
Adjuncts and Mission: Maintaining Distinctives in an Era of Part-Time Faculty

DAVID J. BURNS
Xavier University
burnsd@xavier.edu

YVONNE SMITH
University of La Verne
ysmith@laverne.edu

KEITH STARCHER
Indiana Wesleyan University
Keith.Starcher@indwes.edu

ABSTRACT: Adjunct faculty members are teaching an increasing percentage of courses in higher education. Consequently, adjunct rather than full-time faculty members are increasingly responsible for the transmission of their institutions' missions to students. Are adjunct faculty members successful in transmitting mission to students? In Christian colleges and universities, are adjunct faculty members capable of appropriately integrating faith into their classrooms? The purpose of this paper is to review existing research and to establish an agenda for further research in this area, particularly as it relates to Christian colleges and universities.

INTRODUCTION

In the past thirty years, a quiet revolution has taken place in U.S. higher education (Langen, 2011). In 1969, roughly 78 percent of instructional faculty at colleges and universities were full time and tenured or on tenure track. That percentage has since declined to 33 percent (Kezar & Sam, 2010; Kuchera & Miller, 1988; Martinak, Karlsson, Faircloth, & Witcher, 2006). Even when considering that this statistic includes graduate students who are teaching classes and full-time professors who are not on the tenure track, the relatively rapid change in the makeup of faculties at most colleges and universities is startling. Indeed, over half of all college-level classes offered in some disciplines are taught by part-time, adjunct teachers (June, 2012) and the percentage of classes taught by adjunct faculty members is expected to continue to increase (Komos, 2013; Lazerson, 2010).

Although adjunct faculty members can bring much to an institution, their part-time status means they are com-

monly viewed as a supplementary workforce, tangential to the "real" activities of the institution (Kezar & Sam, 2010; Morton, 2012). There is evidence that this looser connection to the institution extends to the mission of the college or university (Ballantyne, Berret, & Harst, 2010). Adjunct faculty members often have less knowledge of, and experience with, their institutions' missions than their full-time counterparts.

Adjunct faculty members teach classes at all levels, from initial freshman classes to senior capstone classes. At many colleges and universities, a high percentage of lower-level (freshman and sophomore) general education core courses are taught by adjunct faculty members (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Core courses required of all students have historically provided a forum to convey institutions' missions and distinctives to entering students (Filby, 2007). If core classes are taught primarily by adjunct faculty members, then these instructors obviously become largely responsible for initially authenticating the missions of their institutions to students.

Adjunct faculty members also frequently teach upper-division major-based courses, particularly in professional programs, including business. In upper-division courses, the foundation in mission hopefully established in lower-division courses is built upon and made manifest in the students' areas of study. When these courses are taught by adjunct faculty members, they become responsible for integrating the mission into the majors that students pursue. For professors in these upper-division courses as well as those providing instruction in the core classes, integrating the mission into their courses is something which some adjunct faculty members may not be equipped or motivated to do.

This is not to say that adjunct faculty members are not able to effectively convey their colleges' missions to students. Anecdotally, many full-time professors can identify adjunct faculty members who hold the missions of their universities high and effectively pass them on to their students. But as turnover occurs, as "longtime" adjunct faculty members retire, and as the numbers of adjunct faculty members increase, it becomes more likely that at best, mission will be inconsistently taught, or at worst, not taught at all.

When considering mission-based colleges and universities (institutions of higher education that are private, integrally related to religious belief, and which purposefully keep mission at the forefront of their endeavors (VanZanten, 2011), this trend is troubling. Indeed, Weissman (2013) reported that significantly higher percentages of faculty members at private colleges and universities are part-time adjuncts than at public colleges and universities. Hence, it appears that colleges and universities for whom mission is particularly important are apt to use larger numbers of adjunct faculty members. Are mission-based colleges and universities able to maintain their mission within this environment?

One form of mission-based institution of higher learning, Christian colleges and universities, for instance, exist to fulfill a mission which is broader than merely providing education. A quick review of the websites of Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCCU) members makes clear that the missions of these institutions involve providing students the means by which to develop Godly principles and thinking into their lives and careers. Integrating faith throughout the institutions, particularly into academic courses, is viewed as a critical part of conveying the missions of these institutions. Hence, faith integration becomes important for all faculty, including adjunct faculty members. The ability of adjunct faculty members to integrate faith into their classes, therefore, becomes essential to Christian colleges and universities.

The importance of faith integration extends to all disciplinary areas — business programs are not an exception. While it is difficult to locate accurate figures for the percentage of business courses taught by adjunct faculty members in CCCU member institutions, it is likely that adjuncts are teaching a high percentage of these courses. These are upper-division courses that act to synthesize and apply Christian mission and its relationship to business in the minds of students. Appropriate integration in these courses is essential to producing students who will effectively manifest Christ in their business careers (Bovee & O'Brien, 2007; Smith, 2008; Wallace, 2010). This responsibility, however, is increasingly being placed into the hands of adjunct faculty members.

Although mission delivery is not necessarily a problem for some universities, it is critical for Christian institutions. Surprisingly, there is relatively little literature on the subject of adjuncts, faith integration, and mission. The purpose of this paper is to review existing research and to establish an agenda for further research in this area, particularly as it relates to Christian colleges and universities. Specifically, the purpose of this paper is to examine how the use of adjunct faculty members may affect fulfillment of mission for Christian higher education institutions and to propose research agendas. First, the role of adjunct faculty members is examined. Second, the ability of adjunct faculty members to integrate faith into their classrooms as a method to fulfill their institutions' missions is explored. Finally, ways to improve the mission-centric performance of adjunct faculty members are discussed. For each section, important questions for future research are identified. The questions, included in the Appendix, will hopefully foster and encourage research into this important area.

ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBERS

Definition of Adjunct Faculty Members

Adjunct faculty members are "faculty who are hired on a contractual basis to teach one or more classes during a given period of time and who typically do not receive a full-time salary or benefits from the college in which they teach" (Martinak, Karlsson, Faircloth, & Witcher, 2006, p. 42). They are also commonly called part-time or contingent faculty (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Adjunct faculty members often have contracts for one semester or year, though a few institutions offer two- or three-year contracts for selected instructors (Wegner, MacGregor, & Watson, 2003). Adjunct faculty members are, by definition, therefore, temporary members of the faculty. Although some may teach at

a college or university for many years, they tend not to be as connected to the institution as are full-time faculty members (Morton, 2012). Many have full-time nonacademic positions elsewhere, and teaching is an activity that they pursue on the side. Others teach simultaneously at multiple institutions, often at schools with very different missions. Finally, some adjunct faculty members are retirees who are pursuing opportunities to remain intellectually active (Lyons, 2007). In summary, although there is variation, many adjunct faculty members have limited contact with their employing institutions outside of their immediate class times. This becomes even truer if the adjunct instructor teaches mostly online (Dolan, 2011).

