OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

JEANETTE GRASSELLI BROWN, CHAIR
THOMAS W. NOE, VICE CHAIR
GERALD H. GORDON, SECRETARY
EDMUND J. ADAMS
REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES BRADING
SENATOR ROBERT GARDNER
TAHLMAN KRUMM, JR.
GERALD M. MILLER
STEPHEN A. PERRY
J. GILBERT REESE
RALPH E. SCHEY

RODERICK G. W. CHU, CHANCELLOR

Part-time Faculty Survey Report
Prepared for the Ohio Board of Regents

1/22/01

Report prepared by:

Robert Sheehan, Ph.D., Associate Vice Chancellor for Performance Reporting and Analysis

Stephanie McCann, Ph.D., Assistant Director, Higher Education Information System

Note: The authors of this report acknowledge and are grateful for contributions to this report provided by the HEI Advisory Committee, the *ad hoc* part-time Faculty Survey Committee, the staff of the Ohio Board of Regents. Additional thanks to Dr. Kathleen Carr, President of Strategic Research Group of Columbus. The Board of Regents staff would like to thank and congratulate the faculty and staff who participated in the design of this survey, as well as those faculty who took the time to complete the survey. The information generated by this survey contributes to our statewide understanding of one of higher education's most important resources - the dedicated faculty of our colleges and universities.

30 EAST BROAD STREET • 36TH FLOOR • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43266-0417 • (614) 466-6000 • FAX: (614) 466-5866 • www.regents.state.oh.us

Ohio BICENTENNIAL 1803 ♥ 2003

Part-time Faculty Survey Report

Background for the Survey

The Ohio Board of Regents began to survey faculty at state-funded colleges and universities in 1999. The surveys are intended to capture basic information about the activity of faculty. In order to focus on faculty activity in a comprehensive manner, data on full-time faculty and part-time faculty are being collected by different surveys. The 1999 survey was designed only for full-time faculty. A copy of the 1999 Full-time Faculty Survey report can be found at:

http://www.regents.state.oh.us/mainpages/Board_FT_Faculty_Survey_Home.html.

A survey of part-time faculty was conducted in the spring of 2000. This is a report of that Part-time Faculty Survey. The results of the two surveys, in conjunction with other data from the HEI system, will provide a useful profile of the activities of Ohio's public college and university faculty.

This report of the results of the Part-time Faculty Survey considers these three guiding questions:

Questions Guiding Survey of Part-time Faculty

1. What is the part-time faculty *professional* profile (what type of institutions do they work for, what are their academic areas, etc.) for Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?[1]
2. What activities constitute faculty work for part-time faculty at Ohio's state-funded colleges and universities?
3. In what professional climate do part-time faculty work?

Survey Methodology

A weighted, stratified, random sample of part-time faculty was selected from a complete population of all part-time faculty names submitted to the Board of Regents by campuses. The survey was designed by Regents' staff with the guidance of a committee of faculty representatives (the Faculty Survey Committee). A copy of the survey can be found at:

http://www.regents.state.oh.us/hei/faculty/facultysurvey/ptfacsurvey2000.pdf

The four page survey was mailed in April of 2000 directly to respondents at their home address with a postage paid reply envelope. Surveys were returned throughout the Spring and Summer of 2000. Actual sampling of the survey respondents, mailing of the surveys, data collection and data analysis were conducted by a third party contractor (the Strategic Research Group[2]) who then forwarded the computerized survey responses to the Regents for analysis without institutional identification on the surveys. Hence the specific institution associated with each individual response is unknown. There was a 50% response rate of surveyed faculty. Staff of the Strategic Research Group prepared an institutional response rate summary (See Table 1). Responses to the survey were weighted proportionately to reflect the known population size of part-time faculty at each institution at the time of the survey.

[1] The Faculty Survey captures information on only the professional profile of faculty; no demographic information is collected. Demographic data are collected in other Regents' reports.
[2] The Principal Investigator on this Board of Regents project is Kathleen Carr.

Table 1: Population Size and Response Rates of Part-time Faculty

School	Total Faculty	Number Sampled	Number Received	Percent
University of Akron	896	318	179	56%
Belmont Technical College	84	84	50	60%
Bowling Green State University	292	101	46	46%
Central State University	50	50	17	34%
Central Ohio Technical College	135	55	30	55%
University of Cincinnati	908	308	149	48%
Cincinnati State Technical & Community College	250	91	42	46%
Clark State Community College	117	36	18	50%
Cleveland State University	430	154	94	61%
Cuyahoga Community College	923	323	171	53%
Edison State Community College	159	58	29	50%
Hocking Technical College	118	39	12	31%
Jefferson Community College	91	91	51	56%
Kent State University	866	311	176	57%
Lakeland Community College	463	155	88	57%
Lima Technical College	181	56	22	39%
Lorain County Community College	308	113	74	65%
Marion Technical College	72	72	39	54%
Medical College of Ohio at Toledo	58	58	30	52%
Miami University	436	150	84	56%
Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine	3	3	1	33%
North Central Technical College	137	45	25	56%
Northwest State Community College	133	49	26	53%
Ohio University	748	256	135	52%
Ohio State University	1,510	506	157	31%
Owens State Community College	642	217	106	49%
Shawnee State University	142	53	27	51%
Sinclair Community College	551	193	92	48%
Southern State Community College	67	67	34	51%
Stark State College of Technology	522	188	90	48%
Terra State Community College	105	33	16	48%
University of Toledo	484	158	72	46%
Washington State Community College	102	32	18	56%
Wright State University	459	143	70	49%
Youngstown State University	392	131	86	66%
Muskingum Area Technical College	75	75	40	53%
Columbus State Community College	821	249	124	50%
TOTAL	**13,730**	**5,023**	**2,520**	**50%**

Availability of Survey Data for Query Purposes

The survey had 23 questions and many of the questions had numerous sub-questions. Tables presented in this report represent specific responses to the three questions guiding the part-time survey. There are other data tables that may be of interest to policy makers in the state that are not included in this report. To accommodate such requests, a public query tool is being developed which will allow those interested readers to create such tables with ease. This query tool (using Netscape's Navigator browser) will allow users to choose fields from the survey and have an aggregate analysis performed and returned to their own personal computer as a spreadsheet (e.g. Excel) or ASCII text file. This query tool can be found at:

http://www.regents.state.oh.us/hei/queries/unrestricted.html

Note: The query tool is intended for use with Netscape Navigator. Other internet browsers are not supported.
Note: The query tool is expected to contain part-time faculty data by February 14, 2001.

