

2006 AIR/NPEC RESEARCH GRANT PROPOSAL

Is Freshman Retention a Consequence of Faculty Employment Status?:

How Part-Time Faculty Affect Student Outcomes

Grant Amount Requested: \$29,914

Principal Investigator:

Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
North Carolina State University
College of Education
Department of Adult and Higher Education
310H Poe Hall, Campus Box 7801
Raleigh, NC 27695-7801
Phone: 919-515-6240 Fax: 919-515-4039
Email: audrey_jaeger@ncsu.edu

Authorized Institutional Representative:

Matt Ronning
Associate Vice Chancellor
Research Administration/SPARCS
2701 Sullivan Drive
Admin Services III; MS 7514
Raleigh, NC 27695-7514
Phone: (919) 515-2444 Fax: (919) 515-7721
Email: sps@ncsu.edu

Principal Investigator

Authorized Institutional Representative

PROJECT SUMMARY

Part-time faculty are an integral asset to higher education institutions (Gappa & Leslie, 1993), yet are often portrayed as less qualified and less committed than their full-time counterparts. Part-time faculty teach large numbers of first-year students, yet little is known about their affect on student outcomes (Schuster, 2003). On the other hand, a considerable body of research addresses general factors affecting student persistence. These studies portray student persistence as a complex issue involving the interaction of different variables (Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon; 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Seidman, 2005; Tinto, 1993). This broad range of variables includes such general demographic characteristics as gender, race, ethnicity, and age as well as complex psychological variables such as intention and commitment (Tinto, 1993). One potential factor affecting student persistence that has received little attention is the employment status of faculty. Researchers (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1993) assert that the formal and informal academic and social experiences of students affect their decision to persist. However, the literature does not address the relationship between student persistence and the use of part-time faculty. The primary objective of this study is to explore the effects of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on students' decisions to persist.

The use of part-time faculty in higher education is not a new concept. In fall 2003, 66.7% of all faculty in the public community college system were employed part time compared to 33.9% within public four-year institutions (Cataldi, Fahimi, Bradburn, & Zimble, 2005). Leslie (1998) in part attributes the increasing use of part-time faculty to increased financial stress on institutions. Part-time faculty clearly serve a valuable purpose in higher education; however, their increased use raises concerns for administrators, faculty, and policy makers. Part-time faculty members spend a greater proportion of their overall time teaching, but the initial evidence suggests that these appointees are less accessible to students, bring less scholarly authority to their jobs, and are less integrated into the campus culture (Schuster, 2003). Since both part-time faculty employment and freshmen enrollment continue to increase, the exploration of the effect of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on freshmen persistence is warranted.

Focusing on decisions of first year students is critical given that the typical four-year college/university loses 26% of its students between the first and second years and approximately 60% of the students who drop out of any given cohort of entering students do so in the first year (Terenzini & Reason, 2005). The first year of college is foundational for securing a return-on-investment for students, parents, the institution, the state, and society.

Additionally, because of the limited amount of data relating the effects of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on first-year student persistence, this research could have valuable policy implications for campus-based administrators as well as governing boards, system offices, and other policy makers. By using logistic regression to construct a predictive model for persistence based on part-time faculty exposure and several other first-year student attributes that have been identified by the study institutions as well as previous researchers, this research will strive to quantify the effect of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on first-year student persistence.

A multi-campus university composed of 16 public senior institutions of higher education will serve as the site for this study. The 16-campus have approximately 23,000 first year students. Anonymous student record data for the 2004-2005 academic year as well as course enrollments and faculty teaching schedules will be provided by the directors of institutional research at the individual campuses in collaboration with the University System Office.

This study will be an innovative addition to the discussions of student persistence since current research does not explore the effects of part-time faculty instruction on student decisions nor does it consider the differences in part-time faculty instruction across institutions. As the use of part-time faculty grows, so should our understanding of this resource. Previous research (Conley, Leslie, & Zimbler, 2002; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Haeger, 1998; Schuster, 2003) has provided ample information on the characteristics of part-time faculty as well as their role on college campuses but not on the effects of part-time faculty instruction on student outcomes. This investigation will advance our knowledge by contributing a critical missing piece to the discussion of part-time faculty. .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Summary	2
Project Description	5
References Cited	15
Biographical Sketch	18
Budget	23
Current and Pending Support	25
Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources	25
Special Information and Supplementary Documentation	25

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Statement of the Problem

Higher education institutions serve as key employers for communities. According to Gappa (1994), “In the mid-1980s, colleges and universities will be spending well over \$60 billion a year on operations...” (p. 1). Higher education is a labor-intensive venture with approximately 80% of operating costs in personnel (McCabe & Brezner, 1978, p. 59). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), during the fall of 2003, approximately 1.2 million faculty were employed in institutions of higher education with 43.7% of those being employed part time (Cataldi, et al., 2005). Advocates for reducing the number of part-time faculty note that the increasing use of part-time faculty threatens shared governance, academic freedom, and the quality of students’ education (Buck, 2001; Thompson, 2003). Even though these advocates value the contributions of part-time faculty and note that these individuals lack support, job-security, and often the academic freedom that tenure affords, the student experience is often negatively linked to part-time faculty. Thompson notes, “We [the higher education community] need a more secure and rewarded faculty who are held accountable for their teaching quality and who can also hold our institutions accountable in supporting the learning process” (p. 46).