As would be expected, the role of adjunct faculty members is usually limited to teaching activities. That is, they commonly have no research or service expectations placed upon them (Wegner, MacGregor, & Watson, 2003). They are also seldom involved in faculty governance and are generally not included in department discussions about curriculum or policy (Ballantyne, Berret, & Harst, 2010).

Surprisingly little is actually known about who adjunct faculty members actually are and the ways that they are utilized in mission-centric colleges and universities. Areas of needed research include those listed in Section A of the Appendix.

Advantages of Using Adjunct Faculty Members

There are inherent advantages in hiring adjunct faculty members — advantages that extend to both universities and to students. The primary advantages of adjunct faculty members to their employers are the economic advantages and the flexibility they provide. The primary advantage to students is the application-oriented knowledge that adjunct faculty members often bring to their courses. Each of these is discussed more fully below.

Economic Benefits

Clearly, a primary advantage of colleges using adjunct faculty members lies in their relative pay (Komos, 2013). Adjunct faculty members can be employed at a fraction of the price of full-time faculty members. Indeed, salary savings of up to 80 percent are possible by using adjunct faculty members to teach classes (Bettinger & Long, 2010). A 2010 survey reported median salary rates at \$2,700 per three credit course (Flaherty, 2013), although universities located in urban settings often pay significantly less because of the larger pool of potential adjunct faculty members.

Moreover, colleges and universities benefit from additional cost savings from using adjunct faculty members. Adjunct faculty members are often employed with few, if

any, benefits, which results in significant additional savings (Halcrow & Olson, 2008; Liftig, 2014). Furthermore, there are few “overhead” expenses associated with employing adjunct faculty members since they are usually provided limited, if any, support services, such as office space or faculty development — services which are usually required for full-time faculty members (Baron-Nixon, 2007). The lower cost of using adjunct faculty members, therefore, can look very attractive as colleges and universities explore ways to balance their budgets (Liu & Zhang, 2013).

The cost advantage of employing adjunct faculty members may be particularly attractive for professional programs, such as business programs. Full-time business faculty members with terminal degrees are at a premium, resulting in salaries that are commensurately high (Bell & Joyce, 2011). Employing adjunct faculty members in business programs permits cost savings which can support the hiring of additional academically qualified, full-time faculty members or support other programs across campus.

Flexibility

Adjunct faculty members also provide colleges and universities the flexibility to quickly adapt to changes in the environment they face (Smith, 2007). The transient nature of adjunct faculty members, for instance, provides colleges and universities with the ability to quickly react to increases and declines in enrollment and changing student interests (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Such flexibility also allows colleges and universities to quickly adapt to other last-minute changes, such as when a full-time faculty member gets sick or retires (Flaherty, 2013). Furthermore, employing adjunct faculty can permit other types of adaptability, such as occasionally freeing full-time faculty members from some teaching responsibilities to allow them to more effectively pursue research and service activities (Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010) and to offer classes that full-time faculty members do not desire to teach (Morton, 2012). Finally, hiring adjunct faculty members provides colleges and universities with a low-cost, low-risk option to screen potential new full-time faculty members (Autor, 2001).

Student Benefits

Employing adjunct faculty members also has the potential to enhance students’ education (Webb, Wong, & Hubball, 2013). Adjunct faculty members often bring specialized knowledge to the courses they teach along with an ability to show students how the knowledge is applied in a daily fashion in their concurrent employment (Martinak Karlsson, Faircloth, & Witcher, 2006; West 2010), something that full-time faculty members are often unable to do

(Leslie & Gappa, 1994). This is particularly valuable to students pursuing education in professional fields such as business (Wallace, 2010). The employment of business adjunct faculty members may also provide students with leads and assistance in obtaining internships and permanent employment positions (Bettinger & Long, 2010). Furthermore, using adjunct faculty members often allows colleges and universities to offer courses and programs which they otherwise could not (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

Summary

It appears that adjunct faculty members are potentially a winning combination for colleges and universities and for students (Ballantyne, Berret, & Harst, 2010). For these reasons, the surge seen in the use of adjunct faculty members is likely permanent (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Flaherty, 2013). Indeed, with continuing decreases in state and federal aid to higher education, the use of adjunct faculty members will likely continue to grow (June, 2012). Furthermore, changes in the funding priorities in higher education (e.g., a large increase in the number of administrators employed relative to the number of faculty members (Mills, 2012) and increased spending on student services, such as upscale dormitories and elaborate sports facilities (Flaherty, 2013) have placed additional significant burdens on college and university budgets. Areas of needed research include those listed in Section B of the Appendix.

Disadvantages of Using Adjunct Faculty Members

Employing adjunct faculty members is not without problems or shortcomings, especially given the magnitude with which they are currently being employed. As colleges and universities employ ever-larger numbers of adjunct faculty members, some suggest that the use of adjunct faculty is becoming excessive (Gappa, 2000). A key question is whether this situation may be compromising colleges' and universities' educational programs.

Although some question the quality of the teaching of adjunct faculty members (e.g., Schmidt, 2008) others (Landrum, 2009; Thyer, Myers, & Nugent, 2011) found no difference between student evaluation results obtained by full-time and part-time faculty members. Similarly, Hall (2014) observed only a slight difference between student evaluation results between adjunct and full-time faculty members (with student evaluations for full-time faculty members being slightly higher for in-person classes and slightly lower for online classes). This observation, however, assumes that there is a direct positive relationship between student evaluation results and quality teaching – a relationship that is in question (Johnson, 2003). Lord (2008), for

instance, noted that none of the variables typically assessed by student evaluations are qualities viewed as necessary for effective instruction. Although students may enjoy classes taught by adjunct faculty members as much as those taught by full-time faculty members, this fact alone does not necessarily indicate an equal quality of instruction.

When students' behaviors and learning outcomes are examined, results emerge that question the quality of the teaching of adjunct faculty. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2004), Jacoby (2006), and Ronco and Cahill (2006) observed that graduation rates decrease when students are taught by adjunct faculty members. Bettinger and Long (2006), Jaeger and Eagan (2011), and Jaeger and Hinz (2008) found that freshman students taking a higher number of courses taught by adjunct faculty members are less likely to return for their sophomore year. Similarly, Kirk and Spector (2009) observed that students who took an introductory accounting course from an adjunct faculty member were less likely to subsequently major in accounting. Students attending accounting principles courses taught by adjunct faculty members also performed significantly worse in their subsequent finance course. Bettinger and Long (2010), however, note that these effects may differ across discipline. Mueller, Mandernach, and Sanderson (2013) observed a similar situation with faculty members teaching online where students taking classes from full-time faculty members were less likely to withdraw from the course and more likely to continue to the next course.

