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Abstract

This critical action research thesis will explore the 40-year rise of adjunctification, the term coined to describe the increased reliance on adjunct and contingent labor in institutions of higher education. This thesis will examine adjunctification’s detrimental effects on teaching in higher education as a profession, on adjuncts and contingent teachers, and on students. Institutional overreliance on adjunct faculty as cheap, ad hoc labor flies in the face of the role that education should play in society: to develop student potentiality and capacity for critical thought. I believe that the casualization of teaching and the subsequent rise of adjunctification preclude these teachers, however dedicated, from providing the support and attention that students need to be successful. My interest in this concern stems from my personal experiences as an adjunct instructor. These experiences have informed my programmatic intervention, which is the creation of an Adjunct Coordinator Position and a New Adjunct Mentor Program. In order to mitigate the negative effects of adjunctification, this intervention seeks to provide institutional support and investment in adjuncts.

*Keywords:* Adjunct, adjunctification, contingent faculty, neoliberalism, casualization
Chapter 1

Introduction

My experience as both a college student and as an adjunct faculty member have informed and guided my thesis research. I begin this chapter by tracing my journey through obtaining my undergraduate degree, paying specific attention to the ways my professional experiences have intersected with my academic story. I close this chapter by introducing my thematic concern—the adjunctification of higher education and its impact on adjunct and student success and retention, before transitioning to my conceptual framework and definitions.

Journey Through College

Higher education has always been an important part of my family story. My grandmother earned her nursing degree in 1938 despite adamant protests made by her mother and father. My sisters both attended college when I was a young child. My mother started her bachelor’s degree when I was 10, attending class in the evenings and going on to graduate with a master’s degree when I was 18. Given this history, my attendance at college was not just encouraged, but expected.

Despite this expectation, or perhaps because of it, I did not greet college with much appreciation for the milestone that it was. As a commuter whose work and community ties were located about 45 minutes from campus, I was the kind of student who came to campus for class and left immediately afterward. I did not make friends, I did not attend a single event that I was not required to attend, and I did not know anyone except the professors whose classes I took over and over again. I was both unwilling and financially unable to change my schedule or invest myself further. There were also no programs or outreach attempts on campus for students like me, who commuted long distances and worked full-time hours.
This disconnect and lack of involvement in the college community meant that when I experienced a personal trauma, my reaction was to turn to the comfort of my family and friends. I missed weeks of class before I was able to pull myself together, and during this time, I did not receive a single email or phone call from any of my professors. On my return, what I found waiting for me was nothing. Despite the explanation of my circumstances, I received little empathy and no willingness to work with me to get back on track. Rather, I was given a clear message that despite knowing me for years and knowing my work ethic and personality, all I could hope for was a D in each of my classes, assuming that I got perfect scores on three months’ worth of missed work.

Looking back, I wonder whether someone noticing my absence and reaching out would have been the encouragement I needed to get back on track sooner. As it was, though, the experience left me reeling, and the lack of support further alienated me from the institution. I chose to withdraw entirely for the semester, but personal crises again intervened and I found myself living on my own unexpectedly. I was under 24 at the time and was required to claim my family’s income despite being financially independent and making only about 1/10\textsuperscript{th} of their yearly income. After being assured that I would be eligible for grants if I waited the 18 months until my 24\textsuperscript{th} birthday, I decided to focus on work and wait to go back to school.

Unfortunately, the lack of personalized support structures for a student in my circumstance once again left me without vital information. Because I had withdrawn from all of my classes the previous semester, my degree had not progressed, and because I had not returned to school immediately, I was ineligible for financial aid of any kind. When I reapplied 18 months later, I was told that in order to complete my degree, I would need to pay out of pocket for nine credits before I would be eligible for a loan. Given my financial position, though, I was told I
would definitely be eligible for grants once I paid for those nine credits. This lack of support left me unable to complete my degree for six years.

**Finding My Path**

I finally completed my degree 10 years after I started it. I felt an amazing sense of accomplishment, and going back to school as a non-traditional student, and a parent, made me look at my education and education in general in a completely new light. I loved being on campus, I loved being in a classroom, and I realized that I wanted to continue to be involved with education in some way. In particular, I wanted to be able to provide students with the kind of support that I had not received during my college experience.

After graduation, I took a part-time position as a professional reading and writing tutor in the Writing Center at a local community college. This community college is located in one of the poorest cities in the United States. It holds the distinction of being the only community college that is a Hispanic serving institution (HSI) in the state. The students are primarily persons of color, and many come from impoverished backgrounds. They are dedicated, driven, and hard working. Many of them are parents, many of them work full-time, and many of them have siblings or other family members for whom they are responsible. At five hours a week earning minimum wage, I did not make enough money even to cover the gas it took me to drive to work. However, the moment I sat down with my first student, I knew that I was home. They made me want to work harder, to be better at my job so that I could better serve them. Despite this desire, being “better at my job” became increasingly difficult as my role at the institution expanded.

My five-hour-a-week job slowly developed into fifteen hours (the maximum non-union, non-teaching positions can work per union regulations), and after a few years I made the move from the Writing Center to the Multilingual Learning Center (MLC). The MLC is a tutoring
center intended to serve multilingual students on campus. Given the community college’s HSI status, the importance of the MLC is paramount. A year after I started tutoring in the MLC, one of our adjunct faculty members left. My supervisor preferred having someone already familiar with our program step in rather than hiring someone new, and invited me to teach an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Reading course.

**Adjunct Life**

In the years that I worked as a tutor in the Writing Center, I had seen many of my colleagues take on adjunct teaching positions. Most worked in first year college writing courses through the Communications, Arts and Humanities (CAH) division, with a handful opting for pre-college level foundational writing courses. Many also took on courses at other local institutions in an effort to cobble together a living wage. The amount of work these women put into developing their courses astounded me, and the lack of support they received from their full-time counterparts was worrying. I wondered how they were able to be effective faculty members at each of their institutions when they were not integrated into the teaching community, particularly when they also lacked proper resources and adequate pay.

When I was invited to teach, I remembered my colleagues’ experiences and was very hesitant to put myself in such a position. I had no experience in the classroom, and I was concerned that without support I would not be able to serve my students well enough. My supervisor reassured me by pointing out that our EAP program had a common curriculum with a fully-fleshed-out course shell on our learning management system (LMS), and that she and the other EAP instructors would provide support whenever I needed it. I said yes, and joined the ranks of adjuncts in the institution.
Despite my reservations, the experience was wonderful. The MLC where I worked was staffed almost exclusively by EAP faculty, so I was always surrounded by willing, helpful colleagues who were wonderfully supportive. In addition, the common curriculum meant that my limited classroom experience was not a detriment to my students, as I could focus on building my teaching skills without worrying about creating a class out of whole cloth. We were also lucky enough to have the MLC as a dedicated workspace for students. I was able to tutor there, among my colleagues, and use that time as office hours for my students’ convenience. I felt confident that, with the safety net of my work community, I could support my students and help them to thrive.

**A Cautionary Tale**

A year later, the Dean of CAH invited me to teach a foundational writing course in his division. I had learned by that point that there was something to be said for saying “yes” and stepping outside my comfort zone. I would not say that I completely confident, but having taught in the classroom for two semesters, I felt that the challenge was one that I could handle. Once I accepted the class, however, all of that changed. I was given a book, a list of competencies, a generic syllabus outline, and access to an empty course shell on our LMS.

With no background in developing curriculum, few connections with other faculty members who taught in the department, and only a year of teaching experience under my belt, I set to work creating what I hoped would be a good class. I developed my own assignments and assessments, researched best practices and created materials to use in class, and set up my course on our LMS with no training. I did not have a clear idea of how the semester would progress, so this was a weekly endeavor. I could not prepare much in advance because I did not know how far we would get in class, or how to anticipate the success or failure of the curriculum I was
developing. As a result, I spent at least 40 hours per week developing materials, planning my lessons, and filling up our online course with resources. It was a daunting, overwhelming task for which I was not prepared, and for which I was not adequately compensated.

As I had for my EAP Reading classes, I received $820 per credit for my three-credit course. For those classes, where I was supported and provided with materials and structure, that amount was low but not absurd. For my Foundational Writing course, though, this amount no longer seemed near enough to compensate the amount of work I was doing. Our semesters are 15 weeks, and I worked 40-odd hours each week teaching, prepping, grading, and responding to student emails. My $2400 compensation averaged over that time came to about $4 per hour. And if I got sick, I would lose all of my pay for that day despite having to create a new plan and new materials for my students to complete at home. At this point, I was tutoring 8.75 hours per week at the community college (because I was teaching three classes, my available hours for tutoring decreased), teaching three classes at the community college, and had picked up another 10 hour per week professional tutoring position at local Catholic university. I spent about 30 hours a week working outside my home, and another 30-40 working at home. During that year I made about $16,000.

My experience as an adjunct instructor, even in my Foundational Writing course, was tempered by wonderful students and the overwhelming support that I received on a regular basis from my EAP colleagues. In addition, for the last couple of years, the Foundational Studies department has worked hard to create a sense of community so that adjuncts do not end up floundering in the same way that I did as a new teacher. Overall, I have been quite lucky in my experiences. Even in my lucky position, though, the disparity between what I can provide my students and what my full-time counterparts can provide their students is striking.
Full-time and tenured faculty at my community college do much the same work as their adjunct colleagues, but with a salary, benefits, job security, professional development/continuing education compensation, and a voice in institutional governance. This highlights the fact that, despite my best efforts and my dedication to my students and their success, what I can provide my students in terms of time and attention is extremely limited in comparison to what my full-time counterparts can provide them. As well, the difference between my experiences in different departments must be considered. The level of support and integration that an adjunct receives should not be dependent upon the subject that they teach. Add to that the negative effect that this has on what a teacher can provide, and the end result is that students are the ones who suffer.