Although the increased use of part-time faculty within higher education makes sense from an administrative point of view, its use does not come without criticism. In attempting to clarify the real issue, Haeger (1998) writes, “The most important academic concern is the perception that part-time faculty threaten the quality of academic programs in terms of course content, advising, faculty-student interaction, and collegiality within academic departments” (p. 85). Some criticisms of part-time faculty are not based in empirical research. Research comparing the effectiveness of part-time and full-time teaching are rarely cited by critics (Gappa, 1984, p. 8).

In addition to the perceived difference in quality of instruction, opponents of the use of part-time faculty argue that the level of student service provided by such faculty also lags behind that of full-time faculty. In a case study conducted by Gappa and Leslie (1993, p. 101), a community college vice president states:

Part-time faculty don’t have the institution’s mission in focus. They do not know as much about the “open-door” student body as the full-time faculty know. They probably aren’t as ready to diagnose problems and give individual help. Part-time faculty don’t know where to send students who need help, where to get assistance themselves, or other avenues to help, and so on...

Although this quote represents a critical viewpoint of part-time faculty, most criticisms from faculty governing bodies and full-time faculty advocates challenge the lack of support (e.g. office space, computer access, staff support) and job security for part-time faculty. Little evidence exists addressing the differences in student outcomes as a result of exposure to part-time faculty. This research seeks to explore the effects of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on students' decisions to persist.

Review of Relevant Research

Part-time faculty members are a sizable portion of the workforce in postsecondary institutions and are not easily defined. Understanding more about this group is an important task of policymakers, administrations, and researchers. Gappa (1984) defines a part-time faculty member as “anyone who (1) teaches less than the average full-time teaching load, or (2) has less than a full-time faculty assignment and range of duties, or (3) may have a temporary full-time assignment” (p. 5). This definition excludes graduate assistants who are teaching part time in the department where they are also pursuing a graduate degree. All persons included in her definition of part-time faculty are “non-tenured and nonpermanent and have little or no job security unless specific mention is made of tenure status” (p. 5). The use of part-time faculty as an instructional tool is not a new concept. Blackburn (1978) writes,

While records do not permit a definitive determination of the development and use of part-time faculty, we do know the phenomenon extends back to the first colleges and universities. Indeed, the first college staffs in the United States, as elsewhere, were composed of individuals whose principal occupation was other than academic. Most were ministers serving part time in the classroom and destined to leave for a full-time career in the parish in a few years. It was not until well into the nineteenth century, with the possibility that one could make such a life an actual career, that laypersons entered the work of college teaching (p. 100).

A look at the history of higher education finds that as employment opportunities within higher education became more common and lucrative, the population of part-time faculty grew. With the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the GI Bill, US higher institutions experienced an unprecedented increase in student enrollments (Lucas, 1994). The rapid increase in post-war enrollment at US institutions placed two-year or community colleges in an unfavorable position of competing with four-year colleges and universities for qualified, full-time faculty thus leading to an increased demand for part-time instructors (Blackburn, 1978). The use

of part-time faculty in the community college system has continued to grow, and as of 2003, 60% of the total part-time faculty in public higher education was employed in the community college (Cataldi, et al., 2005).

The use of part-time faculty in the United States began its most noticeable increase following World War II (Jacobs, 1998). Graduate schools were producing new Ph.D.s at an incredible rate to meet the demand for qualified instructors to educate the growing number of enrolled students. As Gappa (1984) states, “despite pell-mell expansion of graduate programs, the production of adequately credentialed scholars and researchers bent on academic careers did not catch up with demand in most fields until the mid-1970s” (p. 3). However, eventually production of doctorates did catch up to demand and Ph.D. output began to exceed the number of vacant positions (Blackburn, 1978). The increased production of doctorates, particularly in the humanities, led to an oversaturation in the market (Gappa, 1984). Low retirement rates in higher education and increased job security through tenured positions created a situation in which newly graduated doctorates were unable to find permanent positions in universities (Blackburn, 1978; Gappa, 1984).

The dramatic increase in enrollment following World War II initially hurt the community college system. Unable to financially compete with universities for the limited number of doctorate instructors in the market, the community college system turned to the part-time instructor (Gappa, 1984). The use of part-time faculty by the community college system, however, turned out to be an incredible advantage. As Gappa (1984) states, “Part-timers provided the great flexibility needed to offer the large assortment of vocational and technical programs available at low cost – with or without academic credit, day or night, on or off campus” (p. 3). The community college system was not the only type of institution to benefit from the use of part-time faculty. Four-year colleges and universities also capitalized on the availability of part-time faculty and rapidly instituted new programs or updated existing ones at a very low cost. In support of this philosophy, Gappa (1984) states, “Administrators could provide competent instruction by part-timers at between 50 and 80 percent of the direct cost of comparable instruction by full-time faculty” (p. 4). While there are many reasons for the rapid expansion of part-time faculty in higher education post-World War II, Leslie (1998) summarizes that the two biggest underlying causes have been the rapid expansion of the community college system and the increased financial constraints coupled with increased competition among colleges and universities.