The lower student learning outcomes that have been found in classes instructed by adjunct faculty members have been speculated to arise from shortcomings in the performance of adjunct faculty members (Jacoby, 2006) or as a result of poor working conditions for the adjuncts (Flaherty, 2013). Each of these will be briefly examined.

Adjunct Faculty Member Performance Shortcomings

Organizations, such as the Modern Language Association (MLA), have expressed concern that the increasing use of adjunct faculty members has led to a decline in educational quality (Modern Language Association, 2002). Many adjunct faculty members possess a lack of experience in the classroom before they begin to teach at university level (Leslie, 1998). Most have no educational background in teaching and may have little knowledge of what makes good learning environments for students. Consequently, it can often take several years of teaching experience before an adjunct faculty member becomes effective in the classroom (Ballantyne, Berret, & Harst, 2010). Banachowski (1997) and Webb et al. (2013) observed that adjunct faculty members tend to rely on traditional pedagogical methods, such

as lecturing from a textbook. This might be an attempt to remain in a “comfort zone” or may result from lack of training. Some adjunct faculty members may also minimize student workload in order to minimize their own (Baron-Nixon, 2007; Schmidt, 2008). Baldwin and Wawrzynski (2011) observed that full-time faculty members are more likely to employ learner-centered practices.

Given that adjunct faculty members are most often assessed on student evaluations and not on effective instruction, naturally their attention will be on student evaluations (Kirk & Spector, 2009). Such an approach is not entirely different from full-time instructors (Lewis, 2006; Morley, 2003), but tenured instructors tend to have more freedom to focus on effective instruction since they are not necessarily as constrained by the evaluations of students. Such attention on student evaluations likely affects how adjunct faculty members conduct their classes. A number of researchers, for instance, have observed that adjunct faculty members tend to assign significantly higher grades than their full-time counterparts (e.g., Kezim, Pariseau, & Quinn, 2005; Leverett, Zorita, & Kamery, 2005; Sonner, 2000). Although there is little research on the topic, some faculty members believe that the courses of adjunct faculty members have fewer requirements and possess less rigor than the courses of full-time faculty members.

Working Conditions

Poor working conditions may also be a factor leading to lower student learning outcomes. Adjunct faculty members seldom have offices where they can meet with students, which limits interactions with them (Schmidt, 2008). Also, they frequently have no phone, no mailbox, and often not even a job description (Ballantyne, Berret, & Harst, 2010; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010). Furthermore, they frequently have relatively little time to prepare classes (Flaherty, 2013; Kirk and Spector, 2009) since many adjunct faculty members do not receive contracts or course schedules until a few days before classes begin.

Moreover, adjunct faculty members seldom have opportunities to interact with other faculty members to discuss and share pedagogical alternatives (Webb, Wong, & Hubball, 2013). Adjunct faculty members not only have less contact with other faculty, they also typically have less access to other activities in their departments. They often know little of how their class “fits” into the rest of students’ educational programs or what previous courses students may have taken. When adjuncts are involved in departmental activities such as advising and/or serving on departmental committees, some research suggests that the quality of their efforts may be less, which can adversely affect students and

their departments (Pisani & Stott, 1998). Past research indicates that adjunct faculty members feel isolated from their institutions, alienated, powerless, and invisible (Dobbins 2011; Gappa, 2000). Indeed, most adjunct members wish to be better integrated into their colleges or universities and wish to develop professional relationships with their full-time colleagues (Feldman & Turnley, 2001).

Summary

Although the use of adjunct faculty members provides a number of potential advantages to institutions of higher education and to students, several disadvantages also seem to exist. These disadvantages have the potential to adversely affect the educational experiences of students. Given the growing concern for assurance of students’ learning, the disadvantages of using adjunct faculty members may raise areas of important concern. Areas of needed research include those listed in Section C of the Appendix.

ADJUNCT FACULTY AND FAITH INTEGRATION

At Christian colleges and universities, the dynamics of adjunct faculty members may be more critical than other types of institutions of higher education. Christian institutions are deeply driven by mission. They purposefully seek to infuse faith-based missions throughout their activities, particularly academics. Consequently, their academic missions go much farther than simply imparting knowledge and developing students’ intellectual skills (VanZanten, 2011). The integration of faith into learning is a key component in fulfilling the mission of the Christian college or university; therefore, it is usually viewed as a requirement of all organizational members. Instructors, both full and part time, play a particularly important role in the integration of faith because of their ongoing interaction with students.

The phrase “integration of faith and learning” has been traced to Gaebelein (1954) who saw integration as a recognition of the unity of all disciplinary truths with ultimate Truth. Similarly, Holmes (1987) refers to “the integration of faith into every dimension of a person’s life and character” (pp. 46-47). VanZanten (2011) prefers to use the term “faithful learning,” which she views to be more inclusive than faith integration. Nevertheless, faith integration or faithful learning are inherent to the missions of Christian colleges and universities.

Will Using Adjuncts Harm Faith Integration?

It is not unrealistic to suggest that using a high percentage of, presumably, somewhat transient adjunct faculty

members might endanger that mission. How, for example, can a dean or department chair ensure that each adjunct faculty member is a Christian of godly character (a requirement of CCCU institutions)? This determination can even be difficult to make for full-time faculty where a much lengthier and comprehensive hiring processes is typical.

Even if the adjunct is a strong Christian, does he or she possess the skills and knowledge to appropriately and effectively integrate faith into their classes? Faith integration is not just a matter of reading a few verses at the beginning of class and/or praying. It is more than adding a component, such as a discussion of ethics, to a course (Korniejczuk & Kijai, 1994). Rather, faith integration requires both instructors and students to think deeply about their disciplines and the connections which exist between their disciplines and their faith (Holmes, 1994; Burns, 2012). To effectively integrate faith into courses, faculty members must be well acquainted with the Bible and with the concepts that they are interested in integrating (Chewning, 2001). Faculty members must spend time and thought to truly integrate faith into their courses in a way that is engaging to students (Stamm, 2001; Chan, 2009). Successful faith integration takes a great deal of time and effort to prepare and to implement in a course.