Connection to Adjunctification and Critical Action Research

As a member of the adjunct faculty population, I feel it is incumbent upon me to bring a voice to our circumstances and to the disservice that the lack of institutional support imposes on our students. Because a majority of adjunct faculty can be found at community colleges and for-profit institutions, both institutions which primarily serve economically and racially minoritized groups (Ma & Baum, 2016), and because women are more likely to be adjuncts than men (Birmingham, 2017), there are layers of injustice to be dissected and studied.

For this purpose, Critical Action Research (CAR) is an appropriate lens through which to consider adjunctification. As a critical study, CAR is aimed at maximizing happiness, “bring[ing] together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities” (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood, & Maguire, 2003, p. 75). CAR calls on its proponents to be embedded within the group or topic of study, allowing them to reflect both on their own experience and that of other group members.
Unlike other academic frameworks, CAR insists that objectivity in the face of injustice is unethical, and insists that practitioners embed themselves and take a position on their research. A primary tenet of action research is the importance of knowing through doing, of using study not just as way to gather information but as a path toward social justice (Brydon-Miller, et al., 2003). Not only is this fitting for the study of adjunctification, it is also appropriate for studies conducted by student affairs professionals.

As student affairs professionals, our mission should be to act as advocates for our students and to help them learn to advocate for themselves. To that end, I believe the problem of adjunctification, when it becomes an institutional norm rather than an exception, is an issue worthy of critical study. Of course, the root cause of adjunctification is the fact that the university has become a neoliberal space which prizes individualism and money-making rather than a public space which prizes critical inquiry and human development, a topic I turn to in Chapter 3. However, that concern is much larger than what I can address in this study.

In order to address the more limited issue of adjunctification, I propose the creation of an Adjunct Coordinator position that would provide a voice on campus for adjuncts, who are often left out of faculty governments and unions. This kind of institutional investment would allow adjuncts to move from the fringes of the campus into a space that would be uniquely theirs. On a smaller scale that would require less monetary investment on the part of the institution, I propose a New Adjunct Mentor Program in which full-time faculty and staff members, as well as long-term adjuncts would be paired with new adjuncts in order to provide mentorship and integration into the campus community. In addition to providing immediate information, creating a mentor relationship with faculty or staff members would provide the adjunct with someone to contact should they have questions as they progress through the semester.
Conclusion

In this chapter I discussed my educational background and my personal connection to adjunctification. I also examined the importance of critical action research as a framework for this topic. In the next chapter, I briefly present theoretical and educational frameworks before turning to a review of key terms. I conclude by connecting my programmatic intervention’s relationship to the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies.
Chapter 2

Thematic Concern Statement

This critical action research (CAR) thesis will explore the 40-year-rise of adjunctification, the term coined to describe the increased reliance on adjunct and contingent labor in institutions of higher education. This thesis will also examine adjunctification’s detrimental effects on teaching in higher education as a profession, on adjuncts and other part-time teachers, and on students. Institutional overreliance on adjunct faculty as cheap, ad hoc labor flies in the face of the role that education should play in society: to develop student potentiality and capacity for critical thought. I believe that the casualization of teaching and the subsequent rise of adjunctification preclude these teachers, however dedicated, from providing the support and attention that students need to be successful and nurture critical consciousness in order to “make possible a better future humanity” (Dewey, 1916, p. 95). This concern has informed my programmatic intervention, which seeks to mitigate the negative effects of adjunctification by providing institutional support and investment in adjuncts.

Conceptual Framework

Philosophy

I base my philosophy of education on the premise that institutions of higher education owe their students adequate support and the opportunity to participate in educative experiences which are designed to develop their potentiality and encourage critical thought (Dewey, 1916). When these experiences are not provided, and students are not provided with adequate formal and informal academic experiences, the likelihood of student retention decreases (Tinto, 1975). Similarly, student potentiality is negated when students are taught primarily by a faculty of
adjuncts who are hired on an ad hoc basis, who receive little to no support or supervision, and who are overworked and underappreciated.

Beyond the obvious labor and ethical issues that arise from maintaining a ready pool of desperate and underpaid workers to be at the beck and call of their institution is the fact that this kind of labor—particularly the often last-minute nature of hiring—means that through no fault of their own these teachers do not have the opportunity to carefully craft their class in order provide the educative experiences necessary for students and teachers alike to think critically about the world around them. Instead, the focus of the class becomes the product, the final grade, the assignments and projects, rather than the process. Dewey (1916) explains that this kind of teaching and learning represents a miseducative experience, and positions education itself “as [a] mere means for getting ready for an end disconnected from the means” (p. 109). He goes on to say that “education is literally and all the time its own reward” (p. 109), but adjuncts and part-time faculty are often in position to create those kinds of classes for their students.

**History**

The history of the phenomenon that I and others term adjunctification begins in the late 1970s and early 1980s in the United States. Adjunctification names a practice whereby higher education and postsecondary institutions look to part-time instructors to fulfill the primary teaching tasks in their institutions. There are a number of historical trends that inform and illuminate this phenomenon. This includes, for example, the rise of neoliberal ideologies and the subsequent federal disinvestment and commodification of higher education. The history of this movement also can be aligned with a new consumer model of higher education (Cooper, 2017) that precipitated the increased use of adjunct and part-time labor in institutions of higher
education broadly and community colleges in particular. Because the history of adjunctification lies in a blind spot in Western society, I return to expand on this story in the following chapter.

**Definition of Terms**

**Adjunct (faculty)**

- Used interchangeably throughout the text as either “adjunct” or “adjunct faculty,” the literal meaning of this term describes a faculty member who is hired to supplement the tenured and tenure-track teaching staff. Within the literature (Magness, 2016), the term takes on more nuance, typically referring specifically to part-time faculty members who are hired in an ad hoc fashion, usually receiving single-semester contracts, low wages and no benefits. These teachers are rarely offered opportunities for professional development. For this thesis, I will be utilizing the more nuanced definition.

**Adjunctification**

- Not to be found in a dictionary, this informal term is used by many to describe the dramatic increase in adjunct labor in higher education over the last 40+ years.

**Commodification**

- “The transformation of goods, services, ideas, and people into commodities or objects of trade” (“Commodification,” 2020, para. 1).

**Contingent faculty**

- According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), “contingent faculty” is an umbrella term used to describe “both part- and full-time non-tenure-track appointments” (https://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts). However, in much of
the literature, contingent faculty is used to describe a group of non-tenured faculty who have longer (sometimes even full-time) appointments, better pay, occasionally office space, and who are typically employed by wealthier four year institutions (Magness, 2016). I will be using this more specific meaning.

Neoliberalism

- Entering mainstream political conversation in the late 1970s with Ronald Reagan and continuing to the present, this ideological perspective is associated with free market capitalism and lassais-faire economics. It encourages privatization and deregulation, free trade and globalization, minimal government intervention, austerity, and reductions in government spending (particularly in social welfare programs) in order to increase the role of the private sector in both economically and socially (Smith, 2020).

Part-time faculty

- This term will be used interchangeably with adjunct/adjunct faculty

Retention

- The percentage of a school’s first-time, first-year undergraduate students who continue at that school the next year. For example, a student who studies full-time in the fall semester and keeps on studying in the program in the next fall semester is counted in this rate (FAFSA, 2020)

Student Success

- For this thesis, “student success” will be defined as students’ attainment of learning outcomes, retention/graduation, personal growth and satisfaction, and wellbeing.
ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies

The Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Educators provide both standards for practice and goals for educators to work toward in their professional development. Bearing these standards in mind, this thesis and programmatic intervention will touch upon the professional competency area of Organizational and Human Resources (OHR) through the development of the Adjunct Coordinator position and through the redistribution of institutional resources into areas of support designed specifically with adjuncts in mind. It addresses the Values, Philosophy and History (VPH) competency because without a clear focus on the history of the profession it would be difficult to understand the causes and the needs associated with adjunctification. Finally, I address the Personal and Ethical Foundations (PEF) competency through my own attention to this topic, which I believe often causes real harm to the adjuncts and students who are affected by it (ACPA & NASPA, 2015).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I reviewed my problem statement and introduced my conceptual framework and philosophy. The work of John Dewey is key to my research and subsequent intervention, as is the work of Vincent Tinto (1975). I presented definitions that are core to my work, and I closed by referencing the ACPA/NASPA (2015). Competencies to ground my work in the practice of student affairs. In the next chapter, I provide greater context for my research and concern within a review of the literature.
Chapter 3

Introduction

In this chapter, I will expand on my philosophical positionality regarding higher education and the role I believe it should play in society. I will also discuss the history of higher education, focusing primarily on the political and ideological forces that have precipitated the steady increase in institutional reliance on adjunct and contingent faculty, as well as the issues of power and privilege that this reliance reveals.

Philosophical Positionality

“To Make Possible a Better Future Humanity”

My philosophical positionality is grounded in the theories of John Dewey (1916), Paulo Freire (1968), and Henry Giroux (2014). I believe that institutions of higher education hold a vital position in our society—that of educating our young people not just in subject matter, but in the altogether more fundamental matters of critical thought and democracy. As such, the university owes its students the opportunity to participate in educative experiences which are designed to develop their potentiality and which will allow them to think critically about the world around them. Dewey (1916) explains that there is danger in isolating “the subject matter of the schools…from the subject matter of life experience” (p. 8), in stripping down education from a force that promotes critical thought to a force that indoctrinates, that does not wish to develop, but instead wishes to mold. When these opportunities are not presented, when the practice of education becomes separate and apart from the practice of society, the mission of the university as an institution intended to “make possible a better future humanity” (Dewey, 1916, p. 95) is lost.
“Liberation is a Praxis”

The indoctrination Dewey (1916) describes is also examined by Paulo Freire (1968) in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, where he labels it the “banking model” of education. According to Freire (1968), the banking model assumes that students are empty vessels waiting to be filled up with information from a single, infallible source. This model of education forestalls critical thought and democratic action by disinviting questions and independent reasoning in favor of rote memorization, the parroting of information as presented, and passive receipt of knowledge.