The use of part-time faculty will not diminish in the near future, thus it is important to consider their effect on student decisions. One significant student decision that needs exploration with regard to part-time faculty is

student persistence. There is no lack of research relating to student persistence and retention. Tinto's (1993) model of student integration, Astin's (1975) model of student involvement, and Bean's (1983) model of student attrition are three of the main conceptual frameworks in this area. Many other scholars have contributed to understanding why students do not persist and institutions fail to retain them. Tinto's (1975, 1993) concepts of academic and social integration help inform this research. Tinto's theory suggests that rewarding encounters with the formal and informal academic and social systems of the institution presumably leads to greater student integration in these systems and thus to persistence (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Tinto's (1993) concept of academic integration is not without criticism. Braxton, Hirschy, and McClendon (2004) found only modest empirical support for the influence of academic integration on subsequent institutional commitment and on student departure. Reliable knowledge to support the proposition relating to academic integration fails to emerge in Braxton and Hirschy's (2005) work, particularly at residential colleges and universities. Recent research by Lohfink and Paulsen (2005) adds another dimension to this critique. The authors found that academic integration was not related to persistence for continuing-generation students but had a positive effect for first-generation students.

Mechanisms of social integration include student faculty-interactions as well as the learning environment in the classroom. Working from Tinto's student interactionist theory of student departure, research by Pascarella and Terenzini (1977, 2005) assert that student-faculty interactions play a crucial role in the connection between student and institution. Student-faculty interaction is a significant factor in predicting college persistence (Gaff & Gaff, 1981). Within the classroom, engagement of the student in discussions and collaborative learning experiences are part of a larger experience—the students' adjustment to college and their decision to remain enrolled in the institution (Nora, Barlow, & Crisp, 2005). Stodt (1987) found that the type of interaction that students report as being most important is contact with faculty outside of the classroom. Findings by Endo and Harpel (1982) concur that informal contact, in which faculty members develop friendly relationships with students and exhibit a personal concern with their affective and cognitive growth, has more influence on students' personal and social outcomes in addition to their intellectual gains, which in turn affects persistence. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) note that the research before and after 1990 supports the generally positive effects of nonclassroom student-faculty interactions on educational attainment.

There are additional models that contribute to our understanding of the role of faculty interaction in relation to persistence. Bean (1980, 1983) includes student contact with faculty as one of his behavioral measures in his model of student persistence. Bean's research shows that student interaction with faculty plays an important role in the persistence process. Berger and Milem's (1999) research informs this study as well. Their work contributes to understanding of the relationship between involvement behaviors and integration perceptions by testing the direct and indirect effects of these constructs on student persistence. They note that involvement with faculty has a positive effect on student persistence.

Although some research has explored the role of faculty instruction on student persistence (Braxton, Bray, & Berger, 2000), this research has not focused on the role of part-time versus full-time faculty. Given the substantial differences between part- and full-time faculty, it is important to understand how these differences affect student outcomes. For example, students' perceptions of faculty members' availability and concern for them has been shown to have positive and significant effects on persistence (Halpin, 1990; Mallette & Cabrera, 1991). Given the reported importance of student-faculty interaction on retention, should educators and policy makers question the increased use of part-time faculty? Is there a retention-related cost to part-time faculty utilization? Haeger (1998) notes part-time faculty often do not have offices, hold limited or no meeting hours, have limited or no phone and computer access, and are not compensated for advising students.

Hagedorn and her colleagues concluded from a three-year study that community college administrators and policy makers wanting to encourage student success should not rely heavily on part-time faculty who hold sparse office hours and appear inaccessible (Hagedorn, Perrakis, and Maxwell, 2002). Thus part-time faculty may not be as engaged with students outside of the classroom, leading students to conclude their lack of interest. "When students feel faculty members do not care about the student's development, their bonds to the institution weaken" (Bean, 2005, p. 225). "Several studies suggest that students' perceptions of faculty members' availability and interest in them may be enough to promote persistence" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005, p. 417). Does the reduced availability of part-time faculty have a negative impact on student satisfaction leading to lower first-year retention rates? The literature provides little help in answering this question. Limited objective information is available concerning the comparative effectiveness of part-time and full-time instructors (Gappa, 1984; Gappa & Leslie 1993); what is available is mostly about two-year colleges.

There is little doubt that the combination of increased enrollment, decreased educational funding, and an over-production of doctorate students has led to the rapid increase in the use of part-time faculty. Part-time faculty serve a valuable purpose in higher education; however, their increased use raises concerns for administrators and policy makers. The lack of any clear quantitative data regarding the effects of part-time faculty on student outcomes illustrates the need for additional research.

A 2004 study by Harrington and Schibik attempted to produce some quantitative data in response to the apparent void in the literature regarding exposure to part-time faculty instruction and retention. Harrington and Schibik examined 7,174 entering first-year students at a mid-sized comprehensive midwestern university between 1997 and 2001. The study found a significant ($p = .01$) negative correlation between the percentages of courses taught by part-time faculty to retention rates in the second semester. Harrington and Schibik concluded that part-time faculty members posed a “significant challenge” to first-year students, particularly those “at-risk” (p. 14). Unfortunately, the Harrington and Schibik study failed to define who constituted part-time faculty, used a nominal scale to measure exposure to part-time faculty instruction, and tended to cluster students of lower academic ability with higher percent exposure to part-time faculty instruction. While the work of Harrington and Schibik does advance the literature regarding the effects of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on retention, its dependence upon quartiles (a non-continuous scale) places serious limitations upon its external application.