It is reasonable to suppose that an adjunct faculty member who might expect to teach a class once may not have the motivation, or the time, to do effective faith integration. If they do not have adequate lead time to prepare courses, they also may not have the time to effectively integrate faith into their courses. Moreover, adjunct faculty members who are simultaneously teaching at a number of colleges or universities may not possess the motivation to differentiate their courses to fit the different missions of those universities.

Given the importance of successful faith integration to fulfilling the missions of many Christian colleges and universities, the ability of faculty members to successfully integrate faith into their courses would appear to be of the utmost concern for both full-time and adjunct faculty members. When faith integration does not effectively occur, the missions of Christian colleges and universities are compromised (VanZanten, 2011). At best, the reason for the existence of the university is drawn into question. At worst, the lack of effective faith integration is harmful to the spiritual lives of students and faculty members.

Inadequate faith integration in lower-level (freshman and sophomore) courses, for instance, might weaken students' formation in faith. If students have not been presented with a strong foundation in their lower-level courses, attempts to integrate faith in upper-division classes become very difficult. Even if students receive excellent teaching in faith integration in lower-level courses, the lack of faith inte-

gration in upper-level classes can actually be dangerous, particularly if the lack of integration occurs with adjunct faculty members. Because adjunct faculty members are more likely to possess professional experience (VanderMeulken, 2008), they can be viewed by some students as presenting a clearer picture than full-time faculty members of what is necessary to succeed in their ultimate chosen occupations. If adjunct faculty members are unwilling, or unable, to effectively integrate faith into their discipline, some students might view this as an indication that, although it may be acceptable and appropriate to integrate faith into classroom discussions with their full-time faculty members, it is not necessary or appropriate to do so outside of that context. Students can be unintentionally led to believe that faith should be compartmentalized and should not be exercised in a professional setting. Obviously, this possible outcome is directly contrary to the missions of most Christian colleges and universities.

Summary

Integrating faith is an important activity of faculty members in mission-driven colleges and universities. The additional skill, knowledge, and time required to effectively integrate faith, however, raise questions concerning the willingness and ability of adjunct faculty members to effectively accomplish this activity. Other moral issues are also inherent in this discussion. When potential students visit Christian colleges and universities, they are usually told of the Christian nature of the universities, often with extensive presentations of how faith is integrated through the institution, particularly in the classroom. Is it truthful for colleges and universities to make promises which they may not be able to fulfill? Areas of needed research include those listed in Section D of the Appendix.

CONNECTING ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBERS TO THE MISSION

It appears likely that adjunct faculty members will continue to play a significant role in higher education, even if only for economic reasons (Lyons, 2007). Morton (2012) notes wryly that although colleges and universities desire quality instruction from adjunct faculty members, they generally do not invest in them to produce that quality. Halcrow and Olson (2008) suggest that even though economic realities may not permit significant changes in the structure of adjunct positions, the performance and well-being of adjunct faculty members may be enhanced.

Clearly, a prerequisite to connecting adjunct faculty members to the mission lies in the adjunct faculty members

themselves. Hiring skilled and motivated individuals with the desire for connection is the first step. It is unlikely that the performance of under-qualified and/or under-motivated individuals can be easily positively affected. Likewise, it is unlikely that the faith integration attempts of individuals with little or no faith will be able to be positively affected. This is the key reason that CCCU schools have the requirement that faculty members be professing Christians. Being highly skilled and motivated professing Christians, however, does not necessarily result in effective faith integration in the classroom. Often, colleges and universities must overtly work with adjunct faculty members to help them provide successful classroom experiences.

The most commonly suggested way to improve the performance of adjunct faculty members is for colleges and universities to provide the means to inform and educate them on what is required (Martinak, Karlsson, Faircloth, & Witcher, 2006). Therefore, it appears that initial and ongoing education of adjunct faculty members should be a major consideration for Christian institutions. This might appear to be an obvious and simplistic solution to a complex problem. While that may be true, many Christian institutions are not currently doing even this obvious task (Morton, 2012).

Two mechanisms to help adjunct faculty members connect more fully to the mission of the university are orientation and ongoing faculty development (Halcrow & Olson, 2008). Each will be discussed.

Adjunct Faculty Orientation

One tool to support adjunct faculty members is to provide them with the skills to positively affect their in-class performance and to help them understand the criticality of faith integration is to help them identify with the mission of the institution at a faculty orientation (Morton, 2012). New faculty orientations have the ability to introduce new adjunct faculty members to the distinctives of the university, to provide them with an understanding of its mission, and to introduce them to the expectations of how the mission is to be manifest (e.g., faith integration).

Well-designed new faculty orientations have been shown to accomplish many things. Welch (2002) observed that a faculty orientation can help new faculty members gain a broader picture of the university and facilitate the building of alliances with peers and existing faculty members. It can build enthusiasm and commitment toward the institution (Welch, 2002). Lindbeck and Darnell (2008) reported that new faculty orientations at mid-sized universities (defined as institutions with 3,000 to 10,000 students) ranged up to 48 hours in length (mean of 16.5 hours), with over 85 percent

of schools including a component in institutional information such as the university's mission, and 78 percent including a component on effective teaching strategies.

New faculty orientations, however, tend to be only for new full-time faculty members. Unfortunately, most institutions do not provide an orientation for adjunct faculty members outside the sharing of a few institutional policies. Indeed, as Sassé (2002) suggests, adjunct faculty members usually are left to develop their own orientations through a personal search for information. The obligation for bringing adjunct faculty members into the community of a university, particularly a Christian university, however, seems to be placed directly on the college or university. "It is...the responsibility of the institutions that employ them to ensure the effectiveness of adjunct faculty in contributing to the teaching-learning process and the mission of the colleges and universities" (Ballantyne, Berret, & Harst, 2010, pp. 4-5).

New faculty orientation can do much more than merely share information. It has the potential to have a profound effect on an institution by creating an organizational climate that is inclusive, supportive, and collegial (Baron-Nixon, 2007). Creating such a climate for adjunct faculty members will encourage them to become more involved in the activities of the institution and increase their motivation to carry on the mission of the institution (Baron-Nixon, 2007).

At a minimum, an in-depth orientation that covers three areas is essential for all new adjunct faculty members (Morton, 2012). The first area is a "thorough orientation to the institution, its culture, and its practices" (Lyons, 2007, p. 6) — the personality, unique distinctives, and mission of the institution. This is particularly critical in Christian colleges and universities with high expectations of faith integration in the classroom. Done correctly, this orientation can help adjunct faculty members feel connected to their institution and its mission (Lyons, 2007).