This, Freire (1968) insists, is miseducative. It is only through authentic thinking, developed and advanced through communication between and among students and teachers, that education moves from indoctrination to the practice of freedom and democracy, and allows people to become more fully human. Freire (1968) terms this “problem-posing” education, and describes it as a give and take between teachers and students, students and teachers, in which all are teachers and all are learners, and through critical thought and communication all parties come to a new understanding. This process is liberatory because it is transformative: “Authentic liberation—the process of humanization—is not another deposit to be made in [people]. Liberation is a praxis: the action and reflection of [people] upon the world in order to transform it” (Freire, 1968, p. 79). Since the late 1970s, higher education has moved even further away from this transformative model of education toward a style more akin to Freire’s (1968) banking model.

“The Near-Death of the University as a Democratic Sphere”

The late 1970s and early 1980s mark the beginning of the rise of neoliberal ideologies regarding education, which I explore later in this chapter. The symptoms of this shift include a detachment from the work of developing critical consciousness and instead move toward a
commodified model of education in which knowledge is a product, schools are businesses, classrooms teach only marketable skills, and a majority of teachers are low-wage temps (Giroux, 2014). Like Friere (1968) and Dewey (1916), Giroux (2014) argues that the practice of democracy is impossible under these conditions. Not only are institutions prioritizing the kinds of things that will bring in the most money (for example, military and medical research, or sports), but they are disinvesting in faculty, and by default in the practice of education, at the same time. This shift, Giroux (2014) argues, represents “the near death of the university as a democratic sphere” (p. 16).

“Precarity has become a Weapon”

Higher education’s mandate should be to develop critical consciousness and democratic ideals. Colleges and universities should be “place[s] both to think and to provide formative culture and agents that make democracy possible” (Giroux, 2014, p. 17). This kind of transformative teaching requires a faculty of teachers who are able to dedicate their whole selves to the development of their students. Perhaps the most insidious effect of the corporatization of higher education is the rise of adjunctification, the university’s increased and increasing reliance on adjunct and contingent faculty. Adjunct instructors are the “temp workers” of higher education—undersupported, underpaid, overworked, thrown enough scraps to keep them coming back but by no means enough on which to make a living. These teachers take the classes that are offered to them when they are offered, but the ad hoc nature of this employment means that, often, they do not have the time to craft a course that does much more than focus on skills and job training. And because these teachers tend to work on multiple campuses in order to make ends meet, and are only provided with minimal institutional support, they often do not have the time or the ability to advocate for change.
Adjuncts do not enjoy the protections of tenure, and the lack of support means that the institution can afford to let go of any voices that ask for too much. Giroux (2014) explains, “Precarity has become a weapon both to exploit adjuncts, part-time workers, and temporary laborers and to suppress dissent by keeping them in a state of fear over losing their jobs,” (p. 26). These teachers’ livelihoods rest on not only enrollment but also the good will of their students and administration, so the position they find themselves in is one that is both inescapable and unsustainable. The effects of this uncertainty do not stop with adjuncts. The lack of support and investment also impacts the students they teach and the profession as a whole.

**The Importance of Integration**

Philosophy is essential to a broad understanding of the motives and the movements of ideas in a larger context. In order to apply this understanding in our work, it is equally important that we understand how these broad themes and ideas impact our students. For this, we must turn to student development theories. In his Theory of Institutional Departure, Vincent Tinto (1975) argues that in order for students to persist and graduate they must be integrated into the fabric of the institution. Without meaningful formal and informal interactions with faculty, staff, and peers, students are at higher risk of withdrawal, particularly when controversy arises. When students are taught primarily by adjunct faculty, they face considerable barriers in finding opportunities for these formal and informal interactions because adjunct faculty themselves are not integrated into the campus community. Among adjunct faculty, “freeway fliers,” teachers who teach on two or more campuses, are the rule rather than the exception. As well, institutions rarely provide private office space for adjuncts (Jenkins, 2014). Not only are adjuncts rushing from campus to campus to teach, but the lack of private work space means that even if they have the time, they are unlikely to remain on campus outside of the class time because they have
nowhere to go. The negative impacts on students are borne out by research which shows that students taught primarily by adjunct faculty are less likely to transfer, persist, or graduate (Kezar & Maxey, 2014).

The Importance of Mattering

Nancy Schlossberg’s (1989) Theory of Marginality and Mattering states that students are most at risk to experience feelings of marginality when they feel uncertainty about their roles. When people feel marginalized, they feel as though they do not fit in, which can lead to self-consciousness and even depression. It is not a huge jump to consider that this marginalization affects not only students but also faculty. Because of the lack of institutional support provided to adjuncts, these feelings of marginality are quite common. Adjuncts are often unsure of what is expected of them, or of whether they have a place on campus beyond that of a stopgap. They are rarely included in unions or invited to participate in campus governance, and they typically are not offered the kinds of professional development opportunities provided to tenured and tenure-track faculty. Adjuncts are rarely given the opportunity to integrate themselves into the campus community (Pettit, 2020). By definition, adjuncts are marginalized. In order to address this deficiency, Schlossberg (1989) explains that in order to address feelings of marginality, it is essential that students, and in this case adjuncts, feel as though they matter, as though they are seen, their contributions are recognized and appreciated, and as though they are needed.

Connection to Adjunctification

Part-time faculty make up approximately 40% of higher education’s teaching force, but numbers range from 30% at four-year public institutions to 61% at two-year public institutions. The numbers jump even higher when full-time contingent faculty are included, with contingent faculty making up 80% of faculty. At for-profit institutions, the number can be as high as 100%
Despite the arguments of some scholars (Brennan & Magness, 2016; Magness, 2016), the work that adjuncts do is both valuable and critical to the process of teaching in our current, commodified version of higher education. And yet, the consensus at most universities is that adjuncts are just a convenient resource, human capital to be used and let go on the whims of the market, and undeserving of the support and investment provided to tenured and tenure-track faculty. This lack of investment hurts everyone involved.

Through no fault of their own, adjuncts working under these conditions cannot provide the educative experiences that promote democratic and critical thought. The result is that the classroom becomes not a place for liberation, but a place for indoctrination, and represents a miseducative experience. Giroux (2014) explains that, “the future of democracy depends on the educational and ethical standards of the society that we inhabit” (p. 22). It is of vital importance that this cause be taken up not just among adjuncts and other precarious workers, but also among tenured faculty, administrators, students, and any citizen concerned with higher education continuing to uphold its mission. In order to take up this cause, though, it is important to understand its context and history.

**Historical Context of Adjunctification**

**Who are Adjuncts?**

Though often used interchangeably, adjunct and contingent faculty refer to two similar-yet-different kinds of employment. While neither group can boast true job security, contingent faculty typically receive longer contractual appointments, significantly higher wages (an average yearly income of nearly $50,000 in 2010), and full-time work, as well as perks like dedicated office space and benefits (Magness, 2016, p. 52). These full-time positions are usually not eligible for tenure, and are found at elite colleges and research universities. Adjuncts, on the
other hand, typically have semester-long appointments, low wages (median compensation for a class is less than $3,000, and yearly income ranges from $10,000 to $20,000 from a single institution), limited or no office space, and no benefits (Birmingham, 2017; Magness, 2016, p. 52). Approximately 80% of these teachers work at more than one campus, and 15% work at four or more. When contingent faculty are taken out of the equation, adjunct faculty alone make up approximately half of the teaching force in higher education today (Magness, 2016, p. 50).

This sounds dire, but there are some important benefits to adjunct work for teachers, students, and campuses. For some teachers, the nature of adjunct work allows them to do something they love without the burden and responsibility of full-time work. Retirees hoping to make a bit of extra money and keep themselves invested in their expertise may find a comfortable home among adjunct faculty. Similarly, adjunct work provides an exciting opportunity for professionals who are experts in a specific topic, or who enjoy teaching but have a full time job. Students can benefit from a richer curriculum provided by adjuncts with expertise and experience that full-time faculty may not be able to provide. Finally, campuses benefit both from the low financial cost and the possibility of more diverse class offerings afforded by access to a wide pool of adjuncts looking for work (Elwood, 2013, p. 63; Jenkins, 2014).

For many part-time teachers, though, the long hours, minimal pay, and lack of benefits associated with adjunct work is tantamount to exploitation. This practice is especially egregious in the humanities, a discipline which disproportionately employs part-time teachers and which has seen the erosion of its influence on the college campus as STEM disciplines have become more profitable. Nowhere is this more evident, though, than in first year writing courses and in foundational studies, which, unsurprisingly, are not areas which carry much prestige (Bilia, Dean, Hebb, Jacobe, & Sweet, 2011; Birmingham, 2017; Jaschik, 2008). The significant use of
adjuncts at community colleges and for-profit universities and the low wages that they receive represent clear socioeconomic stratification among institutional types.

