Making Visible Our Invisible Faculty: Mentoring for Contingent Online Faculty

Gaye Luna
Northern Arizona University

Since the U.S. recession, restructuring of the economy highlighted the growth of contingent workforces that provide flexibility, adaptability, and cost-effectiveness in organizations. Academe with limited resources increased reliance on contingent faculty (also known as part-time and adjunct faculty) for teaching. Contingent faculties who teach online for colleges and universities have received little attention in terms of their needs and interests. This article focuses on these invisible and voiceless faculties and presents a meta-synthesis of research that addressed contingent online faculty and mentoring strategies and programs.

INTRODUCTION

Institutions of higher education in the United States employed 1.5 million faculty members in the fall of 2013. Of this number, part-time faculty totaled 45 percent of faculty or over 750,000 individuals working in universities, colleges, and community colleges, an increase of 104 percent from a decade prior (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2016). At the institution of the author, more than 75% of courses within an academic discipline are taught online by contingent faculties who are geographically dispersed from the flagship campus.

Though this surge in casualized labor has exacerbated concerns, the hiring of temporary professors seems unlikely to cease with new-found challenges of disinvestment in higher education, especially at state-supported institutions experiencing public's contempt of inefficiency and lack of accountability (Kelderman, 2016). Once seen as expendable, and almost always invisible and voiceless, contingent faculties have found employment by serving a majority of part-time, online, and weekend students and by teaching developmental classes, lower division offerings, and general education, those courses unattractive to many full-time senior faculty (AAUP, 2014; Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Dutton, 2015). Not surprising, a Congressional Study (U.S. House of Representatives, 2014) noted that contingent faculty in public higher education does the bulk of work in educating institutions' students.

Although there are disadvantages with hiring contingent faculties, institutions can best be served by supporting and mentoring this academic employee base. In today's competitive higher education environment, improving employment for contingent faculties can involve mentoring strategies or programs that address both institutional and contingent faculty needs. In this study, the needs and experiences of contingent online faculty were explored based on a meta-synthesis of research on academic workplace mentoring.

STUDY BACKGROUND

This article provides insight on utilization of contingent teaching faculty in institutions of higher education. As found in the literature, there are numerous effects of hiring faculty on a part-time basis, not only for the institution but for temporary employees as well. Geographically dispersed from main campuses and teaching online courses (Curtis & Thornton, 2013), this particular demographic has grown, too. Nowadays, the higher education marketplace offers numerous programs and courses online for student accessibility and convenience (Chow & Croxton, 2017). The author was interested in examining contingent online faculty studies to determine strategies and programmatic aspects of mentoring. Findings were reviewed to ascertain practices and new ideas for a future mentoring plan at a publically funded state university.

A meta-synthesis of contemporary research (2000-2017) on academic mentoring programs and strategies for part-time online faculty was completed. Upon individual study reviews, the findings were integrated into themes, providing direction to the following question: "What elements of mentoring strategies and programs address the needs of contingent online faculty?"

CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF TEACHING FACULTY

Higher education is changing in terms of faculty profiles. In turn, faculty members who teach part time have fast become a majority of instructional faculty in many departments and colleges. A report on U.S. community colleges (Center for Community College Student Engagement [CCCSE], 2014) revealed, ". . . institutions' interactions with part-time faculty result in a profound incongruity: Colleges depend on part-time faculty to educate more than half of their students, yet they do not fully embrace these faculty members" (p. 3). Contingent faculties provided the base on which institutions stand, yet the culture of academe extended little encouragement, respect, and support while offering low pay, no health care options, limited career advancement opportunities, unstable course loads, no guarantee of continued appointment, and no retirement benefits (Maxey & Kezar, 2015; U.S. House of Representatives, 2014). In this context, paid vacation, sick days, and personal, family and maternity leave, equally important, were non-existent. Operationally, contingent faculty members usually received no clerical support or office space (Kezar, 2013).

The Coalition of the Academic Workforce (CAW) found poverty-level wages with a median pay of $2,700 for a three-credit course (Hananel, 2013). Adding to this issue, a Congressional Study (U.S. House of Representatives, 2014) reported the median annual income as $22,041, requiring contingent faculty to cobble together other teaching assignments at different institutions. Along with stark financial statistics, the study commented on emotional stress of job instability as course loads were often manipulated or cancelled by administration concerned about institutional health-plan costs.