Orientations can also give adjunct faculty members training in fundamental teaching and classroom management skills (Martinak, Karlsson, Faircloth, & Witcher, 2006; Morton, 2012). Beginning with such an understanding helps adjunct faculty members succeed sooner and, hence, also benefits students. It helps adjunct faculty members understand the pedagogical expectations placed upon them (Morton, 2012) and receive recognition for quality work that is perceived as appropriate (Lyons, 2007). They need to know that effective faith integration is an expectation of their university and have an understanding of how to accomplish it.

Orientation can also begin the process of making adjunct faculty members a part of the community of faculty at their institution. Assimilation into one's institution is key

to developing job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Neglecting this, Elman (2003) suggests, can threaten the academic integrity of a college or university's programs. It can also lead to higher turnover since adjunct faculty members will have less connection to the institution.

Adjunct Faculty Development

Appropriate faculty orientation has the potential to significantly improve the effectiveness of adjunct faculty members, but an orientation alone is not sufficient. Ongoing faculty development programs expose faculty members to new techniques, technologies, and pedagogical practices and educate them in their use (Nandan & Nandan, 2012). Guglielmo et al. (2011), state that "faculty development is considered an essential component in the academic success of individual faculty members as well as that of the institution" (p. 1). Likewise, Webb et al. (2013) state, "Adjunct teaching faculty who are expert practitioners in the field do not necessarily translate to expert teachers. ... Professional development is critical" (p. 235). Faculty development can address many areas of a faculty member's responsibilities, including connecting pedagogy to mission by facilitating faith integration (Morton 2012). Burns (2012) details an example of a faculty development program developed to advance a mission-centric perspective among faculty members. Similarly, VanZanten (2011) discusses the process needed for new faculty members to develop faith-integration skills.

Faculty development can continue the community building begun in an orientation. Few colleges or universities have established procedures or opportunities for adjunct faculty members to be a part of the life of the university (Louis, 2009) (see Wallin, 2007, for exceptions). They are typically not even invited to departmental meetings, except possibly social gatherings at Christmas. Consequently, many full-time faculty members do not know adjunct faculty members well, if at all. As a result, adjunct faculty members typically not only have minimal input into departmental goals and activities, they often are not even aware of what they are. Yet, they are expected to play critical roles in reaching departmental goals and fulfilling its activities. Christian colleges and universities desire effective adjunct faculty members, but sadly, they, like other institutions, are often unwilling to commit the resources to produce effectiveness and community (Morton, 2012). Baron-Nixon (2007) suggests that separate development opportunities for full-time and adjunct faculty members are counterproductive and suggest that such activities should optimally include both groups of faculty members. By including both adjunct and full-time faculty members in faculty development, commu-

nity can be developed while building a faculty body which possesses similar skills and abilities to provide continuity in the student experience.

Zutter (2007) and Nolan, Siegrist, and Richard (2007) discuss mentoring as a form of faculty development for adjunct faculty members. Although mentoring is a well-established practice at many colleges and universities, it usually only involves full-time faculty members. Zutter (2007) presents a mentoring program using full-time faculty members as mentors and adjunct faculty members as mentees and reports that adjunct faculty member participants experienced increased collegiality and improved teaching and classroom management skills as a result of their participation.

Summary

It appears that orientations and continuing faculty development are foundational in connecting adjunct faculty members to the mission of their institutions. Areas of needed research include those listed in Section E of the Appendix.

CONCLUSION

Clearly, the growth in the use of adjunct faculty members is having a profound effect on higher education. It is unlikely that this situation will change in the near future. Adjunct faculty members can be expected to continue to teach significant numbers of classes on most campuses. Consequently, research on understanding the use of adjunct faculty members and research into how their performance can be improved would seem to be important. Unfortunately, very little attention has been paid to adjuncts who teach in Christian or other mission-based universities.

As competition increases in higher education (Driscoll & Wicks, 1999), the role of mission as an avenue through which institutional uniqueness can be established and maintained becomes a pre-eminent concern. For Christian colleges and universities, however, the importance of mission extends far beyond solely a competitive advantage. Rather, the mission represents a God-directed mandate — representing not just a positioning exercise, but a heartfelt desire to fundamentally affect students. Many of the brightest, most committed Christian students attend colleges and universities where their faith can be further built and where they can develop the desire, knowledge, and skills to affect their world for Christ. Christian higher education, therefore, plays a significant role in preparing the next generation for the works of ministry and both full-time and adjunct faculty members play a key role in this maturation process. Business

students will hold particularly visible and influential roles in society. Those who have integrated faith into their lives will experience many opportunities to express their faith to others and will possess unique platforms to affect society.

Therefore, with a significant percentage of classes taught by adjunct faculty, increasingly the future is in the hands of part-time faculty members. This issue is of major importance to business programs in Christian colleges and universities. The degree to which Christian business students learn to integrate their faith into their lives and into their business activities will likely be affected by the degree to which they were exposed to effective faith integration in their collegiate education. Hence, given the growth in the use of adjunct faculty members in business programs, attention and research into ways to help adjunct faculty members develop skills in faith integration in the classroom is vital to create a healthy future in Christian business education.

A related issue involves the extent to which Christian colleges and universities actually deliver on what they promise, which at its foundation, is an integrity issue. When promising prospective students and their families that the education delivered will be one where faith is infused and integrated throughout, the institutions are making a promise, the breaking of which would appear to be an omission of major concern. Faith integration by full-time faculty is definitely a requirement, but it is only the first step. Given the pervasive use of adjunct faculty members throughout students' educational experiences, it would seem that effective instruction, including effective faith integration, is also an essential component of classes conducted by adjunct faculty members. To use adjunct faculty members merely because they have experience in a particular area or because they appear to be effective adjunct instructors at a nearby state university does not seem to be an honest course of action. In other words, colleges and universities who claim to be Christian, need to demonstrate faith integration throughout the institution, but particularly in the classroom. Consequently, hiring practices, particularly when adjunct faculty members are involved (since there is often much less importance placed on hiring adjunct faculty members) have the potential to undermine a college's or university's mission.

There are indications that the marketing materials distributed by some Christian colleges and universities may be drifting away from what may actually be delivered in the classroom. If this is true, this would seem to be a concern of the utmost importance. Indeed, this may be a most important potential research issue. Areas of needed research include those listed in Section F of the Appendix.

In conclusion, this paper attempts to explore what is

already known about the effects of adjunct instruction, particularly as it relates to the mission integrity of Christian universities. However there are many important questions still unanswered. Consequently, a series of important questions are proposed with the goal of prompting research into this important area. Faculty members, particularly Christian faculty members, are strongly encouraged to pursue research into the questions raised in this paper with the goal of improving students' education and better equipping them for bringing Christ into the marketplace. The results from the proposed research will provide Christian colleges and universities with the insight necessary to maximize the effectiveness of adjunct faculty members as partners in the fulfillment of their missions.

