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ABSTRACT

Full-time community college faculty moonlight to a much greater extent than does the general workforce. The number of faculty who work second jobs outside of their full-time teaching contract can be projected to exceed 40 percent with a strong possibility that more than half have employment outside of their primary faculty jobs. Chief community college administrators do not believe--or are not willing to admit--that their full-time faculty are so engaged in outside employment.

When faced with years of the same teaching assignments, heavy teaching and advising workloads but limited opportunities and resources for professional growth and renewal, veteran community college faculty become weary and unchallenged. They turn outside of their institutions to revitalize their career plateaus. When institutions fail to recognize or know how faculty respond when they feel "stuck" in their jobs, they jeopardize their greatest resource. Once "lost" to outside employment ventures, faculty become institutionally disengaged.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

"A university is imaginative or it is nothing--at least nothing useful. . . . The whole art in the organization of a university is the provision of a faculty whose learning is lighted up with imagination" (Whitehead in Academic Strategy, p. 176).

Implicit in Alfred North Whitehead's oft-used quotation is the vital role of faculty in teaching. Indeed, his provision of a faculty "lighted with imagination" has especial relevance for community colleges given the teaching focus of their mission. Nonetheless, the problem remains: how brightly does the community college faculty fire really burn, and what ignites the flame? One context for analyzing this problem is faculty moonlighting--an open area of research mostly ignored in the plethora of recent studies on faculty productivity.

To be sure, maintaining vitality in the primary role of teaching has been the subject of much study. The rising cost of higher education in recent years has prompted a number of studies on the productivity and efficiency of
faculty, or in essence, how full-time faculty spend their
time on the job. These studies, however, are completed by
faculty who know that a survey is an opportunity to prove
they are diligent about their jobs. The spirit, or
vitality, of faculty often goes overlooked. The amount of
discretionary time (time that is not spent in the classroom,
advise students, or participating in college-related
functions, such as committee assignments) is periodically
reported as a faculty workload issue. The extent to which
full-time community college faculty engage in external
activities, such as consulting or employment outside of
their teaching contracts, is rarely challenged. Indeed,
empirical data are limited; moreover, when the data show
that faculty moonlight, their reasons for doing so are
almost never explained.

To further complicate the problem, historical
connections of the establishment of community colleges to
the public school system have created a dichotomy in
expectations for community college faculty. It really is
unclear whether community college faculty should more
closely emulate secondary school teachers or four-year
university faculty. Engaging in pursuits outside of the
classroom for community college faculty is generally not valued due to the baggage brought from secondary school thinking. In a study of the American high school of the 1980s co-sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Commission on Educational Issues of the National Association of Independent Schools, *Horace's Compromise* by Theodore Sizer (1984), depicted the growing dissociation of high school teachers to their primary role of teaching. Yet, the public scrutiny of education's effectiveness and efficiency places a parallel burden of accountability on higher education's chief administrators. Since the faculty is a college's major resource and the chief link for the teaching-learning alliance, knowing how faculty spend their time and whether it has an impact on their effectiveness should be a primary administrative concern.

Higher education's top administrators face the challenge of fostering quality learning environments provided by dedicated and invigorated faculty. Knowing, then, how faculty spend their time--contracted time and discretionary time--and the resulting impact on their job performance is critical.
This exploratory study focuses on the extent to which full-time community college faculty moonlight for other than financial reasons and the resulting impact on overall job performance. Three intriguing series of questions led to the study's development.

1. The community college movement in the United States is passing into a new stage of development with problems heretofore unaddressed. By the turn of the century, 40 percent of current full-time community college faculty may retire (Building Communities, 1988). Are these senior faculty still as invigorated as they once were? What is their motivation for staying current in their disciplines, and does their attitude affect classroom teaching? Do these veteran faculty contribute to their institutions at a highly energized level like they once did, or are their institutions (and students) being shortchanged due to other priorities?

2. The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges acknowledged and adopted "faculty renewal" as a primary goal in promoting excellence and guarding against burnout. Do community college administrators know what really works in renewing faculty? Do professional
development plans provide experiences that significantly "light up" faculty? Do community college presidents know (or willingly admit) how their full-time faculty spend their discretionary time (time outside of their assigned responsibilities) and what impact that might have on their job performance? Are there lessons to be learned from what faculty are doing outside of their contractual obligation?

The professional schools of many senior institutions tout the fact that their faculties are career maintaining practitioners in their specific fields. Teaching "what they do" is secondary to "doing what they do." Does a comparable approach have a place in the conception of community colleges and their full-time teaching faculty? Can outside work enhance the ability of full-time teaching faculty at community colleges? If so, does the relationship of the outside work to one's teaching discipline determine whether the activity is beneficial to the individual or not? Do outside work opportunities exist, either as voluntary professional development or as a requirement for full-time community college faculty? Are consulting and moonlighting viewed similarly, and when does the "cost-benefit" ratio become unbalanced? Is working outside of one's contractual
obligation (moonlighting) viewed with skepticism, and, if so, why?

3. The reason why workers in the general population moonlight (hold down other paying jobs in addition to their primary employment) is a popular subject, especially among professional groups (Raffel and Lance, 1990; Stinson (MLR) 1986, 1987, 1990; Jamal, 1988); however, among the teaching profession, far less data are available. Few conclusions, then, can be derived from the general research. Is there merit in studying the motivation for moonlighting among community college faculty; and, if so, what results might be determined which could impact job effectiveness?

Background of the Study

Community colleges are the largest single sector of higher education in the United States. More than 4.5 million students in approximately 1,200 two-year colleges and 51 percent of all first-time entering freshmen comprise the community college student population today (Building Communities, 1988). Approximately one-third of the entire
higher education professoriate is employed by community

At the very core of their mission, community colleges,
like their four-year partners in higher education, proclaim
their commitment to quality education. Mayhew and others in
The Quest for Quality purport that quality and excellence
have been synonymous terms for higher education for more
than 300 years (1990). Certainly one criterion colleges and
universities associate with quality is their ability to
impart knowledge through teaching; i.e., the teaching-
learning link. While interaction with students occurs in
many ways, the classroom is considered a primary vehicle for
directed or guided learning to occur (Levine, 1988). The
value of teaching is almost never questioned, but the
quality or effectiveness of teaching (or education) is never
as good as its proponents claim or as bad as its critics

Schuster wrote in Enhancing Faculty Careers, “The
quality of higher education and the ability of colleges and
universities, of whatever kind, to perform their respective
missions is inextricably linked to the quality and
commitment of the faculty” (1990, p. 3). According to
Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century, "the staff of a college is its single greatest resource" (p. 12). In this context, "staff" means "faculty," and over time there has been a great deal of study and interpretation of the role of an institution's faculty. The reverse is troubling as well: the greatest resource can also become the greatest liability. Lynton and Elman state in New Priorities for the University that "the heart of all reform and essential to its success is active participation by the faculty" (p. 132). If reform comes from above, an institution's administration has a responsibility to engage the active participation of faculty. The role of faculty in shaping the institutions they serve and the antithesis of how "the work place shapes their behavior" (Cohen and Brawer, 1991, p. 65) is a valuable study as community colleges face preparing the nation's work force for a new century.

**Purpose of the Study**

'The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges declared in 1988 that faculty renewal is the key to
continued success in community colleges (Building Communities, p. 12). A primary purpose of this study is to develop profiles of full-time community college faculty who engage in employment outside their full-time teaching contract. The profiles may identify community college faculties' motivation for seeking outside employment and their subsequent basis for primary work satisfaction. The impact of this study may influence how community college administrators view faculty renewal and their follow-through on professional development options for the enhancement of faculty renewal. It can serve to test out the stereotype that moonlighters are financially driven, overburdened, and always exhausted, thus, supporting or changing perceptions as they relate to policy initiatives.

This study promotes investigation regarding the degree to which full-time faculty have turned to outside employment (moonlighting) and some of their reasons for doing so. Important to the study is learning whether community college faculty who are multiple jobholders are shortchanging their institutions or are being energized to the point that their job performance is enhanced. Most significant to this study is whether outside employment is a sign of faculty
burnout and whether it subsequently breeds institutional dissociation for those faculty.

As in the attitude of managers about the general population who are multiple jobholders, college administrators may view faculty moonlighters in a less favorable light. The contribution multiple job holding may make to the individual is a legitimate point for discussion. The point at which the cost to the institution begins to outweigh the benefit is also a valid point for investigation.

**Research Questions**

1. Is moonlighting a result of burnout and lack of challenging opportunities on the part of community college full-time faculty?

2. Does Theodore Sizer's model for American public high school teachers have a "filter up" parallel for American community college faculty?

3. Are community college presidents aware of the extent of and motivation for community college faculty to moonlight?
4. Do community college chief administrators know what impact moonlighting has on the primary job performance of full-time faculty members?

Hypotheses

Moonlighting in community colleges is indicative of full-time faculty burnout and a lack of challenging opportunities for full-time faculty.

Theodore Sizer's model of teaching in the American public high school has a "filter up" parallel for full-time teaching faculty in the American community college.

Community college presidents are not aware of the extent of or motivation for moonlighting by faculty, or they participate in a conspiracy of silence on the extent of or motivation for moonlighting by faculty because of the political sensitivity of the issue.

Community college presidents do not know the impact moonlighting has on the primary job performance of full-time faculty members.
Definitions of Terms

Full-time Faculty. Only community college faculty who were contractually employed full time by their institutions were included in this study. A full-time faculty contract generally includes a specified course load along with other institutional assignments as outlined by the contract. This study does not include adjunct faculty, who may teach one or more courses, but who generally have no contractual obligation other than to teach the courses offered each term as they are available.

Moonlighting. For the purposes of this study, moonlighting among full-time community college faculty is taken to include those who are employed outside of their teaching contract for other than financial reasons. The nature of the outside employment may or may not be directly job related.

Burnout. Burnout among full-time community college faculty is characterized by low morale, little or no motivation, professional paralysis, and an overall sense of institutional disengagement.
**Disengagement.** Also referred to as "alienation" and "dissociation," disengagement is defined as the loss of interest and satisfaction in a faculty's primary job function and a general detachment from the institution.

**Faculty Vitality.** Vital faculty are those who take advantage of opportunities to change or diversify their roles, are fully challenged, professional "movers," and fully committed to their full-time faculty careers.

**Faculty Renewal.** Faculty renewal is defined as the act of professional "invigoration" and the change agent for recommitment to one's primary job role.

**Limitations/Delimitations**

The study promoted investigation regarding why and to what extent full-time community college faculty moonlight.

The study provides preliminary findings on the degree to which chief community college administrators are aware of moonlighting among their full-time faculty.

The study was drawn largely from personal faculty interviews; thus, generalization about faculty moonlighting are suggestive rather than final or wholly universal.
Faculty interviewed were selected by their chief administrator after the administrator was interviewed; thus, the administrator may have inadvertently recommended faculty that purposefully did or did not fall within the framework of the study.

The study speaks to moonlighting as a result of burnout. The corollary of whether outside employment can be used as a technique for faculty renewal cannot be drawn solely from this study.

Significance of the Study

This study can serve as a spring board for discussions among chief academic leaders and community college faculty to determine the kinds of activities that lure full-time teaching faculty away from their institutions. To be effective leaders, key administrators need to identify activities that inspire faculty to renew their commitment to teaching and to the institutions they serve.

With an unparalleled attention to effectiveness and efficiency faced by all of higher education, community colleges can ill afford losing the public trust for
employing and holding a specialized faculty--one excited and dedicated to the missions of the institutions they serve. In times of financial constraints, faculty workloads are often reviewed and occasionally challenged. The amount and use of discretionary time by faculty are rarely questioned--at least openly--by community college administrators. Collège policy pertaining to the external employment of full-time faculty is common, but follow up on such policies is rarely addressed or enforced.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED STUDIES

The review of literature for this chapter encompasses several approaches. Because the literature regarding moonlighting among faculty at any level is scant, research in related areas is necessary. It is important, then, to study the literature as it relates to the primary focus of community college faculty. Within this context, a review of faculty "vitality" is helpful to the understanding of burnout as a characteristic of faculty who moonlight.

The review of a case study written about a high school teacher who moonlights contributes in establishing whether there is a filter-up parallel at the community college level for faculty who become moonlighters for other than financial reasons.

A review of moonlighting among the general workforce sheds additional light on the extent to which individuals work outside of their primary jobs. A look at the characteristics of moonlighters in general helps to form the image of full-time community college faculty who moonlight specifically.
Additionally, it is important to note that there is an avoidance to confront the extent and impact of faculty moonlighting by community college administrators. The literature review supports the lack of attention to the issue and the extent to which policy implications may be drawn.

**Background**

This chapter provides a review of literature and research relative to full-time community college faculty and teaching as their primary role, the extent and impact of moonlighting on the general workforce, and the tendency on the part of educators to avoid confronting the issue of moonlighting. The literature review pertaining to this study indicates the following categories for research: community college faculty demography; teaching as part of the community college mission and scholarship as it relates to the improvement of teaching; workload analysis of community college faculty; faculty vitality; moonlighting or multiple employment in the general workforce; moonlighting and faculty; and moonlighting and community college faculty.
Community College Faculty: A Description

Teaching at community colleges is carried out by some 275,000 faculty members in over 1,100 public and private institutions, who differ, perhaps, as much as the colleges they represent. More than half of community college faculty are part time; more than half are men; most hold a master's degree or equivalent; carry heavy teaching loads with as many as 15 to 20 classroom contact hours a semester; have taught at their same institution for more than 11 years; hold jobs outside of their teaching responsibilities; are "graying" with 40 percent retiring by the turn of the century (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, and Building Communities, 1988).

The "graying" of faculty in all of higher education is, indeed, a record of note with great frequency. Regarding the impact of an older, or "congealed" faculty, Schuster addressed the issue of renewal for the increasing numbers of faculty who are "bunching up in the senior ranks." An added concern is the lack of movement for faculty who with accumulated tenure "find themselves embedded in a single institution" far longer than their previous cohorts (Schuster, p. 9).
Because community colleges developed as "upward extensions of secondary schools," the value system and culture of community colleges have roots to the American secondary school system (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, p. 7). In the early years, Koos (1925) voiced optimism that the junior college movement would be a logical extension of secondary education. As a result, two-year community college faculty have workloads that are more similar to public school teachers than to university faculty, are required to maintain specified office hours, and frequently have work rules that stem from state education codes (Cohen and Brawer, 1989).

Regardless of their demographics, community college full-time faculty have teaching as their main responsibility.

Teaching: The Mission

Classroom teaching hails as the hallmark of community colleges, and teaching is community colleges' "raison d'etre" (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 148). Precursors of the community college were junior colleges, where teaching was acclaimed as "par excellence" (Eells, 1931, p. 389) and
where instruction was declared as the prime function (Thornton, 1972).