Research Question

The proposed research seeks to answer the following research question: What is the quantitative impact of part-time faculty instruction on first to second year student retention? Furthermore, differences will be explored in relation to student entry characteristics.

Proposed Plan of Work (Variables & Datasets)

A review of current literature reveals little in regard to the quantitative effect of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on freshmen retention. What little information is available suggests that as exposure to part-time faculty instruction increases, student retention rates decrease. This study will strive to quantify this effect by using logistic regression to construct a predictive model for retention based on part-time faculty exposure and several other first-year student attributes that have been identified by the study institutions as well as previous researchers (Caison, 2001).

A multi-campus university composed of 16 public senior institutions of higher education will serve as the site for this study. The 16-campus have approximately 23,000 first year students. Anonymous student record data for the 2004-2005 academic year as well as course enrollments and faculty teaching schedules will be provided by the directors of institutional research at the individual campuses in collaboration with the University System Office.

Student demographic data (SAT, gender, ethnicity, high school rank, high school grade point average, major (if known), and place of residence) will be merged with first-year (fall and spring semesters) course data (course, credit hour, instructor) and instructor data (position) using SAS software. The independent variables were chosen based on previous institutional research that supported each of these factors as relevant to student persistence at the study institutions (Caison, 2001).

Table 1. Variables

Variable	Model Role	Description
Retained	Dependent	Binary value, the student persisted (1) into their second year or they did not persist (2).
Ethnicity	Independent	Nominal value, White (1), African American (2), Native American (3), Asian (4), Hispanic (5), Other (6).
High School GPA	Independent	Ratio scale value ranging 0-5.
Gender	Independent	Nominal value, male (1) or female (2).
High School Rank	Independent	Ratio scale value ranging 0-100. Percentage of students with a rank below the observed rank.
Percent Exposure to Graduate Student Instruction	Independent	Ratio value ranging 0-100%. The total number of hours taught by a graduate student during the first year divided by the total number of hours attempted during the first year.
Percent Exposure to Part-Time Faculty Instruction	Independent	Ratio value ranging 0-100%. The total number of hours taught by a part-time faculty member during the first year divided by the total number of hours attempted during the first year.
Percent Exposure to Full-Time Faculty Instruction	Independent	Ratio value ranging 0-100%. The total number of hours taught by a full-time faculty member during the first year divided by the total number of hours attempted during the first year.
Place of Residence	Independent	Nominal value, on-campus (1) or off-campus (2).
SAT Verbal Score	Independent	Ratio value 0-800. The student's score on the verbal portion of the Standardized Aptitude Test (SAT).
SAT Math Score	Independent	Ratio value 0-800. The student's score on the math portion of the Standardized Aptitude Test (SAT).
Total SAT Score	Independent	Ratio value 0-1600. The student's combined score on the verbal and math portions of the Standardized Aptitude Test (SAT).

Data regarding faculty status will receive special consideration. First, a list of instructors will be gathered from all courses taken by the analysis population (new freshmen) during their first year of enrollment. Graduate teaching assistants will be removed from the list of instructors. Next, tenured and tenure-track instructors or those

nontenure-track instructors teaching one full-time equivalent will be assigned full-time faculty status. The remaining instructors will be assigned part-time faculty status.

In this study, the primary research question will be answered using logistic regression with the SAS system. Logistic regression is the statistical analysis of choice because of its predictive ability on a dichotomous dependent variable (retained). The dataset will first be normalized (one key record per student) to produce cumulative totals of the number of first year credit hours taught by each of the three instructor types: full-time faculty, part-time faculty, or graduate student. Each of these cumulative totals will then be divided by the total number of hours that a student took during his/her first year to calculate a percentage (0-100%) exposure to each type of instructor. Descriptive statistics for the study variables as well as a logistic regression model (retained = 1) will be calculated using SAS software. Multicollinearity will be tested for using the REG procedure of SAS software with the TOL (tolerance) and VIF (variance inflation) options (Allison, 1999).

An important limitation of the data is related to the consistency in collection procedures on the various 16 campuses. The type of data collected at one institution may not be equivalent to data collected at another institution. How data is defined at the various institutions may also differ. However, since each of the 16 campuses is required to submit this data to the University System Office, which will provide guidelines to campus institutional researchers, some consistency will be achieved.

Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to explore the effects of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on students' decisions to persist. Focusing on decisions of first year students is critical given that the typical four-year college/university loses over a quarter of its students between the first and second years (Terenzini & Reason, 2005). The first year of college is foundational for securing a return-on-investment for students, parents, the institution, the state, and society. This research could have valuable policy implications for campus-based administrators as well as governing boards, system offices, and other policy makers.

Relationship to PI's Research

The principal investigator has recently conducted a similar investigation at a single institution. This previous research has helped to refine and enhance this proposal. The proposed research adds to the body of knowledge gained by the PI in previous research addressing the roles and rewards of faculty. Further it expands the PI's previous work on student outcomes.

