



Why All Faculty Should Have a Seat at the Assessment Table

JENNIFER DANLEY-SCOTT AND GRAY SCOTT

ABSTRACT

While faculty are often treated as a homogenous group in literature discussing student learning outcomes assessment, this should not be the case. Drawing on responses to a national survey, we show that full-time faculty, both tenure-line and non-tenure-line, are likely to be invited to help design and give feedback on assessments implemented in disciplines, institutions, and classes. Full-time faculty are also likely to be invited to interpret the assessment results and offer feedback on how to use the results to close the loop. Part-time faculty members are not as likely as their full-time colleagues to be invited to participate in the various stages of the assessment loop. The implications of these findings are discussed. Keywords: assessment, part-time faculty, student learning outcomes, success, retention

Introduction

A slew of studies reveals that part-time and non-tenure-track faculty are poorly integrated into educational institutions and are less effective because of their precarious and temporary employment (Baldwin and Chronister 2001; Benjamin 2002; June 2012; Kezar 2012; Kezar and Sam 2011; Street et al. 2012). Yet when educators and administrators write about assessment and student success efforts, they often use the term *faculty* loosely,

implying full participation by faculty of all types. While many readers of their documents might come away with the impression that all faculty are participating in assessment, those aware of the literature on adjunct faculty might assume that only about 40% of “faculty” (those on the tenure track) do so. The latter seems to be the safer guess, but both interpretations are assumptions. To what degree are non-tenure-track faculty invited to be a part of student learning outcomes assessment? The answer to that question has to date been more often presumed than documented.

Surveys are needed to illuminate the differing levels of participation across the faculty spectrum. Campuses feature an array of faculty populations: tenure-line faculty; guest and visiting faculty; full-time, non-tenure-track faculty; graduate student teachers (particularly in programs like first-year composition); part-time faculty. Studies repeatedly show that part-time (and sometimes full-time) non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty are not involved institutionally to the same degree as their tenure-line counterparts. For example, both full- and part-time NTT faculty are unlikely to have a voice in shared governance, committees, or department meetings (Baldwin and Chronister 2001). As these are the moments when information is given and decisions are made, segregation among faculty could potentially affect participation, possibly with long-lasting ramifications.

It is reasonable to question, then, whether NTT faculty are fully involved in assessment at their institutions. They may be submitting documents for reporting purposes or directing their students to take tests to comply with department requirements, but are they involved with assessment in a way that promotes and increases student success? Does their framing of assessment activities support the goals of assessment, or do they introduce assessments to students as “something that needs to be done” before getting back to more important work, potentially affecting student motivation to do their best? Do NTT faculty have input into whether the assessments reflect what students are being taught? Do they adjust their teaching based on the results? With little literature published on the assessment involvement of NTT faculty, exploring how faculty participate in the assessment process is important, especially if doing so identifies whether large faculty populations are being kept (purposefully or accidentally) from the decision-making process.

Some might question whether it matters *who* is invited to participate. Emphatically, yes, it does. Student learning outcomes assessment ideally tries to determine whether students are mastering learning goals during their time in a program or institution. But academic freedom often leads

to classes within the same discipline, even sections of the same course, differing from one another. Sometimes they differ substantially, which is often the case in introductory courses in the general education/core program. A history program may have a dozen sections of a US history course, taught by eight or more faculty members. Teaching styles, textbooks, and materials will vary. Faculty emphasis on any given topic may be thorough or scant, depending on research interests. Some faculty lecture to deliver material while others flip classes, adding group activities and simulations. While varied methods may appear to impart the same basic knowledge of a *subject*, students practice different skills (writing, argumentation, communication, analysis) in different sections and instructors may address different outcomes from section to section. Finally, part-time faculty may also be unaware of what departmental norms and expectations are in the absence of a clearly communicated departmental culture. The performance expectations and evaluation methods for part-time faculty, while often heavily based on student teaching evaluations (Langen 2011), may not always include assessment benchmarks and other expectations known to long-term faculty.

If employment status affects access to resources like office space or photocopying or desirable classrooms, it may also indirectly drive decisions that faculty members make about their teaching. All of these differences can subtly influence the design and results of assessment. A skewed demographic of faculty participants may very well skew what departments think is happening in classrooms. In statistical terms, faculty are an intervening variable, as they teach preferred materials in varying styles.

Other objections to our line of questioning come to mind. It might, for instance, be argued that the question is irrelevant because assessment does not technically require direct involvement from faculty at all. Programs, departments, and institutions can administer assessments in classes without instructor assistance. Others may assume assessment results will trickle down through the ranks. Some might point out that adjunct faculty and graduate students are not paid for service, and therefore they should not be expected to put unpaid time into performing assessment. Still others might point out that tenure-line faculty are the voting members of a department. They are the faculty expected to stay with the institution for a long time and entrusted with its long-term vision. For that reason, an argument might go, they alone should decide how classes and disciplines are assessed. Part-time faculty—less likely to be voting members of departments and often teaching at multiple institutions—are generally less involved at individual

campuses (AAUP 2009) and less involved in departmental decisions, whether on assessment or on other program matters.