Persons using this query tool are reminded that while the data may be aggregated in a variety of ways, there are no specific institutional identifiers and no personal identifiers in the computerized database. Persons with questions about the use of this query tool should email Robert Sheehan at rsheehan@regents.state.oh.us or Stephanie McCann at smccann@regents.state.oh.us.

SURVEY RESULTS

Part-time Faculty Professional Profile for State-funded Higher Education Institutions in Ohio

Faculty Distribution

Part-time faculty make up a significant portion of the state higher education faculty population. Annually, campuses submit data to the Board of Regents on their employee counts. According to the Fall 1999 data, 42% of all faculty were reported by institutions as having part-time status.

Table 2: Full-time and Part-time Faculty – October 1, 1999 All Employee (AM) File Submission by Campuses

Institution Type	Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty		Total Faculty	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Community College	964	39%	1,534	61%	2,498	100%
State Community College	1,608	49%	1,648	51%	3,256	100%
Technical College	607	38%	991	62%	1,598	100%
University Branch	953	37%	1,620	63%	2,573	100%
University Main	11,608	68%	5,547	32%	17,155	100%
Total	15,740	58%	11,340	42%	27,080	100%

In the survey, part-time faculty were asked to identify the type of campus on which they were teaching. Of the statewide part-time faculty population, most are employed by university main campuses and community colleges. This is also true for full-time faculty surveyed the year before, but the larger number of part-time faculty (compared to full-time faculty) in two-year institutions does result in a larger number of part-time faculty being surveyed and responding from those institutions than was true for the full-time faculty survey of 1999.

Table 3: Distribution of Faculty Across Institution Type[3]

Institution Type	Part-time (2000)	Full-time (1999)
Community College	33%	11%
Technical College	8%	4%
Com-Tech[4]	5%	2%
Univ Main Campus	39%	70%
Univ Regional Campus	13%	8%
Free-stand Med School	1%	5%
Total	100%	100%

Readers should be aware that the percentage of part-time faculty is not the same as the percentage of students being taught by part-time faculty. Part-time faculty typically teach fewer courses that full-time faculty and thus may account for a smaller proportion of instructional hours than full-time faculty.

[3] On the survey, part-time faculty were given the choice of institution types provided in table 3. These choices differ from the campus types that are reported in the All Employee (AM) file as shown in table 2.
[4] Com-tech is any 2-year college that is within a university, that is considered both a community and a technical college.

Table 4 below presents the faculty load reported by the survey respondents. Faculty were asked (if they knew) to report their part-time teaching contracts with their college as a percentage of a full time equivalent (FTE) faculty member ranging from 1% to 100%. A majority of all faculty (45%) reported that they did know their FTE and these results are reported below. For almost all sectors, a majority of faculty who knew their FTE status reported that they were employed 25% time or less. Part-time faculty from regional campuses were somewhat less likely to report this level of faculty load. In all sectors, a large majority of part-time faculty report working half time or less. Statewide this percentage is 77%.

Table 4: Self Reported Faculty Load – Expressed as Full Time Equivalence

Full Time Equivalence	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free-stand Med School	Total
0-25%	56%	54%	58%	41%	46%	31%	48%
26-50%	20%	28%	23%	27%	24%	44%	24%
51-75%	18%	11%	14%	16%	18%	10%	16%
76-100%	7%	7%	5%	17%	12%	15%	12%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Percentage of Faculty Who Knew Their Full Time Equivalence						
	52%	42%	50%	41%	39%	27%	45%

Academic Area

The percentage of part-time faculty by academic area varies by sector. Part-time faculty at community colleges most often report an academic area of Humanities (16%) or Mathematics and Natural Science (16%). Part-time faculty at technical colleges (19%) and community-technical colleges (19%) most often report an academic area of Technical Program, and the free-standing medical school part-time faculty report an academic area of Medical and Health Science (98%). Part-time faculty at university main campuses also report an academic area of Humanities most often (18%), with the next highest percentage of faculty reporting Education (14%) as their academic area. Finally, university regional campus' part-time faculty report being in the Humanities academic area (21%) most often. Overall, for all institution types, most part-time faculty report an academic area of Humanities (17%). The differences in academic areas by part-time compared to full-time faculty status are not notable.

