2. Introduce the adjunct/part-time faculty member to other faculty members 	

WHO	Completed Date	ACTION	NOTES	
Department Chair		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss and explore topics of concern including departmental objectives, classroom teaching methods, text(s) and workbook(s), and appraisal forms 2. Review college policies concerning guest speakers, field trips, films, other materials, projects, and assignments of students. 3. Discuss grading system and entire philosophy for evaluation of student progress within the college and department. 4. Discuss association memberships that are recommended for professional growth and development. 5. Introduce the faculty member to student/academic support, the counseling office, and student mental health information 6. Explore services provided to students and the role that the adjunct may play in directing students to counselors/academic help. 7. Explain academic advisement program and the role of the adjunct. 8. Discuss the discipline/communication problems the adjunct may be having with students. 		
	Information Technology Coordinator First Week of Classes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reintroduce yourself and explain the role of the IT coordinator. 2. Explain procedures for acquiring various pieces of equipment (usage, forms involved, time factors, etc.) along with how to set up and operate equipment; indicate common problems, appropriate action to correct, etc; detail methods for obtaining required locations for use of hardware and equipment when applicable. 3. Explain: Blackboard, Web advisor, E-mail 4. Introduce the Help Desk and contact information 	

WHO	Completed Date	ACTION	NOTES
Athletic Director or Assistant Director Second Week of classes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce yourself and explain areas of responsibility. 2. Explain the various types of activities currently available to the student body 3. Discuss NCAA and conference eligibility rules and requirements. 4. Introduce adjunct/Part-time faculty member to coaches 6. Discuss the various rules established for use of school athletic facilities for adjunct/part-time faculty including all work out areas and explain the procedures that must be followed for entrance. 	
Library Director Second week of classes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce yourself and explain the role of the Library Director. 2. Explain the services, search engines, departments, and library procedures for reference materials. 	
Department Director Preliminary Observation Third week of classes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with the new adjunct/part-time faculty member and discuss preliminary observation method. Discuss any problems that may have occurred in the first two weeks of classes 2. Present copy of observation form used 3. Establish observation date for following week and discuss the observation form and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) What will the adjunct be covering? b) What teaching methods will be used? c) What particular item(s) would the teacher like the chairperson to pay special attention to during the observation 4. By talking with the adjunct, try to alleviate any fears he or she may have regarding the observation. 5. Observe class using observation form. 	

WHO	Completed Date	ACTION	NOTES
Department Chairperson After observation		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with adjunct faculty to discuss observation. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Very important to emphasize the positives b) Carefully discuss item(s) which the adjunct wanted feedback. c) Work out an action plan on one or more items if needed 2. Write up a report summarizing both the good points and the areas for improvement 3. Sign observation form/give to adjunct faculty member 	
Department Chair Sixth week of classes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with adjunct faculty member and discuss student /classroom problems. 2. Review the college's grading system with the adjunct and listen to the adjunct's views on grading scale 3. Discuss any problem situations the adjunct may have encountered and how he or she handled or might have handled the situations. 4. Review available services/software that might help the adjunct. 	
Student Activities Director/Department Chair Sixth week of classes trip.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explore what interest the new adjunct has in supervising an extracurricular activity or class 2. Review rules of the school concerning supervision of students participating in extracurricular activities and class trips 3. Offer the necessary help to the adjunct if he or she wants to supervise an extracurricular activity or class trip 4. Explain how to request transportation. 	
Department Chair Seventh week of classes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check on progress the adjunct is making with the class. Speak with students. Explain to the adjunct faculty member the implementation and objectives of the SIR II observation to be performed 	

WHO	Completed Date	ACTION	NOTES
Department Chair	shortcomings.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="967 348 1369 411">2. Review the adjunct's final grading of students. Discuss possible <li data-bbox="967 474 1369 594">3. Discuss the assignments, projects and other work performed by the students. Is it too much or too little being demanded students? <li data-bbox="967 621 1369 720">4. Observe the adjunct faculty member later in the week. implement SIR II <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="906 747 1369 1299"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1000 842 1369 930">1. Meet with teacher to discuss observation, SIR II <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1000 842 1369 930">a) Review improvements noted from other, earlier observation reports. <li data-bbox="1000 957 1369 1020">b) Review SIR II results with adjunct faculty member <li data-bbox="906 1083 1369 1230">2. Write up a report summarizing both the good and bad points observed and add additional items to the action plan with agreement of the adjunct faculty member in order for re-hire <li data-bbox="906 1241 1369 1299">3. Give a copy of the reports to the teacher. 	