**Where Did Adjunctification Come From?**

Adjunctification has its historical roots in both the market-driven nature of American higher education, and in the neoliberal rescission of federal investment that began in the 1970s and 80s and continues today. The confluence of these two aspects of higher education has led to diminished institutional investment in faculty positions as institutions are forced to cater to students and parents who are more easily swayed by amenities than course offerings. The result is a reliance on adjunct faculty which is heavily weighted among open-access institutions where its impacts are felt primarily by low-income, female and racially minoritized students (Birmingham, 2017; “Tenure Status…,” 2019).

**The Neoliberal Roots of Adjunctification**

As Labaree (2016) explains, the market-driven nature of American education means that it is designed to respond to the needs of those seeking an education rather than the needs of a government, church or other institution. In the 1950s and 60s, those needs were largely supported by both society and the government, and a college education was broadly viewed as both a private and a public good. As a private good, education enriched the individual by increasing their opportunity for economic gain as well as personal growth. In fact, one of the major motivators for students attending college were the results of studies which showed that there was a significant earnings gap between those who held a degree and those who did not (Cooper, 2017). However, society understood that this personal enrichment also served as a public good, because educated individuals are “likely to increase others’ productivity” (Romer
1994) and to embrace the fundamental tenets of a tolerant democratic society, which benefits all citizens (Mill 1869)” (Carnoy, Froumin, Loyalka, & Tilak, 2014, p. 360).

At the same time, the government had come to believe that investing in human capital and knowledge production was the key to ensuring the United States’ economic welfare and safety (Cooper, 2017). The result was significant government investment in higher education in the form of both aid for students and grants for institutions to invest in resources. One of the key resources in which institutions were able to invest was tenured positions for faculty. These protected positions provided an incentive for individuals to enter into the teaching profession and acted as an important resource for students. As a result of this broad support, the United States moved to the top of the pack in terms of educational attainment of citizens (Newfield, 2016, p. 38).

Unsurprisingly, this widespread support meant that access to education was afforded to a broader and more diverse population of students. Free and inexpensive public education acted as an equalizer, specifically providing people from racially and socially minoritized groups with access to quality education from grade school to university. Cooper (2017) explains that the inclusive higher education policies enacted in the 1960s produced “a generation of students who understood perfectly” (p. 229) the ways in which they were being oppressed and the politics which reproduced that oppression. Many of these students participated in the civil rights movement, and when they came home promptly set about agitating for changes to policies which they saw as discriminatory (Cooper, 2017, p. 229).

These student protests led neoliberals and neoconservatives to converge in the belief that the democratization of education was fueling a generation of young people who felt no obligation to respect authority on principle. The result was that those in power, particularly
Ronald Reagan and his administration, set about negating this democratization through the use of debt (Cooper, 2017). At the same time, the intensity and sheer number of student protests, as well as their connection to the civil rights movement and the advancement of minoritized groups, led to faltering public support. These feelings were exploited by the new rationale being pedaled by the Reagan administration that free public education was creating a generation of spoiled, privileged brats with no respect for authority. As well, Reagan used loose connections and angry rhetoric to racialize and conflate the issues of free education and the welfare state, describing students as leeches on the backs of hard-working Americans (Cooper, 2017). As a result, the idea of education as a public good lost its potency. Despite having themselves benefitted from public investment in education as young adults, taxpayers were convinced by the Reagan administration’s assertions that free tuition was a societal burden which should instead be a family responsibility, and that any societal benefit to an educated populace was incidental to its primary function as a private investment in oneself (Cooper, 2017, p. 240; Newfield, 2016, p. 39). When he took office, Reagan was quick to use his political capital to secure immediate changes to federal higher education policy, decreasing federal student aid by 20% (Cooper, 2017, p. 240).

For a while after the Reagan administration began its rollback of federal investment in higher education, states were able to cover the deficit. However, as time progressed and the idea of education as a personal investment took solid root, states were unable to cushion the blow. Institutions, in particular selective institutions, shifted the burden to students through increasing fees and tuition. The resulting student debt crisis has made the impact of federal divestment painfully apparent, but the impact on the ways in which the university operates are less immediately obvious. According to Saunders (2007), though, the impact can be seen in the
operation of institutions of higher education according to business principles, where institutions focus on revenue generation by increasing tuition, and rely on market-like behavior by catering to the consumer (p. 1). These behaviors influence both the goals and motivations of students who come to school seeking a degree rather than an education, and the decisions of college and university administration, in particular when it comes to where money is spent.

**The Commodification of the University**

Student and university administrative motivations converge in the idea of the student as a consumer. Because of the enormous cost to students, institutions need to sell themselves to students and their parents. To do this, they must have marketable assets with which to entice students through their doors. Rarely are these assets to be found in the form of faculty appointments; instead, particularly at four-year institutions, money is invested in amenities like extravagant recreation centers and research laboratories. The inevitable result of this focus on selling luxuries is that money for educational necessities like full-time, tenure-track faculty positions is hard to come by. Many institutions deal with this shortfall by increasing tuition or relying on adjunct labor to staff their lower-level classes (Carnevale, et al., 2018, p. 24; Stripling, 2017). At community colleges and other open-access institutions, where increases in tuition may mean that students are priced out of attending, the reliance on adjunct labor as a cost-saving measure is even more apparent. The result is that students who attend open access institutions are significantly more likely to be taught by adjunct instructors. This reliance on temporary faculty is just one facet of the stratification of higher education, and does a disservice to students who are already facing a deficit in terms of the type of institution they are attending.
**Adjunctification as a Symptom of Inequality**

While there are seemingly endless issues which arise from the neoliberal idea of education as a personal investment in human capital, one of the less readily apparent consequences is the stratification of institutions of higher education. In practice, this stratification plays out with those who have means and connections, typically affluent White students, being able to pay for selective, customized educations designed to provide the kinds educative experiences necessary to ensure good jobs and bright futures. One of the main (but often unsung) benefits of these selective institutions is access to dedicated, well-qualified and typically tenured faculty members. The role that they play in the education of their students stretches beyond what happens in the classroom. These faculty members often serve as mentors, introducing students to research opportunities, connecting them with individuals in their field, serving as references, and opening doors that are closed to students who do not have the same networking opportunities.

On the opposite end of the spectrum are those without means and connections. These students are typically low income, female and ethnically minoritized, and unlike their wealthy counterparts they attend open-access institutions which offer mass-market, one-size-fits-all educations taught by majority adjunct faculty. According to a report by the Center on Education and the Workforce at Georgetown, open-access institutions spend significantly less money per student, have fewer resources to support students, and have much lower graduation rates (Carnevale, et al., 2018).

The combination of resources and money spent per student as well as the type of faculty typically employed comes together clearly when one looks at the graduation rates at each type of institution. Carnevale, et al. (2018) explain that “White students who attend selective colleges have an 86% graduation rate, while Blacks and Latinos graduate from them at an 81% rate” (p.
The racial disparity here is upsetting all on its own, but when graduation rates at open-access institutions are considered, the numbers are even more distressing. “At open-access colleges, Whites graduate at a 55 percent rate; only 46 percent of Blacks and Latinos graduate from them” (p. 20). Clearly these differences between selective and open-access institutions favor White students, who are more likely to attend selective schools, and negatively impact minoritized students.

While adjuncts are used at all institutions, selective schools offer better pay and typically employ part-time faculty as a way to enrich their curriculum. Open-access institutions like community colleges and for-profit universities, however, rely heavily on adjuncts not for enrichment but as cheap labor to staff a majority of their courses. In fact, adjunct faculty make up approximately 75% of faculty at community colleges and 93% of faculty at for-profit institutions (Magness, 2016). For students, this is especially concerning because studies have shown that students who are taught primarily by adjuncts have lower rates of retention, persistence, and graduation (Kezar & Maxey, 2014).

The Reagan Era

The impacts of the Reagan administration’s neoliberal racialization and framing of higher education as a private rather than a public good are far reaching. Though nothing compares to the devastation of the student debt crisis which this perspective shift has caused, institutional reliance on adjunct instructors as a cost-saving measure in the face of government disinvestment has serious repercussions for students, in particular students from minoritized groups. When students are taught by teachers who are not supported by the institution, who work obscene hours with minimal compensation, who work multiple jobs in order to get by, there is a significant question of whether the university is providing what it owes to its students. As an adjunct
instructor myself, this question affects me deeply, as the story of adjunctification is my own story. It is essential for those of us who work in higher education to recognize the historical roots of the university’s oppressive and inequitable behaviors so that we may work toward a more just and equitable future.

The Power Dynamics of Adjunctification as a Source of Oppression

Though I briefly touched on adjunctification as a source of oppression in the last section, I believe that it is of the utmost importance to thoroughly explore the inherent racism that exists in this practice. Critical action research “Challenges the claims of a positivistic view of knowledge which [holds] that in order to be credible, research must remain objective and value free,” (Brydon-Miller, et al., 2003, p. 75). Indeed, CAR insists that researchers have an ethical obligation to both name and address injustice when it is discovered. As such, in the following section I will discuss Louis Althusser’s (1995/2014) notion of ideology as indoctrination, the racist and classist roots of neoliberalism, and the direct relationship of these things to adjunctification.

Education as Ideological Indoctrination

For many Americans going to college is not a goal but an expectation. Regardless of the likelihood of college attendance, we are taught from childhood that college is unavoidable if one wishes to be successful and have access to the things that are necessary for a full and productive life. Thus, we must pay the money, accept the debt, and earn the degree that will serve as our passport to “the better things in life”—a better job, a better car, a better house in a better neighborhood. In the neoliberal, capitalist university that sells knowledge and encourages students to take on debt in order to buy their degree, it is no surprise that precarity has become the norm rather than the exception (“Tenure Status…,” 2019). What is perhaps most surprising,
though, is the pernicious transformation of this idea into the new normal. Education IS a private good because *of course* it is. Rather than the university as a site of critical discourse, thought, and the practice of democracy, it is the factory producing workers for hire.