Professional organizations that conduct national research on the conditions of higher education faculty have brought light to the phenomenon and ongoing plight of contingent faculty (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 2006), for example, the New Faculty Majority (NFM) (n.d.) advancing their mission to transform the current employment of faculty working part time. Service and professional groups have seen memberships of academic contingent faculty rise. For instance, Duke University, University of Southern California, and Northeastern University are represented in ranks of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) (n.d.). Labor unions such as American Federation of Teachers (AFT), United States Steelworkers (USWA), and United Auto Workers (UAW) have been attractive to contingent faculty members wishing to organize (Cross & Goldenberg, 2014; Moser, 2014). Yet, they are still "missing from the institutional data picture" (Kezar & Maxey, 2012, p. 47).

Contingent faculties have been labelled part-time and adjunct, with titles used interchangeably. Contingent faculty members fulfill professional teaching assignments in community colleges, colleges, and universities with limited duration contracts and compensation that is determined on a per-course or hourly basis (AAUP, 2014; Biro, 2005). In this study, the term contingent faculty encompassed teaching faculties who were not tenure track, had non-permanent short-term contacts, and were paid differently

from full-time professors. The study did not include lecturer ranks and graduate-student instructional positions and did not address issues such as accreditation requirements, Common Law Rules, independent contractors, state or federal law, and National Labor Review Board holdings.

Eagan, Jaeger, and Grantham (2015) reviewed numerous studies related to contingent faculty. Although recruitment, job satisfaction, commitment, loyalty, and retention of these faculty members have not been studied as extensively as employee pools in business and industry, continuing growth should promote the subject as one of interest. The human aspect of the situation has not changed much from four decades ago when a front-page article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education,* entitled "Part-Time Teachers: Many Angry," underscored the following: "They are, says one of them, *marginal, expendable, underprivileged, underpaid"* (Scully, 1975, p. 1). Contingent faculty will remain de-professionally embedded in the culture of academe unless this new faculty is recognized, embraced, and supported by stakeholders, with full-time faculty members instrumental (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014; Wallin, 2005, 2007).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Recruiting, retaining, and promoting full-time faculty are expensive personnel investments for institutions. With ever-changing economic conditions, colleges and universities that relied on state funding found contingent faculties becoming a more permanent part of higher education. Cost-efficiency arguments abounded with contingent faculty seen as flexible and inexpensive, especially at institutions where governing boards saved monies by regulating maximum teaching loads, wage rates, and benefits (Cross & Goldenberg, 2014; Lui & Zhang, 2013, Ochoa, 2011). Beyond covering faculty shortages, contingent faculties brought skill sets to academic programs and courses with their day-to-day practitioner experiences and career backgrounds (Bettinger & Long, 2010). As stressed,

> [g]iven the constant changes of professional practice, the explosion of practical knowledge, and the increasing importance of the practical dimension of professional education, universities should have to recruit more practitioners to be academics, even on part-time basis, to raise the level of teaching.... In order to produce the most effective professional education, there must be a closer relationship between the professions and postsecondary institutions, and practitioners as part-time teachers are ideal candidates to help bridge the gap between professional practice and professional education. (Chan, 2012, p. 43)

In their seminal work, Gappa and Leslie (1993) offered a typology to describe contingent faculty in four ways: career-enders; specialists, experts, and professionals; aspiring academics; and freelancers. Conducting more than 450 interviews with contingent faculty, full-time faculty, and administrators, Gappa and Leslie emphasized practices that improved performance in the classroom and promoted satisfaction with the institution and its culture. Their recommendations circumscribed surveying contingent faculty about work conditions, distributing pertinent employment policies and guidelines, offering a range of employment options, establishing career tracks that provided incentives and rewards, and developing objective evaluative criteria to help determine contingent faculty re-employment.

Contingent Faculty: Issues and Conditions

Some study outcomes remained consistent across the literature. Contingent faculties in most cases did not participate fully in the following: (a) shared faculty governance (AAUP, 2013; AAUP, 2014; Berret, 2007; Kezar & Sam, 2013), (b) curriculum planning and pedagogical innovations (Biro, 2005; Kezar & Maxey, 2014), and (c) departmental, committee, or university decision making (Biro, 2005; Kezar & Sam, 2013; Ochoa, 2011). Recalling some of these concerns, Liu and Zhang (2013) reasoned that contingent faculty may not have the time nor the inclination to become involved in academe's daily processes or in long-term educational projects.