Community colleges generally do not engage in the research-teaching debate, since their primary mission is teaching. An issue for research universities is whether—and how—research is compatible with teaching. George Vaughan argues that a commitment to teaching does not have to limit the commitment to research. Vaughan asserts that community colleges have a history of not promoting faculty scholarship because of their early ties to the public school system and the general inattention to research (Palmer and Vaughan, 1992). The debate of the role of research and how it contributes to, along with other characteristics, quality teaching continues; and only in recent years have universities begun to recognize teaching through their reward structure. Community colleges, however, do not provide for or reward disciplinary research (Mayhew, 1990). But not only do community colleges fall short of encouraging or rewarding research, it is not evident that they are particularly successful at rewarding or recognizing good teaching (Cohen and Brawer, 1987). An implied result of community college faculties' absence of research is that
they have more time to devote to their teaching (Cohen and Brawer, 1987).

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia conducted a faculty survey in 1991 that showed 34 percent of faculty time at doctoral institutions and 17 percent at comprehensive colleges is devoted to research and scholarly activity. Only 9 percent of community college faculty spend their time similarly. The Virginia study also shows that faculty in doctoral institutions spend approximately 45 percent of their total faculty time on teaching, compared to 80 percent for two-year college faculty (Virginia Faculty Survey, p. 7).

Faculty Scholarship

The definition of "faculty scholarship" may well be at the heart of good teaching for community colleges today. Scholarship is traditionally defined as the creation, interpretation, and dissemination of knowledge (Lynton and Elman, 1987), but scholarship need not mean only university-type research (Pommerville, 1991). Ford (1983) and Parilla (1986) suggest that faculty scholarship also means being committed to a profession. Commitment to a profession, in turn, means being involved in activities that keep one
current. Boy and Pine (1971) speak to the importance of personal growth on the part of faculty members.

What makes for good teaching is a topic of ongoing research within all of education. K. Patricia Cross advocates the improvement of teaching through classroom research. Cross supports the notion that faculty members must be the evaluators of when the teaching-learning link connects by evaluating it as it takes place in the classroom. Others, like Ford (1983), provide characteristics of outstanding teachers, such as "undertaking scholarship, being humane, having good communications skills, counseling students, being an effective teacher, maintaining instructional organization, being a multi-cultural person, and exhibiting quality and substance in teaching knowledge" (Pommerville, 1991).

In a study for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Palmer and Vaughan (1992) support a broader definition of scholarship as applied to community college teaching. They propose that the narrow view by community college administrators, however, results in a deemphasis--often even detrimental stand--on faculty scholarship. Palmer and Vaughan define scholarship as a
number of activities that promote the inquiry, critical analysis, recording, and sharing of information of a specific topic. These include activities such as publishing journal articles and original essays and poems, writing and editing textbooks, displaying art exhibits, and making professional speeches. Because these activities fall outside of classroom teaching (which is the community college's institutional mission), Palmer and Vaughan claim that administrators do not necessarily recognize, reward, or promote them among faculty. When asked about barriers to scholarly activities, community college faculty named their workload, namely time devoted to teaching (61 percent) and time spent advising students outside of class (32 percent) (p. 61).

**Faculty Workload**

Teaching faculty have the opportunity to participate in determining academic standards and shaping the curricula in community colleges. It is through their professional priorities that faculty "sustain or weaken the intellectual and social environment of the college" (Building Communities, p. 13). In a national survey, 63 percent of community college faculty, however, rated their institutions
as "fair" or "poor" on intellectual environment. Additionally, full-time community college faculty are feeling over burdened. Even though they comprise less than half of faculty, full-timers teach three-fourths of the courses offered (Cohen and Brawer, 1991, p. 68). Similarly, faculty report that they are "being spread too thin--with classes too large, time too short, too many essays to grade, and too many inadequately prepared students" (Building Communities, p. 26).

McGrath and Spear in *The Academic Crisis of the Community College* (1991) claim that "structural disarticulation between community colleges and their student populations" (p. 24) has an acute impact on the quality of education at the two-year level. Ethnographers have studied the social psychology of community colleges and have found that "cultural disarticulation" is a common thread among open access institutions (p. 24). Cultural disarticulation occurs in community colleges because students come from such diverse backgrounds, often with little preparation for intellectual challenge. Characteristic of community college students is that they do not engage themselves in more than meeting the certification requirements for degrees that they
think will make them employable. According to McGrath and Spear, even the "very bright" community college students are not even traditional in the sense of the typical college-age student, since they are non-traditional in their attitudes and behaviors (p. 24). The cause for concern, say the authors, is the dilemma that results in the classroom. Negotiation between the student and the teacher becomes paramount to learning. The classroom "becomes dangerous terrain," and students must deal with "teachers fraught with tension and anxiety" (p. 25).

Theodore Sizer portrays a similar scene of abject negotiation in *Horace's Compromise*, a study of the American public high school in the 1980s, as a result of the struggle between the standards the teacher knows are necessary and what is realistically possible given the current students in the current learning environment. Sizer argues that teachers often lose their spirit by resigning themselves to what can be accomplished rather than what should be achieved.

Sizer interviewed and observed high school teachers in their work environments. He analyzed them and their job performance by comparing what they knew they should be doing
and wanted to do professionally with what they realized was possible for them to do. Sizer determined that veteran teachers were committed to their jobs, for they loved teaching. But through the years, the support they received—both from their administrations and the parents—were not enough to sustain their enthusiasm. They had increasingly heavy workloads, too many students in too many classes, and various administrative chores. Even after years of teaching, their "professional" salaries were equal to those of entry-level semiskilled workers. Many of the teachers had to supplement their pay with after school or summer employment. Their days were long and hard. They had no time to "replenish their academic capital" and, besides, "few people seemed to care" (Sizer, p. 20).

Creating an environment that not only allows but encourages faculty to make a difference counters compromise. Perhaps the most critical aspect, Sizer claimed, is the need to address the scholarship of teachers—especially veteran teachers. Fresh study of their disciplines is essential and collaborating with their colleagues is vital. Sizer argued that respect for teaching can be exhibited by acknowledging and supporting it as a profession, by making its salaries
commensurate with the priority it has in our society, and by expressing recognition for its contributions--well paid professionals recognized for what they do well.

So, why are so many teachers fraught with anxiety? Roger Baldwin's work on the critical role of faculty renewal in maintaining a "vital professional workforce" has significance here (Schuster and Wheeler, 1990, p. 27). Community college faculty (especially veteran faculty) who are faced with heavy teaching loads from a diverse and demanding student population, call for specific renewal strategies. Faculty reaching mid-career have the potential for "career plateauing" as they feel "stuck" in their jobs and withdraw psychologically (p. 26). Baldwin and others assert that institutions have a responsibility for providing faculty development at strategic milestones to abate this phenomenon.

Faculty Characteristics

The kind of mental resignation referred to by Sizer can manifest itself in what is referred to as "burnout."

Burnout for community college faculty is a real issue and a threat to the quality of education that serves as the very foundation for this largest segment of higher education.
Cohen and Brawer (1989) reported that faculty feel "demoralized" when they continually face under prepared students. A comparison of Sizer's model for full-time community college faculty would seem relevant.

In an examination of and subsequent paper on The Relationship Between Aging and Job Satisfaction for Humanities and Social Science Faculty in the Virginia Community College System (1990), Mary Lee Tucker Walsh found that veteran community college faculty (15+ years) feel stressed out, intellectually unstimulated in their teaching environments, unsupported in their professional development needs, and not as enthusiastic as when they began teaching in community colleges. These findings would tend to support the hypothesis that Sizer's notion of compromise has a comparable community college variation.

The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges acknowledges that the feelings of fatigue and general burnout among faculty are leading to a loss of vitality that will undercut and weaken the quality of teaching in community colleges if not corrected.

The issue of "teacher burnout" is debated as to whether the phenomenon results more from environmental pressures or
age and adult stages of development (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, pp. 80-81). Assuming a high correlation of both influences and given the work pressures and aging element of community college faculty, burnout is a very real threat. Cohen and Brawer describe burnout among community college faculty as a result of retrenchment, lack of expansion, loss of challenge, and job-related weariness due to age and length of service. "Despaired of facing succession of years of doing the same tasks for the same pay" many community college faculty have turned to outside employment, or moonlighting (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, p. 80).

A number of studies related to the vitality of faculty in the academic setting have significance to possible causes of burnout among full-time community college faculty. In a presentation on Faculty Vitality in "Different Worlds," Roger Baldwin noted the importance of studying faculty in their subcultures and, as a result, that "subject fields matter less and institutional requirements matter more the further a professor works from the research university" (Baldwin, 1988). Although Baldwin’s work did not include community college faculty, he found that "vital" faculty in undergraduate liberal arts colleges have more dynamic and
diversified careers than their university colleagues. Baldwin also relates the significance of a "career plateau" that results when little movement or diversification in job duties occurs among academic professionals (Schuster, 1990 p. 27).

Based on a study by Clark and Corcoran (1985), faculty who have been identified as vital engage in more role changes and take more professional risks. Enlarging on faculty vitality research, Baldwin (1987) cited theory on organizational behavior by Kanter and Peters and Waterman and career development by Hall and Nougaim and Super. For example, Kanter proposes that the intensity of work commitment and effort by employees is influenced by their environmental conditions, especially as they relate to opportunities for career growth and advancement. Baldwin suggests the connection of "vital" faculty to Kanter's description of "moving" workers who are energetic and job involved because they are learning and advancing professionally.

According to Baldwin, professors (like other workers) have the tendency to reach a plateau during their careers. Research in this field indicates that career plateaus can be
temporary or permanent in terms of a worker's vitality. Baldwin encourages higher education to study faculty who are vital to determine what distinguishes them from their colleagues who have low morale, limited productivity, and are "disengaged" or "stuck" in their professions.

Faculty who are "disengaged" and are less productive in their teaching professions are often reported as experiencing burnout. Richard Alfred (1985) supports the notion that burnout adversely affects teaching effectiveness. Alfred purports that "alienation" is a sociological condition that results for faculty for whom "primary satisfaction is no longer obtained through teaching, but through activities which lie outside of the classroom." The community college environment is one of constant change; thus, Alfred contends that faculty experience stress and burnout, which he identifies as "alienation." Feelings of alienation are encouraged by the community college structure, states Alfred, in that faculty are not fully involved in strategic decision-making, that outside of classroom interaction is limited or nonexistent, and that faculty "engage in entrepreneurial interests outside of the college which limit the time and energy they
can devote to instructional innovation and governance" (p. 9).

**Moonlighting in the General Population**

Entrepreneurial interest is a broad category that can be described by a number of more familiar terms, such as supplemental work, off-load work, multiple employment, multiple job holding, and moonlighting. According to the *Monthly Labor Review* (July, 1990), multiple job holding rose sharply in the 1980s. Data from the CPS (Current Population Survey) in 1989 indicated that 7.2 million people held two or more jobs, an increase of 2.5 million from 1980. About 6.2 percent of the population engages in multiple job holding, the highest in three decades (MLR, 1990).

By classification of workers, the categories with the highest rates of multiple job holding were those in public administration (8.8 percent) and service industries (7.8 percent). Of the service industries, 11.1 percent were in educational services. According to the report, approximately one-fourth of all college and university teachers "moonlight," one of the highest multiple job holding rates of all occupations. The data show that much of the work, or preparation for the work, in this second-job
category is performed at home. Supplemental consulting jobs comprise a large portion of this secondary income group for college and university faculty. This particularly high rate for moonlighting by college and university faculty may be a result, in part, of research and related consulting employments, which are encouraged by university systems. It should be noted that no comparable expectation exists or is generally recognized at the community college level.

In fact the very definition of moonlighting among faculty is a debatable issue. Some writers on the subject distinguish consulting from moonlighting based on whether the outside work is job related to the faculty member's teaching discipline (Boyer and Lewis, 1985, pp. 5-6). There are considerably more data on faculty consulting and its appropriateness or acceptance as compared to faculty who have jobs unrelated to their professions. In fact, the issue of professionalism in general is challenged by some who assert that "those who wish the benefits of the academic profession must limit their activities" and that "the traditional career assumes that the faculty member will give full time to whatever duties he performs for his institution" (Furniss, 1981, p. 5). Other writers like
Mayhew challenge the professional status of community college faculty whose primary role is teaching when the majority of the teaching assignments are carried out by part-time faculty (Mayhew et al, 1990). Mayhew's argument is particularly important in light of the large percentage of full-time faculty who find time for outside employment.

Activities external to one's institution in the form of community service are generally viewed very positively by college administrations at the two- and four-year institutional level. Faculty are often encouraged and frequently evaluated, at least in part, on their service to the community. The kinds of activities in which faculty may participate range from serving on local civic groups and school PTAs to service more closely aligned with faculties' professional abilities, such as serving as board members of organizations or providing consulting services to corporations. Professional activities can be on a paid or non-paid basis, and, in these roles, faculty may be representing themselves or their institutions. College administrations generally recognize the public relations value of community service but also realize that "service to the community by faculty members is not the substance upon
which academic reputations are created" (Unrue in *Faculty Responsibility in Contemporary Society*, 1990, p. 123). As Unrue notes, however, questions arise when the perception changes from "supplementing scholarship" to that of engagement "in lieu of it" (p. 123). Some faculty may consider their externally "paid" activities to fall under the rubric of community service; however, the more general understanding is that service to the community is uncompensated.

The reasons why individuals moonlight and the effects of their supplemental work on their primary job are often debated. Muhammad Jamal's research shows that the images of people who hold multiple jobs are often incorrect. The stereotype, according to Jamal, is that moonlighters are economically squeezed, socially deprived, energy drained, and generally uncommitted to their primary job. Using the work of P. W. Mott, Jamal describes a different image of individuals who hold multiple jobs--one of higher self-esteem, more participation in voluntary organizations, a stronger work ethic, and generally more energetic overall (*Personnel Journal*, May 1988). Jamal reflected on the paradox,
Moonlighters. Love them or hate them, they’re out there and their numbers are higher than previously suspected. Whether the employee practice of working a second, paid job in addition to their full-time primary job is encouraged or discouraged by management, moonlighting fulfills a need and, surprisingly, money isn’t always it (p. 49).

Among the general workforce, the main reason for multiple employment given is to meet expenses (32 percent). The second most important reason is that moonlighters enjoy their second job (18 percent) (Personnel Journal, May 1988). Mary Beth Grover recently wrote in an article, "The New Jugglers," that a second career, especially for professionals, adds fulfillment. A second job, says Grover, is the answer to finding the passion moonlighters are seeking (Forbes, April 1992).