Appendix B


Dear Student:

In order to ensure the confidentiality of this process, you have been selected as the designated student to administer the course evaluation. This instructor is to provide sufficient time for students to complete the forms. Though faculty members will not see individual student responses, they will receive a summation of the results.


1. The **purple sheet** completed by the instructor is to be placed on top of the student forms. (If the purple form is not there, please request it). The faculty member will leave the room as, you, the designated student distribute the **STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORTS**. Please write the **SIR REPORT NUMBER** on the board and remind the class that the evaluations are to be done in silence.
2. Pencils should be supplied by the instructor and returned to the Office of the Department Director.
3. **Stress to the students that these sheets must not be folded and must be done in pencil or they can not be processed.** If the instructor has prepared additional questions on a separate sheet, distribute these as well.
4. Student must place the **SIR REPORT NUMBER** (written on the board) in the proper box located in the upper right-hand corner of the sheet.
5. You are to place the **completed purple sheet, all SIR's, and incomplete forms** in the manila envelope and return them to the Office of Academic Affairs (104 Old Main) immediately after they are completed.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance,
Dr. Phillip Belfiore
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Appendix C



INSTRUCTOR'S COVER SHEET
STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE



SIR REPORT NUMBER **305627**

* In the spaces provided, complete the requested information.
 * Use a #2 pencil and completely fill the circles.
 * See the "Instructor's Guide" for further information.

College/University _____
 Department _____
 Course Name/Number _____

Complete the section below for your Class Report heading. Use your last name and course number. You may also add an abbreviation of the subject or department, e.g., "SMITH BIO" in the alphabetical field.

Report Heading	
Alphabetical	Numerical
A	0
B	1
C	2
D	3
E	4
F	5
G	6
H	7
I	8
J	9
K	0
L	1
M	2
N	3
O	4
P	5
Q	6
R	7
S	8
T	9
U	0
V	1
W	2
X	3
Y	4
Z	5

ADMIN. DATE	CURRENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF AS	RETURNED
Month Year			
0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2
3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3
4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4
5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5
6 6	6 6	6 6	6 6
7 7	7 7	7 7	7 7
8 8	8 8	8 8	8 8
9 9	9 9	9 9	9 9

A. From the subjects listed on the back, record at the right the two-digit number representing the field to which this course most appropriately belongs. Fill in the corresponding circle in each column. If the most appropriate sub category is not listed, indicate the most similar general category.

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9

B. Indicate your academic rank.

- 1 Teaching Assistant
- 2 Instructor
- 3 Assistant Professor
- 4 Associate Professor
- 5 Professor
- 6 Other*

C. Indicate your faculty status.

- 1 Full time
- 2 Part time

D. In general, how was this class conducted?

- 1 Lecture - little or no discussion
- 2 Lecture and discussion combined
- 3 Discussion mainly
- 4 Lecture and laboratory
- 5 Laboratory
- 6 Other

E. Class Size

- 1 15 or fewer
- 2 16 - 35
- 3 36 - 100
- 4 over 100

F. Indicate approximate level of course.

- 1 Freshman - Sophomore/1st - 2nd year
- 2 Junior - Senior/3rd - 4th year
- 3 Graduate
- 4 Other

G. Sex/Gender (for research purposes)


- 1 Female
- 2 Male

H. Optional (for local use)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

C0088-0 MHI04072 75275-99705 • FES981100 • Printed in U.S.A.