Research within the last 15 years underlined negative implications related to students: (a) student retention (Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2010; Jaeger & Eagan, 2011a), (b) student graduation (Ehrenberg&

Zhang, 2004; Jacoby, 2006; Jaeger & Eagan, 2009), and (c) student transfer (Eagen & Jaeger, 2009; Jaeger & Eagen, 2011b; U.S. House of Representatives, 2014). Johnson (2011) indicated that contingent faculty gave higher grades; however, Kemmerer (2014) noted that data comparison of grades between contingent faculty and full-time faculty was highly unreliable. Other studies found contingent faculty deficient in a variety of categories: less student interactions, fewer active and collaborative learning and teaching strategies, and less preparation time for instruction (CCCSE, 2014, Moser, 2014; Umbach, 2007).

Revvy and Deason (2014) argued that the path to employment of contingent faculty should identify any unwanted impacts upon students. Overall, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) asserted that "[s]uccessful colleges assess the value of their actions by one overarching evaluative criterion: Is it good for the student? Students' opinions about the institution and the quality of their academic experiences rest in the hands of teaching professionals with whom they spend the majority of their time at the college" (p. 157).

While much of the literature pointed to institutional, academic, and student issues, contingent faculties expressed motivational benefits with higher education employment. Intangible rewards were often overlooked, yet played a crucial part in decisions to teach part-time (Biro, 2005; Carlson, 2015, Dutton, 2015; Wallin, 2007), and enjoyment in teaching and working with students often counterbalanced the pay received (Carlson, 2015).

Adding perspective to the lives of contingent faculty, Erickson (2016) explained why individuals do not leave academe:

1. sunk costs – resources, time, and energy invested in part-time teaching;
2. loss of networks – personal and professional contacts developed from academic teaching and membership in the institution;
3. over-qualification – degree and experience translated negatively to external job market;
4. intellectual stimulation – qualities and conditions different and undervalued in external employment; and
5. passion for teaching – personal fulfillment from one's academic field, students, and colleagues missed in non-academic world.

Supplementing the list, Kendzior (2016) found that contingent faculty are far more likely to have high student-loan debt.

Mentoring Contingent Faculty

Business and industry have a long history of mentoring employees, and studies described outcomes of mentoring as well as styles of mentoring programs (Delong, Gabarro, & Lees, 2008; Kraimer, et al., 2011; Ragins, Weinberg & Lankau, 2011). Academic mentoring of contingent faculty has not been researched as extensively though studies pointed to variables of commitment, engagement, and satisfaction as important (Batiste, 2016; Lewis, 2012). Watson (2012) reported that contingent faculty who received mentoring had more instructional confidence, and with a quality mentoring program, institutional loyalty followed. Most mentoring programs in academe were structured around induction, which included topics of student policies, resource support, and distribution of syllabi and content materials (Wallin, 2005), though one study addressed contingent faculty in terms of integrity of the course and the program, effective teaching, and sustainable relationships within the mentor program (Ziegler & Reiff, 2006). Mujtaba and Gibson (2007) explained a formal orientation and training program at a private university where structured initial training for over 400 dispersed contingent faculty was available, and the program arranged mentorships with assigned mentors and mentees. Rewards for full-time and contingent faculty participation were suggested with compensation or reduction in load as appropriate for full-time professors and stipends of $500 for contingent faculty. Mentoring programs necessitated cooperation of full-time faculty members and discourse on financial, technological, and personnel resources (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014; Wallin, 2007).

The literature on mentoring strategies and programs for contingent faculty teaching online was confounded by conjoined ranks of contingent faculty and full-time faculty, wherein the results could not easily be separated by faculty status (Diegel, 2010; Linck, 2004; Maier, 2012; Marsh, 2010). However, the Online Learning Consortium (OLC) (2017) reported that 59% of institutions had some type of informal

mentoring for online faculty with only 19% of the institutions surveyed offering no training or mentoring to online faculty, whether part- or full-time. Blodgett (2008) recommended mentoring and collaborations with full-time faculty for contingent faculty preparing to teach online, with better communications across personnel as a common thread.

Of the studies addressing mentoring and contingent online faculty, most settings were American private universities and community colleges and Australian higher education institutions. Australian contingent faculty were titled casual academics or sessional academics, with the term casual distance education academics utilized for those teaching online and working from a university campus, from home, or from other premises and receiving no or limited entitlements (Hamilton et al., 2013; Higgins & Harreveld, 2013). As in the U.S., casual distance education academics were increasing in numbers, with informal and formal part-time faculty professional programs available or in development. The following were concerns of Australian counterparts: isolation, marginalization, lack of resources, poor communications, limited job security, and elimination from academic participation. American researchers found similar concerns (AAUP, 2013; American Federation of Teachers, 2010; Biro, 2005; Blodgett, 2008; Brannagan & Oriol, 2014; CCCSE, 2014).