Faculty and Moonlighting

A general population survey, such as the CPS (Current Population Survey), shows that one-fourth of all college and university faculty moonlight. There are any number of studies pertaining to how faculty spend their time. Most of these studies, however, are inventories of the amount of time faculty spend in such areas as course preparation, research, classroom instruction, student advising, committee
assignments, and college governance. The amount of time devoted to community service and consulting is less often questioned. The definition of (or at least the understanding of the inclusiveness of these terms) is frequently different.

In research conducted by Carol Boyer and Darrell Lewis (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, No. 3, 1985) the first major empirical survey of any magnitude on consulting activities of faculty was conducted by the American Council on Education and the Carnegie Commission in 1969. Subsequent surveys were the 1975 Survey of the American Professoriate, a study by the National Science Foundation in 1979, and a survey by the National Research Council in 1981. The results of these surveys show that faculty consulting ranges from 37 percent in all fields to as much as 54 percent. Discrepancies in the results were associated with varying defined samples, such as the period of time for the reported consulting (over the period of an academic year in some cases and over a full year or two in others); not all of the surveys included both professional and nonprofessional faculty; the NRC data included both paid and
non-paid consulting; and faculty in junior or community colleges were not included in all of the studies.

A recent study sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics has relevant data pertaining to the outside employment of postsecondary faculty. The 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) expanded on an earlier study (1987-88) that included administrators. The NOPE-93's sample involved 31,354 faculty at 974 institutions of higher education. The purpose of the study was to provide a national profile of the professional backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF-93 Project Documentation excerpts). An analysis of the subsets provided by the American Association of Community Colleges, (Yong Li, 1996) shows that, of the total sample, 8,952 were faculty at two-year institutions with 5,033 being full-time and 3,919, part-time. It was determined that 25 percent of the full-time faculty (or 1,237) had employment other than at their primary institution. This percentage is slightly lower than previous studies have shown but revealing in the
fact that 10.7 percent of those with "other jobs" worked another full-time job.

Respondents were asked to select one of nine possible descriptions of the outside work they performed. These categories and the percentages were as follows: teaching at a four-year institution (11.8%); two-year institution (6.2%); teaching at an elementary or high school (1.8%); working in a hospital or other health care setting (15.7%); serving on foundations or for other nonprofit organizations (15.7%); for-profit business in private sector (9.5%); federal, state, or local government (3.1%); consulting, freelance, self-owned, etc. (41.1%); and other (7.8%). The highest percentage of faculty with outside employment (41.1%) are engaged in consulting, freelance, and self-owned businesses. For those having other jobs, the respondents were asked to provide the number of other jobs. The minimum number of other jobs reported was one and the maximum was 22 with the average at 1.62 (AACC, Yong Li).

The Virginia Faculty Survey (1991), conducted by the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia, reported partial findings related to faculty and the practice of moonlighting. The sample was stratified by institution with
a percentage of faculty randomly selected for inclusion at all institutions of higher education. Twice as many faculty from community colleges and comprehensives were included because of the disproportionately large number of faculty at doctoral institutions. Faculty reported working an average of 52 hours per week on all of their professional activities with the community college faculty average at 46 hours. In general all faculty in the study reported a very low rate of time spent on “paid consulting” activities with only 1 percent reported in each of the three categories (doctoral, comprehensive and two-year institutions). Significant to these results was the purpose of the study, which focused on the impact of potential budgets cuts on faculty in Virginia. The survey respondents surely realized the importance of reporting heavy workloads with little “extra” time for activities of any kind. The Virginia study reflects the tendency for faculty to justify their workloads and need for higher salaries.

Even the limited data do not give a complete picture of the number and motivation of community college faculty who moonlight. Faculty members may not be inclined to report outside employment, especially when it does not directly
relate to their faculty positions. For example, a faculty member who provides consulting services may acknowledge such employment only if it is conducted outside his or her discipline or service area district, especially if a conflict of interest policy exists. Similarly, a faculty member who engages in employment totally unrelated to teaching, e.g., an English teacher who sells real estate, may not report the employment because of the notion that what one does on his or her own personal time is no one's business.

The paucity of systematic and reliable data opens the flood gates for further study into this phenomenon and its impact on faculty job performance. For example, Virginia's Community College System does not know how many full-time faculty have jobs outside of their faculty contract, according to former Vice Chancellor of Research, Elmo Roeseller. Current Chancellor Arnold Oliver admits that his experience in the System and his intuition say that there are a significant number of full-time faculty who have outside employment. A policy in the Employee Handbook, 1989-91, Commonwealth of Virginia reads:
Outside Employment

If you plan to seek or accept additional employment outside your own agency, you must first talk with your supervisor and have approval from agency management. Management is responsible for determining whether the additional employment will have an adverse effect on your performance or if there is a potential conflict of interest in the second job. If you receive approval to accept additional employment, but your job performance begins to deteriorate, you may be asked to give up the second job.

The Virginia Community College System Policy Manual, 3.7, clarifies the application of this state policy by stating:

Application of Title 2.1 Chapter 10, Virginia Personnel Act, Code of Virginia of 1942 to Faculty. The administration of the foregoing is contained in the State Department of Personnel and Training Policies and Procedures Manual (SG;SB)

Unless otherwise specifically stated, all regulations applied by the Virginia Personnel Act of 1942, as amended, to classified personnel shall be applicable also to faculty personnel.

The Virginia Community College System Policy Manual states under 3.6.7, Outside Employment, that faculty "may engage in outside employment so long as it does not compromise their professional responsibilities to the college or create a conflict of interest as specified in Rule 9.5 of the Rules for the Administration of the Virginia Personnel Act." Clarification of the state policy was
warranted because faculty, by custom, are not treated like the majority of state classified employees. Teaching faculty work a period of time specified by separate contract; they are not required to follow the normal state work hours; and teaching faculty do not observe many of the state holidays as prescribed for the general state workforce. Faculty teach at times and on the schedules more or less directed by their institutions or sometimes chosen by themselves.

The state code is clear, however, that full-time employees of the state are to obtain permission to hold additional employment. The Virginia Community College System further clarified the policy to permit outside employment under certain conditions for teaching faculty due to their special category of employment. From all interpretation, then, the practice of moonlighting for full-time community college faculty is an acceptable practice as long as it is reported and approved. Individual colleges within the VCCS and colleges in general throughout the country may have college policies that address state or system policies pertaining to outside employment. Such
college policies may encourage or restrict outside employment.

At the public school secondary level, teachers have an employment contract much like that of their two- and four-year college counterparts. The academic year has beginning and ending dates; and specific days of instruction, holidays, and other prescribed activities are identified. The "teaching day" at the secondary level, however, is much more defined than it is at the college and university level with a beginning and ending time for all faculty. Whether high school teachers moonlight is also an infrequently studied topic, but a study by Theodore Sizer about the effectiveness of the American public high school in the 1980's references the burnout of teachers and the potential for subsequent reliance on outside employment (Horace's Compromise, 1984). Whether there is a filter up parallel for full-time community college faculty is worthy of investigation.

Peggy Lansing, former manager for employee relations for the VCCS, reported the lack of data on this topic by describing the autonomy of Virginia's community college presidents. Given policies set forth by the State Board for
Community Colleges, presidents can enforce those policies at their discretion. "This is a subject rarely broached in our colleges," commented Marshall Smith, former VCCS Vice Chancellor and now president of John Tyler Community College. Smith acknowledged that, in the absence of a union in Virginia, most faculty would view research in this area as intrusive. Another president in the Virginia Community College System agreed that learning the extent and impact of outside employment by faculty may be difficult but perhaps strategic to improving job performance and morale of Virginia's graying faculty. Responding to the notion, the president commented, "I believe the subject warrants further study."

The subject of outside employment among faculty is somewhat nebulous as well. Robert Weissman in an article, "Harvard Academics in Service of Industry and Government" from A Harvard Watch Report in 1988, spoke of the "secrecy" surrounding scholars' outside activities. Weissman studied the interaction of Harvard faculty with contractual obligations outside of the institution but found that because the subject was so difficult to research, only "the surface of academic moonlighting" was scratched. The
increasing need for governing or regulating such activities is made more difficult because of the yet unproven effect of moonlighting on a faculty member's job performance.

The Carnegie Council periodically surveys the consulting activities of faculty outside of their institution, only to learn that the trend has not changed but the perception of appropriateness has. A study, reported by Marsh and Dillon in the *Journal of Higher Education* (1980), indicated that supplemental income had a high correlation with research productivity for university faculty. The implication is that the supplemental income is beneficial both to the faculty member and the university because it is a result of research activity that is both expected and required. There is no comparable expectation for community college faculty; therefore, supplemental income is not viewed as a possible benefit to either full-time community college faculty or their institutions.

The Institute for Higher Education Research, sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts, in the article "Testimony from the Belly of the Whale" (1992) supports the opinion that faculty have a diminished commitment to their institutions because, among other reasons, institutions have allowed
faculty to tilt their efforts "toward entrepreneurship over institutional responsibility" (p. 3A). The writers claim that, while research universities may have led the charge in setting this tone, "institutions of all kinds have fed the value system that rewards independent entrepreneurial activity over teaching and learning (p. 1A)."

**Conclusion**

A review of the related research reveals studies on the extent of moonlighting among higher education faculty, but the reasons why moonlight are much less known. Specific studies pertaining exclusively to full-time community college faculty were not found. Yet, labor studies of the general workforce show that higher education faculty have one of the highest multiple job holding rates of all occupations. The literature does provide an understanding of the workplace of the community college as it shapes the values, expectations, and scholarship of its full-time faculty. Much of the literature about community colleges concentrates on the critical role faculty play and how their attitude affects their job performance.
Researchers study faculty vitality and its significance to an institution's mission. What distinguishes vital faculty from their colleagues is the basis for ongoing research. However, study pertaining to the characteristics of faculty who are not vital and what led to their loss of vitality is scant. Deserving further study is whether there is a connection between loss of vitality and burnout and if burnout results in disengagement which manifests itself in the choice to moonlight by community college faculty.

It is important to encourage the research of why some full-time community college faculty suffer from professional burnout and become disengaged from their institutions. Community college administrators face the serious challenges of faculty commitment and renewal in times of extreme public scrutiny.

The structural and cultural disarticulation described by McGrath and Spear that exist in community colleges and the abject compromise depicted by Theodore Sizer at the secondary school level result in faculty burnout. This burnout threatens faculty scholarship, which Ford and Pariîla suggest includes commitment to one's profession. Burnout may manifest itself in the form of dissociation, or
alienation, as described by Alfred where faculty derive their greatest satisfaction through activities external to teaching.

Increased accountability in higher education, coupled with the challenges resulting from a graying community college faculty, place a tremendous burden on college leadership and governance to ensure that faculty remain invigorated and not become spiritless.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

This chapter characterizes the research design and procedures used in analyzing the research questions and testing out the working hypotheses of the qualitative study. The methodology, along with any sampling biases and/or generalization limitations used to formulate conclusions, is delineated.

Theoretical Perspectives

This hypotheses of this exploratory study are that moonlighting for other than financial reasons is a result of community college faculty who experience burnout and lack of professional challenges; that community college faculty who moonlight are generally disengaged from their institutions; and that policies regarding moonlighting among faculty are unclear and/or not enforced by administrators who lack awareness of the practice or are reluctant to address the issue.
An important element of the composite profiles is descriptive data that are recorded in narrative based on techniques such as personal interviews. Supporting quotations and anecdotes can be recordings of gestures, reactions to the researcher's questions and probing, nonverbal signatures that may denote comfort level of the subject, and spontaneity that otherwise would not be captured in a survey-based, quantitative format. Boaz and Thomas, early anthropological researchers, provided a theoretical framework for the significance of an "insider's perspective" and "grasp of reality" or point of view (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992, p. 11).

Clark and Corcoran (1985) justified the appropriateness of a qualitative research design for studies that test a complex and ambiguous concept, such as faculty vitality. Additional studies extended the faculty vitality concept by identifying both individual and environmental factors that related to interests, activities, satisfaction, faculty development opportunities, and professional achievements of faculty in a specific institutional setting (Baldwin, 1988). The reverse of faculty vitality--burnout--and one possible
result--moonlighting--might well be tested using this theoretical format.

Method and Data Sources

Using the analytic inductive method first used by Robinson and others but modified as suggested by Bogden and Biklen (1992, Chapter 2), a two-step, structured personal interview format was chosen for gathering data. The personal interview format was chosen to provide an opportunity for the interviewees to respond honestly, openly, and anonymously. Empirical data from previous research generally show how faculty spend their time, both instructional and discretionary; however, the study of how community college faculty in particular spend their time is very limited.

The purpose of a survey (if known) can surely affect its outcome. For example, faculty would be less inclined to report extra activities outside of instruction if the purpose of the survey related to the effect of workload on productivity. The personal interview format allowed faculty and administrators to respond to questions in a non-
threatening setting and with no perceived motive for the study. The personal interview format also allowed for observing nuances and tendencies in the manner in which the questions were answered.

Interviewees were encouraged to talk about when they first began teaching in the community college, what their jobs were like, and what excited them about their faculty roles. They had the opportunity to describe if or how their roles had changed, institutional and personal expectations, and their needs as they had become veteran faculty. Many offered perceptions of their relative "value" based on the degree to which they felt "appreciated." When queried about outside employment, a plethora of opinions and feelings were eventually uncovered. At first the faculty who engaged in moonlighting were cautious with their answers; however, after being asked to describe the advantages of their outside work, the majority became very open. Appendix C provides some of the key descriptors of the reasons why faculty sought outside employment.

A purposeful sampling of chief administrators and full-time faculty from colleges who hold membership in COMBASE, A Cooperative for the Advancement of Community Based
Postsecondary Education, was used for the majority of the interviews. COMBASE is a national consortium of community colleges who share a common commitment to keeping community colleges closely aligned with the needs of the communities they serve. Member colleges strive to "identify, validate, and employ exemplary practices in community based, performance oriented education." COMBASE is a consortium of community colleges that are voluntarily joined together to foster inquiry into national issues and to promote scholarship through research, publications, and professional development programs (COMBASE, 1992). Unique about this organization is that active participation of the chief executive officer, in most cases the president or chancellor, is required. A major focus of COMBASE is "to provide a forum for leaders to discuss major initiatives and institutional breakthroughs" (Gollattscheck, 1994). Because its membership is small (approximately 50 institutions representing 22 states), comraderie among members is abundant and intellectual inquiry is keen. Unique professional opportunities exist for faculty and other administrators who participate along with their chief administrators.
COMBASE colleges are located throughout the country, representing geographical diverse populations and communities; faculty from small to the largest of community college districts; rural, suburban, and urban campuses; and faculty who contract through and work under union and non-union environments. Policy issues are frequently the platform for discussion among the COMBASE CEOs. Therefore, access to a broad range of chief community college executives and their willingness to be interviewed for this study played an influential role in the sampling selection.