These points are problematic due to two trends: first, a growing emphasis on assessment of general education (sometimes termed the *core curriculum*), and second, skyrocketing reliance on NTT faculty to teach general-education or core classes. (Hereafter, we use the term *core* to refer to general education.)

The move to assess core programs is understandable. Student retention, for many reasons, is lowest during a student's first two years of college, a period in which many students are concentrating on their core requirements. And NTT faculty loom large in the core. Nearly two decades ago the Coalition on the Academic Workforce found that, in most programs, more than half of core courses were taught by instructors off the tenure track (MLA 2001). That percentage has very likely increased since 2001. Drawing on Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) figures, an AAUP compilation report found that 70% of faculty in 2011 were considered contingent—a category comprising both full- and part-time NTT faculty—compared with 37% in 1993 and 43% in 1975. Part-time faculty constituted more than two-thirds of contingent faculty in that analysis and roughly 50% of faculty overall that year (AAUP 2013). More recent IPEDS data show that the percentage of faculty who are part-time has continued to climb, reaching 54% in Fall 2014. Indeed, although raw numbers of full-time faculty increased an average of 1.6% per year from 2002 to 2014, the number of part-time faculty has increased at more than twice that rate, at 3.9% (US Department of Education 2014). Because tenure-line faculty often prefer working with students majoring in their fields, and because tenure-line faculty typically choose classes before NTT faculty do, it seems likely that most of the observed growth in part-time appointments has occurred, and will continue to occur, in the core curriculum.

In light of these trends, a considerable body of literature has explored student success and the effect that NTT faculty have on retention. Some studies have concluded that NTT faculty have negative impacts on student retention (Jaeger and Egan 2011), especially when the students are enrolled in “gateway” courses with part-time and graduate student instructors (Egan and Jaeger 2008). Jaeger and Hintz (2009) have found that the more classes students take with part-time faculty, the lower the odds become that they will remain enrolled. Other studies have shown that NTT faculty have similarly negative effects on transfer rates from community colleges to universities (Egan and Jaeger 2009) and that students who take courses

with part-time faculty experience lower graduation rates (Ehrenberg and Zhang 2004; Jaeger and Eagan 2009; Jacoby 2006).

Overreliance on NTT faculty in introductory courses may affect the "less-well-prepared" students most, according to Benjamin (2002). Specifically, Benjamin connects those harms not to the quality of the classroom instruction by part-time faculty, but instead to a faculty member's office hours and knowledge of the institution. Tenure-line faculty tend to hold more office hours and have more intimate knowledge of the campus and its resources than NTT faculty do, and those differences appear to matter. Those findings are supported by Jaasma and Koper (2002), who found a correlation between student satisfaction and faculty availability outside of the classroom. For disciplines that hope introductory courses will bring in more majors, the findings are similarly stark: NTT faculty are less likely to adequately prepare students for upper-division coursework in a field (Burgess and Samuels 1999), and students in classes taught by NTT faculty are less likely—in most cases—to pursue future studies in a major (Bettinger and Long 2004).

The above evidence, again, does not mean that NTT faculty are bad at teaching. A lack of contact hours and lack of familiarity with a given campus and its policies, as noted by Benjamin (2002), are predictable side effects when faculty must juggle classes at many campuses to make ends meet. Additionally, the largest subpopulation of NTT faculty (adjunct faculty) often lack for resources like office space or records storage, and they receive last-minute notification of what they will be teaching (June 2012; Kezar 2012; Kezar and Sam 2011; Street et al. 2012). These issues unavoidably impair teaching preparation and inhibit student-faculty meetings. And while contracts and bargaining agreements increasingly address PT teaching resources, assessment is still largely classified under the umbrella of teaching, which often adds to workload without additional pay.¹ The studies suggest that, under better institutional conditions and increased pay, NTT faculty would have fewer obstacles and their students' experiences and success would likely improve greatly.

Furthering this point, some studies have found that NTT faculty can be more effective than their tenure-line counterparts, as Figlio, Schapiro, and Soter (2013) showed while studying the difference between teaching-oriented (often full-time) lecturers and research-oriented tenure-line faculty. In particular, NTT faculty may prioritize teaching over research to a greater degree than tenure-line faculty do and may spend more time focusing on increasing pedagogical skills and student success measures. For instance,

Scott and Danley-Scott (2015) found that NTT faculty were more likely than tenure-line faculty to say they would participate in assessment if it would improve their teaching effectiveness. Zubrow's (2012) study of adjunct faculty involvement in assessment at Granite State College similarly found that adjuncts were guided by their desire to be better teachers, and "connecting program assessment to that passion was, for them and for the college, the most compelling reason to pursue and contribute to assessment discourse" (Zubrow 2012).