Table 5: Percentage of Part-time Faculty by Academic Area (PT=Part-time; FT=Full-time) and Institution Type in the Fall

Academic Area	Faculty Type	Institution Type						Total
		Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ. Main Campus	Univ. Regional Campus	Free-stand Med. School	
Agriculture	PT (2000)	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%		0%
	FT (1999)	0%	5%	0%	3%	13%	0%	4%
Art	PT (2000)	6%	0%	3%	11%	7%		7%
	FT (1999)	3%	0%	2%	7%	4%	0%	6%
Business	PT (2000)	10%	14%	16%	8%	10%		10%
	FT (1999)	6%	7%	6%	7%	3%	0%	6%
Computer Science	PT (2000)	6%	7%	4%	3%	3%		4%
	FT (1999)	4%	3%	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%
Education	PT (2000)	4%	3%	4%	14%	14%		9%
	FT (1999)	6%	1%	2%	8%	7%	1%	7%
Engineering	PT (2000)	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%		3%
	FT (1999)	3%	5%	5%	7%	2%	0%	6%
Humanities	PT (2000)	16%	9%	13%	18%	21%		17%
	FT (1999)	15%	4%	9%	12%	18%	1%	12%
Law	PT (2000)	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%		3%
	FT (1999)	0%	1%		2%	0%	0%	1%
Mathematics and Natural Sciences	PT (2000)	16%	13%	12%	10%	16%		13%
	FT (1999)	17%	9%	16%	14%	15%	2%	14%
Medicine and Health Sciences	PT (2000)	10%	13%	10%	13%	5%	98%	12%
	FT (1999)	14%	15%	10%	18%	10%	94%	20%
Public Administration	PT (2000)	2%	4%	5%	2%	2%		2%
	FT (1999)	1%	3%		1%	1%		1%
Social and Behavioral Sciences	PT (2000)	10%	11%	10%	13%	11%	2%	11%
	FT (1999)	8%	8%	12%	16%	12%	1%	14%
Technical Programs	PT (2000)	13%	19%	19%	2%	7%		9%
	FT (1999)	19%	34%	35%	1%	12%	0%	6%
Interdisciplinary	PT (2000)	0%			0%			0%
	FT (1999)	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Other	PT (2000)	1%	1%		1%	1%		1%
	FT (1999)	4%	3%	4%	3%	2%	1%	3%
Totals		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Highest Degree Earned

More part-time faculty reported that they had earned a Masters degree (48%) than any other degree type. The next highest percentages were in the Bachelor degree (16%) and Ph.D. (15%) categories. At medical schools part-time faculty most often reported holding a professional degree (52%).

Table 6: Percentage of Part-time Faculty by Highest Degree and Institution Type

Highest Degree Awarded	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ. Main Campus	Univ. Regional Campus	Free-stand Med. School	Total
Certificate	3%	5%	3%	0%			2%
Associate Degree	7%	12%	4%	1%	1%		4%
Bachelor Degree	24%	25%	24%	8%	8%		16%
Professional Cert.	4%	4%	7%	1%	1%		3%
Masters Degree	46%	40%	44%	48%	60%	17%	48%
Educational Specialist	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%		1%
All degree requirements for Ph.D. except dissertation	4%	3%	2%	4%	8%		4%
Professional Degree	5%	5%	7%	14%	4%	52%	9%
Doctoral Degree	6%	6%	7%	23%	17%	31%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 7: Percentage of Part-time Faculty with Graduate Degree by Institution Type

Highest Degree Awarded	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ. Main Campus	Univ. Regional Campus	Free-stand Med. School	Total
Part-time Faculty Reported to Have Graduate Degree	67%	59%	69%	91%	91%	100%	79%

Experience at Institution

Part-time faculty were asked how many years they had been employed at their institution as an instructor. Apparently many faculty do not stay at an institution for very long as most faculty (42%) indicated that they had been employed for 1-3 years at the institution. The second highest response was in the 4-6 year range (19%).

Table 8: Years Employed at the Institution by Institution Type

Institution	Years at institution								Total
	0 years	1-3 years	4-6 years	7-9 years	10-12 years	13-15 years	16-19 years	20 or more years	
Community College	0%	39%	20%	12%	9%	7%	4%	9%	100%
Technical College	1%	47%	17%	15%	8%	3%	4%	5%	100%
Com-Tech		45%	18%	13%	7%	5%	2%	10%	100%
Univ. Main Campus	1%	43%	18%	8%	9%	6%	4%	11%	100%
Univ. Regional Campus	0%	41%	18%	12%	9%	7%	4%	10%	100%
Free-stand Med. School		55%	15%	6%	11%	2%		11%	100%
Total	0%	42%	19%	11%	9%	6%	4%	10%	100%

Experience in Higher Education

Despite the lack of longevity at a particular institution, a large number of part-time faculty reported having considerable experience as an instructor or faculty in higher education. When asked to report how long they had been teaching or a faculty in higher education, 44% of part-time faculty reported being employed in higher education for 20 or more years. Many part-time faculty may have retired from full-time faculty positions thus accounting for the many years of higher education employment reported in these data.

Table 9: Years Employed in Higher Education by Institution Type

Institution	Years in higher education								Total
	0 years	1-3 years	4-6 years	7-9 years	10-12 years	13-15 years	16-19 years	20 or more years	
Community College	5%	16%	11%	8%	6%	6%	3%	45%	100%
Technical College	5%	17%	8%	9%	10%	6%	4%	41%	100%
Com-Tech	6%	22%	15%	10%	4%	4%	1%	39%	100%
Univ. Main Campus	4%	19%	11%	6%	6%	4%	5%	45%	100%
Univ. Regional Campus	3%	16%	13%	8%	8%	7%	2%	44%	100%
Free-stand Med. School		33%	11%	11%	7%			38%	100%
Total	4%	18%	11%	8%	7%	5%	4%	44%	100%

Part-time/Full-time Status Issues

Despite their part-time status, it is possible that part-time faculty might have other assignments at an institution. Thus, to better understand their employment status, part-time faculty were asked to answer a few questions about their employment status and their goals for that status.

Part-time faculty were asked to identify whether they had a full-time non-teaching position in addition to their regular part-time position. Most part-time faculty (95%) do not have full-time work doing non-teaching activities at the institution at which they are teaching part-time.

Table 10: Other Full-time Institutional Work

Employed Full-time at This Institution	Percentage
No	95%
Yes	5%
Total	100%

Part-time faculty were also asked whether, in addition to their teaching, they were working in a non-teaching part-time position at the institution at which they taught. As Table 11 shows, ninety two percent of part-time faculty responded no.