METHODOLOGY

Synthesis of research allowed for greater understanding of the phenomena under study and was interpretive or explanatory rather than deductive. Meta-synthesis, as a meta-methodology, aggregated different forms of research and allowed interpretive conclusions (Bondas & Hall, 2007). Aggregation of contingent online faculty experiences surrounding mentoring were synthesized and presented interpretively.

The study search strategy aimed to find only published studies or dissertations. Databases (i.e., ProQuest, Education Source, Educational Administration Abstracts, and ERIC) were searched for contingent online faculty mentoring. These databases were selected based on educational, academic, and higher education content, and search terms included adjunct, contingent, associate, online, virtual, faculty, higher education, part-time, mentor*. Only literature from 2000 to the present was considered.

Sixty-four (64) results were returned from a combination of database searching. Inclusion criteria for the final review were qualitative and quantitative articles that addressed contingent online faculty mentoring. After removing non-English language documents, duplicate articles across databases, documents published prior to year 2000, and articles without higher education context, 12 citations remained for assessment. An additional criterion to exclude documents focusing on student-faculty mentoring produced nine articles for final examination and synthesis.

RESULTS

Table 1 is a summary of participants, methods, focus, artifacts, and findings of the synthesized articles on mentoring contingent online faculty. A critical appraisal process determined document quality and permitted evaluation and engagement with each article. Seven articles met all criteria, and documents eliminated were not appropriate to the study.

TABLE 1
META-SYNTHESIS SUMMARY

Author	Participants	Methods	Study Focus	Mentoring artifacts	Findings
1. Biro (2005)	10 online adjunct faculty	Grounded theory approach with semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions	Determined how adjunct faculty received and perceived their preparation, support, and value as online instructors	Required training and mentoring relationship beneficial	Mentors checked regularly, observed online courses, served as guides for questions. After support and training, participants received online teaching approval. Communica-tions and mentoring were important.
2. Blodgett (2008)	Convenience sample of 28 public and private universities; adjunct instructors taught at least one online course within last two years	Mixed methods; web-based survey and small focus group	Explored development and training experiences encountered by online adjunct teachers	Mentoring effective preparation and experience for online adjuncts	Immediate and timely access to program administrators or faculty mentors allowed better communica-tions. Study recommended mentoring structure to address unique teaching needs.
3. Brannagan & Oriol (2014)	Online adjunct instructors; private university; N = unknown	Applied model related to Bandura's social cognitive theory, predicated on concept of self-efficacy and belief in ability to engage in particular behaviors	Examined theoretical foundations for model used to orient and mentor online and determine related outcomes for adjunct faculty development	Online adjunct faculty coordinator directed each step of process, conducting initial three-week orientation and working with assigned mentors	Mentoring adjunct faculty socialized them to same instructional standards as full-time faculty. Orientation, communicationand engage-ment were emphasized.

Author	Participants	Methods	Study Focus	Mentoring artifacts	Findings
4. Fulkerth (2014)	Adjuncts in case study; private university; N = unknown	Case Study	Evaluated program aimed to improve student perceptions of courses in MBA and Law degrees	Student evaluation comments used to mentor online adjunct faculty for teaching improvement	Targeted adjunct-teacher training and communica-tions were successful with student feedback and existing resources.
5. Lees (2011)	139 stratified random sample of online adjuncts at four-year, for-profit colleges and universities	Non-experimental study	Assessed preferred learning style and satisfaction of training method for adjunct faculty	Communication and collaboration through reflection and online mentoring to increase satisfaction, improved faculty self-concept, and increased instructional effectiveness	Pearson's r determined correlation between teaching experience and faculty satisfaction toward both training method and training content. Both males and females felt more satisfied with training that included mentoring and communicating
6. Puzziferro-Schnitzer & Kissinger (2005)	10 new online adjuncts in case study at public community college	Case Study	Explored mentoring program with online support	Virtual mentoring program personalized; collegial support for online adjunct faculty	Mentors used coaching communica-tions and methods then developed appropriate resources. Access to other instructors for collaboration and support was important.
7. Rogers, McIntryre, & Jazzar (2010)	Adjunct online faculty at private university; N = unknown	Interviews	Determined perspectives of adjunct participants' needs for online mentoring	Quality of adjunct development (communication, skills, life balance and relationship formations) determined quality of adjunct teaching	Mentoring program accommodated high-performing online faculty. Program included professional development, communica-tions, life balance, and relationship formations.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND MENTORING

The search discovered publications about mentoring strategies and programs for contingent online faculties. Although the synthesis was limited by the small number of studies that met the criteria, thematic threads were clear. Contingent online faculty desired support and services such as better communications, professional development, and specialized training for the online environment.