724608



Response Categories For Question A.
Select Most Appropriate Subject

1 0	Agriculture and Natural Resources	5 7	Life Sciences
1 1	Allied Health and Health Sciences	5 8	Mathematics and Statistics
1 2	Dental Services	5 9	Military Sciences
1 3	Health Services	6 0	Parks and Recreation
1 4	Medical Technologies	6 1	Philosophy, Religion and Theology
1 5	Nursing	6 2	Physical Sciences
1 6	Rehabilitation Services	6 3	Chemistry
1 7	Other	6 4	Geological Sciences
1 8	Architecture and Environmental Design	6 5	Physics
1 9	Area and Ethnic Studies	6 6	Other
2 0	Business and Management	6 7	Psychology
2 1	Accounting	6 8	Protective Services
2 2	Administrative Support	6 9	Criminal Justice
2 3	Banking and Finance	7 0	Law Enforcement
2 4	Business Administration and Management	7 1	Other
2 5	Marketing	7 2	Public Affairs
2 6	Other	7 3	Social Work
2 7	Communications	7 4	Other
2 8	Communication Technologies	7 5	Social Sciences
2 9	Computer and Information Sciences	7 6	Anthropology or Archeology
3 0	Education	7 7	Criminology
3 1	Elementary Education	7 8	Economics
3 2	Secondary Education	7 9	Geography
3 3	Physical and Health Education	8 0	History
3 4	Special Education	8 1	International Relations
3 5	Other	8 2	Political Science and Government
3 6	Engineering and Engineering Technologies	8 3	Sociology
3 7	Chemical	8 4	Other
3 8	Civil	8 5	Trade and Industrial Technologies
3 9	Electrical	8 6	Visual and Performing Arts
4 0	Engineering Technologies	8 7	Art History
4 1	Industrial	8 8	Design
4 2	Mechanical	8 9	Dramatic Arts
4 3	Other	9 0	Film Arts
4 4	Foreign Languages and Literature	9 1	Fine Arts
4 5	French	9 2	Music
4 6	German	9 3	Other
4 7	Spanish	9 4	_____
4 8	Other	9 5	_____
4 9	Home Economics and Vocational Home Economics	9 6	_____
5 0	Interdisciplinary Studies	9 7	_____
5 1	Law and Legal Services	9 8	_____
5 2	Letters and Humanities	9 9	_____
5 3	Classics		
5 4	English Language and Literature		
5 5	Speech		
5 6	Other		

Appendix D



SIR II STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II (SIR II)

SIR II Report Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

This questionnaire gives you the chance to comment anonymously about this course and the way it was taught. Using the rating scale below, mark the one response for each statement that is closest to your view. Fill in the appropriate circle to the right of the statement.

- (5) Very Effective
- (4) Effective
- (3) Moderately Effective
- (2) Somewhat Ineffective
- (1) Ineffective
- (0) Not applicable, not used in the course, or you don't know. In short, the statement does not apply to the course or instructor.

As you respond to each statement, think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.

A. Course Organization and Planning

- | | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The instructor's explanation of course requirements | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2. The instructor's preparation for each class period | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 3. The instructor's command of the subject matter | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 4. The instructor's use of class time | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5. The instructor's way of summarizing or emphasizing important points in class | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

Very Effective
Effective
Moderately Effective
Somewhat Ineffective
Ineffective
Not applicable

B. Communication

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 6. The instructor's ability to make clear and understandable presentations | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7. The instructor's command of spoken English (or the language used in the course) | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 8. The instructor's use of examples or illustrations to clarify course material | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 9. The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 10. The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

C. Faculty/Student Interaction

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 11. The instructor's helpfulness and responsiveness to students | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 12. The instructor's respect for students | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 13. The instructor's concern for student progress | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 14. The availability of extra help for this class (taking into account the size of the class) | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 15. The instructor's willingness to listen to student questions and opinions | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

D. Assignments, Exams, and Grading

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 16. The information given to students about how they would be graded | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 17. The clarity of exam questions | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 18. The exams' coverage of important aspects of the course | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 19. The instructor's comments on assignments and exams | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 20. The overall quality of the textbook(s) | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 21. The helpfulness of assignments in understanding course material | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

E. Supplementary Instructional Methods

Many different teaching practices can be used during a course. In this section (E), rate only those practices that the instructor included as part of this course.

Rate the effectiveness of each practice used as it contributed to your learning.