REFERENCES

- Autor, D. H. (2001). Why do temporary help firms provide free general skills training? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(4), 1409-1448.
- Baldwin, R., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; What we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1485-1509.
- Ballantyne, S., Berret, B., & Harst, W. (2010). Fulltime faculty perceptions of leadership in adjunct faculty to maintain Franciscan identity. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 9, 1-9.
- Banachowski, G. (1997). *Advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time faculty in community colleges*. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges.
- Baron-Nixon, L. (2007). *Connecting non full-time faculty to institutional mission: A guidebook for college/university administrators and faculty developers*. Sterling VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Bell, R. L., & Joyce, M. P. (2011). Comparing business faculty's salaries by rank and gender: Does AACSB accreditation really make a difference. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 15(2), 19-40.
- Bettinger, E. P. & Long, B. T. (2010). Does cheaper mean better? The impact of using adjunct instructors on student outcomes. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(3), 598-613.
- Bettinger, E. P. & Long, B. Y. (2006). The increasing use of adjunct instructors at public institutions: Are we hurting students? *In What's happening to public higher education*, R. Ehrenberg, ed. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 51-70.
- Bovee, S. L. & O'Brian, M. (2007). The development of an integrated experiential model for student transformation. *Christian Business Academy Review*, 2(1), 9-18.

- Burns, D. J. (2012). Facilitating integrating mission into the classroom: Xavier's mission academy. In *Renewing mission and identity in Catholic business education proceedings*. St. Thomas MN: John K. Ryan Institute.
- Chan, A. (2009). Microeconomic applications to the Bible: An extension to Stamm's arguments in 2001. *Christian Business Academy Review*, 4(1), 31-36.
- Chewing, R. C. (2001). A dozen styles of Biblical integration: Assimilating the mind of Christ. *Journal of Biblical Integration in Business*, 6, 114-152.
- Dobbins, K. (2011). Reflections on SoTL by a casual lecturer: Personal benefits, long-term challenges. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), Article 24.
- Dolan, V. (2011). The isolation of online adjunct faculty and its impact on their performance. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(2), 62-77.
- Driscoll, C. & Wicks, D. (1999). The customer-driven approach in business education: A possible danger? *Journal of Education for Business*, 74(1), 58-61.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. & Zhang, L. (2004). *Do tenured and tenure track faculty matter?* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Elman, S. E. (2003). A regional accreditation perspective on contingent faculty appointments. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (123), 71-78.
- Feldman, D. C. & Turnley, W. H. (2001). A field study of adjunct faculty: The impact of career stage on reactions to non-tenure-track jobs. *Journal of Career Development*, 28(1) 1-16.
- Filby, I. L. (2007). Bringing truth, joy, and eternity into the classroom: Using perfume to teach introductory marketing. *Christian Business Academy Review*, 2(1), 49-56.
- Flaherty, C. (2013). Making the case for adjuncts. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.207elmp02.blackmesh.com/news/2013/01/09/adjunct-leaders-consider-strategies-force-change>.
- Gaebelein, F. E. (1954). *The pattern of God's truth: The integration of faith and learning*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Gappa, J. M. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 27(1), 77-86.
- Gappa, J. M. & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guglielmo, B. J., Edwards, D. J., Franks, A. S., Naughton, C. A., Schonder, K. S. Stamm, P. L., Thornton, P. & Popovich, N. G. (2011). A critical appraisal of and recommendations for faculty development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 75(6), 1-10.
- Halcrow, C. & Olson, M. R. (2008). Adjunct faculty: Valued resource or cheap labor? *Focus on Colleges, Universities, and Schools*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Hall, H. (2014). Using end-of-course student survey data to investigate faculty effectiveness. *Christian Business Academy Review*, 9(1), 107-112.
- Holmes, A. F. (1987). *The idea of a Christian college*. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- Holmes, A. F. (1994). What about student integration. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 3(1), 3-5.
- Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment of community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1081-1101.
- Jaeger, A. J. & Eagan, M. K. (2011). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state system of public higher education. *Educational Policy*, 25(3), 507-537.
- Jaeger, A. J. & Hinz, D. (2008). The effects of part-time faculty on first year freshman retention: A predictive model using logistic regression. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 10(3), 3-53.
- Johnson, V. E. (2003). *Grade inflation: A crisis in college education*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- June, A. W. (2012). Adjuncts build strength in numbers. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 59(11), 17.
- Kezar, A. Sam, C. (2010). Non-tenure-track faculty in higher education – Theories and tensions. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 36(5), 1-91.
- Kezim, B., Pariseau, S. E. & Quinn, F. (2005). Is grade inflation related to faculty status? *Journal of Education for Business*. 80(6), 358-363.
- Kirk, F. R. & Spector, C. A. (2009). A comparison of the achievement of students taught by full-time versus adjunct faculty in business courses. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 13(2), 73-81.
- Korniejczuk R. I. & Kilai, J. (1994). Integrating faith and learning: Development of a stage model of teacher implementation. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 3(1), 79-102.