Meta-synthesis results highlighted that institutional and student policies were shared with contingent online faculty, contacts and teaching advice were made accessible, and virtual mentoring fostered professional development. With teaching feedback vital for newly hired and continuing contingent faculty, mentoring provided evaluative comments and strategies, and coaching honed online teaching skills. In the final analysis, the aggregated studies pointed out that organizational support and coaching by mentors should be compulsory. These results were similar to the findings of Biro (2005), Blodgett (2008), Rogers, McIntryre, and Jazzar (2010), and Puzziferro-Schnitzer and Shelton (2009).

ARTIFACTS OF MENTORING PRACTICE

Synthesized findings provided three mentoring themes: (1) communications, (2) professional development, and (3) specialized training for teaching in an online environment. Mentors, mentoring, and relationships were integral artifacts of these themes, with mentoring and communications integrating both individual and institutional needs. On a cultural basis, the goal of inclusiveness into a department or college promoted institutional identity, responsibility, and accountability. Contingent online faculty members gained not only foray into a community but were offered help in understanding and implementing policies and securing training and development for teaching assigned online courses. In empowering contingent online faculty, students benefited from strengthening instructor skill sets and arming professors with knowledge of course, departmental, and college requirements. Positive institutional impacts and contingent faculty effects were illustrated by

- increased communications;
- improved satisfaction with employment;
- increased feelings of worth and belonging within the academic environment;
- increased institutional, college, and departmental involvement with contingent faculty;
- elimination of institutional system barriers to contingent faculty;
- increased knowledge of learning management systems and other technology;
- increased contingent faculty instructional effectiveness and quality; and
- enhanced online skill sets of contingent faculty.

24/7 VIRTUAL MENTORING PROPOSAL

A dynamic virtual mentoring framework accommodates the environment, situation, and dispersion of contingent online faculty members. Researchers identified that professional development through online learning platforms was well received and practical (Pete, 2016; Rogers, McIntyre, & Jazzar, 2010; Vaill & Testori, 2012). The proposed mentoring framework based on no specific times or dates and no geographic places takes the formality and rigidity out of traditional mentoring and allows building of communicative, reciprocal relationships between contingent online faculties and mentors while conforming to institutional, college, and departmental expectations and standards. Online teaching can be enhanced through virtual mentoring sessions, and faculties are unburdened from complex, formalized professional development that commands their attention but does not answer their questions or meet their immediate needs.

If institutions are able to offer online education successfully to students, it should follow that they can build a virtual infrastructure to facilitate communications, professional development, and mentoring. Goals could include building community, ensuring accountability, improving teaching skills, and

retaining consistency across the curriculum. Elements and factors follow as critical to successful virtual mentoring within the proposal.

Dynamic Mentoring Efficiency

Time and efficiency form the bedrock of contingent online faculty work. As such, mentoring has changed to a needs-based framework (Rockquemore, 2012) that requires individuals to ask themselves, "What do I need?" and "How can I get my needs met?" A dynamic mentoring approach accordingly ". . . acknowledges that it's normal to have an evolving set of needs throughout your career . . . that those needs are most effectively, efficiently, and comprehensively met in the context of a broad network of information, community, support, accountability and ongoing feedback" (Rockquemore, 2012, para. 9).

Determining contingent online faculty members' needs is the first step. Mentoring programs utilized surveys, telephone interviews, and email inquiries to obtain information. Outreach also addressed the following subjects: (a) professional development; (b) academic, curricular, and instructional responsibility and accountability; (c) institutional support and sponsorship; (d) emotional and psychosocial support; (e) staff, material, and technological support; and (f) evaluation procedures and processes. Once needs of individual contingent online faculties are determined, development of appropriate and relevant virtual mentoring activities and relationships should be discussed.

A password-protected customized portal with menu options should include induction and orientation, course content and materials, instructional guides and tips, and professional development and training opportunities. Professional networks, news and announcements, and contact emails and phone numbers should be provided with links to internal job postings. Because faculty members could communicate via apps (e.g., Messenger, Twitter, Facebook, WeChat), tools from the social media landscape can be useful. Professional engagement generated through Skye, web-cam technology, chat rooms, discussion boards, and posting areas for feedback and recommendations could be created to promote community. With support, information, and resources for contingent online faculty found in one place, anytime, anywhere, self-directed learning becomes important as faculty members determine which parts of a virtual 24/7 mentoring portal can meet their needs at any particular time.