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 22. Problems or questions presented by the instructor for small group discussions | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 23. Term paper(s) or project(s) | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 24. Laboratory exercises for understanding important course concepts | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 25. Assigned projects in which students worked together | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 26. Case studies, simulations, or role playing | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 27. Course journals or logs required of students | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| 28. Instructor's use of computers as aids in instruction | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

Very Effective
Effective
Moderately Effective
Somewhat Ineffective
Ineffective
Not used

Questionnaire continued on the other side. ➡

For the next **two** sections (F and G), use the rating scale below. Mark the one response for each statement that is closest to your view. Fill in the appropriate circle to the right of each statement.

- (5) **Much More** than most courses
- (4) **More Than** most courses
- (3) About the **Same** as others
- (2) **Less** than most courses
- (1) **Much Less** than most courses
- (0) **Not Applicable**, not used in the course, or you don't know. In short, the statement does not apply to the course or instructor.

Much More than most courses
 More Than most courses
 About the Same as others
 Less than most courses
 Much Less than most courses
 Not Applicable

F. Course Outcomes

29. My learning increased in this course 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0
30. I made progress toward achieving course objectives 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0
31. My interest in the subject area has increased 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0
32. This course helped me to think independently about the subject matter 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0
33. This course actively involved me in what I was learning 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0

G. Student Effort and Involvement

34. I studied and put effort into the course 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0
35. I was prepared for each class [writing and reading assignments] 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0
36. I was challenged by this course 5 ... 4 ... 3 ... 2 ... 1 ... 0

H. Course Difficulty, Work Load, and Pace

37. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was:
 5 Very difficult 4 Somewhat difficult 3 About right 2 Somewhat elementary 1 Very elementary
38. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was:
 5 Much heavier 4 Heavier 3 About the same 2 Lighter 1 Much lighter
39. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was:
 5 Very fast 4 Somewhat fast 3 Just about right 2 Somewhat slow 1 Very slow

I. Overall Evaluation

40. Rate the quality of instruction in this course as it contributed to your learning (try to set aside your feelings about the course content):
 5 Very effective 4 Effective 3 Moderately effective 2 Somewhat ineffective 1 Ineffective

J. Student Information

41. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?
 1 A major/minor requirement 2 A college requirement 3 An elective 4 Other
42. What is your class level?
 1 Freshman/1st year 2 Sophomore/2nd year 3 Junior/3rd year 4 Senior/4th year 5 Graduate 6 Other
43. Do you communicate better in English or in another language?
 1 Better in English 2 Better in another language 3 Equally well in English and another language
44. Sex 1 Female 2 Male
45. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
 1 A 2 A- 3 B+ 4 B 5 B- 6 C 7 Below C

K. Supplementary Questions

If the instructor provided supplementary questions and response options, mark your answers in this section. Mark only one response for each question.

46. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 48. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 50. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 52. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 54. 5 4 3 2 1 NA
47. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 49. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 51. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 53. 5 4 3 2 1 NA 55. 5 4 3 2 1 NA

L. Student Comments

If you would like to make additional comments about the course or instruction, use a separate sheet of paper. You might elaborate on the particular aspects you liked most as well as those you liked least. Also, how can the course or the way it was taught be improved? An additional form may be provided for your comments. **Please give these comments to the instructor.**



If you have any comments about this questionnaire, please send them to:
 Student Instructional Report II, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08541-0001.

Appendix E

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II[®]

Enrollment	Admin. Date	Report No.	Batch No.
43			



MERCYHURST COLLEGE
CLASS REPORT

Assessing Courses and Instruction

PERCENTAGES reported below are based on the total number responding, which is: 39

