Documenting Adjunct Recruitment Events

How was this process done in the past? In November 2010, GRCC held its first adjunct recruitment event, planned by Cathy Wilson, Lydia Cruz, Christine Davis, Steve Abid and Paula Sullivan. The purpose of the event was threefold: provide a realistic job preview for adjunct applicants, allow for pre-screening by dept heads and program directors and diversify our adjunct applicant pool. A second event was held in May 2011 and a third event is in the planning process for October 2011. The planning committee for the October event includes Cathy Wilson, Lydia Cruz, William Faber and Paula Sullivan.

How are you doing it differently now?

What data or information led you to improve this process?
The event planning process included: gathering departmental input about adjunct hiring needs; selecting applicants to be invited to the event according departmental hiring needs; developing and implementing the event agenda; assessing the event; using data to improve subsequent events. Because this process worked well for the first event, we continued to use this process for subsequent events. However, areas for improvement based on survey data were implemented for May and October 2011 events. Process details are presented below.

November 2010 Applicant Selection Process: Department heads and program directors from Arts and Sciences and School of Workforce Development were asked if they would like their respective areas to be represented and/or advertised for the event. As a result, 16 disciplines were identified: Accounting, Computer Applications, Communications, Economics, Education, English, Gender Studies, General Business, History, Language and Thought, Mathematics, Political Science, Psychology, Social Sciences, Sociology. The entire adjunct pool was then assessed according to departmental needs for new adjuncts in the above mentioned disciplines. Human Resources promoted the event by sending emails to professional and/or minority list servs, by inviting current qualified and interested minority employees to attend as well as by word of mouth. As a result of this process, 547 formal invitations were extended. 170 or 31% of those invited attended the event. On site and drop in registration was also available.

November Agenda Items: The event was held on a Saturday morning, 8:30 – noon. The schedule of events included opening remarks followed by four breakout sessions: 1. Adjunct Instructor Professional Development Resources: 2. Overview of Blackboard; 3. Question and Answer with GRCC Adjunct Faculty and HR Staff; 4. Computer Lab with Human Resources Staff. After the break out sessions, participants could meet with departmental faculty and/or representatives for the purpose of screening resumes. Participants then returned to the general meeting place to answer final questions and attend the final wrap up.

November Event Assessment: After the event, Zoomerang surveys were sent to all who attended, including on site and drop in registrations. Questions addressed participants’ perception about the overall value of the program, as well as the value of individual sessions. Participants were also given the opportunity to respond to opened ended questions about the strengths of the program and areas for improvement. The planning team met to analyze survey results in January 2011. Unfortunately, specific response rate data is not available at this time. However, responses were overall very positive and appreciative of the event. Some specific areas for improvement included:

1. The registration period was too long
2. The wrap up session was nice but was not necessary
3. The flow of break out sessions was crowded
4. The question and answer breakout session was not structured enough.
5. Use of the computer lab to download resumes was unnecessary.
6. Waiting time to meet with departments was too long and impersonal.
7. There was not enough time to talk with departmental faculty.

Data analysis suggested that the November 2010 event was a success (based on number of participants and positive survey results and number of adjuncts hired for winter 2011). Therefore, the planning committee determined to hold another event in spring 2011. The second event was held in May 2011.

**May 2011 Applicant Selection Process:** As in fall 2010, department heads and program directors from Arts and Sciences and School of Workforce Development were asked if they would like their respective areas to be represented and/or advertised for the event. This time 10 disciplines were identified: Communications, Business, Journalism, Entrepreneurship, Spanish, Marketing, Chemistry, Physics, Statistics, Biology.

**May 2011 Data Driven Improvements:** During the planning process for the May 2011 event, data collected from the fall 2010 surveys was used to make the following improvements:

1. We shortened the time between registration and actual start time.
2. We planned for two breakout sessions instead of four.
3. We combined registration with computer assistance from HR staff as needed.
4. We replaced the Question and Answer session with a Panel discussion. The panel was composed entirely of adjuncts, three of whom were longstanding adjuncts and one who had just completed her first semester teaching with us. Associate Deans Abid and Sullivan posed questions to panel members for the purpose of facilitating discussions between faculty and participants. They were also able to answer administrative questions that faculty could not.
5. We kept both the Overview of Blackboard and Adjunct Instructor Professional Development Resource sessions because of their value to previous participants.
6. We tried to recruit more discipline specific faculty for departmental meetings.