Connections to Current Knowledge

As noted in the previous section, the proposed research builds on a single campus study conducted by the PI in the spring of 2005. In addition, it expands Harrington and Schibik's 2004 related study. This proposed research project is part of a small pool of studies addressing the impact of part-time faculty use on college campuses.

Dissemination Plan

Because the proposed research study seeks to examine a problem central to many college campuses, results will be shared with a wide variety of audiences. Information will be shared with institutional researchers so that similar studies can be conducted at other campuses. In addition, results will be shared with administrators, faculty, and policy makers who are concerned about the use of part-time faculty and student persistence. Results will be prepared and submitted for publication to journals that focus on faculty roles and rewards, student retention, and general higher education journals such as: Journal of College Student Development, Journal of College Student Retention, Journal of Higher Education, Research in Higher Education, and The Review of Higher Education. Also, conference proposals will be prepared and submitted to the AIR Annual Forum. The research project will begin June 2006 and end June 2007. Specific research activities are identified.

June 2006-August 2006

Obtain and analyze journal articles, manuscripts, books, conference proceedings, and paper presentations relevant to this topic.

September 2006-May 2007

Submit progress report to the Association for Institutional Research. Obtain data from individual institutions. Clean and analyze data. Discuss research findings. Develop implications and recommendations. Submit final research report to the Association for Institutional Research. Submit proposals for paper presentations and manuscripts for publication. Present findings at AIR Annual Forum.

Policy Relevance

The proposed research study seeks to examine the effects of exposure to part-time faculty instruction on students' decisions to persist. Findings from this research will help guide institutional and system-wide decision makers in policies addressing the use of part-time faculty. Specific types of policies include, the number of courses offered by part-time faculty members, the types of courses offered by part-time faculty members, and the resources available to part-time faculty members.

Innovative Aspects

The proposed research investigation will extend the research literature in the areas of part-time faculty use and student persistence. First, this study is unique because it adds to the existing knowledge about part-time faculty beyond individual characteristics and campus concerns to the impact on college student decisions. Second, the site for this study is a multi-campus university composed of 16 public senior institutions of higher education. The 16 campuses offer tremendous institutional diversity, including two Historically Black Colleges and Universities, a Native American Serving Institution, and an arts college. Third, the proposed research project will employ statistical measures that differ from current research (Harrington & Schibik, 2004) in this area and are more appropriate for this type of research.

Intended Audience

The research will be critical to a variety of stakeholders. The audiences for whom this research will be important include higher education scholars, institutional researchers who are engaged in activities relating to part-time faculty and/or student persistence, campus based administrators responsible for decisions about part-time faculty members and/or student persistence, part-time and full-time faculty members, and system-based administrators who are involved in issues of part-time faculty and/or student persistence. Since the multi-campus site comprises all public institutions, legislators and other government officials could benefit from the research findings. Finally, students and parents may be interested in learning more about the role part-time faculty play in students' educational success.

REFERENCES CITED

- Allison, P. D. (1999). *Logistic regression using the SAS system: theory and application*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.
- Astin, A. W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Caison, A. (2001). *Retention and student quality*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Cataldi, E. F., Fahimi, M., Bradburn, E. M., & Zimble, L. (2005). 2004 National study of post-secondary faculty (NSOPF:04) report on faculty and instructional staff in fall (NCES Report No. 2005-172). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Bean, J. P. (1980). Dropouts and turnover: The synthesis and test of a causal model of student attrition. *Research in Higher Education, 12*(2), 155-187.
- Bean, J. P. (1983). The application of a model of turnover in work organizations to the student attrition process. *The Review of Higher Education, 6*, 129-148.
- Bean, J. P. (2005). Nine themes of college student retention. In Seidman, A. (Ed.), *College student retention* (pp.213-243). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Berger, J. B., & Braxton, J. M. (1998). Revisiting Tinto's interactionist theory of student departure through theory elaboration: Examining the role of organizational attributes in the persistence process. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(2), 103-120.
- Berger, J. B., & Lyon, S. C. (2005). Past to present: A historical look at retention. In Seidman, A. (Ed.), *College student retention* (pp. 1-29). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Berger, J. B. & Milem, J. F. (1999). The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in a causal model of student persistence. *Research in Higher Education, 40*(6), 641-664.
- Blackburn, R. T. (1978). Part-time faculty and the production of knowledge. In D. W. Leslie, (Ed.), *Employing part-time faculty* (pp. 99-111). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Braston, J. M., & Hirschy, A. S. (2005). Theoretical developments in the study of college student retention. In Seidman, A. (Ed.), *College student retention* (pp. 61-87). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Braxton, J. M., Bray, N. J., & Berger, J. B. (2000). Faculty teaching skills and their influence on the college student departure process. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(2), 215-227.
- Braxton, J. M., Hirschy, A. S., & McClendon, S. A. (2004). *Understanding and reducing college departure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Buck, J. (2001). The president's report: Successes, setbacks, and contingent labor. *Academe*, 87(5), 18-26.
- Conely, V. M., Leslie, D. W., & Zimbler, L. J. (2002). Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Endo, J. J., & Harpel, R. (1982). The effect of student-faculty interaction on students' educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 16(2), 115-138.
- Gaff, J. G., & Gaff, S. (1981). Student-faculty relationships. In Chickering, A. W., & Associates (Eds.), *The modern American college* (pp. 642-656). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J. M. (1984). *Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads* (Report No. 3). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Haeger, J. D. (1998). Part-time faculty, quality programs, and economic realities. In Leslie, D. W. (Ed.), *The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects*. (pp. 81-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hagedorn, L., Perrakis, A., & Maxwell, W. (2002). *The negative commandments: Ten ways community colleges hinder student success*. (ED 466 262)
- Halpin, R. (1990). An application of the Tinto model to the analysis of freshman persistence in a community college. *Community College Review*, 17, 22-32.
- Harrington, C., & Schibik, T. (2004). Caveat emptor: Is there a relationship between part-time faculty utilization and student learning outcomes and retention? *AIR Professional File*. No. 91, Spring. Tallahassee, FL: Association of Institutional Research.
- Jacobs, F. (1998). Using part-time faculty more effectively. In Leslie, D. W. (Ed.), *The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects*. (pp. 9-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leslie, D. W. (1998). The growing use of part-time faculty: understanding causes and effects. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, No. 104. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leslie, D. W., & Gappa, J. M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, No. 118. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