Finally, faculty groups may differ in feeling valued and appreciated by their institutions. The feeling of being appreciated by an institution can affect how collegial or effective a faculty member may be (Ambrose, Huston, and Norman 2005), which may in turn affect faculty attitude and teaching effectiveness. As student enthusiasm can be affected by instructor enthusiasm (Alsharif and Qi 2014), when faculty feel involved and appreciated by the university or college students may benefit.

If we believe that factors like working conditions, involvement level, and level of value affect teaching, then they must also matter to student success. Because faculty conditions vary, failing to invite part-time faculty to participate in the entire assessment loop limits information on what half of the faculty do in their sections and the challenges they face. Such practices may render assessments less robust or lead faculty and administrators to misinterpret findings. Moreover, to assume part-time faculty are uninterested in assessment is inaccurate; they are quite interested if the assessment is designed to provide information on teaching techniques (Danley-Scott and Scott 2014; Scott and Danley-Scott 2015). Just as one wouldn't interview only men for an election survey, one should not ignore half of the faculty when deciding how to meaningfully assess student learning and suggesting best practices inside a classroom.

The Survey

To gauge involvement across categories of faculty, we created a survey for distribution to faculty serving as instructors of record at community colleges and universities throughout the United States. We administered the online, anonymous survey (approved through our campus institutional review board) through PsychData in the Fall of 2014. Invitations with informed consents were sent by email to random faculty of varied departments, with each message containing the survey's static URL. To ensure a

diverse pool of respondents, faculty were solicited from a minimum of one private four-year institution, one public four-year institution, and one two-year institution within each state. We solicited additional respondents from each institution type in states with larger populations, such as California, Texas, New York, Ohio, and Florida. Because NTT faculty contact information was often unavailable or outdated on university and college websites, NTT respondents were also solicited from an adjunct email list with a national membership.²

The invitation was directly emailed to 2,231 potential respondents. Of these, 177 emailed invitations were bounced back by institutional email servers due to discontinued addresses or because faculty were on sabbatical. Also, because over half of the invitations were sent to NTT faculty, it is highly likely many of the email addresses were no longer in use because the faculty member was no longer affiliated with the college or university, either permanently or else for that semester.

After completing the survey, respondents were given the opportunity to receive a \$5 electronic gift card if they provided an email address in a second survey that was segregated to protect the anonymity of respondents who requested compensation. Of 201 respondents, we had 197 usable responses. The 149 respondents who requested gift cards represented 49 states (we received no institutional email address affiliated with Utah) and a variety of private, public, and religious two- and four-year institutions, as well as some noninstitutional email addresses. The responses provided by faculty showed that our pool came from a variety of fields and disciplines, with some (math and English) more heavily represented in the NTT pools. This distribution aligned with a recent study of the number of NTT faculty in various disciplines (Kezar, Maxey, and Eaton 2014), showing that some disciplines staff classes and sections heavily with NTT faculty.

Precurity Rankings

In the interest of privacy and anonymity, we asked respondents relatively few demographic or institutional questions. Whether the faculty member worked at a two-year institution or four-year institution was asked, but not the name of the institution or the location of the institution. Because of the nature of the study, however, we did ask respondents to self-identify their employment status. Respondents selected their employment type from a list, ranging from part-time to full-time, visiting to tenured. For those who

felt their employment required explanation, such as faculty who held dual appointments, that is, teaching department chairs, we provided an "other" response option, with an open response prompt for clarification of employment type.

Of the 197 respondents, 191 provided selections or written information enabling us to code them into three employment categories. We assigned each category a precarity score and created an ordinal variable on a scale of 1 to 3. That is, we ranked the job categories according to the job stability and security likely experienced by the faculty member, with high numbers suggesting more job security and low numbers suggesting less job security. Respondents who were part-time (PT) were coded as a 1; visiting faculty and full-time non-tenure-track (FTNTT) were coded as a 2; tenure-line or administrators who teach as part of their contract (TT) were coded as a 3.³

After coding, our sample contained useable responses from 57 PT faculty, 48 full-time or visiting NTT faculty, and 86 tenure-line or long-term contract faculty from states or institutions that did not have a tenure process. Data were exported from PsychData to SPSS and all statistical models presented in the paper were run using SPSS version 19.

Results: Frequencies of Participation

To determine whether true differences exist among the responses of the three faculty groups, we ran a one-way ANOVA on several questions. Using precarity as an independent variable, we measured the differences among group responses answering yes or no on the following survey items:

- whether they were invited to participate in designing or provide feedback on the assessment device;
- whether they had input into how the assessments were interpreted; and
- whether they felt valued by their institution.

An ANOVA found statistically significant differences among the responses of the three groups for whether the faculty felt valued by the institutions ($F(2, 188) = 3.622, p < .05$), were invited to participate in assessment in general ($F(2, 188) = 17.256, p < .001$), and whether the groups were invited to help interpret assessment results ($F(2, 116) = 3.376, p < .05$).