Using the same selection process, 270 people were invited. 63 or 23% attended.

**May 2011 Agenda Items:** The event was again held on a Saturday morning, 8:30-11:30. Because of survey feedback, the schedule of events for May included a combined registration and HR computer assistance, opening remarks, 2 breakout sessions (Adjunct Instructor Professional Development Resources and Blackboard Overview), a panel discussion and short wrap up, followed by departmental meetings with full time faculty.

**May 2011 Event Assessment:** After the event, Zoomerang surveys were sent to all who attended, including on site and drop in registrations. Questions addressed the participants’ opinion about the overall value of the program, as well as the value of individual sessions. Participants were also given the opportunity to respond to open ended questions about the strengths of the program and areas for improvement. The planning team met in June 2011 to analyze survey results and plan for fall 2011. Based on survey results, the event seems to have been successful. In particular, participants found the breakout sessions and Panel discussions to be very helpful. Areas for improvement from this data set included:
1. limit Bb to overview only. (The May presentation was too technical for the purposes of this meeting)
2. recruit more faculty
3. eliminate waiting lines
4. create signage for departmental sessions
5. shorten time for registration

October 2011 Data Driven Improvements: The planning committee has tentatively planned a third event for October 2011. Based on feedback from the May event, the proposed October agenda includes: Shorter registration time, two breakout sessions (Adjunct Instructor Professional Development Resource sessions and Blackboard Overview), Panel discussion and departmental meeting sessions. We are also considering adding Lakeshore to the departmental breakout meeting sessions. The October event assessment will be consistent with prior assessments and results from October data will be used to plan subsequent events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>November 2010</th>
<th>May 2011</th>
<th>October 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant selection process</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depart. representation</td>
<td>16 disciplines</td>
<td>10 disciplines</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Breakout sessions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Changes/improvements made because of data improvement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiring Data results: After the November 2010 recruiting event, hiring data for winter 2011 indicated that 59 new adjuncts were hired, 13 of whom were minorities (22%) compared with 8.3% minority hired in fall 2010. The only variable appears to be the recruitment event.

After the May 2011 recruitment event, hiring data for fall 2011 indicated that 42 new adjuncts were hired, 7 (17%) of whom were minorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Adjunct Hiring data</th>
<th>Winter ‘11</th>
<th>Fall ‘11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of new hires</td>
<td>SAS: 49</td>
<td>SAS: 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWD: 10</td>
<td>SWD: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in % minority new hires</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvement Documentation Form

1. How was this process done in the past?

   a. **Faculty ‘interviewed’ potential adjunct one at a time.** The faculty member would complete a document containing basic questions focused on the candidate’s credentials and teaching interests.

   b. **Department heads recruited department faculty to conduct ‘interviews’ during the adjunct event.**

   c. **Faculty members were unprepared to ‘interview’ candidates.**

2. How are you doing it differently now?

   a. **Department faculty will facilitate the potential adjuncts as a group to complete the document regarding credentials and teaching interests.**

   b. **Human Resources representative will visit DH/PD leadership meetings as well as individual department meetings to recruit faculty to participate in the adjunct event.**

   c. **An orientation will take place to inform faculty on how to facilitate the ‘interview’ process.** (This may be done via email or tutorial video.)

3. What data or information led you to improve this process?

   a. **The survey results indicated that the participants were not happy about the wait time to be ‘interviewed’.**

   b. **Several departments were understaffed during the departmental breakout sessions.**

   c. **Several faculty members commented on their lack of preparedness for the event.**

4. How will you know that the new process is "more better" (or way more better) than the old one?
a. Survey results won’t contain comments on ‘waiting too long’ to be interviewed.

b. Departmental representation will increase.

c. Faculty members will participate in the orientation.