A. Course Organization and Planning <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
1. The instructor's explanation of course requirements . . .			54	38	8			4.46
2. The instructor's preparation for each class period . . .			49	41	10			4.38
3. The instructor's command of the subject matter . . .			72	23	5			4.67
4. The instructor's use of class time . . .			46	41	10	3		4.31
5. The instructor's way of summarizing or emphasizing important points in class . . .			67	23	8	3		4.54
Overall mean for COURSE ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING is: 4.47 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.23.								
B. Communication <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
6. The instructor's ability to make clear and understandable presentations . . .			51	33	15			4.36
7. The instructor's command of spoken English (or the language used in the course) . . .			62	33	5			4.56
8. The instructor's use of examples or illustrations to clarify course material . . .		3	67	18	13			4.55
9. The instructor's use of challenging questions or problems . . .			46	41	8	5		4.28
10. The instructor's enthusiasm for the course material . . .			69	23	8			4.62
Overall mean for COMMUNICATION is: 4.47 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.28.								
C. Faculty/Student Interaction <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
11. The instructor's helpfulness and responsiveness to students . . .			62	33	5			4.56
12. The instructor's respect for students . . .			82	13	5			4.77
13. The instructor's concern for student progress . . .			85	10	3	3		4.77
14. The availability of extra help for this class (taking into account the size of the class) . . .		3	62	31	5			4.58
15. The instructor's willingness to listen to student questions and opinions . . .			77	21	3			4.74
Overall mean for FACULTY/STUDENT INTERACTION is: 4.69 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.27.								
<p>+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4. - This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4.</p>								

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT II®

D. Assignments, Exams, and Grading <i>Think about each practice as it contributed to your learning in this course.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
16. The information given to students about how they would be graded . . .			59	36	3	3		4.51
17. The clarity of exam questions . . .			54	33	8	5		4.36
18. The exams' coverage of important aspects of the course . . .			62	28	10			4.51
19. The instructor's comments on assignments and exams . . .	5	3	51	28	5	8		4.33
20. The overall quality of the textbook(s) . . .		5	44	36	13	3		4.27
21. The helpfulness of assignments in understanding course material . . .		3	51	36	10			4.42
Overall mean for ASSIGNMENTS, EXAMS, AND GRADING is: 4.40 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 4.02.								

E. Supplementary Instructional Methods <i>Rate the effectiveness of each practice used as it contributed to your learning.</i>	Omit	Not Used	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
22. Problems or questions presented by the instructor for small group discussions . . .	3	10	44	38	3	3		*** 4.39
23. Term paper(s) or project(s) . . .		13	46	31	8	3		*** 4.39
24. Laboratory exercises for understanding important course concepts . . .	5	62	18	13	3			*** 4.44
25. Assigned projects in which students worked together . . .	3	10	44	36	8			*** 4.40
26. Case studies, simulations, or role playing . . .	3	41	31	18	8			*** 4.40
27. Course journals or logs required of students . . .	5	62	21	13				*** 4.61
28. Instructor's use of computers as aids in instruction . . .	5	56	23	10	5			*** 4.47
Means are not reported (***) for SUPPLEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS. 4.44								

F. Course Outcomes <i>Mark the response that is closest to your view.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Much More Than Most Courses	4 More Than Most Courses	3 About the Same as Others	2 Less Than Most Courses	1 Much Less Than Most Courses	Mean
29. My learning increased in this course . . .			28	38	23	10		3.85
30. I made progress toward achieving course objectives . . .			28	33	31	8		3.82
31. My interest in the subject area has increased . . .			33	36	21	10		3.92
32. This course helped me to think independently about the subject matter . . .			33	41	18	8		4.00
33. This course actively involved me in what I was learning . . .			28	46	13	13		3.90
Overall mean for COURSE OUTCOMES is: 3.90 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 3.65.								

G. Student Effort and Involvement <i>Mark the response that is closest to your view.</i>	Omit	Not Applicable	5 Much More Than Most Courses	4 More Than Most Courses	3 About the Same as Others	2 Less Than Most Courses	1 Much Less Than Most Courses	Mean
34. I studied and put effort into this course . . .			26	41	26	5	3	3.82
35. I was prepared for each class (writing and reading assignments) . . .			21	41	31	5	3	3.72
36. I was challenged by this course . . .			15	23	49	10	3	3.38
Overall mean for STUDENT EFFORT AND INVOLVEMENT is: 3.64 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 3.63.								

+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4.
 - This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.
 For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4.