The study was based on personal interviews, which were conducted in two stages. An initial telephone call was made to the presidents of the institutions in the study for the purpose of introducing the research project. When necessary, the telephone call was followed by a letter requesting an on-site interview with the CEO of the selected colleges (Appendix A). The topic of the research and nature of the interview were identified in the letter.

Secondly, each CEO was asked to identify one or two faculty members according to a list of criteria (Appendix A) with whom an interview would be requested. A separate interview with the identified faculty member was requested.
at the time of the on-site visit or at a subsequent meeting. All interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis.

A standard list of questions was used as a basis for each of the interviews (Appendix B). Anecdotal material was welcomed and encouraged. Tape recordings and extensive notetaking during the interviews were used to record participant responses.

**Limitations**

Faculty for the interviews were selected by their chief administrator at the conclusion of the CEO's interview. Only the criteria were to be used by the administrator in recommending the faculty members to be contacted, but personal bias in the selection may have occurred. For instance, the CEO could have selected faculty known to moonlight or known not to moonlight because of the content of the interview.

The researcher's hypotheses and personal experience with the subject may have been detected by the interview participants. Interviewees fearful of divulging personal information such as what they do on their own time may not
have been completely forthcoming with answers to the questions.

The researcher may have registered nonverbal behavior exhibited by the interviewees as influential in their answers.

**Data Analysis**

Various criteria were determined for extracting data and were coded for organizational purposes. This permitted the vast amount of information obtained through the interviews to be categorized. For example, for faculty who responded that they did have outside employment, the nature of the employment was recorded. The employment was then coded as being related to their primary employment or not job-related. The primary reasons for seeking outside employment were recorded as financial or other. Because the study focused on only those who moonlight for other than financial reasons, further sorting of the diverse answers was necessary. Key words and phrases were identified that reflected on the underlying causes for the respondents' answers. Unique and particularly descriptive quotations
were separated out for anecdotal support. For example, a faculty member who answered that he worked another job because he was underpaid went on to explain that he had never been "rewarded" by his institution for his teaching. He described how the outside employment was good for his "ego" because he was regarded as an "expert." An analysis of his comments showed that it wasn't the extra pay provided by the outside job at all that he sought--it was recognition from the employer and the people with whom he worked that answered his need.

The personal interview format was critical, also, for the community college presidents and chancellors (CEOs) because the spontaneity and the manner in which they gave answers to the questions were as important as the answers themselves. A survey instrument would not have permitted the collection of this descriptive data. The personal interview format provided the opportunity to observe the degree of familiarity or the willingness to openly discuss the topic on the part of the CEOs.

The data from both sets of interviews were categorized. For example, grids for recording the following data (as shown in Appendix C) were used:
1. demographic data on faculty and CEOs (number of years of teaching in total, number of years at current institutions, number of years and locations as a chief administrator;  

2. teaching disciplines of faculty;  

3. the number of faculty who did and did not moonlight; the nature of the outside employment--job-related or not; reasons for moonlighting  

4. the extent faculty believed moonlighting existed (not much--10% or less, a considerable number--25% or less, or very common--40 to 50% or more); the extent CEOs believed faculty moonlight (same percentages)  

5. knowledge of faculty and CEOs about a policy pertaining to outside employment; familiarity/understanding of policy; policy enforced or not enforced  

6. advantages/disadvantages of outside employment  

7. perception of moonlighting for faculty and CEOs  

8. key words/phrases used to describe burnout  

The data were then analyzed inductively to produce a theory related to community college faculty who moonlight for other than financial reasons. Boyer and Lewis claim that the "lack of theory on which to base research on faculty activities and evaluate its results has become increasingly problematic as national survey data on consulting and other faculty activities accumulate" (1985, p. 56). They also contend that little is known about individual patterns of faculty consulting over time and
careers (p. 57). This study's design through interview and observation provided for the formation of a loose descriptive theory of community college faculty moonlighters.

Based on this theory and using the format of Horace's Compromise as a model, profiles of faculty were developed. Sizer and his colleagues conducted a five-year study that involved visiting almost one hundred American high schools. They observed all of the elements involved in the secondary teaching-learning process but concentrated mostly on teachers, students, and subjects. Sizer himself had high school teaching experience, but he drew his analyses from the many personal situations he encountered through interview and observation. He wanted to draw "word pictures" that reflected the feel of the American high school in the 1980s. Sizer did that through his account of Horace Smith and his ultimate compromise.

The structure of this study provided a review of the literature related to the relevance of an invigorated faculty with a focus on community colleges. It allowed for inquiry as to why faculty may not remain "lighted up" especially as they become veterans in their teaching
careers. How faculty respond to their conditions was identified in this study by their choice to seek outside employment. Empirical data related to faculty and outside employment (also referred to as consulting) were used to support the theory that full-time community college faculty do moonlight. This study sought to confirm the extent to which faculty moonlight and to unveil their reasons for doing so. Inductive analysis enabled two profiles of community college faculty moonlighters to be drawn to illustrate the mosaic of feelings and needs described by the faculty who were interviewed.

Additionally, and not reflected in previous works, this study was designed to capture findings that might shed light on the paradox that surrounds the extent of moonlighting among community college faculty and the secrecy or avoidance of chief administrators to address the issue.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This chapter presents a compilation of the data collected through personal interviews. The grids and coded responses of the interviews are provided as Appendix C. Descriptive data of the sample population interviewed are given as an introduction. The first section reports results derived from community college faculty; the second section focuses on data gathered from community college presidents and/or system chancellors.

Description of the Sample

Two groups of community college personnel were selected as the sample for the study: (1) full-time teaching faculty and (2) community college presidents and/or system chancellors. Membership in the national community college association, COMBASE, served as a ready source for the study, but the sample was not limited to this group.

A total of 38 interviews were conducted: 20 full-time teaching faculty and 18 college presidents/chancellors. All
interviewees were employed by their colleges on a full-time basis. Faculty were selected based on their "veteran" status of ten or more years of community college teaching experience. All of the administrators interviewed were, or had been in the past, a chief executive officer of a two-year community or junior college. Their cumulative years of community college experience were immense. The chief administrators interviewed included some of the most highly respected past and current leaders in this country's community college history.

The institutions represented by the sample are comprehensive, two-year, community, junior, or technical colleges with the associate degree being the highest offered degree. Each is accredited by one of the six regional agencies recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. The colleges in the sample range in size from small, single campus institutions, such as Virginia Highlands Community College in Virginia and Santa Fe Community College in New Mexico, with approximately two to three thousand students each, to large multi-campus colleges or districts, such as State Center Community College District in California and College of DuPage in Illinois, who each serve well over
30,000 students. The colleges represented by the sample are located in rural America, suburbia, and densely urban areas throughout the country.

The interviews were with community college representatives from 15 different states. The sample covered colleges in the southern most states, the Mid-Atlantic, the Northeast, the Midwest, and several from the West Coast. Figure 1 illustrates the geographical breadth of the sample. The 15 states in this study represent approximately 47 percent of the total population of students (18 and older) enrolled in public community college throughout the United States (Community Colleges: A National Profile, AACC, 1992). Community colleges in a number of states operate under collective bargaining. What faculty can or cannot do is, for the most part, clearly defined by contract. This sample includes interviews with representatives from states where faculty have some form of collective bargaining, as well as those that are non-union. The union/non-union distinction was made to determine what degree, if any, collective bargaining arrangements had on the occurrence of community college faculty moonlighting. Figure 1 provides a graphic view of the sample states with a
distinction for those states whose faculty have some form of collective bargaining.

**Geographical Distribution of Interview Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left">States with Collective Bargaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 1

The interviews represent colleges in the states regarded as the pacesetters, like California and Florida, and states with a strong industrial and occupational focus for colleges in the Midwest to the transfer emphasis of the Northeast. The states in the sample were: Rhode Island,
Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Tennessee, Mississippi, Illinois, Michigan, Colorado, Oregon, New Mexico, California, Nebraska, and Texas.

The profile of the sample states somewhat approximates the geographical distribution of the population of public community colleges nationwide. Table 1 provides the percentage distribution of the geographic sample. The Northeast Region may be under represented in the sample while the Southeast is over represented. Given the breadth and variety of the colleges in the sample and the approximation to the total population, these institutions are representative of the 975 public two-year community, junior, and technical colleges throughout the United States today. Therefore, the sample has generalization.
Geographic Location of Sample Colleges in Comparison to Geographic Distribution of the Population of Public Community Colleges Nationwide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Colleges by Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains &amp; Midwest</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

**Faculty Interviews**

The study considered the relationship of disengagement (perhaps a result of burnout) to the motivation for seeking outside employment on the part of full-time community college faculty. The American Association of Community Colleges recognizes that by the turn of the century, 40 percent of current full-time faculty may retire (Building Communities, 1988). There are abundant numbers of senior or veteran faculty among the community college ranks. Faculty
renewal and burnout are not just issues for senior faculty; but for the purposes of this study, the length of service of the faculty members interviewed was important. Only "veteran" faculty with 10 or more years of full-time service were solicited for interview purposes in order to learn if there is a correlation between seniority and burnout, and if so, whether moonlighting is a result.

Three of the faculty interviewed had less than 10 years at their current institution but had a total of 10 or more years in community college teaching. Table 2 shows the average number of years at the faculty members’ current institution and the average total number of years in full-time community college teaching. Most of the faculty interviewed were entrenched; only a few had taught at institutions other than those to which they were currently affiliated. Notable was the absence of movement among these full-time community college teaching faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF SERVICE (FACULTY)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of years at current institution</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total number of years in full-time community college teaching</td>
<td>19.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The teaching disciplines of the faculty interviewed were diverse. Table 3 lists the 14 teaching assignments of the study sample. The faculty interviewed represented about equally general studies or transfer disciplines and disciplines involving occupational or technical programs. For this reason, the sample of interviewees is generally representative of full-time teaching faculty in community colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING DISCIPLINES OF THE FACULTY SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management/Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Laboratory Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Systems Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
The data show that three-fifths, or 60 percent of the 20 faculty interviewed in this study have employment outside of their teaching contract, as represented in Figure 2. The outside employment for 10 of the 12 faculty is related or somewhat related to their teaching discipline. Boyer and Lewis described related outside employment as being affiliated with "one’s profession, field of study, or discipline" (Boyer and Lewis, 1985, p. 46). Brown and Schuster reported part-time teaching at other institutions, royalties from writings, artistic performances, and private professional practice for specialists, such as physicians, engineers, lawyers, and economists, as being related employment (1986, pp. 257-258). Appendix C provides the coded responses of the faculty who moonlight with the types of employment (related or unrelated) in which they engage.

Almost all of the interviewees voiced their opinion that, based on their experience, many full-time community college faculty moonlight with an average estimate of 50 percent or more.
Figure 2

For the 12 faculty who admitted to moonlighting, 10 (or 83 percent) had employment that was related or somewhat related to their teaching discipline. The coded responses of these interviews are presented in Appendix C. Examples of related outside employment included an English faculty member who also was a paid editor for a national magazine, an accounting professor was the principal of an accounting firm, and a horticulture faculty owned and operated a landscaping business. There were two faculty who had
unrelated employment. The psychology professor, who also had a partial counseling assignment, owned three national corporations that developed accounting software. A Computer Information Systems instructor (female) was a major in the National Guard. This faculty member classified her role with the Reserves as outside employment.

Many examples of faculty who work in supplemental jobs unrelated to their teaching assignments were cited by the interviewees. Every faculty member interviewed knew of one or more colleagues who had outside employment. They gave examples, such as an English professor who sold real estate, a psychology professor owned and maintained apartment complexes, an art instructor managed a scholarship service, a history professor and an English professor together owned a bookstore, and several teaching faculty were "reported" to be in the military reserves.

The primary reasons for seeking outside employment by those interviewed were twofold: (1) an opportunity to "do something different" and (2) extra income. The motivation for faculty who moonlight for other than financial reasons was a primary focus of this study. The faculty who said they initially sought the outside employment for the extra
income offered that they were motivated by the activity and the extra income eventually became secondary. The faculty who claimed that additional opportunity or frustration with their jobs was their primary reason for moonlighting commented that the extra income was a "nice feature." None of the faculty interviewed in this study who moonlighted did so exclusively for financial reasons.

All of the faculty who moonlighted, however, stated that they believed their college and the students they taught benefitted from the knowledge and application of skills obtained through their outside employment. In response to the question about additional benefits they derived from their outside employment, faculty offered the following justifications:

1. "Brings the real world to the classroom"
2. "Helps me to stay current"
3. "Adds to my knowledge base"
4. "Gives me credibility in my profession"
5. "Provides personal experiences to draw on in the classroom"
6. "Allows students to see that English is an applied skill and can be profitable"
7. "Gives me a broader perspective of what students need to be taught"

8. "Provides an opportunity for me to stay on the cutting edge"

Regarding the extent (or amount) that full-time faculty members moonlight, the responses spread across a broad range. An answer in terms of percentage was not requested; therefore, the responses included terms that described the interviewees' opinions, like "very little" or "considerable," while others gave an estimate in terms of a percent. Appendix C provides the interviewees' responses by category. One faculty member's answer to this question was "practically nonexistent," and another response was 10 percent; however, the majority of the respondees estimated 50 percent or above. Most of the faculty interviewed believe that moonlighting among community college faculty is prevalent. Figure 3 illustrates the responses of faculty about the extent to which they believe community college faculty moonlight.
About half of the faculty interviewed (9) believed that there was a policy that governed outside employment for full-time faculty. These faculty were all in non-union environments and whose time outside of the classroom was not as rigidly governed or protected as those in a collective bargaining arrangement. There was no other appreciable difference in the responses of faculty who had union
contracts compared to those were not under collective bargaining.

Nine of the respondents said there was no policy (or one that they knew of), and two admitted that they did not know whether a policy existed or not. The grid detailing the responses of the interviewees about their knowledge of a policy relating to outside employment for faculty is provided in Appendix C.

The faculty who said that a policy governing outside employment existed were somewhat undecided about under whose jurisdiction the policy was written. Most "guessed" that a policy was administered from the system or state level and that it related to a conflict of interest. Eight of the faculty commented that they knew they were not to use college resources, such as phones and equipment, to conduct other business. One respondent, however, openly admitted that many of her private business's clients were her teaching colleagues.