Dynamic Mentoring Relationships

Findings from the meta-synthesis pointed to contingent online faculty expressing desire for mentoring relationships. A contingent online faculty member may want support in a variety of areas, thus more than one online mentor could be considered. The four most common selection methods for mentoring dyads or pairs were determined as follows: (1) no criteria (e.g., selected randomly by administration), (2) selected criteria (e.g., faculty needs, departmental faculty expertise), or (3) voluntary pairings. Pairs could be based on academic background and course assignments (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014), or as in one study, matching pairs were selected by software expertise and discipline (Puzziferro-Schnitzer & Kissinger, 2005).

Mentoring relationships warranted some definition in order to be successful, for example, reciprocal agreement in terms of time, expectations, and participation. Each of the cases in the meta-synthesis noted the importance of timely and appropriate communications, a unifying constant in developing and sustaining collegial relationships. With virtual mentoring, securing full-time faculty mentors who commit to availability and flexibility is critical.

Dynamic Mentoring Support

Virtual support for contingent online faculty can be inexpensive compared to traditional formalized mentoring or professional development programs. Questions of institutional support staff and technology development costs should be addressed, as well as possible extrinsic rewards or motivations for mentors and contingent online faculty. In the literature, reward and recognition options were offered to full-time faculty mentors: 50 percent release time from teaching responsibilities for mentoring program development, 20 percent reduction in course enrollment for a semester; and course-release time per academic year (Brannagan & Oriol, 2014). A few studies suggested stipends for both mentors and contingent online faculty members (Maier, 2012; Puzziferro-Schnitzer & Kissinger, 2005).

INSTITUTIONAL REWARDS AND IMPLICATIONS

Higher education administration and fully employed faculties need to understand how mentoring strategies and programs intersect with academic issues. As Mizell (in Higgins & Harreveld, 2013) stated, "Professional development is required for the constant challenges facing universities, including continual changes in subject content, emergence of new instructional methods, advances in technology, changed laws and procedures and student learning requirements" (p. 190). Everything that an institution of higher learning should do to improve teaching qualities and skills of contingent online faculty will ultimately be passed along to students. Controlling costs of meetings rooms, travel, meals, and accommodations is required for budget management. Additionally, each contingent online faculty member rehired equates to a reduction in costs of fulfilling that individual's course(s). Albeit a 24/7 virtual program may present multi-dimensional issues along the way, dynamic mentoring should be viewed as current and future insurance.

Universities and colleges need to acknowledge the emergence and importance of contingent faculties as casualization of the teaching work force evolves. For institutions that rely heavily on contingent faculty, online or virtual mentoring strategies and programs should be considered. In today's higher education market and with contingent faculty members no longer on the academic margins, institutions that nurture this emerging teaching army take that significant step in making these human resources visible within the academy.

And as Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, (1995) punctuated, "Part-time faculty make critical contributions to teaching and learning in the higher education enterprise—educationally, socially, and economically . . . . Part-time faculty are sleeping giants; their sheer numbers and their impact on college instruction cannot and should not be ignored. . . . . The issues that have separated part-timers from the larger academic community will not go away. They will be addressed, or they will maim higher education" (p. 157). The enculturation and support of contingent faculty are now compelling.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2006). *AAUP contingent faculty index 2006.* Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/5EC9F777-EDB8-43B8-AE7B-AA5CCBA3A762/0/AAUPContingentFacultyIndex2006.pdf

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2013). *The inclusion of government of faculty members holding contingent appointments.* Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/report/governance-inclusion.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2014). *Background facts on contingent faculty.* Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts.

American Federation of Teachers, AFT Higher Education. (2010). A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. *American Academic, 2*, 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/aa_partimefaculty0310.pdf

Baldwin, R. G., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; what we need to know. *American Behavioral Sci*entist, *55*, 1485–1509. doi: 10.1177/0002764211409194

Batiste, H. (2016). *Understanding contingent faculty: A quantitative study of engagement, satisfaction, commitment, and mentoring needs.* Retrieved from http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/2634

Berret, B. (2007). *Examining the participation of contingent faculty in the shared governance of institutions of higher education*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3298291)

Bettinger, E., & 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.

Biro, S. C. (2005). *Adjunct faculty perceptions about their preparation, support and value as online instructors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest database. (AAT 3255630)

Blodgett, M. C. (2008). *Adjunct faculty perceptions of needs in preparation to teach online.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3311265)

Bondas, T., & Hall, E. O. C. (2007). Challenges in approaching meta-synthesis research. *Qualitative Health Research, 17*, 113-121.