The findings in table 1 show variance in how often the different categories of faculty were invited to participate in the assessment process,

TABLE 1. Percentage of respondents answering "Yes" to questions, grouped by self-identified status

	Part Time, NTT Faculty	Full Time, NTT Faculty	Tenure Line Faculty
Do you feel valued by your institution?	52.6%	70.8%	73.3%
Were you invited to participate in designing or providing feedback on an assessment device for your department or unit?	39%	60.4%	75.6%
• If no to above, did you try to offer feedback anyway?	32.5% (n=40)	57.9% (n=19)	38% (n=21)
• If yes to above: University asked for help in designing instrument.	11.8% (n=17)	24.1% (n=29)	28.1% (n=64)
• If yes to above: University asked for feedback on instruments.	11.8% (n=17)	17.273.8% (n=29)	14.1% (n=64)
• If yes to above: Department asked for help in designing instrument.	35.3% (n=17)	58.6% (n=29)	67.2% (n=64)
• If yes to above: Department asked for feedback on instruments.	58.8% (n=17)	69% (n=29)	54.7% (n=64)
Did you accept the invitation to help with assessment?	94.1%	96.6%	90.6%
N	57	48	86

* One respondent marked yes for invited to help, but did not answer how s/he was asked to help.

according to respondents. Unsurprisingly, there was a difference overall in whether the faculty groups felt valued by their institutions, with only 52.6% of PT faculty reporting that they felt valued while 70.8% and 73.3% of FTNTT and TT faculty, respectively, stated they felt valued. Looking closely at questions relating to assessment, the results show that PT faculty were least likely to receive an invite to assist with assessment. Full-time faculty (regardless of tenure status) were the most likely to have been invited to participate in assessment. Broadly, 39.8% of PT faculty reported that they had been invited to help design or give feedback on the assessment device that would be used in their department or classes. In comparison, 75.6% of TT faculty were invited to participate, and 60.4% of FTNTT faculty were asked to participate.

Departments were more likely than college or university institutions to have asked PT faculty for assistance with assessment design. PT faculty (58.8%) and FTNTT faculty (69%) reported department invitations for feedback on assessment instruments, but only 11.8% of PT and 17.2% of

FTNTT faculty reported having been invited to provide feedback at the institutional level. If departments are as willing to loop in NTT faculty as the data suggest, one wonders why NTT faculty (part- and full-time) seem to be underutilized at the institutional level. One possibility, suggested by our own anecdotal experiences, is that PT faculty may be left out of the communications between the institutions and faculty. For instance, NTT faculty may not belong to the institution's faculty email lists or they may not be invited to college- and university-wide meetings. A second possibility, suggested by university officials we have spoken with, is that an institution's full-time employees may feel that asking PT faculty for input is unfair to PT faculty given their lower compensation and job security. Moreover, it is possible that contracts or union memorandums of understanding may limit institutions from asking contingent faculty to participate in assessment meetings without providing additional pay. In these scenarios, institution-level requests for faculty participation may be less likely to be passed along to PT faculty than departmental requests are. The disparity between department and institutional invitations might, in other words, be partly explained by the fact that most assessment is still being carried out at the department and discipline level. University-wide assessment is relatively new, compared with discipline-level assessment. Any of these possibilities, or several in tandem, may also explain why 28.1% of TT faculty were asked by their institution to help design an assessment instrument, while only 11.8% of PT and 24.1% of FTNTT were similarly asked.

Perhaps more problematic is that TT faculty (67.2%) were far more likely to have reported that their departments asked them to help create assessments, compared with PT (35.3%) and FTNTT (58.6%). Yet, on the occasions that NTT faculty were asked to help, they were slightly more likely than their TT counterparts to accept the invitation: 96.6% of FTNTT faculty and 94.1% of PT faculty accepted the invitation to help with assessment, while 90.6% of TT faculty accepted the invitation to participate. That difference is consistent with the findings of other studies that FTNTT faculty are more concerned with teaching effectiveness than TT faculty are, as the latter often emphasize research and service, either out of personal choice or in response to the pressures of professional expectation. Underscoring the above implications was the fact that 57.7% of FTNTT faculty who were not asked to be a part of assessment design attempted to offer feedback anyway, while only 38% of TT and 32.5% of PT faculty made that effort.

Administrators may be surprised that almost all respondents said that they agreed to help with assessment. This result is likely a respondent self-selection bias: faculty with an interest in (or experience in) assessment may have been more inclined to respond to our survey link. Nevertheless, the number should be heartening to those who prefer that assessment be faculty-driven.

When we look at whether the faculty are involved in the final stage of assessment, *closing the loop*, we find that precarity again affects involvement. In each case, TT faculty had more information and influence over interpreting findings and applying assessment than the other two faculty groups did. This was especially the case in determining what classroom changes should occur in response to the assessment results.