Althusser (1995/2014) identifies the mechanism that not only fuels but creates this impetus as “interpellation,” and insists that the source of interpellation is the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA), which he defines as any institution that is subsumed by the state. These institutions include religion, morals, politics, and education, among others. The goal of the ISA is the reproduction of dominant ideologies (Althusser, 1995/2014). This is not in and of itself either good or bad, but with the ideologies of capitalism and neoliberalism holding sway, the promotion of democratic ideals and critical thought are certainly not what ISAs are typically espousing. For many, those ideals are designed to remain out of reach.

**The “Golden Age” of Higher Education**

Although access to higher education in the United States has historically been the purview of wealthy White men, during the mid-20th century, the ideologies of the ruling class were focused on the democratization of higher education in support of a better-educated citizenry. The belief was that in order to maintain the country’s newfound status as a significant world power, the United States was going to have to throw its weight into the knowledge economy and invest in human capital. Those with the power to make decisions and shape US policy therefore pushed for substantial commitment to broadening the scope of the federal government’s financial investment in higher education. The result was astounding—federal dollars flowed into grants, bridge programs, recruitment programs, and historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), and “unprecedented numbers of low-income, Black, Latino/a, and women students” were welcomed into colleges and universities across the country.
This inclusion not only provided for a better-educated and more marketable citizenry, but also created “a generation of students who understood perfectly” the ways in which they were being oppressed and had the pluck and intellectual fortitude to advocate for themselves (Cooper, 2017, p. 229).

According to Nancy Fraser (2000), many of these movements were “struggles for the ‘recognition of difference’ [which at the time] seemed charged with emancipatory promise” (p. 107). These struggles arose from the dramatic shift in student demographics (Cooper, 2017), and the students involved “aspired not only to assert hitherto denied identities but to bring a richer, lateral dimension to battles over the redistribution of wealth and power, as well” (Fraser, 2000, p. 107). Their self-assurance, their youth and often minoritized status, and their demands for recognition and redistribution were powerful. However, than creating avenues for change, in many ways they created the perfect conditions for White America’s contempt and distrust.

**The Downward Slide**

At the same time that these protests were occurring, America was facing a recession. Americans’ economic anxieties made them ripe to embrace neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies which espoused private ownership and accountability. In 1980 President Reagan took office after running on a paternalistic platform which capitalized on the idea that federally subsidized higher education was creating a generation of spoiled, privileged brats with no respect for authority. As well, Reagan worked hard to racialize and conflate the benefit of free education with the welfare state, describing students as leeches on the backs of hardworking Americans and banking on White America’s mistrust of people of color, particularly in the face of their economic hardships (Cooper, 2017).
The student movements of the 1970s and 80s may have failed on the economic front, but they had succeeded in introducing concepts like women’s studies, Black studies, and ethnic studies to the humanities. In the face of these powerful new “minoritarian epistemologies,” cultural conservatives were forced to admit defeat (Cooper, 2017, p. 252). Contrary to the expectation that the inclusion of diverse epistemologies and named departments would lend itself to a more diverse campus, Sara Ahmed (2012) points out that “when things become institutional, they recede…[becoming] part of the background for those who are part of the institution” (p. 152). Because in many cases the lip service paid to diverse epistemologies through their inclusion in curriculum is front and center in the humanities, at first glance it may appear as though there is equity and inclusion; the reality is far more perverse.

In practice, institutional inclusion without deeper commitments to reform came at a price for minoritized students who saw their access to affordable education dwindling at the same time that their abstracted identities were finding space on campus in the form of departments and fields of study. Even today, these departments are able to thrive “on [the] condition that they do not in any way upset the economic premises of expanded access to education” (Cooper, 2017, p. 253). In this way, the institutionalization of minoritarian epistemologies has shifted the focus of the inequities faced by those groups from something concrete that requires redistribution to rectify, to something abstract which need only be studied.

The neoliberal/neoconservative loss of the humanities to the so-called culture wars has not only impacted the students whose economic needs are superseded by the recognition provided by the departments named after them; it has also affected the departments and the faculty who hope to teach in the discipline. As neoliberal ideologies encouraged federal divestment from education, colleges and universities have taken to focusing their shrinking
budgets on amenities and administrators. After all, a fancy new dining hall or recreation center is much more likely to draw in students who will be able to pay the tuition dollars that the university needs in order to stay open.

**The Reality of Adjunctification and Oppression**

The inevitable result of this focus on selling degrees and luxuries to consumers (as opposed to providing an education to students) is that money for the less attractive educational necessities such as full-time, tenure-track positions is hard to come by. Across the board, instruction expenditures have shrunk while the number of administrative positions has ballooned. Just 17% of college instructors are tenured (Birmingham, 2017; Jaschik, 2008); the rest are contingent faculty who have full-time hours but no path toward tenure, or adjunct faculty whose contracts are per class and who, on average, learn of their teaching appointments less than three weeks before the start of the semester (Birmingham, 2017).

This is especially egregious at community colleges and for-profit institutions, where adjunct faculty make up virtually all the teaching force and Black and Hispanic students are disproportionately enrolled (Ma & Baum, 2016, p. 5). In addition, with the humanities as the seat of democratic and critical discourse, and home to Black, ethnic and women’s studies, among four-year colleges and universities humanities is the discipline that has seen the highest institutional trend toward reliance on adjuncts. The disproportionate impact of adjunctification on minoritized identities does not end with students and subjects, however. The vast majority of teachers in these precarious positions are women and people of color, 31% of whom live at or below the poverty line. Twenty-five percent require public assistance to make ends meet (Birmingham, 2017).
These teachers, who are largely responsible for educating America’s poor, Black, and Hispanic students, are teaching under impossible circumstances. If we consider Althusser’s (1994/2014) assertion that universities play the role of the ISA, responsible for interpellating and reproducing the dominant neoliberal ideology, it is clear that they are teaching under impossible circumstances by design. The lack of adequate support for adjunct faculty, the lack of a living wage, and the lack of supervision and professional development all negatively impact adjuncts themselves. But more importantly, all of these deficiencies negatively impact the students they teach. Studies have shown that students who are taught primarily by adjunct faculty have lower rates of retention, transfer, and degree completion than those who are taught by tenured faculty (Kezar & Maxey, 2014). That said, there is, perhaps, hope.

Connecting to Ideology

The grim reality of the neoliberalism and its relationship to adjunctification seems insurmountable, yet to do nothing is as much an acceptance as it is an evasion. If it is within our power to create change, then it is our responsibility to try. Althusser (1995/2014) offers some hope for a way to move forward. He contends that the ISA is not only the site of interpellation, but also the site of struggle, because:

the…ritual practices in which a ‘primary’ ideology is realized can ‘produce’ (in the form of by-products) a ‘secondary’ ideology—thank God, since, otherwise, neither revolt nor the acquisition of revolutionary consciousness nor revolution would be possible. (p. 187)

In other words, the ISA is both the site where indoctrination takes place, and also the site where indoctrination can be rejected. According to Althusser (1995/2014), the fact that ISAs represent not just indoctrination but also choice has two sides. On the more sinister side is the idea that we cannot be fully interpellated unless and until we have tried on other behaviors, other ways of
being, and seen that the dominant way of being provides us with the most immediate gains, the
most positive outcomes. Once that has happened, we are more likely to embrace and espouse the
dominant ideologies in which the ISA seeks to indoctrinate us, and to encourage others to do the
same. On the other hand, as Althusser (1995/2014) points out, as the site of struggle, the
university offers us the opportunity to learn about and embrace ideas that diverge from those
who hold capital.

Having the tools and the opportunity to identify sources of oppression is empowering.
Being able to experiment with other ways of being is educative. For students with minoritized
identities, adjunctification negates this opportunity. Adjuncts’ often tenuous connections to their
institutions and their lack of a living wage or any kind of job protection limits their ability to
provide these kinds of educative experiences for their students, or to participate in advocacy
themselves. However distant structural change may be, small steps toward mitigating the
negative effects of this massive problem are possible right now and can be a source of both hope
and progress. As educators, it is our responsibility to take these steps.

Conclusion

It is in this hope that I have developed my intervention, one part of which is the creation
of an Adjunct Coordinator position. This position would, among other things, be responsible for
creating a sense of community among adjuncts and ensuring adequate pay, mentorship,
supervision, and inclusion in governance. In this chapter, I addressed my philosophical
positionality, including discussion of John Dewey (1916), Paulo Freire (1968), and Henry
Giroux (2014). I also examined the history of neoliberalism and the rise of adjunctification.

In the next chapter, I discuss my proposed response to the challenges described in this
chapter. My intervention is designed to disrupt the neoliberal balance of power and privilege in
the university by insisting on the recognition of adjuncts as a vital and necessary part of the university. My intervention also seeks to redistribute not only money but also resources into a position that allows adjuncts to hold space on campus and advocates for their needs. The ultimate goal is that by providing resources and support to the individuals who hold these precarious positions, we will be creating a faculty that is better able to support and educate their students.
Chapter 4

Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the development of an Adjunct Coordinator position and New Adjunct Mentor program, both of which are designed to mitigate the harm inflicted on adjuncts and their students as a result of adjunctification. I begin with an overview of my purpose and theoretical basis for this programmatic design, including goals and objectives necessary to measure its effectiveness. Next, I describe both prongs of my intervention in detail, including an overview of expected cost. I close with a discussion of potential challenges to implementation, and offer some suggestions for meeting these challenges.