ASSESSING COURSES and INSTRUCTION

H. Course Difficulty, Workload, and Pace <i>Mark the response that is closest to your view.</i>	Omit	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	About Right	Somewhat Elementary	Very Elementary
37. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was . . .			13	79	8	
	Omit	Much Heavier	Heavier	About the Same	Lighter	Much Lighter
38. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was . . .			3	85	13	3
	Omit	Very Fast	Somewhat Fast	Just About Right	Somewhat Slow	Very Slow
39. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was . . .			3	87	8	3

Means are not appropriate for COURSE DIFFICULTY, WORKLOAD, and PACE. Review the distribution of students' responses.

I. Overall Evaluation	Omit	5 Very Effective	4 Effective	3 Moderately Effective	2 Somewhat Ineffective	1 Ineffective	Mean
40. Rate the quality of instruction in this course as it contributed to your learning. (Try to set aside your feelings about the course content.)		33	41	21	5		4.03
OVERALL EVALUATION mean is: 4.03 The comparative mean for FOUR-YEAR institutions is: 3.97.							

J. Student Information	Omit	Requirement in Major	College Requirement	Elective	Other			
41. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?		90	3	8				
42. What is your class level?	Omit	Freshman/ 1st Year	Sophomore/ 2nd Year	Junior/ 3rd Year	Senior/ 4th Year	Graduate	Other	
	3		13	31	54			
43. Do you communicate better in English or in another language?	Omit	Better in English	Better in Another Language	Equally well in English and Another Language				
		92	3	5				
44. Sex	Omit	Female	Male					
	3	31	67					
45. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?	Omit	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C	Below C
		4.0	3.75	3.5	3.0	2.75	2.0	
	21	13	54	13				

K. Supplementary Questions	Omit	NA	5	4	3	2	1
46.							
47.							
48.							
49.							
50.							
51.							
52.							
53.							
54.							
55.							

+ This mean is higher than the comparative mean. See page 4.
 - This mean is lower than the comparative mean. See page 4.

For explanation of flagging (*), see "Number of Students Responding," page 4.

INTERPRETING SIR II[®]

The SIR II is designed to:

- Identify areas of strength and/or areas for improvement.
- Provide information on new teaching methods or techniques used in class.
- Provide feedback from students about their courses.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS RESPONDING

The number of students responding can affect the results when the class is very small (fewer than 10 students are enrolled), or when fewer than two-thirds of the students enrolled in the class actually respond. For this reason, a Class Report **will not be produced** when fewer than five students responded, that is, fewer than five completed answer sheets were received for a class.

The degree of accuracy for each item mean increases as the number of students responding increases. For example, the estimated reliability for the Overall Evaluation item is .85 if 15 students respond and .90 if 25 students respond. (A full discussion of the reliability of student evaluation items can be found in *SIR Report No. 3*.) To call attention to possible reliability concerns, a report will be flagged (*) for one or more of the following.

- * The number responding **will be flagged** when: 10 or fewer students responded or less than 60 percent of the class responded (this calculation is based on information from the *Instructor's Cover Sheet*).
- * An item mean **will not be reported** when: 50 percent or more of the students did not respond, or marked an item "Not Applicable," or fewer than five students responded to an item.
- * An overall mean **is not reported** when one or more item means are not reported.

PRELIMINARY COMPARATIVE DATA

The comparative means used throughout this report are based on user data from a sample of two and four year colleges and universities that participated in the 1995-96 SIR II pilot administration. The comparative means for 4-year institutions were obtained by averaging the mean ratings for more than 4,800 classes from 19 4-year institutions. The comparative means for 2-year institutions were obtained by averaging the mean ratings for approximately 2,700 classes from five 2-year institutions. These means will be updated periodically. An institution is identified by type -- two-year or four-year -- on the Processing Request Form that is returned with the questionnaires for scoring. Either two-year or four-year comparative data are used, based on that identification. However, the selected comparison group is not necessarily the most appropriate comparison group for a particular class or institution. For example, mean ratings within each institution type may vary depending upon class characteristics such as class size, level, and subject area. The *Comparative Data Guides* for two-year and four-year colleges contain class means and percentile distributions for different class sizes, levels, types of class (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab), and for several different subject areas. A copy of the appropriate *Guide* is sent to institutional coordinators with the SIR II reports.