For instance, the likelihood that faculty learned how their individual classes performed on assessments varied by faculty status. As table 2 shows, PT faculty (62.1%) were less likely than their counterparts to receive those section results. In comparison, 75.9% of FTNTT reported they received their section results, while 80.3% of TT faculty were given their section results. Moreover, PT faculty (41.1%) were much less likely than their counterparts (65.5% for FTNTT and 70.5% TT) to know how the department's assessments went.

A particularly troubling finding is the lack of NTT involvement in interpretation. Involvement in interpretation should be high across the board since faculty are aware of how their courses are run, and because it is likely

that PT faculty run classes differently than FT faculty do, due to differences in resources, alignment with department norms, and availability. Yet PT faculty were much less likely than other groups to have a say (by 18–30 percentage points) in how results were interpreted or applied. Only 37.9% of PT faculty reported being invited to participate in interpretation, while 55.2% of FTNTT and 67.2% of TT faculty were involved in interpretation.

Our final finding regarding the frequency of involvement is that PT faculty were less likely to be invited to participate in the changes made in response to the results. Only 41.1% of PT reported invitations to be involved in the translation of results to action, compared with 65.5% of full time and 80.3% of TT faculty.

Our findings augur future problems for student success efforts. We appear to be looking at a “perfect storm” scenario involving two whorls of ignorance: institutional ignorance of what NTT faculty are doing and witnessing, plus NTT faculty ignorance of their institution's student success efforts and findings. Although in some cases those veils of ignorance may be created by the provisions of adjunct contracts or by union stipulations, the result in any case is the same: a potentially dysfunctional and incomplete assessment practice. At many universities and colleges, the lion's share of general education courses is taught by FTNTT and PT faculty. Because many of those faculty are not invited to offer insight into the assessment instruments, data interpretation, or instructional improvement to meet student needs, colleges and universities are deprived of their frontline experiences and perspectives.

Accuracy of interpretation is also likely to suffer if the majority of the faculty teaching are not offering possible explanations for observed results. Teaching style, classroom organization, activities, experiences, and testing methods can all affect what students learn as well as increase or decrease student performance on assessments. Suggesting changes to curriculum without the involvement of the faculty who teach the courses often can lead to a number of problems, from inappropriate changes to teacher frustration or downright insubordination. At the same time, the FTNTT and PT faculty—for many students, the faces most associated with the institution and its student support—remain largely unplugged from the student success efforts of their institutions and are not informed of assessment results. Compounding matters, their students are encountering that storm during their first two years, when they are at their highest risk of dropping out.

If only for the possibility of improving student success results, administrators should take note of the above findings. However, administrators

TABLE 2. Percentage of respondents answering “Yes” to questions, grouped by self-identified status

	Part Time, NTT Faculty	Full Time, NTT Faculty	Tenure Line Faculty
Has your department shared with you the results of your sections' assessments?	62.1%	75.9%	80.3%
Has your department provided the results of the department's assessments?	41.1%	65.5%	70.5%
Do you have input into how the assessment results are interpreted?	37.9%	55.2%	67.2%
Do you have input into any changes proposed in response to the assessment results?	41.1%	65.5%	80.3%
N	57	48	86

may reasonably worry that expanding the invitations to participate to NTT faculty might be seen as insensitive to their employment realities, or as violations of union contracts, prompting backlash. NTT faculty, especially part-time, non-contract faculty, often feel exploited and ignored by their departments and institutions. For this reason, we also asked questions about the relationship between being asked to participate in assessment and faculties' sense of their relationship with employing institutions. The section that follows reports on those findings.

Results: Do Participants Feel Valued?

If it is correct that feeling valued by an institution can change how effective faculty and staff are (Ambrose, Huston, and Norman 2005), learning and assessment may be deeply impacted by the simple act of inviting NTT faculty to participate and have a say in assessment. To determine whether such effects are positive or negative, we looked at whether inviting everyone to participate in assessment increased—or decreased—the likelihood that faculty reported that they felt valued by their institution.

Initial ANOVA results showed significant differences ($p < .05$) among the three types of faculty when it came to whether they felt valued by their institution. Affirmative answers to the being-valued question predicted whether faculty were invited to participate in assessment. There is similarly a positive, highly significant ($p < .01$) Pearson correlation of .238 between being invited (coded as 1) and feeling valued. It seems reasonable to interpret this in two ways: To ask for an opinion or help says that a person's opinion is valued. As well, asking for an opinion on or assistance with assessment also shows that a department or administration is aware of their non-tenure-line faculty, and perhaps regularly involves these faculty groups. The result may be evidence of a kind of Ben Franklin effect, a psychological phenomenon by which performing favors for others makes one more inclined (rather than less inclined) to like the beneficiaries (McRaney 2011).