- Lohfink, M. M., & Paulsen, M. B. (2005). Comparing the determinants of persistence for first-generation and continuing generation students. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(4), 409-428.
- Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Mallette, B., & Cabrera, A. (1991). Determinants of withdrawal behavior: An exploratory study. *Research in Higher Education, 32*(2), 179-194.
- McCabe, R. H., & Bezner, J. L. (1978). Part-time faculty in institutional economics. In Leslie, D. W. (Ed.), *Employing part-time faculty* (pp. 59-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nora, A., Barlow, E., & Crisp, G. (2005). Student persistence and degree attainment beyond the first year in college. In Seidman, A. (Ed.), *College student retention* (pp. 129-153). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. (1977). Patterns of student-faculty informal interaction beyond the classroom and voluntary freshman attrition. *Journal of Higher Education, 48*(5), 540-552.
- Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuster, J. H. (2003). The faculty makeover: What does it mean for students? *New Directions for Higher Education, No. 123*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seidman, A. (2005). *College student retention*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Stodt, M. M. (1987). Educational excellence as a prescription for retention. *New Directions for Higher Education, No. 15*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Terenzini, P. T., & Reason, R. D. (2005, November). Parsing the first year of college: A conceptual framework for studying college impacts. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*, 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Thompson, K. (2003). Coningent faculty and student learning: Welcome to the strativersity. *New Directions for Higher Education, No. 12.*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Dr. Audrey J. Jaeger is an Assistant Professor of Higher Education in the Department of Adult and Higher Education at North Carolina State University. She teaches in the areas of student development, student services, organizational theory, governance of higher education, and politics of higher education. She previously taught at New York University and Baruch College, City University of New York. She received her bachelor of public administration at the University of North Dakota, her master of science in college student personnel at Western Illinois University, and her doctorate in higher education administration at New York University. While pursuing her degree and teaching as an adjunct faculty member at Baruch College, Dr. Jaeger held a full-time administrative position at New York University's Wagner School of Public Service in academic advising and curriculum development. Dr. Jaeger also worked for several years in student affairs administration at Bucknell University before pursuing her Ph.D. As a student affairs professional, she has experience in orientation, student activities, student government, Greek affairs, leadership development, community service and academic advising.

Dr. Jaeger's research and scholarship have focused on student outcomes and faculty roles and rewards. Her student outcome research has focused on student persistence, academic performance, as well as student affective and non-cognitive development. Dr. Jaeger has used aspects of emotional intelligence theory as well as faculty roles to look at these various student outcomes. Dr. Jaeger has also explored the roles and rewards of faculty in relation to higher education's contributions to the public good. She is currently completing a multi-campus study that addresses the public service role of faculty members. Her research has been published in journals such as *Research in Higher Education*, *The Journal of College Student Development*, and *Educational Policy*.

Dr. Jaeger has been recognized as a promising new scholar by the American College Personnel Association [Emerging Scholar Distinction, 2004]; the Kellogg Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good, the University of California-Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute, and the University of Michigan Center for the Study of Higher and Post-Secondary Education [Intergenerational Research Symposium Emerging Scholar Recipient, 2002]; and the University of Southern California Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis {Higher Education Governance Research Institute Emerging Scholar Recipient, 2002}.