Two faculty members said that there was a clear college policy relating to outside employment. In one instance, the interviewee knew the policy well because the college's newly appointed president had recently enacted a policy about
moonlighting. In this case, there had been wide media coverage about a full-time university faculty member in Minnesota who also held a full-time teaching position at another institution in North Carolina. The Minnesota Court of Appeals recently upheld its earlier decision to fire the professor, citing, the "period of time away from the University (of Minnesota) clearly prevented him from applying himself full time to his scholarship and service at the University, which he knew he was required to do" (Charlotte Observer, March, 1996). The media made a public example of the situation by challenging the taxpayers (and legislators) as to whether this "public" employee was earning his salary at either institution. The community college faculty member interviewed in this study was very aware of the new policy that defined guidelines pertaining to outside employment for all full-time employees at that particular community college because the community college president put his faculty "on notice." The policy defined outside employment as "work done for pay for the benefit of agents or agencies or organizations other than Central Piedmont Community College or for the benefit of any private business or in the conduct of a profession" (CPCC Policy and
Procedures Manual, 4.XX, I, 8/9/93. The policy further explained the college's position as the "primary employer of all regular, full-time employees" and that "no full-time employees shall engage in outside employment without the prior approval of his/her immediate supervisor" (4.XX, II). Additionally, expectations for full-time employees (which included faculty) were established that excluded paid activities conducted during the normal work week; on college property; that caused the employee to be late, leave early, or not be available for required work outside of the regular work week; or that adversely affected the job performance of an employee. The policy was clearly articulated to all employees, who were told that it would be enforced. Failure to notify the institution of outside employment was grounds for termination.

The two faculty from this institution were knowledgeable of the policy and reported that the policy was enforced. Seven of the faculty who said that they believed a policy existed did not know what the policy contained nor did they have any knowledge that it was ever enforced.

Almost unanimously, all faculty interviewed believed that their administrations viewed outside employment
negatively. The exception was two faculty members who knew that their CEO was very supportive of this practice. He was, in fact, among the few CEOs who believed that outside employment was beneficial to full-time faculty.

The faculty who admitted (willingly) that they moonlighted shared their experiences somewhat cautiously in the interview, but most offered that they would not do so with their administrations. One faculty member commented, "I would never say what I am telling you around my institution." The reason most often given for the need for confidentiality was that most administrators do not look favorably on outside employment. In fact, the majority of those interviewed said that, although they believed the practice of moonlighting among community college faculty was prevalent, it was rarely if ever discussed. Another reason often cited (especially by unionized faculty) was that "what faculty did on their own time was no one else's business." The opinion of most faculty was that moonlighting is generally viewed with disfavor; therefore, it is a subject rarely discussed.

These 20 "veteran" faculty were asked to describe burnout as it related to their teaching profession. There
There were a number of different terms and phrases used to describe burnout, including unchallenged, loss of self-image, following the same routine for too long, not empowered, perception of limited opportunities, unappreciated, and not valued. In summary, the faculty in this study considered burnout to be a result of "sameness," teaching the same courses, using the same teaching methodologies (pedagogy), following the same schedule. In no case did an interviewee respond that burnout was a result of stress from working long hours or teaching too many courses or being assigned too many students or advisees.

The works of Baldwin (1988) and Clark and Corcoran (1985) show that vital faculty do not feel a sense of "sameness": instead, they engage in role changes and have a sense of diversity in their jobs. The data shown by this study indicate that burnout adversely affects the vitality of faculty and that faculty who sense burnout have the potential for becoming disengaged from their institutions.

The faculty in this study who admitted to moonlighting described their opinion of burnout in a very personal way. In fact, the reasons they gave for seeking outside employment correlated with their descriptions of burnout.
One faculty member said that teaching the same courses over a long period of time caused burnout. He had answered that he sought outside employment because he had "varied interests" and "liked doing a lot of different things." Several respondents who said that burnout resulted from being "unchallenged" and a "lack of opportunity for advancement" had established their own businesses. The faculty who moonlighted found ways to combat their burnout--outside of their institutions.

The 12 faculty who moonlighted were, in fact, generally "proud" of the work they did outside of their institutions. They felt "valued"; they considered themselves to be accomplished; they believed that their outside work helped them to be better teachers. Yet, they did not share these feelings with their colleagues; there was no institutional recognition--their paid activities were cloaked in secrecy.

Eight of the faculty said that they had no additional employment at the time of the interview. Of these faculty, two were in graduate programs, two faculty had 12-month contracts and said they had no time for extra work, three respondents said they had families that kept them busy, and one faculty member said that he was very involved
professionally (he served on an accrediting board, was president of a professional association, and had published any number of articles and papers, and he traveled in the summers). These data are presented in Appendix C.

**CEOs Interviews**

Interviews with the community college chief executive officers were equally revealing. These 18 CEOs represented a plethora of experience both in years as community college leaders as well as having served in many different states whose scope of policies and practices was very broad. One might expect that putting questions related to faculty and moonlighting before community college administrators with such depth and breadth of experience would be extremely revealing and informative.

The interviews with the community college presidents and chancellors (CEOs) were less structured. The first question asked, "To what extent do you think community college faculty moonlight?", served as a springboard for lengthy recitations on faculty "motivation" (or the lack of it). The majority of the respondees either did not know how
to initially answer the question (and were visibly bothered because they couldn't) or began to describe the negative effects of moonlighting. The reactions of the CEOs corroborated the opinions of the faculty who believed that their administrators viewed moonlighting in a negative way.

Four of the current or former chief administrative officers said that there was a policy that specifically addressed outside employment for faculty. Two of the CEOs shared a copy of the policy; two did not.

One of the CEOs had given considerable attention to the issue of outside employment for full-time faculty. This president pulled from his file a policy recently written and approved that addressed faculty members' outside employment. It was the situation where the media had covered the story about the faculty member who was employed full time at two institutions in two different states. Because of the national negative press, higher education was virtually put on notice about fiscal responsibility. The policy was written to heavily regulate (and thus discourage) any outside employment that served as a conflict of interest to full-time teaching faculty.
One of the CEOs was somewhat familiar with the policy that addressed outside employment, and he offered that his faculty had many opportunities that might thwart seeking outside employment. He cited opportunities to carry courses for overload (at a full pay rate), 12-month contracts were an option for faculty in the occupational disciplines, and faculty were encouraged to teach and consult with businesses through the college's non-credit campus for very attractive rates of pay. The policy at this institution stated that "acceptance of additional employment of any kind must be approved by the local executive officer" and that, should additional employment be requested, the "Office of the Attorney General or the State Ethics Commission" must make a conflict of interest determination" (South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, 8-7-101.1, 9/26/90).

Two of the CEOs who said that there was no policy governing outside employment, said they wished one existed at the Board level. Both offered that they preferred the college position to be a full-time job for faculty.

Three of the CEOs responded that trying to "regulate a faculty member's time was a waste of administrative time."
One veteran president declared, "Who would even want to have such a policy!" One president replied, "If this (moonlighting among full-time faculty) could be monitored, the state would crack down on it--fraud and waste in government!" Whether a policy existed or not, the overwhelming majority (80 percent) of the CEOs were reluctant to say that a policy was warranted or that, if one existed, it needed to be clarified.

Of the four CEOs who said that a policy existed, two reported that approval was required through their office. The remaining two replied that it was the dean or department chair's responsibility to grant approval and report cases of outside employment. In the states and institutions where faculty were under collective bargaining agreements, there was no evidence of policies regulating faculty outside of their contract. In non-unionized environments, findings ranged from no policy (and the shock of even such a suggestion) to strict policy with enforcement. Somewhere in the middle was uncertainty or inability to answer the question and intrigue about the practice in general.

Perhaps the single most intriguing outcome of the CEO interviews was the fact that these community college leaders
were uncertain about the extent to which full-time faculty moonlight. They were uncomfortable that they had been asked to respond about an issue they were either unprepared to answer or usually had been able to dodge. They generally responded that they believed very few of their faculty engaged in outside employment activities; therefore, they believed that moonlighting was not an issue. In general, these community college CEOs believed that less than one-fourth of full-time faculty moonlight (Figure 4). Nine of the CEOs estimated that fewer than 10 percent of full-time community college faculty moonlight. Only two estimated the extent to be 40 to 50 percent.
Figure 4

Further in the interviews, four of the CEOs changed their initial responses about the outside employment of full-time faculty. Several began to cite examples of faculty who had outside employment interests, and they offered that most were faculty in occupational programs and in other institutions.

When asked if outside employment was a contributor or a detractor from a faculty member’s job, four of the 18 CEOs answered that it could be a contributor. The coded
responses are provided on the grid in Appendix C. Examples given were as follows:

1. “It keeps them fired up.”

2. “Outside employment brings prestige to the classroom.”

3. “Consulting and other paid employment helps to keep faculty current in their fields. Even if the employment is not job related, it helps the faculty member to bring a different perspective to what he or she teaches.”

4. “Moonlighting is beneficial, because for faculty happiness is determined by income.”

Notably, 16 of the 18 CEOs stated that they had either not been asked these questions before or had not even considered the implications of full-time faculty having outside employment. The subject placed these CEOs in a visibly uncomfortable position.

Contradictions in the CEO interviews were abundant. One CEO was interviewed twice; the interviews occurred approximately eight months apart. Some of the answers given in the second interview were totally opposite from those provided in the first interview. For example, in the first interview, the respondee said there was a Board of Trustees'
policy that governs outside employment for faculty. In the second interview, he stated that there was no policy. In both interviews, he offered that 25 percent or fewer moonlight and that additional income was the primary reason. However, he offered in the first interview that moonlighting enabled faculty to parallel their area of work and, thus, enhanced their ability to teach. In the second interview, the CEO stated that moonlighting at his institution was minimal because he has taken measures to ensure that faculty did not have to work outside of the institution. These measures included the option to teach extra courses at the faculty member's full rate of pay and the option for faculty to work on a twelve-month contract.

Summary

Many full-time community college faculty moonlight. While the relative numbers in this total sample were small (12 of 20 faculty), they correspond to the estimates given in national studies. The extent of moonlighting among full-time community college faculty is as high as 50 percent.
Even those faculty who said they did not moonlight were able to cite examples of faculty who did.

Findings in this study suggest that faculty are not driven to outside employment primarily for the extra income. In many cases, veteran faculty see outside employment as a way to combat the sameness of their teaching jobs, to renew themselves by doing something new and challenging, to seek opportunities for advancement that do not exist in their teaching positions. Often faculty moonlighters meet with success on the "outside" because they are energetic and competent. Their primary allegiance stands to shift from the institutions they serve to their outside jobs. Their outside activities often go unnoticed; in fact, most of what they do goes unnoticed--as long as they meet their contractual obligations and receive satisfactory student evaluations. Their faculty salaries and benefits become a comfortable supplement to their outside employment.

Based on the findings in this study, community college administrators do not think that full-time faculty moonlight to any great extent and for those that do, they believe the extra income is the primary motivation. Most chief administrators were uncomfortable with discussing the
regulation of faculty time. References to regulation
(policy) and the practice of moonlighting were generally
viewed negatively (at least initially) by the majority of
the administrators interviewed. This study pointed to the
general inattention or "avoidance" to address either the
costs or benefits of moonlighting by full-time faculty.
This chapter pulls together the threads of information from the various sources and attempts to weave them into a fabric in the format of two composite profiles of full-time community college faculty who moonlight and the environment in which they work. These two profiles represent an analysis of previous studies by Marsh and Dillon (1980), Furniss (1981), Boyer and Lewis (1985), and Baldwin (1987 and 1988), along with twenty structured interviews with full-time community college faculty from across the country. Additionally, eighteen structured interviews with community college presidents and chancellors aided in the review of perceptions of the practices and policies relating to moonlighting by faculty at their institutions. Statistical data from the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics and the American Association of Community Colleges that described faculty and community colleges during the timeframe (the late 1960s to the early
1990s) were used as supporting sources. The recorded data from the interviews are presented in Appendix C.

The individuals' names and locations are fictional; however, the people, places, and times are real. More importantly, the characters and their inner thoughts and feelings about their circumstances have been brought together in two portraits to reflect the majority of the individuals interviewed for this study.
"Lighted up with imagination or a spiritless professoriate . . . " Meet Maurice Morrison and Hazel Watters.

Profile 1: Morry Morrison

1990

The first signs of spring were beginning to appear, and the daylight hours were welcomingly longer each day. Maurice Morrison, Morry to most everyone who knew him, sat pensively watching the sun slowly descend behind the trees as he thought about the decision he had to make.

Morry had not thought much about retirement; he had enjoyed an interesting and fulfilling career--at least until the last few years. How great it would be to sleep late in the mornings, read a favorite book under the shade of the tree, refinish an old rocking chair, and still have time to fish every day! But while the early retirement package offered to him was attractive, Morry wasn't at all sure that he was ready to make the move. He reflected...
Maurice Allen Morrison, Bachelor of Science in Mathematics, Cum Laude. Morry's family applauded and whistled as they watched him, donned in cap and gown, wave the baccalaureate diploma he had just received marking the end of an era. Morry had been diligently working with the university's placement office in hopes of landing a job. Being out of college would make him a prime candidate for the draft, as the Vietnam War was escalating.

Graduating with honors was an indication that Morry had been a serious student, but that had not always been the case. At Riverside High School, Morry had busied himself with everything except studying and his grades clearly reflected his penchant for socializing. But on the first day of senior government class, Morry met Horace Smith. Unlike any teacher he had ever had, Mr. Smith helped Morry come to grips with his future by helping him to focus on his abilities. Not only did Morry decide that he wanted to go to college, but it was then that he knew he wanted to become a teacher and help other kids like Mr. Smith had helped him.

In the few weeks after graduation, Morry interviewed with three different public school systems all within an
hour of his hometown. In mid June, Bay County offered him a teaching contract, which would begin in August. For a starting salary of $6,235, Morry accepted his first full-time job.

The next five years for Morry were memorable. He and Ann, his college sweetheart, married and bought their first home. It was an old Victorian house that they decided to restore. He was a popular teacher at Bay County High School, and Morry welcomed extracurricular assignments. He was the yearbook advisor, Junior Class sponsor, and faculty liaison to the PTA. There were homecoming floats to build, field trips to coordinate, and cafeteria, bus, and parking lots to supervise. Most of all Morry liked teaching. He really tried to make mathematics relevant for his students. More than anything Morry wanted his students to learn how to learn and to understand that learning was a lifelong process.

Morry had catch-up learning to do himself. He was accepted and began a master's degree program at the nearby university. Teaching during the day, attending classes two nights a week, and keeping up with the reading and writing assignments were a challenge. But Morry was ignited by all
he was involved in; he thrived on all the activity. He learned along with his students, and he was a good role model.

It took two and a half years for Morry to complete his masters program. It had been tough financially for Morry and his wife—a mortgage, educational expenses, and now, they were expecting their first child. Morry was seriously considering his future.