It is not clear from the above data whether the results of this correlation are affected by tenure-line-status, however. Hence, three logistic regressions were performed to analyze the effects of faculty status and invitation to participate in assessment on whether a respondent felt appreciated. Model 1 shows the influence of faculty status on whether a respondent felt appreciated. Model 2 shows the influence of being invited to participate in assessment on whether a respondent felt appreciated. Model 3 shows

the effects of both independent variables on a faculty member's feeling of being appreciated.

Faculty status, or level of employment precarity, was scored on a 1–3 ordinal scale with part-time faculty assigned a 1. Invitation to participate was scored as 0 or 1, as the faculty were either invited or not invited to participate in institutional or departmental assessment. Whether faculty felt valued was similarly scored 0 or 1. Faculty status affected a faculty member's feeling of value, and as the faculty status increased from part-time faculty to lecturer to tenure-line faculty, the feeling of value increased as well. The invitation to participate in assessment similarly increased a faculty member's feeling of being valued by their institution.

The details of the three models are shown in table 3. Model 1 was significant, $\chi^2(1) = 6.078$, $p = .014$, with a Nagelkerke $R^2 = .043$. Faculty status was a significant predictor of feeling valued, $p = .014$, and had an odds ratio of 1.560, indicating that as faculty status level increases from part-time to full-time to tenure-line, the respondent is more likely to feel appreciated. Model 2 was also significant, $\chi^2(1) = 10.909$, $p = .001$, with a Nagelkerke $R^2 = .076$. Invitation to participate in assessment was a significant predictor, $p = .001$, and had an odds ratio of 2.782, indicating that those faculty invited to participate in assessment are more likely to feel appreciated than faculty not invited to participate. At last, model 3 included both predictors, and the model was significant, $\chi^2(2) = 11.850$, $p = .003$, with a Nagelkerke $R^2 = .083$.

TABLE 3. Logistic Regression Analysis of Faculty Status and Invitation to Participate on Respondents' Feelings of Being Valued by Institution

Independent Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Faculty Status	1.56*		1.309
Invitation to Participate		2.782**	2.253*
Constant Exp(B)	.780	1.132	.725
Model Chi-Square [df]	6.078[1]	10.909[1]	11.850[2]
Nagelkerke R ²	.043	.076	.083
N	191	193	191

Faculty status is an ordinal variable (1, 2, 3) based on precarity of employment. Invitation to participate in assessment is a dichotomous variable (0, 1). The dependent variable is whether the respondent feels valued by their main institution of employment. It is coded 0 = respondent does not feel valued and 1 = respondent feels valued. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

In this model, faculty status became nonsignificant when invitation to participate in assessment was included in the same model, $p = .173$. Whether a faculty member was invited to participate in assessment was the only significant predictor in model 3, $p = .017$, and had an odds ratio of 2.253.

While one cannot compare models directly, the Nagelkerke R^2 values show that including the invitation to participate variable creates a stronger model and better predicts why a faculty member felt valued by an institution. Also interesting was that when run as sole independent variables, faculty status and invitation to participate are significant variables, yet when included together in model 3 faculty status loses significance, leaving participation in assessment as the only significant predictor of faculty feeling valued. In the final model, we see that the invitation to participate in institutional or departmental assessment design increased the likelihood that a respondent felt valued by 2.253 times over a faculty member who was not invited to participate in assessment.

The end results suggest that invitation to participate has a positive effect on feelings of being valued, and that those who were invited to participate (more often the FT/NTT and the TT) felt more valued than faculty who were not invited. In fact, as the three models demonstrate, the invitation to participate has the strongest effect on whether a faculty member felt valued by their institution.

Conclusion

While most faculty members are invited to participate in assessment, PT faculty are not invited at the same frequency as their colleagues. Consistently, PT faculty were not invited as often to design, give feedback, discuss findings, or apply findings related to assessment. Low participation by PT faculty limits the effectiveness of assessment because such faculty teach a large and growing percentage of core courses that serve as gateways to majors and retention choke-points on the way to graduation.

Although institutions vary in the percentage of PT faculty they employ and likely vary in the obligations outlined in faculty contracts, our findings are likely relevant to most institutions, as the national trend is to increasingly depend on PT faculty to teach core classes that are assigned student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes assessment is also unlikely to disappear in the near future, and if meaningful assessment is to occur,

more faculty need to be invited to participate in every stage of the process. When accrediting bodies begin to question how the assessment loop is closed, it is a reasonable bet that they will increasingly look at which faculty are involved.

At the same time, it is heartening to note that FT/NTT faculty were routinely involved in closing the loop, at levels close to their tenure-line counterparts. Such behavior is consistent with findings that NTT faculty can be just as (if not more) effective than TT faculty in the classroom (Figlio 2013). Faculty who are concerned with student success and participate in measuring it may be more likely to implement changes in their classes.