Design

Purpose

Chapter 3 described the historical impacts of neoliberalism and the commodification of higher education, which have led directly to the increased reliance on part-time and adjunct labor in institutions of higher education. Although many adjuncts are excellent, dedicated educators, the circumstances under which a majority of them teach preclude them from offering their students the kind of educative experiences that their full-time counterparts can offer. The effect of these circumstances lead to students, most often in first-year introductory or remedial courses (Stenerson, Blanchard, Fassiotto, Hernandez, & Muth, 2010), being taught by exhausted, preoccupied, and undersupported faculty.

Although it is impossible to address the larger issues of which adjunctification is only a symptom, it is possible to mitigate some of the negative effects. To this end, I propose the creation of an Adjunct Coordinator position, which would be responsible for providing support, advocacy, and representation for all adjuncts on campus. As well, this position would be
responsible for the development and implementation of a New Adjunct Mentor Program. This program was designed with a small-to-mid-sized community college in mind, but could easily be scaled up for a larger institution by creating a similar position for each discipline or college.

**Goals and Objectives**

To ensure that measurable progress can be made and to define the scope and scale of the proposal, there are four goals for this program:

- Ensure adjuncts receive adequate support based on their specific needs and the needs of the institution
- Increase adjunct preparation and normalize hiring practices
- Develop and maintain a well-trained pool of adjunct faculty who can better support students
- Increase adjunct retention

In order to accomplish these goals, the following objectives have been set for each component of the intervention:

1. Create an adjunct Coordinator position that will:
   - Ensure that every new adjunct has access to a Mentor
   - Work with IT staff to create and maintain Adjunct Resource Page on the institution website
   - Develop and implement New Adjunct Orientation
   - Develop, resource and implement a comprehensive New Adjunct Mentor Program

2. Create and implement a New Adjunct Mentor Program that will:
   - Match all new adjuncts with a full-time faculty member, staff member, or long-term adjunct
Ensure that Mentors connect with new adjuncts at least twice a month for the duration of the semester

Ensure that new adjuncts are able to correctly identify at least two campus resources for students

**Theoretical Frameworks**

**Philosophies**

The development and design of both the Adjunct Coordinator position and the New Adjunct Mentor Program are directly informed by the neoliberal critiques of Henry Giroux (2014), which suggest that the commodification of higher education and the casualization of teaching through extemporary hiring practices directly impact student learning by creating circumstances in which teachers cannot teach to the best of their abilities. The combination of these programmatic interventions was conceived to address this deficiency by providing representation, advocacy, and support for adjuncts.

**Learning Theories**


*Tinto’s (1975) Theory of Institutional Departure*

Although both the Adjunct Coordinator position and the New Adjunct Mentor Program are intended to directly impact adjunct faculty members, the ultimate goal of both programs is to create a culture of commitment and support that extends from administration through faculty and on to students. Tinto (1975) explains that for students to persist to graduation, it is vital that they are invested both socially and academically. This includes formal roles, like classroom
exchanges and one-on-one meetings, as well as informal interactions with faculty members around campus. For adjuncts, who make up a significant portion of higher education instructors, this is an overwhelming expectation. Because a majority of adjuncts work on multiple campuses in order to make ends meet (Jenkins, 2014), finding time and space to provide formal one-on-one meetings can be an exceptional burden. Additionally, finding time to spend on campus in an informal capacity is almost impossible. The Adjunct Coordinator position is meant to address this deficiency by leading the charge and advocating for institutional investment in space, training, and community-building for adjuncts, so that they are better able to provide support for their students.

Schlossberg’s (1989) Theory of Marginality and Mattering

The New Adjunct Mentor Program is specifically designed with Schlossberg’s (1989) theory of marginality and mattering in mind. Schlossberg (1989) states that when people take on new roles, they often do not know where they stand or what to expect, and these feelings can lead to feelings of marginalization. Many new (and seasoned) adjuncts experience this sense of marginalization, which are compounded by the fact that many adjuncts find their classes added or removed with little notice, and therefore receive virtually no time to prepare and have limited opportunity for course or department orientation. It is no surprise that adjuncts and other contingent faculty find it difficult to feel as though they are part of anything larger than the one small room they occupy for a few hours a week on campus. The goal of the New Adjunct Mentor Program is to address these feelings of isolation and disengagement by creating space and opportunity for relationship-building and integration of adjuncts into the campus community.
**Baxter-Magolda’s (2002) Good Company for the Journey**

In her description of “good company,” Marcia Baxter-Magolda (2002) describes the value of experienced peers offering their expertise and knowledge in partnership with those who are just starting out. She explains that this kind of guide helps those who are learning by providing a helping hand while also validating learners’ knowledge and supporting their autonomy. Both the New Adjunct Mentor Program and the Adjunct Coordinator position are meant to provide good company to adjunct faculty members. The Adjunct Coordinator will accomplish this by creating adjunct-specific spaces on campus and through the development of a support structure that will allow for adjuncts to meet and share experiences. The New Adjunct Mentor Program will provide good company by connecting adjuncts with experienced professionals who are well-versed in the campus climate and culture. Although teaching in higher education is traditionally a very solitary job, external support can make the difference between a successful class and one that is mediocre. For many adjuncts, these support systems are sorely lacking. I believe that by creating a more supportive work environment, these programs will also create a better-trained, better prepared adjunct faculty who can in turn act as good company to their students.

**Organization and Content**

My intervention draws heavily from my own lived experience as an adjunct. For example, I have chosen the creation of an Adjunct Coordinator position and a mentor program to address the lack of institutional investment in adjunct faculty, and to address the “trickle down” effects of the lack of adequate adjunct support. Thus, my own experience as an adjunct faculty member informs the organization and overall content of my intervention. I also draw on the experiences and needs as described by other adjuncts (Bilia, et al., 2011). In my experience, the lack of representation and union membership has meant that despite working for my institution
for nearly ten years, I am constantly passed over for jobs, I have never received a raise, I continue to have to park in the student lots, and I have no space on campus in which to conduct office hours. My intervention has been organized to address these concerns.

Despite the fact that my institution would not be able to teach its students without relying on adjunct faculty, adjuncts are treated as though they are expendable, allowed no voice, and provided with support only if the deans and directors of programs decide to offer it. This kind of insufficient and spotty support means that teaching experiences for adjunct faculty vary widely across campus, and educational experiences for students vary widely as well. Both the Adjunct Coordinator position and the New Adjunct Mentor Program are meant to normalize and standardize the adjunct experience on campus, and this process is mirrored in my intervention.

**Program Proposal**

**Adjunct Coordinator Position**

A full-time, year-round faculty-level position will be created to work in concert with full-time faculty, staff, and administration in order to provide support, supervision, training, and representation for the institution’s adjunct faculty. The Adjunct Coordinator will be responsible for facilitating Adjunct Orientation twice per year, as well as creating a New Adjunct Orientation and developing and implementing the New Adjunct Mentor Program (described in detail below). The Adjunct Coordinator will also be responsible for facilitating the creation of a well-organized and comprehensive Adjunct Portal on the institution’s learning management system (LMS), and organizing an Adjunct Lounge (see Appendix A for more details). In addition to adjunct-facing duties, this position will hold a seat on Faculty Senate in order to provide much-needed advocacy for adjuncts in issues of institutional governance. The position will be expected to remain abreast of best practices regarding adjunct hiring, training, retention, and support. Long-term goals for
this position include advocating for union inclusion (if applicable), an elected seat on Faculty Senate, longer contracts, pay raises, and other duties as assigned. This position will report to the Dean of Instruction or Provost.

**New Adjunct Mentor Program**

In order to provide a comprehensive experience, a program will be created that is required for all newly hired adjuncts and returning adjuncts who have not taught at the institution for more than four semesters. The Adjunct Coordinator will host a New Adjunct Orientation (see Appendix B for more details), of which the New Adjunct Mentor Program will be the focal point. This program will require a number of phases, including research and development, hiring and training of Mentors, and implementation. Once these tasks are accomplished and in place, the Adjunct Coordinator will match all new adjuncts with a Mentor based on survey responses and availability of Mentors. The initial meet and greet of Mentors and new adjuncts will take place at the New Adjunct Orientation. At this time, participants will exchange contact information based on their preferred method of communication, and if interested will participate in a campus resource fair. Over the course of the remainder of the semester, Mentors will be expected to contact their Mentees at least twice a month, and to respond to Mentee queries within three business days (see Appendix C for more details).

**Implementation, Training, and Technology**

Hiring for the Adjunct Coordinator position will focus on master’s level candidates with higher education teaching experience. Preference will be given to candidates with adjunct teaching experience. Initially, the main focus of the Adjunct Coordinator will be the creation of an Adjunct Portal on the institution’s LMS that will act as a repository for resources and important information, as well as a central location where the Adjunct Coordinator can highlight
and celebrate adjuncts. This will require the Adjunct Coordinator to work closely with IT in order to ensure that the site is easy to navigate and remains up-to-date. Of equal importance will be the New Adjunct Mentor program, which will likely take at least six months to a year to develop and implement. In order to ensure that both of these projects can be live by the beginning of the fall semester, this position should likely be filled in January, or the start of the previous spring semester.

Once the Adjunct Coordinator begins developing the Adjunct Mentor program, they will need to research best practices regarding adjunct hiring and retention as well as doing extensive research to become fluent in campus resources and institutional policies and expectations. Using this information, the Adjunct Coordinator will create a training module to be used during Mentor Orientation. The Adjunct Coordinator will need to market the need for Mentors to existing full-time faculty and staff, long-term adjuncts, and deans and directors. The eventual goal would be that deans and directors would nominate individuals for participation.