- Komos, M. (2013). "Thanks for asking:" Adjunct faculty members' views of effective teaching. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 24(4), 133-164.
- Kuchera, M. E. & Miller, S. J. (1988). The effects of perceptions of the academic job market on adjunct faculty: An identity-theory analysis. *Sociology of Education*, 61(4), 240-254.
- Landrum, R. E. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty? *College Teaching*, 57(1), 23-26.
- Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(2) 185-196.
- Lazerson, M. (2010). The making of corporate U: How we got here. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 57(9), B5-B6.
- Leslie, D. W. (1998). The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 26(4), 1-7.
- Leslie, D. W. & Gappa, J. M. (1995). The part-time faculty advantage. Metropolitan Universities: *An International Forum*, 6(2), 91-102.
- Leverett, H. M., Zurita, F. I., & Kamery, R. H. (2005). The effects of adjunct instruction on final grades in the principles of accounting course. *Proceedings of the Academy of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 9(1), 79-83.
- Lewis, H. R. (2006). *Excellence without a soul: How a great university forgot education*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Liftig, R. A. (2014). The American adjunct: Almost always a bridesmaid, almost never a bride. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 43(3), 10-11.
- Lindbeck, R., & Darnell, D. F. (2008). An imperative for colleges and universities: Orienting and supporting new faculty members. *Academic Leadership*, 6(3).
- Liu, X., & Zhang, L. (2013). Flexibility at the core: What determines employment of part-time faculty in academia. *Industrial Relations*, 68(2), 312-339.
- Lord, T. (2008). What? I failed? But I paid for those credits! Problems of students evaluating faculty. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 38(2), 72-75.
- Louis, D. (2009). Adjuncts: Solutions for a mistreated majority. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(39), A72.
- Lyons, R. E. (2007). Deepening our understanding of adjunct faculty, in *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, R. E. Lyons, ed. Bolton, MA: Anker, 1-12.
- Martinak, M. L., Karlsson, R., Faircloth, R., & Witcher, P. M. (2006). We're so glad you asked: Maryland adjuncts speak out on their status, needs, and opinions. *The Journal of Continuing Education*, 54(3), 42-47.
- Meixner, C., Kruck, E.E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching*, 58(4), 141-147.
- Mills, N. (2012). The corporatization of higher education. *Dissent*, 59(4), 6-9.
- Modern Language Association (2002). *Ensuring the quality of undergraduate programs in English and foreign languages: MLA recommendations on staffing*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Morley, L. (2003). Reconstructing students as consumers: Power and assimilation, in M. Slowey and D. Watson, eds. *Higher education and the lifecourse*. London: Open University Press, 79-92.
- Morton, D. R. (2012). Adjunct faculty embraced: The institution's responsibility. *Christian Education Journal*, 9(2), 396-407.
- Mueller, B., Mandernach, B. J. & Sanderson, K. (2013). Adjunct versus full-time faculty: Comparison of student outcomes in the online classroom. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 9(3), 341-352.
- Nandan, S. & Nandan, T. (2012). Perceived learning from faculty development programs of faculty in higher education. *International Journal of Learning*, 18(11), 277-287.
- Nolan, G., Siegrist, C. & Richard, N. (2007). A mentoring network for adjunct faculty: From proposal to pilot and five-year plan, in *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, R. E. Lyons, ed. Bolton, MA: Anker, pp. 1-12.
- Pisani, A. M., & Stott, N. (1998). An investigation of part-time faculty commitment to developmental advising. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(2), 121-142.
- Ronco, S., & Cahill, J. (2006). Does it matter who's in the classroom? Effect of instructor type on student retention, achievement and satisfaction. *Association for Institutional Research Professional File*, (100), 1-15.
- Sassé, M. (2002). Part-time adjunct faculty self-orientation, or digging in the college information mine. *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 29(3), A2-A5.
- Schmidt, P. (2008). Use of part-time instructors tied to lower student success. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(12), A1-A10.
- Smith, V. C. (2007). A systems approach to strategic success with adjunct faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges* (140), 55-66.

- Smith, Y. S. (2008). Spirituality in the classroom: Two integration exercises for management (and other) classes. *Christian Business Academy Review*, 2(1), 38-47.
- Sonner, B. S. (2000). A is for 'adjunct:' Examining grade inflation in higher education. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(1), 5-8.
- Stamm, B. (2001). Dad, my Bible has some economics in it. *Journal of Biblical Integration in Business*, 6, 196-201.
- Thyer, B. A., Myers, L. L., & Nugent, W. R. (2011). Do regular social work faculty earn better student course evaluations than do adjunct faculty or doctoral students? *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 31(4), 365-377.
- VanderMeulken, R. (2008). Adjunct instructors bring real-life experiences to students. *Reading Eagle*, (August 24).
- VanZanten, S. (2011). *Joining the mission: A guide for (mainly) new college faculty*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Wallace, R. C. (2010). Engaging business practitioners to develop students' faith and talents. *Christian Business Academy Review*, 5(1), 23-30.
- Wallin, D. L. (2007). Part-time faculty and professional development: Notes from the field. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (140), 67-73.
- Webb, A. S., Wong, T. J., & Hubball, H. T. (2013). Professional development for adjunct teaching faculty in a research-intensive university: Engagement in scholarly approaches to teaching and learning. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, 25(2), 231-238.
- Wegner, S., MacGregor, C., & Watson, R. (2003). Best practices for the use of part-time practitioner faculty members in principal preparation programs. *Connections: Journal of Principal Development and Preparation*, 5, 32-37.
- Weissmann, J. (2013). The ever-shrinking role of tenured college professors. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/04/the-ever-shrinking-role-of-tenured-college-professors-in-1-chart/274849/>
- Welch, G. F. (2002). A new faculty orientation program: Building a core of new faculty to shape the future of the college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (120), 11-16.
- West, E. (2010). Managing adjunct professors: Strategies for improved performance. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 14(4), 21-36.
- Zutter, C. (2007). Mentoring adjunct instructors: Fostering bonds that strengthen teaching and learning, in *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, R. E. Lyons, ed. Bolton, MA: Anker, 68-80.

APPENDIX AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Research into the use and effectiveness of adjunct faculty members is a form of scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL), a relatively new research focus. SOTL involves scholarly inquiry into the nature of teaching and learning, with the goal of improving and increasing the value of students' educational experiences. SOTL is recognized by each of the business program accreditation agencies and SOTL research is recognized and accepted by many business journals (including the CBFA journals), not just journals focused on business education.

The research questions highlighted below address important SOTL issues and concerns about which little or no research has been done. Therefore, given the educational focus of CCCU colleges and universities, the research streams proposed below represent not only opportunities to extend knowledge, but to extend knowledge which has the potential to directly positively affect the quality of education, particularly at Christian institutions. Readers are encouraged to seriously consider pursuing these areas of research need.

Section A: Adjunct Faculty Members: The Present Situation

Surprisingly, relatively little is known about the use of adjunct faculty members, particularly at CCCU colleges and universities. Research identifies the present use of adjunct faculty members and how their use differs across discipline and across institution is needed. Areas for research include:

- To what extent are adjunct faculty members used in CCCU colleges and universities and in which areas (e.g., business courses)? How does the use of adjuncts faculty members at CCCU colleges differ from the usage at other similar non-CCCU church-related schools, and from similar-sized secular institutions? For instance, are adjunct faculty members utilized in the same programs, at the same level (e.g., freshman vs. senior), and to the same extent?
- What is the nature (e.g., employment status, years of teaching, years of experience) of adjunct faculty used and how does it differ between institutions and disciplines?
- Does the use of adjunct faculty members in business programs differ across institutions with different accreditations (e.g., ACBSP, IACBE, no accreditation)?
- Has the composition/use of adjunct faculty members changed over the past decade?
- What are the hiring procedures and policies for hiring adjunct faculty members? What criteria are used? How

does the hiring procedure and policies for hiring adjunct faculty members differ from those for hiring full-time faculty members?