Table 11: Other Part-time Institutional Work

Employed Part-time at This Institution Other Than Teaching	Percentage
No	92%
Yes	8%
Total	100%

Part-time faculty were also asked whether they taught at another campus in addition to their teaching assignment at the institution for which we were specifically surveying. Results were somewhat unexpected. Anecdotally, many stories are told of part-time faculty taking many teaching assignments at different institutions in order to piece together a full-time salary. However, Table 12 shows that only 19% of part-time faculty are teaching at multiple institutions. While this is a significant number of part-time faculty, apparently most people are only teaching at a single institution.

Table 12: Teaching at Multiple Campuses

Teach at Another Campus During Fall 1999	Percentage
No	81%
Yes	19%
Total	100%

Table 13 shows part-time faculty responses to the question of whether their goal was to become full-time faculty. Most (46%) said no, 27% said yes, and 26% were unsure.

Table 13: Goal of Being Full-time

Goal to be Full-Time Faculty	Percentage
No	46%
Yes	27%
Unsure	26%
Total	100%

Related work of part-time faculty

Part-time faculty were also asked to identify whether they were currently engaged in professional work related to their teaching. Most part-time faculty (69%) reported that they were engaged in professional work that was related to the area in which they taught. Thus, while part-time faculty may not be working multiple teaching positions to piece together a full-time salary, many do seem to be working other jobs in addition to their teaching. This statistic may reflect that some institutions ask par-time faculty to teach classes that are related to their profession in an effort to give students the most up-to-date education.

Most medical school (94%) part-time faculty reported working in a related field. A high percentage of community-technical (75%) and technical (73%) college part-time faculty also reported that they were currently involved in professional work related to their teaching area. Even at university main campuses, most part-time faculty (71%) reported that they were engaged in professional work that was related to the area in which they were teaching.

Table14: Part-time Faculty Engaged in Work Related to Teaching

Institution Type	Faculty Also Working in Related Area
Community College	67%
Technical College	73%
Com-Tech	75%
Univ Main Campus	71%
Univ Regional Campus	61%
Free-stand Med School	94%
All Institution Types	69%

Table 15 considers by academic area part-time faculty who are also working in a related area. Most often, part-time faculty in Law (96%) and Public Administration (92%) reported that they were currently engaged in professional work related to their teaching area. Part-time faculty in Humanities (44%) or Mathematics and Natural Science (41%) academic areas were less likely to be engaged in related work outside of the university.

Table15: Part-time Faculty Engaged in Work Related to Teaching, by Academic Area

Are Engaged in Professional Work Related to Area Teaching	
Agriculture	82%
Art	83%
Business	84%
Computer Science	79%
Education	71%
Engineering	77%
Humanities	44%
Law	96%
Mathematics and Natural Sciences	41%
Medicine and Health Sciences	86%
Public Administration	92%
Social and Behavioral Sciences	70%
Technical Programs	83%
Interdisciplinary	68%
Other	68%
Total of All Faculty	69%

When do part-time faculty teach?

To understand when part-time faculty are teaching, part-time faculty were asked if they taught during the day, night or weekends. These categories were not mutually exclusive so part-time faculty could check as many as they wished. Table 16 below identifies those part-time faculty who answered yes regarding whether they taught during a particular time. Part-time faculty seem to be just as likely to be teaching during the day (57%) as at night (56%). Few part-time faculty (14%), however, reported teaching weekends.

Table 16: When Part-time Faculty are Teaching

When Taught	Percentage answering yes
Days	57%
Nights	56%
Weekends	14%

Part-time Faculty Activity: What Constitutes Part-time Faculty Work?
An important goal of the survey was to identify what activities make up the workload of part-time faculty. Part-time faculty were asked to consider their activity under the categories of teaching, research/scholarship/performance, professional growth, administration, and service to profession and professional public service.

- **Teaching** included teaching, grading papers, preparing courses; developing new curricula; advising or supervising students; working with student organizations or intramural athletics.
- **Research/Scholarship/Performance** included research; reviewing or preparing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing grant proposals; seeking outside funding; giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts, or giving speeches.
- **Professional Growth** included taking courses, pursuing an advanced degree, participating in faculty externships; or engaging in practices or activities to remain current in an academic field.
- **Service to profession** included service to professional societies/association; being an officer or member of professional organizations.
- **Administration** included only administrative tasks performed for a faculty member's home institution, including service on technology advisory committees, president's cabinet, university senate, business and industry advisory committee, or accreditation committee.
- **Professional Public Service** included paid or unpaid community service; providing legal or medical services or psychological services to clients or patients.

While the categories above are, in practice, not mutually exclusive, part-time faculty were asked to group their activity as if the categories were exclusive. For this question, part-time faculty were asked to focus on time spent per activity during the 1999 Fall Term only. Part-time faculty reported spending more time on teaching (81% of their time) than other activities.

Overall, part-time faculty responses differed from responses of full-time faculty in the previous year. Part-time faculty (4%) reported much less time spent in Research, Scholarship, and Performance than full-time faculty (20%). Part-time faculty (2%) also reported less time in Administration than full-time faculty (13%). Interestingly, both part-time faculty (4%) and full-time (5%) reported similar amounts of time spent in professional growth.

Table 17: Faculty Work Time Spent by Activity in the Fall

Activity	Part-time Faculty (1999)	Full-time Faculty (2000)
Teaching	81%	51%
Research, Scholarship, Performance	4%	20%
Professional Growth	4%	5%
Administration	2%	13%
Service to Profession	2%	4%
Professional public service	2%	4%
Other paid or unpaid service	2%	2%
Total reported percentages	97%	99%

Activity by Institution Type

Part-time faculty activity did not differ greatly by institution type except at medical schools where more time was reported in Public Service and Research, Scholarship, Performance. Also, part-time faculty spent slightly more time in Research, Scholarship, and Performance at university main campuses (6%). Differences do exist, however, in the activity of part-time faculty when compared to full-time faculty by institution type. The role of part-time faculty is almost entirely teaching, whereas full-time faculty report greater percentages of time spent in administration in all sectors and research and scholarship at four-year institutions.