BRIEF CURRICULUM VITAE

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Ph.D. in Education, New York University, Concentration: Higher Education Administration

M.S. in College Student Personnel, Western Illinois University

B.S. in Public Administration, University of North Dakota, Summa Cum Laude

Training & Certifications, National Center for Educational Statistics Database Training, SAS, SPSS, Emotional Quotient-Inventory Certification, Myers Briggs Type Indicator Certification, Emotional Competence Inventory-360 Assessment Certification

PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE

Assistant Professor of Higher Education, North Carolina State University (8/2001-Present)
Department of Adult and Community College Education

Program Coordinator, New York University (8/2000-7/2001)
Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service

Program Administrator, New York University (7/1998-8/2000)
Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service

Adjunct Assistant Professor of Public Administration, Baruch College-City University of New York (1/1999-5/2001) Graduate School of Public Affairs

Adjunct Lecturer of Public Administration, New York University (8/2000-5/2001)
Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service

Admissions Coordinator, Higher Education Program, New York University (7/1997-6/1998)
Department of Administration, Leadership, and Technology

Research Assistant, New York University (1/1998-5/1998)
Department of Administration, Leadership, and Technology, Dr. James L. Bess

Director of Campus Activities and Programs, Bucknell University (PA) (11/1995-6/1997)
Office of Campus Activities and Programs

Assistant Director of Campus Activities and Programs, Bucknell University (PA) (5/1993-11/1995)
Office of Campus Activities and Programs

Adjunct Instructor, Western Illinois University (8/1992-5/1993)
Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Administration

PUBLICATIONS

Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service. *Educational Policy*, 20(2).

Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2006). Institutional culture and civic responsibility: An ethnographic study. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 52-68.

- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C.H., (2006). Moving toward the market and away from public service?: Effects of resource dependency and academic capitalism. *Journal of Outreach & Engagement*, 10(3).
- Jaeger, A. J., & Caison, A. M. (2005). Rethinking criteria for training and selection: An inquiry into the emotional intelligence of resident assistants. *NASPA Journal*.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2004). Fulfilling the public-service mission in higher education: 21st century challenges. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 84(4), 34-35.
- Jaeger, A. J. (2004). The place for emotional growth in professional education. *Journal of Public Administration Education*, 10(1), 43-61.
- Akroyd, D., Jaeger, A. J., & Jones, L. C. (2004). A comparison of access to and use of computer-based instructional technology: A national study of full-time and part-time community college faculty. *Community College Review*, 32(1), 40-51.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2004). *Climate for extension and engagement at North Carolina State University: A 2003 case study*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.
- Jaeger, A. J. (2003). Job competencies and the curriculum: An inquiry into emotional intelligence in graduate professional education. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(6), 615-639.
- Jaeger, A. J. (2002, June). Governance for the public good: An examination of the University of North Carolina System. In W. G. Tierney (Chair), *Challenges for Governance*. Symposium conducted at the Higher Education Research Governance Institute, Santa Fe, NM.
- Jaeger, A. J. (1999). Student government's role with local, state, and national governance structures. In T. Nolfi-Torek (Ed.), *Advising student governments: Models of practice and strategies for success* (pp. 15-27). Columbia, SC: National Association for Campus Activities Educational Foundation.

SELECTED PRESENTATIONS

Refereed

- Thornton, C.H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2006, March). *Between the bookends: Valuing civic responsibility every day*. Program accepted for the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Indianapolis, IN.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Hinz, D. (2005, November). *The effects of part-time faculty on first semester freshmen retention: A predictive model using logistic regression*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2005, November). *Neither honor nor compensation: Faculty and public service*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2005, November). *Institutional culture and civic responsibility: An ethnographic study*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Philadelphia, PA.
- Jaeger, A. J., Grant, S. C., & Blair, T. S. (2005, April). *Emotional intelligence as a predictor of resident satisfaction*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Nashville, TN.
- Haley, K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2005, April). *Learner-centered graduate programs?* Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Nashville, TN.
- Evans, N. J., Broido, E. M., Jaeger, A. J., & Mitchell, A. A. (2005, April). *Strategies for professional publishing*. Program presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Nashville, TN.

- Jaeger, A. J., & Duffy, J. (2005, February). *Emotional intelligence in higher education: A research review*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Resource Center for The First Year Experience and Students in Transition, Phoenix, AZ.
- Jaeger, A. J. (2004, March). *Identifying star performers: Using emotional intelligence in RA selection*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- Jaeger, A. J. (2004, March). *First year student persistence: An analysis of non-cognitive variables*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- Whitt, E., Dalton, J., & Jaeger, A. J. (2004, March). *Searching scholarship and generating research questions*. Program presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- Evans, N. J., Broido, E. M., Jaeger, A. J., & Carnaghi, J. (2004, March). *Strategies for professional publishing*. Program presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Philadelphia, PA.
- Jaeger, A. J., Bresciani, M. J., & Sabourin Ward, C. (2003, November). *Predicting persistence and academic performance of first year students: An assessment of emotional intelligence and non-cognitive variables*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Jaeger, A. J., Collins, D., & Scafide, K. (2003, November). *Connecting emotional intelligence to theories of cognitive and identity development*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Jaeger, A. J., & Thornton, C. H. (2003, November). *Extension and engagement at land grant institutions: Strategies for expanding the culture of service*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2003, November). *Will the service university emerge from the research university?: A dialogue on Cumming's (1998) model for change*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Jaeger, A. J. (2003, April). *The probable effects of the new accountability demands on faculty emotional well-being: An "EQ" analysis*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Akroyd, D., & Jaeger, A. J. (2003, April). *A comparison of access to and use of computer-based instructional technology: A national study of full-time and part-time community college faculty*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, Dallas, TX.
- Sloan, T., Luckadoo, D. C., Jaeger, A. J., Jackson, F. (2003, April). *The relationship between outcomes, measurement, and decision making for continuous improvement*. Program presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Minneapolis, MN.
- Jaeger, A. J., Bresciani, M. J., Zelna, C. L., & Luckadoo, T. R. (2003, March). *The Student Learning Imperative—continuing to stimulate change, encourage collaboration, and improve education*. Program presented at the meeting of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, St. Louis, MO.
- Jaeger, A. J. (2002, April). *Does emotional growth and development have a place in professional education?* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Kasworm, C., & Jaeger, A. J. (2002, March). *Adult voices and their connection to college and student services*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Long Beach, CA.