Much of this information needed to provide insight into these questions is not available through public sources. Instead, the information will likely need to be acquired directly from the institutions/departments.

Section B: Advantages of Using Adjunct Faculty Members

How are the advantages of using adjunct faculty members effectively utilized by colleges and universities? Areas for research include:

- Is there an optimal ratio of adjunct versus full-time faculty members that leads to optimal student learning outcomes? Does the ratio differ between different disciplines or different types of courses?
- Are there certain courses that are preferably taught by full-time faculty members? If there are, what specific course characteristics make these courses better suited to be taught by full-time faculty members?
- Likewise, are there certain courses that are preferable to be taught by adjunct faculty members? What specific course characteristics make these courses better suited to be taught by adjunct faculty members?
- Does the presence of adjunct faculty members have the ability to enhance the performance of full-time faculty members?
- What is appropriate compensation for adjunct faculty members? Do differences in level of pay for adjunct faculty members affect their performance? Does the fact that many adjunct faculty members will freely work at very low wages justify their low wages?
- To what extent are adjunct faculty members' supposed advantages to students actually manifested? Are adjunct faculty members able to effectively bring their professional experience into the classroom (assuming they possess the experience)? Do they provide additional opportunities to students (e.g., helping them to acquire internships and/or permanent positions)?

Research into the advantages provided by adjunct faculty members will be conducted necessarily at the individual program level and will necessitate comparisons between full-time and adjunct faculty members in different settings (e.g., departments, programs, and/or institutions).

Section C: Disadvantages of Using Adjunct Faculty Members

What are the disadvantages of colleges and universities using adjunct faculty members, and how can the disadvan-

tages be overcome or minimized? Areas for research include:

- Is the performance of adjunct faculty members inferior to that of full-time faculty members? Do weaknesses manifest themselves to a greater extent in some courses than others? How can the weaknesses be overcome?
- How can the teaching performance of adjunct faculty members be improved?
- Are student evaluations the best measure of the performance of adjunct faculty members? What are other possible measures?
- Could the teaching performance of adjunct faculty members be improved by improving their working conditions?
- To what degree do adjunct faculty members interact with each other and other faculty members? Does such interaction positively affect their teaching? If so, how can community be furthered?

Research into the disadvantages provided by adjunct faculty members will be conducted necessarily at the individual program level and will necessitate comparisons between full-time and adjunct faculty members in different settings (e.g., departments, programs, and/or institutions).

Section D: Adjunct Faculty and Faith Integration

For CCCU colleges and universities, faith integration is clearly the most important issue concerning the use of adjunct faculty members. Although academics and preparation of students to occupationally contribute to society is important, the missions of CCCU colleges and universities provide critical components of their distinctive competencies and their reasons for existence. Hence, the ways which adjunct faculty members either enhance or impede the abilities of CCCU colleges and universities to fulfill their missions are vital. Areas for research include:

- To what degree do adjunct faculty members understand the mission of the institution at which they teach? Similarly, do adjunct faculty members possess the knowledge/ability/time to effectively integrate the institution's mission into their courses?
- If a college or university promises a Christian education, at the very minimum should the instructors be professing Christians? How is the faith of adjunct faculty members presently assessed? Is as much importance placed on the faith of adjunct faculty members in the hiring process as it is for hiring full-time faculty members? Why or why not?
- What is the minimum amount of faith integration in the classroom that should be expected of adjunct faculty members?
- To what extent do adjunct faculty members integrate faith into their classes now? What additional skills/

knowledge and or working conditions are needed for adjunct faculty members to more effectively integrate faith into their classes?

- Do adjunct faculty members simultaneously teach at secular institutions or other faith-based institutions, which put less emphasis on the integration of faith? If so, how do their approaches to faith differ across different types of institutions?
- To what extent are CCCU colleges and universities dependent on adjunct faculty members to be the primary conveyors of the institutions' faith mission to students? Are adjunct faculty members aware of this role? To what extent are they successful to carrying this out?

Research into the faith integration of adjunct faculty members will likely need to involve multiple research methodologies. Although some of the issues might be examined via conventional quantitative methodologies, qualitative methodologies, including phenomenological research, will be required to understand the nature and extent of faith integration and its relative success.

Section E: Connecting Adjunct Faculty Members to the Mission

There is general agreement that colleges and universities need to develop stronger and more effective orientation and development programs for their adjunct faculty members (Martinak, Karlsson, Faircloth, & Witcher, 2006). The issues regarding the ability and willingness of adjunct faculty members to effectively contribute to a college or university raises several questions for future research, including:

- To what extent are orientation programs available to adjunct faculty members? What do orientation programs cover? What are the preferences/desires of adjunct faculty members concerning the availability/content of orientation programs?
- Can the teaching performance of adjunct faculty members be improved through the availability of an orientation program (are orientation programs effective)?
- To what extent are faculty development programs available to adjunct faculty members? What types of faculty development are available? What are the preferences/desires of adjunct faculty members concerning the availability/content of faculty development programs?
- If faculty development programs are available, to what extent are adjunct faculty members involved? Can the teaching performance of adjunct faculty members be improved through faculty development?
- What types of faculty development programs are presently being used to provide adjunct faculty members the tools necessary to successfully teach and to successfully

animate their college or universities' mission? Do adjunct faculty members take advantage of existing faculty development programs?

- Are mentoring programs viable faculty development programs? If so, are they best as a supplement to or as a replacement for other forms of faculty development?
- Can the teaching performance of adjunct faculty members be improved through the availability of faculty development programs (are faculty development programs effective)?
- How involved are adjunct faculty members in their departments/universities? With what activities are they invited/involved?
- How can mission-based colleges and universities best incorporate faith integration into faculty orientations and faculty development? Can faith integration be addressed in traditional orientation and development activities, or are alternative methods needed?

Many of the questions posed in this section involve reporting current practices in CCCU schools. Hence, with the exception of questions addressing faith integration, some preliminary work has been conducted for questions primarily involving practices at secular institutions. This will allow comparisons.

Section F: The Accuracy of the Portrayal of Faith Integration in Marketing Materials

An accurate portrayal of the extent of faith integration in marketing materials would appear to be an important issue for research. Areas for research include:

- How accurately do CCCU institutions portray the faith integration that their institutions provide?
- Has there been any change in the level of faith integration promised in institutions' marketing materials over the past couple of decades? If there is, why has it happened? If the attention to faith integration in marketing materials has increased, has there been a corresponding increase in actual faith integration? If the attention to faith integration has decreased, does the decreased attention reflect decreased faith integration? Does it reflect a changing in the mission of the affected institution(s)?