Table 18: Faculty Work Time Spent by Activity, by Faculty Type (PT=Part-time; FT=Full-time) and Institution Type in the Fall

Activity	Faculty Type	Institution Type						Total
		Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ. Main Campus	Univ. Regional Campus	Free Standing Med. School	
Teaching	PT (2000)	85%	84%	84%	77%	84%	46%	81%
	FT (1999)	70%	73%	73%	47%	58%	32%	51%
Research, Scholarship, Performance	PT (2000)	3%	2%	2%	6%	3%	11%	4%
	FT (1999)	6%	4%	4%	24%	17%	26%	20%
Professional Growth	PT (2000)	4%	5%	3%	5%	4%	4%	4%
	FT (1999)	7%	7%	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%
Service to Profession	PT (2000)	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	9%	2%
	FT (1999)	3%	2%	2%	4%	3%	5%	4%
Administration	PT (2000)	1%	1%	0%	2%	2%	3%	2%
	FT (1999)	11%	9%	9%	14%	12%	%	13%
Public Service	PT (2000)	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	15%	2%
	FT (1999)	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	13%	4%
Other Paid or Unpaid	PT (2000)	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	5%	2%
	FT (1999)	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%

Specific Research and Teaching Activities by Institution Type

The broad categories of activity that were defined in Table 17 were also broken down into specific tasks. Part-time faculty were asked whether they had performed specific activities during the previous academic year (between the end of the 1998 Fall Term and the end of the 1999 Fall Term)*. Table 19 reflects the percentage of part-time faculty by institution type who answered that they **did** perform specific tasks.

Responses varied across institution type. It has been shown that the duties of part-time faculty mostly involve teaching. With regard to specific activities, the only activity with consistently higher numbers was "advising students." Other than teaching, part-time faculty were most likely to report that they had advised students (29%). In addition, some part-time faculty reported serving on a committee at their institution (15%) and developing a new course or program (14%).

Few part-time faculty seemed to be involved in research related activities. Overall, only 12% of part-time faculty reported that they presented a paper at a conference or published a book, article, or abstract. In addition, few part-time faculty responded that they had written a research grant proposal (6%) or had received a research grant (9%).

* Future references in this document to the previous academic year refer to the period between the end of the 1998 Fall Term and the end of the 1999 Fall Term.

Table 19: Percentage of Respondents who Spent Time in Selected Activities in the Previous Academic Year, by Faculty Type (PT=Part-Time; FT=Full-Time) and Institution Type

Activity	Faculty Type	Community Colleges	Technical Colleges	Com-Tech	Univ. Main Campus	Univ. Regional Campus	Free Standing Medical College	Total
Develop or administer alternative learning systems	PT (2000)	10%	7%	9%	14%	11%	19%	12%
	FT (1999)	46%	46%	26%	39%	44%	45%	41%
Publish a book, monograph, article, abstract, etc.	PT (2000)	8%	5%	5%	18%	11%	29%	12%
	FT (1999)	27%	18%	20%	77%	58%	75%	66%
Present a paper at a conference	PT (2000)	8%	5%	5%	18%	10%	47%	12%
	FT (1999)	30%	17%	24%	74%	59%	67%	64%
Give a formal or creative performance, etc.	PT (2000)	8%	5%	6%	13%	8%	15%	10%
	FT (1999)	16%	15%	9%	18%	16%	19%	17%
Write a research grant proposal	PT (2000)	5%	1%	5%	8%	5%	21%	6%
	FT (1999)	18%	15%	7%	60%	47%	54%	52%
Receive research grant funding	PT (2000)	6%	4%	7%	13%	7%	21%	9%
	FT (1999)	11%	11%	1%	49%	34%	48%	41%
Serve as an officer of a local institutional organization	PT (2000)	12%	14%	8%	15%	10%	10%	13%
	FT (1999)	28%	29%	29%	30%	35%	38%	30%
Serve as an officer of a regional, national international organization	PT (2000)	5%	6%	5%	10%	4%	15%	7%
	FT (1999)	16%	13%	14%	34%	23%	32%	30%
Develop a new course or program	PT (2000)	12%	12%	17%	17%	13%	9%	14%
	FT (1999)	69%	62%	80%	64%	67%	49%	64%
Mentor faculty	PT (2000)	4%	5%	3%	6%	5%	26%	5%
	FT (1999)	65%	54%	48%	54%	57%	47%	55%
Market a new program or recruit students	PT (2000)	7%	9%	5%	8%	8%	22%	8%
	FT (1999)	58%	63%	70%	59%	52%	48%	58%
Serve on a committee at your institution	PT (2000)	13%	16%	9%	17%	17%	43%	15%
	FT (1999)	93%	88%	95%	91%	97%	90%	92%
Serve on an undergraduate students committee	PT (2000)	1%	0%	0%	4%	1%	2%	2%
	FT (1999)	18%	10%	14%	39%	20%	9%	32%
Serve on undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees	PT (2000)	0%	1%	0%	2%	1%	2%	1%
	FT (1999)	5%	8%	6%	12%	7%	11%	11%
Serve on graduate thesis or dissertation committees	PT (2000)	0%	0%	0%	4%	1%	9%	2%
	FT (1999)	1%	1%	2%	66%	22%	48%	51%
Serve on graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees	PT (2000)	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%	4%	1%
	FT (1999)	2%		2%	56%	16%	47%	43%
Advise students	PT (2000)	24%	19%	19%	36%	31%	42%	29%
	FT (1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Work with student organizations	PT (2000)	3%	4%	3%	9%	5%	4%	6%
	FT (1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Serve as a coordinator of department program or student activity	PT (2000)	4%	5%	1%	9%	7%	9%	6%
	FT (1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Student Contact Outside of Class Time

Part-time faculty were asked to quantify the number of hours they spent with students outside of class time during the 1999 Fall Term. Table 20 displays this activity by institution type. Most part-time faculty (51%) at all institutions reported 1-3 hours of contact with students.