Community colleges were opening at the rate of one every day in the early seventies. Several of Morry's colleagues were talking about applying to Bay City Community College, which was scheduled to open in the fall. Fred, Morry's next door neighbor who was a real estate broker, was encouraging him to become certified in appraising and to join his realty firm. The beginning nine-month teaching salary at the community college (around $10,000 for a position at the instructor rank) was not much more than Morry's current salary of just over $9,000, but the potential for increases would be greater than the county's pay scale for teachers. At any rate, appraising real estate was too tentative to pay the bills he had accumulated. Yet, it was a difficult decision.
Morry was one of six mathematics instructors employed by BCCC for that beginning term. In fact, the entire faculty and staff were new; only several administrators had begun during the previous year to prepare the physical plant, develop policies and procedures, establish curricular offerings, and recruit the faculty and staff. Morry was assigned to teach four courses, which meant a faculty load of 14 credits and 16 contact hours. He had three course preparations. There were students to advise, registration to assist with, division and college committee meetings to attend. They were busy but exciting years for Morry and his colleagues. They collaborated on teaching methods, course syllabi, course sequence, content, student preparation, and evaluation. He joined and participated in the state mathematics association. Morry felt that he had made the right career choice.

The first few years at BCCC sped by. The college's student enrollment grew at phenomenal rates. The size of the faculty and staff doubled. The college's founding president left to become chancellor of a community college system in another state. Morry, who had become active in the Faculty Congress, was asked to serve on the presidential
search committee. He sat on other campus committees and was very involved in the statewide mathematics faculty association. The extra income from the two overload courses he carried each semester was helpful. Morry was a good teacher, accessible to his students, involved in the growth of the institution, and committed to professional activities of his discipline.

Morry's family, too, had grown; he and Ann had three children. Ann was a registered nurse at the local hospital. They both juggled work, house chores, and children's activities. Morry was a skilled craftsman and enjoyed his hobby of refinishing furniture and remodeling old buildings. The house he and Ann had restored was highlighted in a national magazine and had won several local awards.

After almost eighteen years at BCCC, Morry was still teaching basically the same math courses. More students seemed to be ill prepared for college-level mathematics than ever before. The college's total enrollment had grown to record numbers, but fewer students were enrolled on a full-time basis. Most of Morry's students had a family and job commitments. Although their intentions were honorable, many of them were truly part-time students in every sense.
Morry had chosen years earlier not to pursue an administrative post at the college. He really liked teaching. Committee assignments had become laborious, though, as the same few people in the college always did most of the work. Morry, as well as many of the veteran faculty, felt isolated from the college's administration. To them bureaucracy within the institution had reached record levels. The faculty rarely interacted with the president, who seemed to have fundraising as his highest priority. Morry's Dean of Instruction at BCCC was always in a meeting, trying to respond to growing institutional demands or making budgets stretch to cover the needed services. The mathematics department was chaired by one of the math faculty, who was given several released hours from teaching to handle the departmental administrivia. The department chair reported to the Dean of Instruction.

Opportunities for professional development were fewer due to larger staffs, more students, and fewer resources. After the first decade of the college, increases in faculty salaries had slowed considerably; there was no faculty union at BCCC. Courses taught on overload status were no longer paid at regular faculty rates but rather at adjunct, or
part-time faculty rates. Teaching a full summer contract was more important to Morry than ever, since he had growing family and personal financial responsibilities. However, summer contracts for faculty were always dependent on the enrollment; and because of a tightened budget, the institution had lowered the summer pay to 60 percent of regular pay for faculty. Morry was no longer involved in the Faculty Congress. He had grown tired of attending departmental meetings with colleagues who did nothing but complain about their teaching loads, how they were unappreciated by the students and the administration, and how the few faculty workshops that were offered each year were usually on Friday afternoons or the day just before a holiday. Morry felt unchallenged and unrewarded—financially and professionally.

Morry’s annual evaluation required that he submit his students’ evaluations (which were usually satisfactory), three peer critiques (which had become a mere quid pro quo), an entry about his professional growth (he maintained membership in two professional associations but no longer attended meetings or conferences), and a short paragraph that described his community service (which was easy to
answer as Morry listed various local community organizations in which he participated). As long as there were no student complaints, Morry seemed to coast like most of his colleagues.

An apartment building in town was up for sale and Morry's neighbor, Fred, encouraged him to take a look at it. With some carpentry talents and attractive financing, Morry decided he could make it work. Even with the extra course or two he taught each semester and the ten office hours he was required to post, Morry's schedule allowed him to be out by one o'clock three afternoons a week. When he was assigned to teach a night course, he could often arrange a four-day work week. After all, this would mean reliable summer employment, and Morry would be his own boss (for a change).

Around BCCC outside employment—or moonlighting—somehow had negative undertones with the administration, but Morry didn't exactly know why. Morry thought there might even be a policy pertaining to outside employment, but he didn't inquire about one. The Dean of Instruction did not ask Morry what he did outside of his college responsibilities. Besides, he knew most of his colleagues
had outside business ventures, and he doubted they had
gotten approval. Moonlighting was rarely, if ever,
discussed even though many faculty did it. Morry felt that
as long as he taught his classes, what he did on his own
time was personal.

Renovating the apartment building took a lot of time
and hard work, but Morry enjoyed his labor. Within a year,
the complex was fully leased, and Morry began to realize a
profit on his investment. He then purchased two row houses
and began their restoration. The property was bordered by
the historic district, so Morry joined a local group who was
engaged in researching land grants. Later Morry was
appointed to the Historic Commission.

Through the years, Morry had received two promotions
and now had the academic rank of associate professor. His
nine-month teaching contract was at a comfortable salary of
just under $40,000.

Morry taught his math courses, advised and counseled
his students as best he could, and dashed out of BCCC's door
at the first available moment every day. Some of Morry's
colleagues knew that he was a contractor and landlord "on
the outside." He only attended departmental meetings when
they were required, and rarely did he volunteer to serve on college committees anymore. But Morry was an effective teacher, and his student evaluations were very good.

The sun began to wain and the lake was ever so calm. Hours had passed as Morry contemplated his decision. Did he want to take advantage of the early retirement offer and devote all of his time to his management company and his service on the Historic Commission? Did he want to continue teaching and add more years to his retirement package?

After all--Morry really had the best of all worlds ...

Profile 2: Hazel Watters

Hazel Watters was an entrepreneur from the word go. Even as a child, she had shown talents of being a successful business person. Hazel was always interested in clothes; she liked to read about models, but most of all she liked to design outfits and imagine how they would look on her favorite models. She was an excellent seamstress. After making her dress for the Junior Class Prom, many of her friends began asking her to design clothes for them.
Hazel was encouraged by her family to attend college, where she majored in Business with a minor in Marketing. She helped to finance her college education by working in a department store. The store manager recognized Hazel's talents, and he offered to provide a scholarship for her to pursue graduate studies if she would continue working part-time with the company. Hazel completed a Master's in Business Administration degree two years later in 1975.

While in her graduate program, Hazel had to complete an internship program with an administrator at a local community college. She found that she really liked the enthusiasm and high level of activity at the college. Somehow Hazel felt as though she related to the students—most of whom were balancing their education, a job (and sometimes two), and often a family.

Before she even completed her degree, Hazel was asked by the department chair of business to apply for a full-time teaching position. The faculty salary was good, and the prospects for increases were promising because the Faculty Association had a good record of negotiating favorable contracts. She decided to take the job.
Because the marketing program at the college was small, Hazel was the only full-time faculty member in the department. It was her job to employ adjunct faculty for additional courses offered beyond her workload. She also had to schedule courses, review and select textbooks, and evaluate part-time faculty and their course syllabi.

Hazel was a very busy person on the campus and off the campus. Because of her previous work experience and ties to the department store, Hazel was able to arrange for her students to fulfill externship requirements at the store.

She arranged buying trips for her students to cities they had only dreamed about. Her many contacts in the industry proved to be very beneficial to her students and the college.

The practical experience that Hazel brought to the classroom was valued by the college administration. The program advisory committee that she organized was a "who's who" list of highly recognized marketing experts in the region. The program's reputation and enrollment grew.

Hazel had joined the college's faculty with a high degree of connectivity and self-sufficiency. As the years passed, the more Hazel did, the more she was expected to do.
Institutional bureaucracy had become a real barrier in getting additional staff to relieve the pressure of maintaining a dynamic program. Student advising took a lot of Hazel's time but so did making all the arrangements for special trips and shows that her department sponsored--for the students. Because resources at the college were very limited, Hazel obtained supplemental funding from her network of colleagues in the industry. It seemed the more Hazel did for her program, the less the college did to support her efforts.

Hazel began to be annoyed that her colleagues in other programs did not seem to have the extra workload that she had. The clerical work associated with the program had become a burden. When donations were made to her program, there were thank-you letters to write. She had the scheduling of trips to make for her students; yet, there was no support staff to help her with these tasks. The faculty contract was clear: there were no restrictions on additional employment. Faculty could pursue whatever business interests they wanted to, and many did.

Hazel began to feel abandoned and not hopeful for a change in her circumstances. The opportunity arose for
Hazel to open a consignment shop in a mall not far from her home. She certainly had the retail and buying experience required, and she had enough savings for the capital needed. If she cut back on her special projects at the college (maybe then someone would take notice of how much she had been doing), then she would have enough time to get the store up and running.

Hazel's consignment shop flourished. She even had her students working in the store, which had become so successful that it was open six days a week. Everything she touched was successful. She opened several more businesses, hired accountants, managers, and her students!

As busy as Hazel was, she always took time for her students. In fact, every Sunday afternoon Hazel held "open house." This was a time students could come to Hazel's home on a relaxed and informal basis, talk about their goals, personal progress or problems, snack on munchies. Hazel knew each one and each one's hopes and dreams.

Hazel had always been self-sufficient. After 20 years with the program, Hazel had learned to look outside of the college for the support she needed. Her program was one of the best in the state, she modeled the concepts she taught
to her students, and she was a committed teacher. But her institution had provided little in terms of personal recognition and reward. She, in fact, benefitted far greater--professionally and financially--by turning her entrepreneurial spirit outside of the institution.

Hazel was now independently wealthy in her own right, and her contract with the college was secondary to her other business interests. She still liked her teaching, but there was only so much time in a day . . .
Morry and Hazel are representative of the faculty who joined community colleges in the late 1960s and '70s. Morry was a high school teacher who viewed teaching at the local community college as a move up. Hazel was attracted to teaching in the community college as a good career choice.

In the late 60s and early 70s, Morry, like many secondary teachers, saw the opportunity for professional advancement through the growing number of community colleges. Cohen reported that the number of public community colleges peaked in the 1970s to over 1,070 (Cohen and Brawer, 1989). The career path for secondary school teachers had previously been fairly narrow in that administrative posts were their only "move up." Teaching at most four-year institutions required advanced degrees, and the likelihood of a career path leading from secondary schools to senior institutions was very slim. Requiring a master's degree, many new community college administrations looked to the secondary school teacher population for their faculty base. The California State Department of Education reported that "around 44 percent of new teachers of academic
subjects entering two-year colleges in California in 1963 moved in directly from secondary schools, and others had had prior experience with them" (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, p. 69).

In the late 1970s as the growth leveled, the proportion of faculty from the secondary market also declined. Graduate programs, like Hazel’s, became a ready source of new faculty for community colleges.

Pursuing a teaching position at a community college for Morry and Hazel meant faculty salaries that were competitive with comparable positions requiring their level of education. Salaries for community college faculty have tended to be higher than for secondary school teachers but lower than for university faculty. Collegiate faculty salaries rose fairly drastically in the mid-60s to mid-70s (the time period when Morry and Hazel entered community college teaching). Real salaries during that period rose 23 percent (compared to 18 percent for employees in the private sector) (Bowen and Schuster, 1986, p. 89). Citing the Digest of Educational Statistics, Cohen and Brawer reported that community college faculty salaries have remained lower than university faculty over the years. The salary differential widened from less than 7 percent in the early 1980s to
almost 10 percent by the end of the decade (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, p. 73). Analysis of the salaries of professional and managerial occupations, which were comparable to those in academic professions, and using data from the Current Population Survey for 1982, Bowen and Schuster found that of 16 occupations, post-secondary faculty ranked tenth with a median annual salary of $26,608. Secondary teachers, however, ranked thirteenth with a median annual salary of $21,284 (Bowen and Schuster, 1986, p. 83).

Based on data from the Digest of Education Statistics (Table 224, 1994, p. 234), the average salary for faculty in all ranks for two-year institutions in 1990 (the year of Morry's early retirement offer) was $34,720. The average salary for the rank of associate professor in all institutions was $39,329. The National Education Association's Estimates of School Statistics (1995) indicates that the national average salary for classroom teachers in 1990 was $33,123. Morry's community college salary was greater, on the average, by about $6,000 than if he had remained teaching at the high school level, and his schedule offered a great deal more flexibility to engage in other activities.
The highest academic degree held by both Morry and Hazel was a master’s degree. The National Center for Education Statistics reported that in 1972, 74 percent of two-year college instructors held a master’s as their highest degree (Cohen and Brawer, 1989).

Like many of their colleagues in the 1970s, Morry and Hazel were young faculty members. A study by Cohen and Brawer of humanities faculty at community colleges nationwide showed that in 1975 one-third were 35 years old or younger. Almost half (49%) of all humanities faculty were 40 or younger. By 1983 only 15% were 35 years of age or younger (1987, p. 64). The “graying” of community college faculty is being realized in phenomenal proportions. The AACJC reported in its Summary of Selected National Data that by the late 1980’s, as much as 63 percent of all full-time community college faculty were over the age of 45 (p. 18).

With more than 15 years teaching at one institution, Morry and Hazel were representative of their colleagues who were mid-career faculty with long careers at one institution. Cohen and Brawer reported that large numbers of community college faculty in the mid 80s had been at
their same institutions for more than ten years. A survey of humanities faculty nationwide indicated that as many as 50 percent had been at one institution for more than ten years (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, p. 68). Many community college faculty have experienced a one-stop, one-step career, frequently having "lifelong ties to one college" (McGrath and Spear, 1991, p. 140).

Morry and Hazel were among the majority of faculty who were full-time, as opposed to part-time faculty. Between 1968 and the mid-70s, the percentage of full-time faculty ranged between 59 and 66 percent. By the late 1980s, for example, only 41 percent were full-time with 58 percent being part-time faculty (AACJC Summary, p. 17). The workload of institutional responsibilities, such as participating in college governance, advising students, and curricular revisions shifted disproportionally to the full-time faculty who had fewer colleagues with whom to share the work. As Morry and Hazel gained "veteran faculty" status, their workloads increased.

Even with the increased workload, veteran community college faculty like Morry and Hazel, often choose the courses and sections they teach. Faculty frequently have
the flexibility of selecting days and times for their schedules that best meet their needs. The number of hours taught by full-time faculty averages between 13 to 15 (compared to 5 to 9 for university faculty) (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, p. 74), and the contact hours for faculty who teach courses that have additional assigned labs can go even higher. The maximum number of contact hours for faculty varies by college or state system. The numbers of students that faculty teach fluctuates even more than the assigned number of contact hours. Cohen and Boyer (1986) reported from a study of the Illinois Community College Board in 1988 that showed the average class size for lecture classes to be 19.2.