Brannagan, K. B., & Oriol, M. (2014). A model for orientation and mentoring of online adjunct faculty in nursing. *Nursing Perspectives, 34*(6), 128-130.Carlson, J. S. (2015). Factors influencing retention among part-time clinical nursing faculty. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, pp. 42-45.

Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE). (2014). *Contingent commitments: Bringing part-time faculty into focus* (A special report from the Center for Community College Student Engagement). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Program in Higher Education Leadership.

Chan, J. (2010). The use of practitioners as part-time faculty in postsecondary professional education. *International Education Studies, 3*(4), 36-45.

Chow, A. S., & Croxton, R. A. (2017). Designing a responsive e-learning infrastructure: Systemic change in higher education. *American Journal of Distance Education, 31*(1), 20-42.

Cross, J. G., & Goldenberg, E. N. (2009). *Off-track profs: Non-tenured teachers in higher education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2013). Here's the news. *Academe, 99*(2), 4-19.

DeLong, T. J., Gabarro, J. J., & Lees, R. J. (2008). Why mentoring matters in a hypercompetitive world. *Harvard Business Review*, *86*(1), 115-121.

Diegel, B. (2010). *Similarities and differences in perceptions of adjunct faculty and division chairpersons regarding teaching support, mentoring, and professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty at a community college* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3401830)

Dutton, D. (2015). *An exploration of the motivation and experience of contingent academic faculty in a university setting* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10094541)

Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, 168-188.

Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education, 86*(3), 448-483.

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *Journal of Human Resources, 40*, 647–659. doi: 10.3368/jhr.XL.3.647

Erickson, D. (2016). Why it's so hard to leave academe. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 62*(17), D21.

Fulkerth, R. (2014). Structuring long-term faculty training: According to needs exhibited by students' written comments in course evaluations. *International Conference e-Learning*, pp. 353-356.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hamilton, J., Fox, M., & McEwan, M. (2013). Sessional academic success: A distributed framework for academic support and development. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice 10*(3), 1-16.

Hananel, S. (2013, November 1). Growing number of part-time professors join unions. *The San Diego Union-Tribune.* Retrieved from http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/sdut-growing-number-of-part-time-professors-join-unions-2013nov01-story.html

Higgins, K., & Harreveld, R. E. (2013). The casual academic in university distance education: From isolation to integration--a prescription for change. In J. Willems, B. Tynan, & R. James (Eds.), *Global challenges and perspectives in blended and distance learning* (pp. 202-211). Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.

Jacoby, D. (2006). The effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1081-1103.

Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2011a). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state system of public higher education. *Educational Policy 25*(3), 507-537.
Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M., K. (2011b). Navigating the transfer process: Analyzing the effects of part-time faculty exposure by academic program. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(11), 1510-1532.
Johnson, I. Y. (2011). Contingent instructors and student outcomes: An artifact or a fact? *Research in Higher Education 52*, 761–785. doi: 10.1007/s11162-011-9219-2
Kelderman, E. (2016, February 29). Unshared governance, new pressures threaten the faculty's role in leadership. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Unshared-Governance/235442
Kemmerer, K. P. (2014). Rigor, grades, support, and the amount of time students spend outside of class: A comparison of full- and part-time faculty in an entertainment and music business program. *MEIEA Journal, 14*(1), 123-156.
Kendzior, S. (2016). The contingent faculty retirement crisis. Retrieved from *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://chroniclevitae.com/news/1401-the-contingent-faculty-retirement
Kezar, A. (2013). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 54*(5), 571-598.
Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (n.d.). *Dispelling the myths: Locating the resources to support non-tenure track faculty.* The Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success. New York, NY: Spencer Foundation, Teagle Foundation, and Carnegie Corporation.
Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2012). Missing from the Institutional data picture: Non-tenure-track faculty. In Yonghong Jade Xu (Ed.), *New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 155, Refining the focus on faculty diversity in postsecondary institution* (pp. 47-66). doi: 10.1002/ir
Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014, July/August). Troubling ethical lapses: The treatment of contingent faculty. *Change*, pp. 34-37.
Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education: Demographics, experiences, and plans of action. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(11), 1419-1442.
Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2013). Institutionalizing equitable policies and practices for contingent faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 84*(1), 56-87.
Kraimer, M. L., Seibert, S. E., Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., & Bravo, J. (2011). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational support for development: The critical role of career opportunities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(3), 485-500.
Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education, 53*(3), 325-352.
Lees, T. D. (2011). *Relationship between learning style, gender, and satisfaction toward training of adjunct online faculty*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 3472257)
Lewis, V. (2012). *Prediction of job satisfaction based on workplace facets for adjunct business faculty at four-year universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 3513048)
Linck, H. F. (2004). The virtual academy: Ensuring online success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 28*(1), 49-50.
Liu, X., & Zhang, L. (2013). Flexibility at the core: What determines employment of part-time faculty in academia. *Industrial Relations, 68*(2), 312-339.
Maier, L. (2012). What are online teaching faculty telling us about building community? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 36*(11), 884-896.
Marsh, F. K. (2010). High performance team: Building a business program with part- and full-time faculty. *Journal of Education for Business, 85*, 187-194.
Maxey, D., & Kezar, A. (2015). Revealing opportunities and obstacles for changing non-tenure-track faculty practices: An examination of stakeholders' awareness of institutional contradictions. *Journal of Higher Education, 86*(4), 564-596.