The results of this study have implications in academic and institutional research. Given that PT are less likely to be invited to the assessment process and more likely to be left out of the distribution of results or best practices recommendations, it seems reckless to assume they will achieve results similar to FT/NTT or TT faculty as a result of interventions proposed by institutions or departments. If an institution cannot involve PT faculty in the assessment process due to institutional or contractual obstacles, researchers should consider analyzing the differences in outcomes between PT and FT faculty, to gauge whether different circumstances are producing different results. Institutional researchers should be cautious not to draw prejudicial interpretations of the data, as the causes of any detected differences may be institutional rather than innate.

With regard to service, departments and administrations should make an effort to include all faculty. Administrators and departments should not assume that assessment only interests full-time faculty, or that invitations to be involved in assessment will somehow informally filter down through the faculty ranks. Invitations to participate should be formal to ensure that all faculty members know of the opportunity, and should invite all faculty to help design and implement assessments, and analyze the results. Even if departments feel it is unfair to ask PT faculty to work extra without compensation or pay, it is better to let individual faculty members determine whether they want to be involved in the process. A faculty member may choose to participate in the effort to increase personal teaching effectiveness or for other reasons.

Finally, our study shows that asking faculty for their opinion sends several important messages to critical stakeholders in higher education. It shows faculty that they are valued by the institution and department, opening the process and making it transparent, while giving faculty an

opportunity to affect the policies that trickle down to their classrooms. For that reason, institutions that wish to keep faculty, both tenure-line and non-tenure-line, collegial and involved should remember assessment as a way to show all faculty they are integral to the student success movement. Inviting a wider range of faculty also communicates that institutions and departments are serious about student success. The more representative faculty participation is, the more valid assessment data will be, and better informed faculty are likely to be more effective teachers. Conversely, leaving a large segment of the teaching population out of the conversation may reasonably be perceived as an indicator that the assessment is not truly aimed at student improvement or faculty improvement.

JENNIFER DANLEY-SCOTT is visiting assistant professor in the Department of History and Government at Texas Woman's University. Dr. Danley-Scott's research examines the issues surrounding the increasing use of contingent faculty. Past studies investigated methods of efficient assessment of large classes and achieving discipline-wide assessment while maintaining academic freedom and reducing stereotype threat.

GRAY SCOTT is the assistant director of Academic Assessment and an associate professor of English at Texas Woman's University. A past director of the university's first-year composition program, Dr. Scott researches challenges that we face when we attempt to assess complicated activities like writing, adjunct labor issues, and academic dishonesty.

Notes

The authors would like to thank the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Texas Woman's University for the small-grant funds to pay for survey incentives. We would also like to thank statistician Weidan Zhou in the TWU Center for Research Design and Analysis for his feedback.

1. Other observers cite workload disparities, as PT faculty are rarely paid for service and preparation time. In an executive summary, the American Federation of Teachers called on local leadership to pay closer attention to student success and institutional efforts to increase retention. Their recommendations include an increase in shared governance as well as fair pay so that PT faculty can perform the "essential duties of faculty" (AFT 2011, 12), and "investment in a healthy staffing system rather than one built on the exploitation of contingent labor and the loss of full-time tenured faculty" (17). The AFT's acknowledgment of the workload issue opens the door to future bargaining and contractual language involving assessment. The National Education Association's observations on workload and assessment are

more pointed: the pressure to implement assessment will lead to an increase in unpaid work for part-time faculty and contracts should be cautious of the language that binds faculty to assessment participation (NEA 2013).

2. It should be noted that a high number of institutions made it very difficult, if not impossible, to find the names and contact information for their NTT faculty. Some universities and colleges made it appear that they had no faculty other than tenure-line, even in math and English departments, which are the largest employers of NTT faculty.

3. Two full-time faculty reported employment in systems that do not offer tenure but earn extended contracts after several years of teaching and observation; these faculty were coded as a 3.

References

- Alsharif, Naser Z., and Yongyue Qi. 2014. "A Three-Year Study of the Impact of Instructor Attitude, Enthusiasm, and Teaching Style on Student Learning in a Medicinal Chemistry Course." *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 78 (7): 132.
- Ambrose, Susan, Therese Huston, and Marie Norman. 2005. "A Qualitative Method for Assessing Faculty Satisfaction." *Research in Higher Education* 46 (7): 803-30.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 2009. "What Are the Part-Time Faculty?" July-August. <https://www.aaup.org/article/who-are-part-time-faculty#.WC37NblrKoo>.
- . 2013. "Trends in Faculty Employment Status, 1975-2011." March 20. https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Faculty_Trends_o.pdf.
- American Federation of Teachers (AFT), AFL-CIO, Higher Education. 2011. "Student Success in Higher Education." Executive Summary. <https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/studentssuccess0311.pdf>.
- Baldwin, Roger G., and Jay L. Chronister. 2001. *Teaching without Tenure*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Benjamin, Ernst. 2002. "How Over-reliance on Non-tenure track Appointments Diminishes Faculty Involvement in Student Learning." *Peer Review* 5 (1): 4-10.
- Bettinger, Eric, and Bridget Terry Long. 2004. "Do College Instructors Matter? The Effects of Adjuncts and Graduate Assistants on Students' Interests and Success." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper no. 10370, March. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. http://www.nber.org/papers/w10370.pdf?new_window=1.