Part-time faculty reported spending less time outside of the classroom with students than full-time faculty. Almost 30% of full-time faculty reported 7-10 hours of contact with students. In addition, 18% of part-time faculty reported spending no time at all with students outside of class. In contrast, only 2% of full-time faculty reported spending no time with students outside of class.

Table 20: Average Hours of Faculty Contact with Students Outside of Classroom by Faculty Type (PT=Part-Time; FT=Full-Time) and Institution Type

Hours per week spent with students outside of class	Faculty Type	Institution Type						Total
		Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ. Main Campus	Univ. Regional Campus	Free-stand Med. School	
0	PT (2000)	26%	36%	22%	11%	11%	6%	18%
	FT (1999)	0%			2%	3%	6%	2%
1 – 3	PT (2000)	55%	44%	56%	48%	54%	32%	51%
	FT (1999)	4%	3%	2%	10%	6%	22%	9%
4 – 6	PT (2000)	13%	11%	14%	26%	20%	38%	19%
	FT (1999)	12%	17%	8%	28%	27%	29%	25%
7 – 10	PT (2000)	4%	6%	5%	7%	8%	6%	6%
	FT (1999)	31%	37%	42%	28%	27%	18%	28%
11 – 15	PT (2000)	2%	0%	2%	4%	3%	2%	3%
	FT (1999)	31%	28%	29%	18%	21%	16%	20%
16 – 20	PT (2000)	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	4%	1%
	FT (1999)	13%	10%	13%	8%	8%	7%	9%
21 - 25	PT (2000)	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
	FT (1999)	5%	3%	2%	3%	4%	0%	3%
26 - 30	PT (2000)	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	10%	1%
	FT (1999)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%
31+	PT (2000)	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%
	PT (2000)	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
Total	FT (1999)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Reviewing and Critiquing Student Writing

Part-time faculty were asked to consider the amount of time they spent reviewing and critiquing student writing during the Fall Term of 1999. Table 21 displays this activity by institution type. Forty-three percent of part-time faculty reported spending no time at all critiquing student writing, compared to 18% of full-time faculty. Percentages of part-time faculty reporting no time spent in the review of writing were highest at Technical Colleges (55%), Community-Technical Colleges (54%), and free-standing Medical Colleges (54%). Overall, almost a third (32%) of part-time faculty and 36% of full-time faculty reported 1 - 3 hours a week spent reviewing student writing, and 12% of part-time faculty and 22% of full-time faculty report spending 4-6 hours a week reviewing and critiquing student writing.

Table 21: Average Hours Spent by Faculty Reviewing and Critiquing Student Writing by Institution and FacultyType

Hours per week spent reviewing students writing	Faculty Type	Institution Type						Total
		Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free-stand Med School	
0	PT (2000)	47%	55%	54%	37%	36%	54%	43%
	FT (1999)	16%	17%	15%	16%	18%	44%	18%
1 – 3	PT (2000)	33%	22%	27%	32%	40%	31%	32%
	FT (1999)	34%	43%	39%	37%	30%	27%	36%
4 – 6	PT (2000)	9%	16%	7%	15%	12%	4%	12%
	FT (1999)	20%	17%	28%	23%	22%	14%	22%
7 – 10	PT (2000)	6%	4%	3%	8%	4%		6%
	FT (1999)	11%	11%	9%	12%	12%	12%	12%
11 – 15	PT (2000)	3%	1%	4%	4%	3%	8%	4%
	FT (1999)	7%	4%	3%	6%	8%	3%	6%
16 – 20	PT (2000)	1%	0%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
	FT (1999)	5%	4%	3%	3%	4%	0%	3%
21 – 25	PT (2000)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%		1%
	FT (1999)	2%	0%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%
26 – 30	PT (2000)	0%		2%	0%	1%		1%
	FT (1999)	3%	3%		0%	1%	1%	1%
31+	PT (2000)	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%		1%
	PT (2000)	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%
Total	FT (1999)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Professional Climate of Part-time Faculty

A major concern among part-time faculty is the climate in which they work. The issue raised by the committee that designed the survey was that part-time faculty may work in less than ideal circumstances even though they make up a large proportion of the faculty work force. In order to understand the work environment of part-time faculty, they were asked to respond to a number of questions regarding the professional climate in which they work. Because full-time faculty did not have these questions on their survey in 1999, comparison between the professional climates of part-time and full-time faculty is not possible.

Office space can be a valuable tool that allows faculty to meet with students and prepare for class time. Part-time faculty were asked questions regarding their office space. Table 22 shows that 57% of part-time faculty are provided with office space. Community colleges seem least likely to provide office space; only 44% of part-time faculty at community colleges reported access to office space. Part-time faculty at university main campuses (67%) and university regional campuses (67%) most often reported access to an office.

Table 22: Part-time Faculty Provided Office Space

Institution Type	Yes	No	Total
Community College	44%	56%	100%
Technical College	49%	51%	100%
Com-Tech	47%	53%	100%
Univ. Main Campus	67%	33%	100%
Univ. Regional Campus	67%	34%	100%
Free-standing Medical School	64%	36%	100%
Total	57%	43%	100%

Part-time faculty who reported having access to an office were also asked whether that office space was adequate. Overall, 73% of part-time faculty with offices believed their office space was adequate. Community college faculty (31%) were most likely to be dissatisfied with their office space, and university main campus part-time faculty (23%) were least likely to be dissatisfied.