Moser, R. (2014, January 13). Overuse and abuse of adjunct faculty members threaten core academic values. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/OveruseAbuse-of-Adjuncts/143951

Mujtaba, B. G., & Gibson, J. (2007). The creation and implementation of a formal faculty orientation and training program in higher education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 4*(6), 17-24.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2016). *The condition of education 2016: Characteristics of postsecondary faculty* (NCES 2016-144). Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

New Faculty Majority (NFM). (n.d.). *NFM research and resources*. Available online at: http://www.newfacultymajority.info/equity/projects-a-initiatives/research-and-resources

Ochoa, A. (2011). Contingent faculty: Helping or harming students? *The Journal of the Professoriate*, pp. 136-153.

Online Learning Consortium (OLC). (2017). *2009 - Learning on demand: Online education in the United States.* Retrieved from https://onlinelearningconsortium.org/survey_report/2009-learning-demand-online-education-united-states/

Patton, C. (2016, December). Adjuncts demand to be heard. *University Business,* p. 25.

Pete, E. (2016). *Online training impact on adjunct faculty compliance and satisfaction with professional development* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 10008985)

Puzziferro-Schnitzer, M., & Kissinger, J. (2005). Supporting online adjunct faculty: A virtual mentoring program. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 9*(2), 3243.

Puzziferro-Schnitzer, M., & Shelton, K. (2009). Supporting online faculty. Revisiting the seven principles (a few years later). *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 12*(3), 1-10.

Ragins, B. E., Cotton, J. L., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 1177-1194.

Reevy, G. M., & Deason, G. (2014). Predictors of depression, stress, and anxiety among non-tenure track faculty. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 701-732. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00701

Rockquemore, K. A. (2012). Don't talk about mentoring. National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/advice/mentoring/debut_of_new_column_on_mentoring_in_higher_education_careers#sthash.en1yvYTN.dpbs

Rogers, C. B. H., McIntyre, M., & Jazzar, M. (2010). Mentoring adjunct faculty using the cornerstones of effective communication and practice. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 18*(1), 53-59.

Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1995). *Strangers in their own land.* Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Scully, M. G. (1975). Part-time teachers: Many are angry. *Chronicle of Higher Education, IX*(16), 1, 4. Retrieved February 12, 2016, from http://chronicle.com'article/1975-Part-Timers-/235201.

Service Employees International Union (SEIU). (n.d.). Faculty forward, transforming higher education. Retrieved from http://seiufacultyforward.org/

U.S. House of Representatives. (2014, January). *The just-in-time professor: A staff report summarizing eforum responses on the working condition of contingent faculty in higher education.* Washington, DC: House Committee on Education and Welfare.

Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 91-123. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2006.0080

Vaill, A. L., & Testori, P. A. (2012). Orientation, mentoring and ongoing support: A three-tiered approach to online faculty development. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 16*(2), 111-119.

Wallin, D. L. (2005). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publications.
Wallin, D. L. (2007). Part-time faculty and professional development: Notes from the field. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (140), 67-73. doi: 10.1002/cc.306
Watson, C. A. (2012). *An ex post facto study on the relationship between self-reported peer-to-peer mentoring experiences and instructor confidence, institutional loyalty, and student satisfaction among part-time instructors.* Dissertation, Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, School of Education.
Weinberg, F. J., & Lankau, M. J. (2011). Formal mentoring programs: A mentor-centric and longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Management, 37*(6), 1527-1557.
Ziegler, C. A., & Reiff, M. (2006). Contingent faculty mentoring, a vital responsibility in a changing educational climate: The Lesley University contingent faculty mentoring program. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 14*(2), 247-269.