Faculty are generally expected to maintain a limited number of office hours (usually 10) in which to advise students and conduct course preparation. They are also expected to participate in college governance, revise curricula, and serve on campus committees. The degree to which faculty participate in duties outside of their classroom varies also by college and system. Olswang and Lee (1984) in a study on institutional accountability argued that full-time faculty owe their institutions 100 percent,
but they recognized that "what constitutes full-time service for a faculty member has never been well understood or defined." (p. 32). The authors claimed that the independence faculty have because of their flexible schedules is no basis for not putting in "full-time effort for full-time salary" (p. 32).

With the aging of community college faculty came attention to the issue of "burnout." New faculty were not being brought on board at the same rate as in the earlier days, the full-time faculty had to carry a heavy workload, faculty began to "crowd toward the top of the salary schedules" (Cohen and Brawer, 1989, p. 80), formal in-service training (or professional development opportunities) was recognized as one of the most critical needs but stretched budgets threw up barriers as institutional expansion waned. Palmer and Vaughan (1992) cited a study conducted by George Mason University's Center for Community College Education and the National Council for Instructional Administrators, which solicited 840 community college faculty at 101 institutions. Regarding scholarship, 61 percent of the full-time faculty responding to the survey said that "teaching takes up too much time" (p. 60).
Morry's and Hazel's portraits reflect the anecdotal comments recorded from the survey's respondents, which included "the problem with the community college is we teach too much--repeat ourselves too often and don't have enough time and energy to refuel." Another faculty member stated that he had "gotten out of the habit of being scholarly" after having taught five courses every term (including summers) for years (Palmer and Vaughan, 1992, p. 62).

Professional development for faculty in community colleges too often depends on what remains in the budget. With constant shifting of state and local funding sources and having to offset rising costs, community colleges have since the 1980's been raising student tuition. Funds for innovative faculty development are all too infrequent. Vaughan and Palmer (1992) assert that often the professional development programs that do exist concentrate on "how to teach rather than what to teach" (p. 70). Faculty development too often does not rate as a high priority in community colleges, and as faculty in their one-step careers continue teaching year to year, "burnout is becoming the new academic disease" (Palmer and Vaughan, 1992, p. 70).
Even the expectation of development through scholarship for community college faculty cannot be documented. Mayhew and others in the *Quest for Quality* (1990) asserted that community college faculty are not only not expected to be scholarly ("perhaps as a legacy from their secondary-school origins" p. 37), they are not prepared to conduct researched-based scholarship. Because the educational requirement generally is a master's degree, community college faculty do not have the training in research as do their university counterparts. The authors also contend that community college leaders do not set the expectation by placing a "high value on research, scholarship, and intellectuality" (p. 37). Vaughan restated work by Robert Parilla which charged higher education with "insulating the craft of teaching from the scholarship that nourishes it" especially in community colleges because of the heavy teaching loads of faculty and the lack of professional development opportunities needed to keep abreast of their disciplines (Vaughan, 1992, p. 70). Morry and Hazel reflect the feelings of ambiguity and the compromise that is so often associated with the lack of a "professional future
beyond maintenance of membership in the guild" (McGrath and Spear, 1991, p. 141).

The tendency to lose steam in one's profession, especially at certain career plateaus, has been pointed out by Baldwin, Seidman, and others. In an article on the Southern Institute for Faculty Renewal (1991), Haugen and Talbert noted that it is not unusual for "graying, mid-career" faculty to become less enthusiastic about their disciplines or even teaching. They pointed out, however, that preventing this kind of burnout especially for community college faculty is critically important because "their exclusive commitment to teaching" makes them uniquely sensitive to this problem (AACJC Journal, 1991, p. 12). The cohort that included Morry and Hazel slowly began to find "few new challenges in their work and despaired of facing a succession of years doing the same tasks for the same pay. They turned to other jobs on their off hours" (p. 80).
Chapter 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This exploratory study supports the notion that veteran community college faculty do engage in employment outside of their teaching contracts. Supported by the empirical data in the referenced studies and as presented in Appendix C and highlighted by the discrepancies reported in previous works, this study underscores the controversial nature of the subject for both full-time community college faculty and their chief executive officers.

There is a "filter up" parallel to Theodore Sizer's model for high school faculty. Historical connections of the establishment of community colleges to the public school system have created a dichotomy in expectations for community college faculty. It really is unclear as to whether community college faculty should more closely emulate secondary school teachers or four-year university faculty. Engaging in pursuits outside of the classroom for community college faculty are generally not valued due to the baggage brought from secondary school thinking.
The baggage becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, especially in light of Burton Clark's portrayal of the "extreme opposite ends of the institutional hierarchy" from the faculty in major universities' graduate-level professional schools to faculty in "downtown community colleges" who have heavy teaching loads and teach "introductory and subintroductory courses" (The Academic Life, 1989, p. 6). In interviews with faculty, Clark noted that community college faculty were perceived not as "scholars" but "mere teachers, serving in a fashion more similar to high school teaching than to university work" (p. 6).

McGrath and Spear (1991) referenced work by Peter Buttenwieser who conducted a study for the Ford Foundation and found a "pronounced inferiority complex" among community college faculty. Because of so little distinction among its professional ranks, community colleges have a poorly defined (if any) "public system of recognition or reward beyond initial admission to and permanent membership in the guild. Unlike the university professoriate, both high school and community college teachers work one-step careers, evaluated, if at all, by journeyman notions of competence. Typically,
faculty have lengthy, even lifelong ties to one college. With neither upward nor parallel movement available to them, professional life looms as the teaching and reteaching of the same courses, maybe even in the same classrooms" (McGrath and Spear, 1991, p. 140).

Historically community colleges are reaching adulthood. They have enjoyed the growth and spontaneity reflective of adolescence. The American Association of Community Colleges stated in its Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges that "the renewal of community college faculty is absolutely crucial. If renewal is not forthcoming, if faculty support is not available, the community college will have depleted its most essential resource" (Building Communities, p. 12). How faculty act and react within their organizational culture and in their professional careers is a paramount concern for community college leaders. Chief administrators must not allow organizational culture to be invisible, nor the reactions of faculty within those settings to go unnoticed. McGrath and Spear caution that the culture of organizations is often "invisible to the natives" (1991, p. 32).
In a relatively new work on organizational leadership, Belasco and Strayer in *Flight of the Buffalo* (1993) assert that as organizations age, they tend to rely on past successes. Large corporations that have restructured or reengineered are learning that they may have gained employees' "hands, but not their hearts and minds."

Community college leaders can be concerned about efficiency and productivity, but without changing leadership paradigms, it may well be that community colleges are losing the intellectual capital of their greatest resource--the faculty.

Furniss accused academia with "displays of astonishing ambivalence" about the mid-career established academic and charged that institutions have a responsibility because "change will result only from pushing" especially with those faculty who have not even realized the necessity for the push (Furniss, 1981, p. 100). In the challenge to reinvent community colleges, McGrath and Spear emphasize the lesson that "strengthening institutions...almost certainly requires interventions...otherwise, academic rigor and integrity may be given up slowly, incrementally, negotiated away" (McGrath and Spear, 1991, pp. 35-36).
Vaughan's (1992) assertion is that scholarship in its broadest sense is not fostered by community college leaders because it is associated with research, which has historic ties to universities. According to McGrath and Spear (1989), the ambiguity is enhanced by the system of academic rank, tenure, and promotion that are not typically connected to scholarly accomplishments or even necessarily good teaching in community colleges. Distinction for community college faculty is based not on scholarship or effectiveness determined by a society of professionals, but rather from seniority and years of service at their institutions.

This study supports the empirical data that show as high as 50 percent of full-time community college faculty moonlight. It also supports the premise that full-time faculty who moonlight do so mainly for other than financial reasons.

The primary reason found for seeking outside employment by community college faculty in this study was the desire to do something different. Many veteran faculty felt as though they were no longer challenged, had been allowed to perform the same duties repeatedly for too long, were alienated as to how strategic decisions were made in the institution,
were less optimistic about their influence on learning outcomes than when they began teaching at the community college level, and had little recognition and diminished college resources and support for their efforts.

The data show that moonlighting among full-time community college faculty ranges from 25 to over 50 percent. Through an analysis provided by the AACC of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 1993 survey, it was determined that 41 percent of the community college faculty who moonlight are engaged in consulting, freelance, and self-owned businesses. Over 10 percent of those who moonlight have other full-time jobs. Community college CEOs have avoided for too long the fact that significant numbers of full-time faculty have outside employment without learning the reasons why faculty are turning outside their institutions in other employed activities. This trend of turning outward has resulted in long-term disengagement—not ownership.

Jamal Muhammad's look at people in the general workforce who choose to moonlight showed that they are not necessarily economically squeezed and often have a stronger work ethic. Muhammad contends that moonlighters often are
more energetic and more highly motivated by their intense level of involvement in many activities. Alfred (1985, p. 9) writes that when faculty begin to feel alienated and no longer derive satisfaction from their primary job, they will look outside of the classroom for activities that provide stimulus. This study supports the notion that veteran faculty reach a point at which, if they are not professionally challenged, they will turn to other self-gratifying activities.

The motivation for faculty to moonlight has critical institutional and policy implications. The earliest inquiries on the motivation for faculty to consult, one of which was conducted in 1942 by Logan Wilson, argued that low salaries led faculty to seek outside employment. Wilson’s work linked outside employment to economic self-interest, which laid the foundation for equating “academic man” with “economic man” (Boyer and Lewis, 1985, p.42). Subsequent reports by Wilson in 1965 and 1979 built on the assumption that faculty are lured away from their primary job responsibilities by external dollars. Boyer and Lewis reported several studies, however, that contradicted this notion (Boyer and Lewis, 1984; Patton, 1980; Patton and
Marver, 1979) and claimed that "faculty are not being induced to seek outside professional consulting activities to supplement their base academic salaries" (p. 43). The authors challenged the earlier thinking and maintained that "academic man is not economic man . . . Rather, most faculty appear to be motivated primarily by other important factors" (p. 43).

The primary motivation for holding multiple jobs on the part of full-time teaching faculty is not necessarily financial. Most faculty seek outside employment as a means to do something different, to engage in challenging endeavors, and to take advantage of expertise they have acquired over the years. Once financial gain is experienced, it becomes more captivating for faculty to continue these lucrative pursuits.

This exploratory study reveals that community college faculty moonlight to a much greater extent than their presidents think they do. Most presidents also believe that faculty who have outside employment do so mainly for the additional income rather than for any additional job satisfaction they may experience.
The initial reaction to the practice of moonlighting was expressed by all of the respondees very negatively. Faculty were reluctant to describe their outside employment; presidents were quick to say that very few of their faculty had outside employment. Only when asked if there might be a benefit to teaching were faculty more open to discuss their activities (as if the interviewer might be a comrade who understood). Presidents were slow to admit that their faculty may not be professionally fulfilled only by their full-time teaching contract.

Whether the costs outweigh the benefits of outside employment for full-time faculty remain unclear. University faculty are recognized for their consulting contracts that bring prestige to their institutions. Outside employment related to their teaching disciplines is often allowed within the AAUP and American Council on Education's conflict of interest policy that allows faculty to divide their time in a variety of activities, including consulting, as long as the "amount of intellectual effort he is actually devoting" is not in question (AAUP, 1977, p. 82). Based on studies regarding policies referencing outside employment, the "one-
"day a week rule" was the most common time limitation given (Boyer and Lewis, 1985, p. 49).

In community colleges, however, outside employment is not perceived as it is at the university level. Boyer and Lewis found only one study examining policies governing outside employment that included community colleges. Allard's study in 1982 showed that fewer community colleges had policies and for those that did, the policies were more restrictive "especially with regard to amount of compensation, time limitations, and prior approval" (Boyer and Lewis, 1985, p. 53).

Community college presidents underestimate the extent to which community college faculty hold outside employment. Generally speaking, presidents believe faculty moonlight for the benefit of extra income. Most chief administrators of community colleges view outside employment negatively. Few agree that outside employment can add credibility and prestige to the classroom. Little attention has been devoted to whether faculty increasingly disengage themselves from their institutions in order to pursue outside employment or if the outside employment itself creates the separation.
Interviews conducted for this study indicated that community college chief administrators underestimate the propensity by full-time faculty to seek outside employment. In fact, most presidents do not know whether they should address the issue or continue to avoid it due to its controversial and political nature.

Moonlighting can be a "public relations nightmare" for both faculty and presidents. Organized faculty efforts generally claim that teaching loads are too burdensome, students are ill prepared and require increasingly more individual help, and student advising and other institutional requirements result in an undue hardship. It would appear that there is time left in a full-time faculty work week for little else. If the extent of moonlighting were fully disclosed, faculty might lose support in their ongoing quests to increase salaries while decreasing contractual obligations.

For college chief executive officers, faculty moonlighting is a political issue. One president argued that if he did not lobby for higher faculty salaries, he would be viewed as not supporting his faculty. His best faculty, then, would be lured away to other systems. If the
community and/or fiscal policymakers are made aware of the fact that faculty hold extra jobs outside of their teaching contracts, sentiment would not be in their favor to pay them good salaries. According to this one president, this is a "Catch 22" situation. One president offered that faculty view the community college as a "womb"--a place where their careers are safe, where they have a guaranteed base salary with a satisfactory retirement package, and where they can do as much or as little as they want elsewhere.

**Conclusions**

Based on this research, several conclusions can be drawn.

1. Full-time community college faculty do moonlight for other than economic reasons. Veteran faculty in community colleges may not lose their initial love for teaching or their dedication to the classroom; but if they become involved in outside employment that progressively captures their interest and time, their institutional commitment may diminish. Without a conscious effort on the part of faculty and administrators together, faculty can and
do fall behind in pedagogy and discipline content; however, the loss of commitment to one's institution in terms of active involvement is viewed less altruistically among faculty. For the large number of community college faculty who do moonlight, outside employment can challenge the "primary" status of their full-time faculty contract. The effect of outside employment may have a positive influence directly on the classroom. The interesting paradox, however, is that the institution often loses due to the diminished involvement on the part of the faculty.

2. This study did not delve into faculty renewal or the kinds of professional development plans that can successfully reverse burnout among faculty. A more closely aligned issue is that if half of community college faculty seek outside employment because of the motivational aspect, college administrators should make a conscious effort to determine what lessons can be learned from the practice to result in a win-win situation for everyone. The practice of job-related paid consulting is simply not discussed among the community college chief administrative ranks. Universities have permitted and even encouraged faculty to secure consulting contracts and research projects that
benefit both the faculty individually and the institution. Community colleges are losing valuable funding sources as well as faculty involvement and expertise when faculty turn in secrecy outside of the institution for opportunities that are rewarding both financially and professionally.