Table 23: Part-time Faculty Satisfied with Office Space?

Institution Type	Yes	No	Total
Community College	69%	31%	100%
Technical College	71%	29%	100%
Com-Tech	73%	27%	100%
Univ. Main Campus	77%	23%	100%
Univ. Regional Campus	71%	29%	100%
Free-standing Medical School	74%	26%	100%
Total	73%	27%	100%

Part-time faculty who had office space but were dissatisfied with that office space were asked to describe how their office space was inadequate in an open ended question. Their primary responses are grouped into categories and shown in Table 24. Most part-time faculty (56%) believed that their office space was inadequate because of inadequate physical space. Others cited not enough desks (8%) and lack of computers (7%). Still others cited the lack of privacy (7%) and storage space (6%).

Table 24: Reasons why office space is inadequate

Reason	Percentage of Faculty reporting reason
Inadequate Physical Space	56%
Not Enough Desks	8%
Lack of Computers, Too few Computers/Printers	7%
No Privacy	7%
Lack of Storage Space	6%
Other	3%
Lack of Security, Crime, No Locks	3%
Lack of Phones, Too few Phones'	3%
Equipment Out of Date	2%
Too far from Class	2%
Limited Access to Office	2%
Having a Space Sometimes and Other Times Not	2%
Switching Spaces in Different Quarters	1%
Limited Access to Equipment or Supplies	1%
Noisy	1%
Total	100%

In addition to office space, other tools are important for the professional climate of part-time faculty. Part-time faculty were asked to report whether they had access to computers, voicemail, clerical support, and other resources during the 1999 Fall Term. Table 25 shows the percentage of part-time faculty by institution type who report access to these resources.

A very important resource for the distribution of handouts and exams is copying and/or duplicating facilities. Eighty nine percent of all faculty reported that they had access to this resource. At university regional campuses, 96% of part-time faculty reported having access to copying and/or duplicating. Interestingly, their counterparts at main campuses (86%) were less likely to have such access.

Parking and library privileges also seemed available to part-time faculty. Eighty one percent of all part-time faculty reported that they had access to library facilities, and 80% reported access to parking.

As technology continues to make its way into the teaching industry, technological resources become increasingly important tools for faculty. Part-time faculty report access to technological resources in varying degrees.

Overall, 63% of part-time faculty reported having access to computers. Free-standing medical school part-time faculty (83%) most often reported that that they had access to computers. University regional campus part-time faculty (72%) also had a high percentage of respondents saying that they had access to computers. Part-time faculty seemed much less likely to have access to email and the Internet. Overall, only 50% of part-time faculty reported having access to email, and only 53% reported having access to the Internet. These numbers seem peculiarly low in an age where more and more communication is occurring using these resources. Most interestingly, at institutions that have a mission that includes technological training as an important focus, that is, at technical colleges, only 36% of part-time faculty reported having access to email and only 40% reported having access to the Internet. Numbers were highest at the free-standing medical schools and university regional campuses. Of medical school part-time faculty, 70% reported having access to both email and the Internet. At regional campuses, 66% of part-time faculty reported having access to email, and 64% reported having access to the Internet.

Table 25: Faculty who answered yes to having particular resources.

Resource	Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ. Main Campus	Univ. Regional Campus	Free-stand Med. School	Total of all Faculty
Computer	65%	57%	60%	60%	72%	83%	63%
Voice Mail	28%	32%	31%	26%	37%	43%	29%
Clerical Support	63%	69%	61%	60%	77%	61%	64%
Library Privileges	80%	65%	74%	84%	88%	83%	81%
Parking	83%	87%	88%	71%	92%	79%	80%
Copying and/or Duplicating	91%	89%	91%	86%	96%	79%	89%
Telephone	63%	62%	62%	66%	71%	75%	65%
E-mail	40%	36%	38%	58%	66%	70%	50%
Internet Access	50%	40%	45%	56%	64%	70%	53%

Part-time faculty were asked to comment on their academic experience by responding to a series of opinion statements. Table 26 provides the faculty responses by institution type. An extensive review of the table is not possible for this report, but comment is provided on some of the items in the table.

Part-time faculty seem more likely to believe that they get feedback on their performance and access to the Departmental Chair. Overall, 60% of part-time faculty either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “I receive timely feedback on my performance.” In addition, 75% of part-time faculty either agreed or strongly agreed that they had easy access to the Department chair.

Part-time faculty also responded that they had favorable relationships with their tenured colleagues. Sixty eight percent of part-time faculty either agreed or strongly agreed that they had comfortable relationships with tenured faculty, with only 10% responding that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Part-time faculty responded that they had little involvement with departmental activities that involve departmental planning and decision making. While some part-time faculty (39%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they were regularly invited to departmental meetings, almost as many (44%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with that statement. Very few part-time faculty attend department meetings with full-time faculty (over 60% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “I attend departmental meetings with full-time faculty”). Finally, less than 11% of part-time faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they had voting responsibilities on departmental issues.