Local Comparative Data: Equally important and useful are an institution's own comparative data. Such local comparative data -- e.g., an Institutional Summary, departmental summaries, program summaries -- are available to any user institution. Forms for ordering these reports are included in the *Institutional Coordinator's Manual*.

Understanding Mean Ratings

Ratings can vary by class size and discipline. The *Comparative Data Guides* provide data by various categories to assist users in interpreting the SIR II reports. Please refer to the *Guide* and to the SIR II Guidelines for further information. Since student ratings typically tend to be favorable, it is important to have comparative data to interpret a report fully. For example, while a 3.6 is numerically above average on a 5-point scale, it may be average or even slightly below average in comparison to other means for items in SIR II.

What Makes a Score Difference Significant?

The mean scores on all of the items and scales in this report have been compared against the scores obtained by all of the classes in one of the appropriate comparative data groups (two-year or four-year institutions). Specifically, the scores have been compared against the score values corresponding to the 10th percentile and 90th percentile in the comparative group. If the results indicate a score is sufficiently reliable and is below the 10th percentile or above the 90th percentile, it will be flagged in the report as follows:

- + This class mean is reliably at or above the 90th percentile.
- This class mean is reliably at or below the 10th percentile.

Scores above the 90th percentile or below the 10th percentile are flagged when there is appropriate statistical confidence that the "true scores" (i.e., the scores that would be obtained if there were no measurement error) fall within these ranges. If a score is flagged with a +, there is less than one chance in 20 that the "true score" is below the 90th percentile; if a score is flagged with a -, there is less than one chance in 20 that the "true score" is above the 10th percentile. (One chance in 20 is the commonly accepted measurement standard for a 95% confidence level.)

Because measurement error varies from class to class, instructors with identical means on the SIR II items may not have the same items flagged. In particular, measurement error tends to be larger when the number of respondents is low and when disagreement among the respondents is high. For example, instructors in small classes are likely to have fewer items flagged than those in large classes because there is less confidence of the reliability of means in small classes.

Copyright © 1995 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

57206-12723-SIRP1-4ELX 7/24/95

57206-12037 • CE21800X • I.N. 301208 • Printed in U.S.A.

Appendix F

Permission - SIR II

Betancourt, Juana [jbetancourt@ETS.ORG]

Sent: Friday, June 12, 2009 1:27 PM

To: Georger, Daryl

Dear Mr. Georger:

I received your voice message today which provided the necessary information to process your request.

Educational Testing Service (ETS) is pleased to grant royalty free, nonexclusive, nontransferable permission to use ETS's copyrighted Student Instructional Report II (SIR II) materials. It is our understanding that you will be using these materials as part of your dissertation at Mercyhurst College. The following terms apply to this permission:

1. The material is to be used only for the research purposes described in your request and is not to be distributed, published, or used in any other manner without written permission from ETS.
2. If applicable, please use the following credit line following the source citation on the page where you use the material and/or other appropriate location:

Reprinted by permission of Educational Testing Service,
the copyright owner.
3. You will assume responsibility for the analyses and conclusions of your study and, other than acknowledgment of the source of the questions, you will not use ETS' name in such a way as to imply participation in or responsibility for your research.
4. Please send a copy of your research results (and/or dissertation) to Juana Betancourt,
Educational Testing Service, Office of General Counsel, Mail Stop 04-C, Rosedale
Road, Princeton, NJ 08541 when available.
5. It is agreed that any changes in the terms and conditions of this Agreement must be in writing and approved by an authorized representative of ETS.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Juana Betancourt
Manager, Copyright Group
General Counsel's Office
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541
609-734-5988 (voice)
609-734-1690 (fax)

Appendix G

Hi Daryl,

Debbie Lewis has graciously agreed to provide you with occasional assistance with your need for anonymous photocopies of SIR documents. Thanks Debbie!

Dr. S

Dr. Tom Staszewski (Dr. S.)
Dean of Academic Services
Mercyhurst College North East
16 West Division Street
North East, PA 16428
Phone: 814-725-6119
Fax: 814-725-6307
tstaszewski@mercyhurst.edu