3. As evidenced by this study, community college CEOs are not aware of the extent to which community college faculty moonlight. Most of the presidents and chancellors interviewed had not even thought about the practice or its impact on their institutions. It seems that there are, in fact, valuable lessons to be learned from what faculty do outside of their teaching contracts.

Faculty moonlighting is not a subject easily researched. Discretionary time is a personal issue. Recognizing that community college faculty moonlight to any extent is a political hot bed for administrators. Understanding how to capture the motivation for and resulting benefits to both the faculty and the institution certainly is a worthy pursuit for future study.

4. The understanding among community college faculty about the acceptance of outside employment by their administrations is vague at best. When policies exist, they
may be unclear. There is no general understanding like the "one day a week" rule for consulting in universities. There is confusion over whether outside employment is acceptable at all by policy, to what degree it can be practiced, the nature of the work—whether it is job related or not, and the underlying question of whether moonlighting challenges the professional status of faculty in general.

**Recommendations**

A series of contradictions have been identified. These contradictions are the logical basis for future research and query. These contradictions with recommendations for further study may be used by individual community colleges as a point from which to begin discussions on the career development needs of veteran full-time faculty and the role outside employment of full-time faculty may have in that process. The recommendations are as follows:

1. This study suggests that moonlighting among veteran community college faculty may be prevalent, but moonlighting is generally not discussed openly by faculty and is rarely addressed by college chief executive officers. Faculty in
this study indicate that their primary reason for seeking outside employment is "opportunity." Community college presidents in this study believe faculty moonlight primarily for the additional income. Further study to determine the extent of and motivation specifically for full-time community college faculty to seek outside employment is warranted.

2. Faculty who turn outside for challenging opportunities may become disengaged from their institution; however, if renewal comes from pursuing outside activities, the study of what causes the invigoration and how one's primary role can be enhanced should be pursued. Moonlighting may be viewed as beneficial or detrimental to one's primary faculty role; how it adds or detracts should be studied.

3. This study suggests that faculty who moonlight are seeking new challenges outside of their primary faculty jobs. Institutional professional development programs, then, may not be effective in meeting the individual needs of faculty, thereby falling short in terms of faculty renewal. Administrators must make a conscious effort to learn what motivates veteran faculty in mid-career and to
promote new and challenging opportunities so that they do not have to turn away from their institutions for renewal.

4. Based on this study, few community college faculty know whether a policy exists that speaks to outside employment. Administrators are often noncommittal about the existence or enforcement of policies that regulate outside employment. In many cases there is a policy that requires faculty to notify their supervisors of employment outside of their teaching contract; however, rarely is such a policy enforced. This trend is supported by the literature on policies pertaining to outside employment by faculty. Most administrators admit, however, that unless a problem is brought to light, they might not know whether faculty are engaging in employment outside of their teaching contracts. Most agree that even broaching the subject is risky business. More explicit and clearly articulated policies pertaining to outside employment for full-time community college faculty are in order.

5. This study suggests that moonlighting among full-time community college faculty is rarely discussed; however, longitudinal studies of postsecondary faculty conducted by the U.S. Department of Education indicate that most full-
time faculty have outside employment. Based on this study, moonlighting typically generates a negative connotation; although, most faculty believe that their outside employment enhances their teaching. Institutional benefits and costs as a result of faculty moonlighting warrant further study.

6. The conclusions of this study indicate that full-time community college faculty feel a sense of individual invigoration by pursuing outside employment, yet institutional commitment may be diminished. The model used by Roger Baldwin (Faculty Vitality: Extending the Concept Beyond the Research University) for studying individual and institutional/environmental factors that characterize faculty vitality may be applicable to the further research of the degree to which community college faculty become disengaged as a result of moonlighting, thus, losing institutional vitality.
APPENDIX A

INITIAL LETTER FORMAT AND CRITERIA
Dear

Thank you for agreeing to talk with a member of my staff, Joanna Hanks, regarding the research for her program in Higher Education at The College of William and Mary. Joanna is studying the motivation by community college faculty for seeking outside employment and the resulting effects of that employment on their job performance. I believe that the implications of this study will be meaningful for college presidents in our ongoing effort to retain and energize our faculty.

Joanna will be in touch with you soon to schedule a time that is convenient for her visit to your campus. I identified you as a contact for Joanna because of your commitment to community college education and your innovative spirit. Please share with her any programs and special activities that you have initiated; we can surely benefit from what you are doing at _______________________.

Many thanks for your help, and I will look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,

S. A. Burnette
Criteria for Faculty Interview Identification

1. Must be full-time teaching faculty.

2. Should have at least 10 years of community college teaching with no major interruption to service (e.g., no sabbatical or long-term administrative assignments).

3. Prefer faculty with at least five years at current institution.

4. Faculty position should be a curricular teaching position (versus continuing education or assignment to business/industry training).
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
QUESTIONS FOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

1. Is there a policy pertaining to outside employment for faculty at your institution?

2. If so, under whose jurisdiction does the policy exist (i.e., college policy, system policy)?

3. How strictly or leniently is the policy enforced?

   Why?

4. What do you think is the primary motivation for faculty to seek outside employment?

5. In your opinion, are there other reasons?

6. Do you consider outside employment to be a contributor or a detractor from a faculty member's job?

   How or Why?
QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

1. How long have you been a faculty member at this institution?

2. In what type of employment outside of your faculty contract do you participate?

3. When did you enter this employment?

4. What was your primary reason for seeking outside employment?

5. What additional advantages do you experience from this activity?

6. How does your employment outside of the institution affect your faculty position?

7. Is there a policy at your institution that governs outside employment of faculty members?

    If so, under whose jurisdiction was the policy written (i.e., college policy, system, or state)?

    To what degree is such a policy enforced?

8. How is outside employment viewed by the administration of your college?
9. How might outside employment be incorporated in the professional development plans of faculty?

10. As a "veteran" faculty member (10 or more years), how would you describe "burnout" as it relates to your profession?
APPENDIX C

GRIDS/CODED DATA
## FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location City, State</th>
<th>Tchg. Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patti Trainer</td>
<td>Pikes Peake CC</td>
<td>Pikes Peake</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bumgardner</td>
<td>Mountain Empire CC</td>
<td>Big Stone Gap</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Warren</td>
<td>Lord Fairfax CC</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Tollerson</td>
<td>Collin Cty. CC</td>
<td>Mc Kinny</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Bierchen</td>
<td>Petersburg Jr. C.</td>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth Collins</td>
<td>Central Piedmont CC</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Pretti</td>
<td>State Technical Inst.</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam O'Dell</td>
<td>Walters State CC</td>
<td>Morristown</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Galliday</td>
<td>Santa Fe CC</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendall Fowler</td>
<td>Mountain Empire CC</td>
<td>Big Stone Gap</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Wilson</td>
<td>Virginia Highlands CC</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Jackson</td>
<td>Fresno City CC</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Watson</td>
<td>Fresno City CC</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Timblin</td>
<td>Central Piedmont CC</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Lang</td>
<td>Central CC</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Fisher-Lawson</td>
<td>Elgin CC</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Lewis</td>
<td>Lord Fairfax CC</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moe Rucker</td>
<td>Central CC</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Madonna</td>
<td>CC of Rhode Island</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACULTY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th># Yrs. Tchg/Current Inst.</th>
<th># Yrs. Tchg/Total CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty B</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty G</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty H</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty J</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty K</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty L</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty O</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Q</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty S</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Employed Outside?</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty D</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty E</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty F</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty G</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty H</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty I</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty J</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty K</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty L</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty N</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty O</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Q</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty R</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty S</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty T</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>*Extent of Moon.</td>
<td>Reg. by Policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty J</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty K</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extent of Moonlighting

Very Little, 10% or less = 1
Considerable, 25% or less = 2
Extensive, 40-50%+ = 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current Inst.</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Anthony</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Collin Cty. CC</td>
<td>Mc Kinny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Beck</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Lord Fairfax CC</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Barton</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Greenville Tech.</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Dresser</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Central CC</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gollattscheck</td>
<td>Former Pres. (ret)</td>
<td>Valencia CC</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Groves</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Texas State Tech.</td>
<td>Waco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Listen</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>CC of Rhode Island</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold McAninch</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>College of DuPage</td>
<td>Glen Ellyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Mellinger</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mississippi Gulf Coast CC</td>
<td>Perkinston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Moriarty</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Portland CC</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunder Myran</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Washtenaw CC</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Owen</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Piedmont CC</td>
<td>Roxboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Pietak</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Joliet Jr. College</td>
<td>Joliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Smith</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Illinois Eastern CC</td>
<td>Olney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Stewart</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>State Center CC District</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Wygal</td>
<td>Former President</td>
<td>Florida CC at Jacksonville</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Zeiss</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Central Piedmont CC</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>*Extent of Moon.</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Contributor/Detractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C (maybe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ 1st; stimulation 2nd</td>
<td>D (maybe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>real entrepreneurs; prestige</td>
<td>C (maybe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never been asked this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ makes them happy</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ and maybe do something different</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>D (probably)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ and stay current</td>
<td>C (maybe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ and credibility</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ (must, no summer employment)</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extra income</td>
<td>No idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keeps 'em fired up</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extra income</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated Extent of Faculty Moonlighting

Very Little, 10% or less = 1
Considerable, 25% or less = 2
Extensive, 40-50%+ = 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reg. by Policy?</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Policy Enforced?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>College/State</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Gov. Board</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO J</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Q</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE FOLLOWUP LETTER
January 28, 1993

Dr. Paul Heath, President
Elgin Community College
1700 Spartan Drive
Elgin, IL 60123-7193

Dear Dr. Heath:

Please accept my thanks for a marvelous visit to your college last week. Your campus is extraordinarily beautiful--even in the fog!

I appreciate the time that all of you took in explaining your economic development efforts, and the materials you shared will be very helpful. You certainly do have a varied program and are innovative in your instructional delivery. Most of all I was impressed with how everyone seems to work so well together.

I am especially grateful for the opportunity to talk with you regarding my dissertation study. Your open and honest answers to my probing questions provided a rare opportunity of access to your many years of service as a community college president. I am flattered that you found the topic to be so intriguing and of potential value to community college leaders. Perhaps it will be worthy of reading some day.

Give my best to your wife, Mary; I was sorry to learn of her recent hospitalization. Both of you should come to beautiful Virginia in the spring; we'd like to show you our college.

Gratefully,

Joanna D. Hanks, Director
Economic Development
APPENDIX E

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES
LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Interviews were conducted over a period of two and one-half years. At the time of each interview, the following biographical data were accurate for each interviewee:

Presidents and System Chancellors (CEOs) (and others)

Anthony, John H., President, Collin County Community College, McKinney, Texas

Beck, Marilyn, President, Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown, Virginia

Barton, Tom, President, Greenville Technical College, Greenville, South Carolina, 1962-present

DiCroce, Deborah M., President, Piedmont Community College, Charlottesville, Virginia

Dresser, Judy, President, President, Central Community College, Hastings, Nebraska, 1990-present; 14 years in Oregon

Gollattscheck, James F., retired; previously, President, Valencia Community College, Orlando, Florida; Executive Vice President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC--now AACC)

Groves, Cecil L., Chancellor, Texas State Technical College System, Waco, Texas; former president in Colorado

Heath, Paul, President, Elgin Community College, Elgin, Illinois

Keller, George, Editor, Johns Hopkins Press, author and former professor, Maryland.
Lansinger, Peggy, Former Manager for Employee Relations, Virginia Community College System, Richmond, Virginia

Listen, Ed, President, Community College of Rhode Island, Warwick, Rhode Island, 1978-1993; 5 years as Chancellor of Los Angeles Community College District; 7 years as a community college president in Connecticut

McAninch, Harold D., President, College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, Illinois

Mellinger, Barry, President, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, Perkinston, Mississippi

Moriarty, Daniel F., President Portland Community College, Portland, Oregon; previously in Maryland

Myran, Gunder A., President, Washtenaw Community College, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Oliver, Arnold R., Chancellor, Virginia Community College System, Richmond, Virginia

Owen, H. James, Piedmont Community College, Roxboro, North Carolina; previously President of Gilford Technical Community College, North Carolina and Northeast State Technical College, Tennessee

Pietak, Raymond A., President, Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois, 1984-present; previously as a president in New York, Missouri, Michigan, and Pennsylvania

Roeseller, Elmo, (Retired) Vice Chancellor of Research, Virginia Community College System, Richmond, Virginia

Smith, Harry V., Chancellor, Illinois Eastern Community Colleges, Olney, Illinois; previously in Arkansas

Smith, Marshall, President, John Tyler Community College, Richmond, Virginia; former Vice Chancellor, Virginia Community College System
Stewart, Bill F., Chancellor, State Center Community College District, Fresno, California, 1985-present; previously as president in Alaska, Oregon, and Iowa

Wygal, Benjamin R., President, Florida Community College at Jacksonville, Jacksonville, Florida, 1970-1984; previously, Interim President at Union College, Lincoln, Nebraska

Zeiss, Tony, President, Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina, 1992-present; previously, President, Pueblo Community College, Pueblo, Colorado
Full-Time Teaching Faculty

Bierchen, Jo, Nursing, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Florida

Bumgarner, Gary, Business Management, Mountain Empire Community College, Big Stone Gap, Virginia

Collins, Mary Beth, Sociology, Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina


Fowler, Wendall, Engineering, Mountain Empire Community College, Big Stone Gap, Virginia

Galliday, Joan, Mathematics, Santa Fe Community College, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Gossett, Bonnie, Medical Laboratory Technology, Greenville Technical College, Greenville, South Carolina

Jackson, Jeannette, Computer Information Systems, Fresno City Community College, Fresno, California

Lang, Brad, Agriculture, Central Community College, Hastings, Nebraska

Lewis, Bill, Mechanical Engineering, Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown, Virginia

Madonna, Edward A., Mathematics, Community College of Rhode Island, Warwick, Rhode Island

O'Dell, Sam R., History, Walters State Community College, Morristown, Tennessee

Pretti, Mary, Accounting, State Technical Institute, Memphis, Tennessee
Rucker, Moe, Horticulture, Central Community College, Hastings, Nebraska

Timblin, George, Engineering, Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina

Tolleson, Martha, English, Collin County Community College, McKinney, Texas

Trainer, Patti, Business, Pikes Peake Community College, Pikes Peake, Colorado

Warren, Bill, Physics, Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown, Virginia

Watson, Don, Psychology/Counseling, Fresno Community College, Fresno, California

Wilson, Helen, English, Virginia Highlands Community College, Abingdon, Virginia
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