Table 26: Opinion Statements

		Institution						Total: All Faculty
		Community College	Technical College	Com-Tech	Univ Main Campus	Univ Regional Campus	Free-stand Med School	
I receive mentoring from Department Chair.	Strongly Agree or Agree	48%	44%	47%	40%	32%	66%	43%
	Neutral	24%	26%	30%	24%	29%	24%	25%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	28%	29%	23%	36%	39%	10%	32%
I receive timely feedback on my performance.	Strongly Agree or Agree	67%	62%	58%	56%	55%	64%	60%
	Neutral	16%	16%	21%	21%	24%	18%	19%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	17%	22%	21%	23%	21%	18%	20%
I am regularly invited to departmental meetings.	Strongly Agree or Agree	42%	35%	45%	39%	29%	90%	39%
	Neutral	17%	21%	20%	15%	23%	2%	17%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	41%	44%	35%	46%	49%	8%	44%
I attend departmental meetings with full time faculty.	Strongly Agree or Agree	23%	15%	24%	22%	12%	63%	21%
	Neutral	17%	18%	19%	13%	16%	23%	15%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	60%	68%	58%	66%	71%	14%	64%
I have easy access to the Department Chair.	Strongly Agree or Agree	76%	78%	79%	76%	67%	92%	75%
	Neutral	14%	13%	11%	16%	15%	2%	15%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	10%	9%	11%	8%	19%	6%	10%
I have a comfortable relationship with tenured faculty.	Strongly Agree or Agree	67%	64%	63%	70%	64%	85%	68%
	Neutral	22%	24%	24%	21%	24%	6%	22%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	11%	12%	13%	9%	11%	9%	10%
I have voting responsibilities on departmental issues.	Strongly Agree or Agree	9%	9%	10%	12%	10%	29%	10%
	Neutral	25%	18%	24%	16%	22%	42%	21%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	66%	73%	66%	72%	68%	29%	69%
I have opportunities for professional development..	Strongly Agree or Agree	49%	35%	45%	46%	42%	84%	46%
	Neutral	27%	31%	29%	26%	29%	8%	27%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	25%	34%	26%	28%	30%	8%	28%
I participate in professional development opportunities.	Strongly Agree or Agree	39%	34%	36%	44%	34%	76%	40%
	Neutral	31%	27%	32%	28%	33%	20%	30%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	30%	39%	33%	29%	33%	4%	31%
I participate in professional public service.	Strongly Agree or Agree	31%	36%	29%	41%	32%	58%	36%
	Neutral	28%	25%	33%	24%	25%	31%	26%
	Strongly Disagree or Disagree	41%	39%	38%	35%	44%	11%	38%
Total: All Faculty		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Final Open-ended Questions

At the end of the survey, part-time faculty were asked two open-ended questions. First, they were asked to describe the reasons why they teach part-time. Table 27 shows the variety of responses we received to this question. Most often (24%), part-time faculty reported that they taught because they enjoyed it, with some of the other responses being variations on this them.

Table 27: Reasons Given for Teaching Part Time

Describe why you teach part time	Percentage
Enjoy teaching	24%
Enjoying interactions with students	8%
Want to become a full-time teacher	7%
Income	6%
Need time to devote to career	5%
Unable to find other full-time position	5%
Need time to devote to family	4%
Helps one learn and stay updated in ones field	4%
It is rewarding	4%
Retired from full-time teaching	4%
To pass on real world experience to students	3%
To pass knowledge and skills to others	3%
Did not want to teach full-time	3%
Help people	3%
Enjoy the field that I teach in	2%
Retired from profession	2%
Enjoy learning experience	2%
Flexible schedule	2%
Not enough education for full-time	2%
Giving back	2%
Sharing love of subject	1%
Enjoy the challenge	1%
Favor for someone, Asked to teach	1%
Environment, Peers, Coworkers	1%
Can not teach full-time	<1%
Professional Growth	<1%
Develop relationships with future professionals	<1%
To develop areas of scholarship	<1%
Being a mentor	<1%
Develops my public speaking skills	<1%
Do not want pressure of full-time position	<1%
Other	1%
Total	100%

The second open-ended question on the survey asked part-time faculty if they had other comments to add. There were many varied responses to this question. In some cases, faculty used separate sheets to write responses that would not fit in the limited space available on the survey. In other cases, separate letters were written to the Regents' staff, and a few phone calls were made to Regents' offices. It is not possible to quantify the many responses into categories because most of them were specific to the particular work situation of the respondent. However, it should be noted that there were many references to the low salary and lack of health benefits or tuition reimbursement.

Pay scale is clearly as important an issue for part-time faculty in the state of Ohio as it is nationwide. In its 1993 report on the status of part-time faculty, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) also noted the low compensation received by part-time faculty. Their recommendation was that compensation for part-time employees should correspond fractionally to full-time compensation, including essential fringe benefits such as health and pension contributions (see report at: http://www.aaup.org/ptlink.htm). It seems clear that part-time faculty at Ohio's state higher education institutions do not feel they are being compensated fairly.

Because the Ohio Board of Regents is a coordinating board, decisions about salary are not a part of its function. Salary scales are determined by each institution. Oversight regarding salary issues lies with the Board of Trustees for each institution.

Conclusions

This report has reviewed the results of the part-time faculty survey with a emphasis on the three issues the survey was designed to address: the profile, activity, and professional climate of part-time faculty.

The professional profiles of part-time faculty are quite homogeneous. They tend to have at least a Masters degree. They teach both during the day and night. Generally, they do not have an additional position at the institutions at which they teach part-time, but they do often have another job in a profession that is related to the one in which they teach.

The activity that most engages part-time faculty is teaching. In general, part-time faculty spend little time in research, administration, or other activities. Most part-time faculty spend an average of 1-3 hours a week outside of the classroom with students.

Part-time faculty opinions' regarding their office climate vary by institution type. Overall, only a little over half of part-time faculty are provided with office space. Of those that do have office space, about a third are dissatisfied with that space. Part-time faculty have access to some resources such as copying and/or duplicating and parking. However, fewer faculty have access to the Internet, email or voicemail. Part-time faculty generally have good relationships with tenured faculty, but they do not tend to have voting responsibilities in their departments. As to other climate issues, part-time faculty have varying opinions depending on their institution type.

The Ohio Board of Regents will begin its next round of faculty surveys in 2002. In 2002, full-time faculty will be the focus. Part-time faculty will be surveyed again in 2003.