- Burgess, Larry A., and Carl Samuels. 1999. "Impact of Full-time Versus Part-time Instructor Status on College Student Retention and Academic Performance in Sequential Courses." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 23:487-98.
- Danley-Scott, Jennifer, and Gray Scott. 2014. "The Other Half: Non-tenure Track Faculty Thoughts on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment." *Research and Practice in Assessment* 9.
- Eagan, M. Kevin, and Audrey J. Jaeger. 2008. "Closing the Gate: Part-time Faculty Instruction in Gatekeeper Courses and First-year Persistence." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 115:39-53.
- . 2009. "Effects of Exposure to Part-time Faculty on Community College Transfer." *Research in Higher Education* 50:168-88.
- Ehrenberg, Ronald L., and Liang Zhang. 2004. "Do Tenured and Non-Tenure Track Faculty Matter?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper no. 10695. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w10695.pdf>?new_window=1.
- Figlio, David N., Morton O. Schapiro, and Kevin B. Soter. 2013. "Are Tenure Track Professors Better Teachers?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper no. 19406. September. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19406>.
- Jaasma, Marjorie, and Randall Koper. 2002. "Out-of-Class Communication between Female and Male Students and Faculty: The Relationship to Student Perceptions of Instructor Immediacy." *Women's Studies in Communication* 25:119-37.
- Jacoby, Daniel. 2006. "Effects of Part-time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates." *Journal of Higher Education* 77:1081-1103.
- Jaeger, Audrey J., and M. Kevin Eagan. 2009. "Unintended Consequences: Examining the Effect of Part-time Faculty Members on Associate's Degree Completion." *Community College Review* 36:167-94. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091552108327070>.
- . 2011. "Examining Retention and Contingent Faculty Use in a State System of Public Higher Education." *Educational Policy* 25:507-37. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0895904810361723>.
- Jaeger, Audrey J., and Derik Hinz. 2009. "The Effects of Part-time Faculty on First Semester Freshmen Retention: A Predictive Model Using Logistic Regression." *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice* 10 (3): 265-86.
- June, Audrey Williams. 2012. "How Universities Treat Adjuncts Limits Their Effectiveness in the Classroom, Report Says." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 23. <http://chronicle.com/article/Adjuncts-Working-Conditions/133918/>.
- Kezar, Adrianna. 2012. "Spanning the Great Divide between Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty." *Change*, November/December. doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.728949
- Kezar, Adrianna, Daniel Maxey, and Judith Eaton. 2014. "An Examination of the Changing Faculty: Ensuring Institutional Quality and Achieving Desired Student Learning Outcomes." Council for Higher Education Accreditation: Occasional Paper. January. https://www.chaea.org/userfiles/Conference%20Presentations/Examination_Changing_Faculty_2013.pdf.
- Kezar, Adrianna, and Cecile Sam. 2011. "Understanding Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: New Assumptions and Theories for Conceptualizing Behavior." *American Behavioral Scientist* 55:1419-42. doi: 10.1177/0002764211408879.
- Langen, Jill M. 2011. "Evaluation of Adjunct Faculty in Higher Education Institutions." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 36 (2): 185-96. doi: 10.1080/02602930903221501.
- McRaney, David. 2011. *The Benjamin Franklin Effect*. October 5. Retrieved from <https://youarenotsoSMART.com/2011/10/05/the-benjamin-franklin-effect/>.
- Modern Languages Association (MLA). 2001. *Summary of Data from Surveys by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce*. March 13. http://www.mla.org/pdf/caw_report.pdf.
- National Education Association (NEA). 2013. "Bargaining Student Learning, Quality, and Assessment." *NEA Almanac of Higher Education*. http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/2013_Almanac_Dougherty.pdf.
- Scott, Gray, and Jennifer Danley-Scott. 2015. "Two Loops That Need Closing: Contingent Faculty Perceptions of Outcomes Assessment." *Journal of General Education* 64 (1): 30-55. doi: 10.1353/jge.2015.0004.
- Street, Steve, Maria Maisto, Esther Merves, and Gary Rhoades. 2012. "Who Is Professor 'Staff' and How Can This Person Teach So Many Classes?" *Center for the Future of Higher Education*. August.

[https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/profstaff\(2\).pdf](https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/profstaff(2).pdf).

US Department of Education. Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. 2014. *IPEDS: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System: Trend Generator for Degree-Granting Institutions, Employment Status and Occupational Categories Provisional Data*. <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/>.

Zubrow, Judy. 2012. "Case Study: Engaging Adjunct Faculty in Program Assessment." *Journal of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness*

2 (1): 77-102.