Criteria for serving as a Mentor will include at least three consecutive years working at the institution, no history of disciplinary issues, and a letter of recommendation from the individual’s supervisor. Participants will also receive a stipend of $500. Alternatively, tenure-track faculty may choose to use this time as service hours for tenure. New adjuncts and Mentors will be asked to complete a voluntary survey, which will include questions about discipline, work experience, education, and outside interests (SEE APPENDIX B). If possible, matches will be made based on complementary criteria. If not, matches will be made based on availability of mentors. The goal would be to have a Mentor for every new adjunct, but if participation is limited, Mentors may take on more than one Mentee. Should this be the case, Mentors may receive an additional stipend for their extra time.
Expenses

Funding the Adjunct Coordinator Position

The Adjunct Coordinator position requires a significant commitment from the college. Based on similar positions at a small-to-mid sized community college, $50,000 is an appropriate salary offer for a position of this kind. I chose to include a range of $45,000-$60,000 to be decided upon based on experience and education. In addition, because this is a full-time position, it will require a benefits package of about $20,000. For this reason, the total cost for the position should be between $65,000 and $80,000 annually. In order to fund this position, a grant or soft money should be considered. The initial request should be for a pilot of two to three years, during which time the success of the position will be assessed. This assessment would look for information regarding adjunct and student retention, adjunct well-being, and student success, as aligns with the intervention goals and objectives. The results of these assessments will provide necessary qualitative and quantitative data that will speak to the ways in which the position benefits the institution. Ideally, the institution would eventually support the position and with permanent dollars.

Funding the New Adjunct Mentor Program

The final component of my intervention, the New Adjunct Mentor program, is geared toward supporting and integrating adjuncts into the campus community. This program has a few components. First, potential mentors need to be located and encouraged to participate. Although a long-term goal for the program includes participation becoming a requirement of select full-time positions, participation in the program will need to be on a voluntary basis to start. Gathering Mentors will require marketing in the form of posters and email communications, and incentives will be monetary. Mentors will be expected to spend about two hours in training, three
hours at New Adjunct Orientation, and four to five hours with their Mentee. Compensation will include a $500 stipend for up to 15 volunteers. Initially, this incentive will be paid for through donations from various departments, the solicitation of which would be one of the Adjunct Coordinator’s duties. Long-term investment would be in the form of a departmental “tax” per new adjunct hired for the semester.

In order to participate in the program, Mentors will be required to attend a two hour training where they will refresh themselves on information about the institution and learn about best practices for integrating, supporting and retaining new adjunct instructors. This workshop will include a meal and other refreshments, a pen and binder of printed materials that Mentors can take with them, as well as lanyards with name badges and Mentor t-shirts.

The final piece of the Mentor Program is the New Adjunct Orientation where new adjuncts will learn about the campus and its community and meet their assigned Mentor. This three hour Orientation will include a meal and other refreshments, a pen and binder of printed materials for the adjunct to take with them, name badges and lanyards, a Mentee t-shirt, and a whiteboard marker.

Research and material development for each event will be part of the Adjunct Coordinator position. My hope is that the Adjunct Coordinator position would have a budget of its own from which adjunct compensation will be pulled. Should this budget exist, Mentor Training and New Adjunct Orientation would be funded from there. If not, funding would come partly from whatever budget is responsible for adjunct compensation and partly from donations from departments. Space for each event would be on campus and therefore free. The total cost for both aspects of this intervention would be approximately $100,000 annually.
Limitations

Finally, it is important to consider the limitations of this programmatic intervention. First and foremost will be institutional buy-in. Adjuncts represent inexpensive, flexible labor, and the reason that there is an issue around support for this population is that institutions do not want to spend the extra money. The most effective route to addressing this limitation will be programmatic assessment as it relates to adjunct and student retention, but of course that cannot happen until the position and program have had years to prove their worth. Until then, presenting current research on the benefits of adjunct support for students and institutions is likely the most effective way to encourage institutions to make this a reality. Another important factor will be encouraging other like-minded stakeholders to promote the cause, particularly tenured faculty who have a more solid platform from which to speak.

A final challenge is scheduling. Adjuncts are overworked and their time is exploited already, and adding yet another requirement to their already over-full schedules is a potentially unfair expectation. That said, for the well-being of students, it is important that faculty are well-trained and well-versed on the resources available on campus, and New Adjunct Orientation is a quick, comprehensive way to provide that information. However, in the interest of fairness, all information covered during Orientation should be available on the Adjunct Portal for them to peruse at their convenience. As well, adjuncts could be invited to attend Orientation via a video conferencing tool if circumstances preclude them from attending.

Conclusion

In this chapter I discussed the creation of an Adjunct Coordinator position and a New Adjunct Mentor Program as effective ways to address the lack of institutional support for adjunct faculty. I also presented training, technology, and expenses, as well as potential challenges to
implementation. In the next chapter, I address assessment and evaluation. I conclude by considering limitations to this project, and future considerations.
Chapter 5

Introduction

In this chapter, I will address the role of leadership in navigating change, in offering support for adjuncts, and in bringing the Adjunct Coordinator position and the New Adjunct Mentor Program to fruition. I will also consider the importance of assessment and evaluation in ensuring that this intervention is meeting its proposed goals and is not excluding or alienating anyone unintentionally. Finally, I will discuss limitations and consider the role of adjunctification in higher education during the current COVID-19 crisis.

Role of Leadership

The focus in creating this intervention has been primarily on nurturing a culture of support for adjuncts so that ultimately they can support their students. Many adjuncts feel called to teach, but also feel undersupported and undervalued by their institutions. Additionally, they find it difficult or even impossible to create the kind of environment in which leadership development can occur in their classrooms (Pons, et al., 2017). The lack of support for adjuncts is felt at institutions across the United States, and both the Adjunct Coordinator position and the New Adjunct Mentor Program are designed to provide both support and leadership for the adjuncts that they serve. I now turn to addressing challenges to implementation.

Challenges to Implementation

One of the main benefits of primarily hiring from a pool of adjuncts is the fact that adjuncts are flexible, quick to accept opportunities to teach, and, most importantly, they are cheap labor. Convincing administration to invest money and resources into the creation of the Adjunct Coordinator position and the New Adjunct Mentor Program will likely be difficult. Creating the circumstances under which this kind of endeavor might be met with willingness will
require visionary leadership, boldness, and persistence. It will also require the support of deans, program directors, and other stakeholders who may or may not see the value in supporting this population of teachers.

**Leadership in Addressing Adjunctification**

Two theoretical models ground my thoughts on leadership as it relates to my intervention: Whitten-Andrews’ (2016) addition of Comprehensive Support to the Social Change Model of Leadership and Meyerson’s (2001) navigating change through Strategic Alliance Building.

**The Social Change Model of Leadership with Comprehensive Support**

One important argument in favor of this intervention is that adjuncts are often required to be leaders. Adjuncts lead classes, lead students, and are the face of the university for many students. However, it is incredibly difficult to lead well when adjuncts themselves do not receive adequate leadership or support. In developing the Adjunct Coordinator position and New Adjunct Mentor Program I focused heavily on this limitation in conjunction with the Social Change Model of Leadership (SCM) as described by Jeannie Whitten-Andrews (2016). The SCM is designed to develop individual, group, and community leadership skills for students. There are 7 Cs associated with each level of the SCM—Consciousness of self, Congruence, and Commitment make up the Individual values; Collaboration, Common Purpose, and Controversy with civility make up the Group values; and Citizenship makes up the Society/Community values. In Whitten-Andrews (2016) addition to the model, she includes Comprehensive Support in order to address the structural and external forces that affect individuals’ ability to benefit from the SCM. The values she associates with Comprehensive Support include Contextual Support and College Support (p. 206).
Community colleges employ a large percent of adjunct faculty (Pettit, 2020), and because they are also more likely to enroll students from minoritized groups (“Tenure Status…,” 2019), the added Comprehensive Support elements are especially applicable to working with community college students, staff, and faculty. I developed the Adjunct Coordinator position and New Adjunct Mentor Program with this population in mind. My intervention is situated firmly within the College Support value, which “focuses on the responsibilities of the college as a whole (particularly administration) in supporting an environment where staff, faculty, and students are able to successfully access and engage in effective leadership development.” (Whitten-Andrews, 2016, p. 206). Whitten-Andrews explains that in order to ensure that students receive the educative experiences that they rightfully expect when they come to college, it is essential that the faculty who serve them receive adequate support, like institutional resources professional development and training, care, and equitable hiring practices (Whitten-Andrews, 2016, p. 207).

Like Whitten-Andrews (2016), I believe that it is not possible to facilitate leadership development in the classroom when one is laboring without access to institutional resources. Whitten-Andrews (2016) explains that these deficiencies should be “addressed by student affairs through professional development, redistribution of institutional resources, and staff care” (p. 207), among other things. With this in mind, both the Adjunct Coordinator position and the New Adjunct Mentor Program are meant to provide leadership for adjuncts and resources that adjuncts can use to provide adequate leadership and support to their students.

**Navigating Change through Strategic Alliance Building**

Change is never easy to accomplish, and when change disrupts the status quo it is even harder to manage. One effective way to navigate change is through partnerships with other
concerned parties. Debra Meyerson (2001) describes the value of “strategic alliance building” thus: “…they gain a sense of legitimacy, access to resources and contacts, technical and task assistance, emotional support, and advice…[as well as] the power to move issues to the forefront more quickly than they might by working alone,” (p. 99). It is difficult for any substantial change to occur when a majority of decision-makers are either actively against the idea or are not convinced of its value. Although there can be power in a single voice advocating for change, there is considerably more weight to an argument that is championed by a visionary leader who has already brought others over to their way of thinking. There is power in numbers, especially when those numbers include a group of likeminded and concerned stakeholders.