Jaeger, A. J. (2001, November). *Job competencies and the curriculum: An inquiry into emotional intelligence in graduate professional education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, VA.

Jaeger, A. J. (2000, April). *Pedagogical implications of emotional intelligence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association, Washington, DC.

Jaeger, A. J. (1996, February). *Advising student programming boards: A common approach to educationally-purposeful programming*. Program presented at the meeting of the National Association for Campus Activities, Nashville, TN.

Steffes, J., Skarie, K. A., & Jaeger, A. J. (1994, March). *Collaboration, communication, and cooperation through quality structured experiences*. Program presented at the American College Personnel Association, Indianapolis, IN.

HONORS AND AWARDS

North Carolina State University Academy of Outstanding Teachers (2005)

North Carolina State University College of Education Outstanding Teacher (2005)

American College Personnel Association Emerging Scholar Distinction (2004)

American College Personnel Association Commission on Housing and Residence Life Research Award (2003)

Intergenerational Research Symposium Emerging Scholar Recipient (2002)

Higher Education Governance Research Institute Emerging Scholar Recipient (2002)

New York University Steinhart School of Education Samuel E. Eshborn Service Award (2001)

American College Personnel Association Outstanding Doctoral Student Award (2000)

American College Personnel Association Graduate Student Paper Award (2000)

Delta Delta Delta Foundation Mary Margaret Haftner, Graduate Fellowship (1999–2000)

Delta Delta Delta Foundation Second Century Award, Graduate Fellowship (1998–1999)

National Association for Campus Activities Educational Foundation Graduate Scholarship (1997)

American College Personnel Association Annuet Coeptis Award for Emerging Professionals (1996)

American College Personnel Association Outstanding New Professional Award (1996)

National Association for Campus Activities Educational Foundation Outstanding Project Manager (1995)

National Association for Campus Activities East Coast Region Outstanding New Professional Award (1995)

National Association for Campus Activities Educational Foundation William E. Brattain Graduate Scholarship (1992)

Dr. Nell Glynn Koester Scholarship–Outstanding First-Year College Student Personnel Graduate Student (1991)

Honor Societies: Phi Kappa Phi (Scholarship), Omicron Delta Epsilon (Economics), Pi Sigma Alpha (Political Science), Pi Lambda Theta (Education), Mortar Board (Service), and National Order of Omega (Greek).

BUDGET

Grant Project Title: Is freshman retention a consequence of faculty employment status?: How part-time faculty affect student outcomes

Personnel

Principal Investigator:	1.0-FTE summer month @ \$6,969/mo	6,969	
Graduate Assistant:	4.5-FTE academic year months @ \$1,444/mo	<u>13,000</u>	
Total Salaries and Wages			19,969

Fringe Benefits and Travel

Principal Investigator:	23%	1,603	
Graduate Assistant:	13%	1,690	
Travel expenses for 2 research trips to each of the 16 multi-campus sites		1,068	
Travel for PI to attend the Air Annual Forum to present research results		<u>1,500</u>	
Total Benefits and Travel			5,861

Other Direct Costs

Tuition for Graduate Assistant		<u>4,084</u>	
Total Other Direct Costs			4,084

TOTAL AMOUNT OF REQUEST **29,914**

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

Personnel: \$19,969

Funds are requested for one month of salary for the principal investigator (PI) for time spent overseeing and coordinating the research project, data analysis, writing, and supervising a graduate assistant. Funds are also requested to hire a doctoral-level graduate research assistant to assist with the research project's operation and data analysis. The assistant will contribute to the project's research activities and help in the preparation and dissemination of the project reports and presentations.

Fringe Benefits and Travel: \$5,861

Fringe rates for the PI are based on NCSU's faculty fringe rate of 23% of salary. Graduate assistant benefits are calculated at 13% of wages. Requested travel includes expenses to cover 2 trips to each of the 16 multi-campus research sites, for a total of 32 trips. The cost is estimated to be \$1,068 and is calculated based on 75 miles per roundtrip at the current federal mileage rate of \$.445. Travel costs, estimated at \$1,500, are also included for the PI to attend the required Annual AIR Forum in order to disseminate the research results.

Other Direct Costs: \$4,084

Per NCSU policy, tuition is requested for the graduate assistant based on the current 2005-2006 rates and includes a 10% estimated inflationary increase.

TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$29,914

CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT

The principal investigator has no current or pending support from external resources.

FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT AND OTHER RESOURCES

The proposed research project will be conducted at North Carolina State University using the equipment and facilities readily available to the principal investigator through the Department of Adult and Higher Education.

Existing infrastructure will be utilized in this study.

SPECIAL INFORMATION AND SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

Not applicable to this research study.