**Assessment and Evaluation**

Assessment and evaluation are essential parts of any program to ensure that the program is serving the role it is meant to serve. For the Adjunct Coordinator position, clear expectations and specific goals should be shared and discussed when the successful candidate is hired. Evaluation of performance will come in the form of yearly reviews, which should focus on adjunct satisfaction and retention, as well as successful completion of projects. An assessment of student and adjunct evaluations will be an important component of this process as well. This review should be conducted by the Dean of Instruction.

Assessment and evaluation of The New Adjunct Mentor Program will occur mainly in the form of surveys (see Appendices E, F, & G). New adjuncts and Mentors will receive a survey before, during, and after their experience in the program. Questions will be on a range of topics, but for new adjuncts will focus primarily on how well-supported the new adjunct feels, what aspects of the program were most and least effective, and how well-equipped to answer questions their Mentor was. Mentors will be asked questions regarding their training, how well-
equipped they felt they were to address questions posed by new adjuncts, how well-supported they felt by the AC over the course of the program, and so on. As well, new adjuncts will be asked to complete a satisfaction survey following New Adjunct Orientation. These surveys will be on a five point Likert scale, with the option to write more detailed observations and opinions included. For individuals who chose a rating below three, there will be a request for more feedback and the offer of a one-on-one meeting with the Adjunct Coordinator to find out more about what went wrong.

I chose this programmatic intervention because of my personal experience and what worked best for me, but it is essential that the program be flexible and open to change based on the needs of new adjuncts and Mentors. This is of the utmost importance because the program should be designed not just with adjuncts in mind, but with them in practice. Because these measures are meant to instill a sense of community and support, a survey will allow both Mentors and new adjuncts to bring their authentic voices to the table and be heard. Not only will this method help to foster that sense of community, but it will also allow the Adjunct Coordinator to tailor the program to adjunct needs as adjuncts see them.

Limitations and Looking Ahead

Limitations

This programmatic intervention is designed for a small-to-mid-sized community college, but it could be scaled up to include multiple positions, for example, one Adjunct Coordinator for each department or College (e.g., College of Arts and Sciences, College of Education). An increase in the number of Adjunct Coordinators, however, would require a shift in duties, and would likely make representation on Faculty Senate difficult or impossible. Funding is also a limitation, and would be dependent upon the kind of institution for which the program is
intended. For example, at a larger institution with fewer adjuncts, a teaching component may make sense in order to ensure there is enough work to warrant a full-time position. In this scenario, a terminal degree would be expected.

Another limitation is the lack of tenured faculty support. The safety of tenure is a powerful platform from which to advocate, but the plight of their contingent colleagues is often overlooked by tenured and tenure-track faculty who do not experience the same kinds of barriers or concerns. That said, adjunctification impacts all faculty in higher education by taking up space where tenured positions used to be offered, by undermining the value of faculty to the institution, and by casualizing the profession of teaching in higher education. It is in tenured faculty’s best interest to speak on behalf of their adjunct colleagues, yet it remains frustratingly taboo.

A final limitation for this thesis and its intervention is the sheer size of the structural and systemic issues that have led to adjunctification in the first place. That said, other structural issues that are related but beyond the scope of this intervention include longer adjunct contracts to ensure continuity of faculty for students, pay increases for adjuncts, a stronger voice from full-time faculty members in support of their part-time colleagues, and more full-time positions on campuses across the country.

Looking Ahead

Given the current circumstances of COVID-19 and the potentially devastating effect it may have on institutions of higher education in the United States and across the world, talking about more full-time positions and higher pay may seem like a fantasy. With campuses already talking about remaining closed until 2021 (Dickler, 2020), polls showing that high school seniors are seriously considering postponing their first year until this crisis passes (Seltzer, 2020), anecdotal evidence of hiring freezes at institutions across the country, and the years-long
recession that could be on the horizon, the question of what institutions will do about adjuncts is a poignant one. So far in the last few weeks I have seen articles that suggest that adjuncts will save institutions, and at the same time have spoken directly with people who say their institutions are considering consolidating all of their classes to tenured faculty and not inviting any adjuncts to teach. Although I would love to look to the future with hope, I am skeptical. At the very least, I think it is safe to say that higher education will never be the same after this crisis recedes. Regardless, it is clear that colleges and universities will likely rely on temporary, flexible faculty to meet the demand of the institution to balance the need for teachers and the need to be fiscally aware. Investing in the most vulnerable faculty on campus will also be an investment in the students they are hired to serve.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I discussed the value and necessity of leadership, specifically the importance of allies when one is attempting to navigate change. I also considered the importance of assessment and evaluation in providing honest and accurate appraisal of programmatic success. I concluded with observations about the COVID-19 crisis and its potential relationship to adjunctification as higher education attempts to navigate this crisis.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Adjunct Coordinator Position—Job Description

This full-time, year-round position works with adjunct instructors, full-time faculty, administration, and staff to provide support, supervision, guidance, and representation to the institution’s adjunct population. The successful candidate will be responsible for developing and implementing Adjunct Orientation, facilitating the Adjunct Mentor program, supervising and evaluating adjunct performance, and developing and updating relevant documents. This position reports to the Dean of Instruction.

Responsibilities:

1. Collaborate with Human Resources and other departments in the adjunct hiring process
2. Onboard new adjunct faculty each semester
3. Participate in planning, organizing and facilitating Adjunct Orientation
4. Conduct supervision of adjuncts through in-class evaluation and assessment of student success & retention
5. Collaborate with other departments to provide adjunct faculty with professional and skill development
6. Organize an Adjunct Lounge and creating other opportunities for community development
7. Facilitate the creation and maintenance of an engaging and attractive Adjunct Website complete with resources, information about campus events, training opportunities, etc.
8. Develop and implement a New Adjunct Mentor Program, to include developing training materials and recruiting and training Mentors from currently employed full-time staff and faculty
9. Research and stay abreast of best practices for hiring, retaining, and supporting adjunct instructors

10. Participate in Faculty Senate, strategic planning, and budget development, as well as attend relevant meetings

*Required Qualifications:*

1. Master’s degree in Higher Education or related field
2. At least five years’ experience in higher education
3. Experience in faculty development, curriculum development, and staff training & orientation
4. Excellent written and verbal skills
5. Strong problem solving and decision making skills
6. Demonstrated strong interpersonal skills, particularly the ability to work well with all levels of staff and faculty and the ability to bring teams together

*Preferred Qualifications:*

1. Bilingual Spanish/English
2. Experience as an adjunct instructor
Appendix B

New Adjunct Orientation Schedule—11:00-2:00 (suggested)

11:00: Welcome from the President

11:30: Overview of institution, expectations, etc.

12:00: Brief break-out session with deans/department/program directors

12:30: Mentor-Mentee match-ups

1:00: Lunch with Mentor

1:00-2:00: Option Resource Fair
Appendix C

Mentor Program—Mentor Expectations

Role of the Mentor

As a Mentor, your job is to orient your Mentee both to the physical campus and to the campus community. During your initial meeting, you will take your Mentee around campus, introducing them to important resources that they may find helpful. In addition, you will help your Mentee understand our mission, policies, and procedures. Your most important role as a Mentor representing our College is to model integrity, compassion, and excellence.

Expectations:

If possible, you will be matched with your Mentee based on your Match Survey responses. Your appointment as a Mentor will last for one semester. During that time, there are a number of ways in which you will be expected to provide guidance to your Mentee:

1. Attend and complete the Mentor Training Program
2. Attend New Adjunct Orientation and participate in the pairing process
3. Provide your Mentee with any relevant materials you possess for the classes they will be teaching
4. Respond to questions from your Mentee within three business days
5. Conduct at least one face-to-face meeting (based on your Mentee’s schedule) during the semester
6. Contact your Mentee at least once per month using your agreed upon method of communication over the course of the semester
7. Engage your Mentee in academic discussions relevant to your field, including sharing new information, articles, research, and developments
8. Complete Initial, Mid-Semester, and End of Semester reports through Google Forms by the specified due dates
Appendix D

Match Survey

Please answer the following questions. If possible, matches will be made based on complementary responses.

1. How long have you worked in education? In what capacities?

2. What subjects/classes have you taught?

3. In which subjects do you hold degrees? At what level?

4. What drew you to teaching?

5. What drew you to [this institution]?

6. Do you have any hobbies or unique interests?

7. What is your preferred form of communication? Please circle all that apply.
   - email
   - face to face
   - text
   - phone call
Appendix E

New Adjunct Mentor Program Pre-Survey (Mentor Version)

1. What do you expect to gain from this experience?

2. What tools and resources would be helpful for you over the coming semester?

3. Why did you choose to participate in the New Adjunct Mentor Program?
Appendix F

New Adjunct Mentor Program Mid-Semester Questionnaire (Mentee Version)

Please respond to the following questions using a scale of 1-5, with 1 being the most negative, and 5 being the most positive.

1. I am happy with my mentor.

2. I feel supported by my mentor.

3. I feel supported by the institution.

4. This experience is meeting my expectations.

Below, please write any observations, positive or negative, that you would like to share.
Appendix G

New Adjunct Mentor Program Post-Survey (Mentee Version)

Please respond to the following questions using a scale of 1-5, with 1 being the most negative, and 5 being the most positive.

1. I was happy with my mentor.
   a. Please explain your answer

2. I felt supported by my mentor.
   a. Please explain your answer

3. I felt supported by the institution.
   a. Please explain your answer

4. This experience met my expectations.
   a. Please explain your answer
Please answer the following questions in a few sentences.

What did you enjoy most about this program? What did you enjoy least?

Below, please write any observations, positive or negative, that you would like to share.