1987

# Growth Contracting In The Small College

Patrick Allen
*George Fox University*, patrickallenauthor@gmail.com

III.6

# Growth Contracting in the Small College

A. PATRICK ALLEN

> Hard times are producing nothing less than a complete change in the character of our institutions of higher learning. Every aspect of their work is being affected. Their faculty, their students, their organization, their methods, their teaching, and their research are experiencing such alteration that we who knew them in the good old days shall shortly be unable to recognize them. Many changes are for the better. Others may wreck the whole system (Hutchins 1933, p. 714).

Although these words were written during the great depression of the 1930s, they read as though they were printed in a recent issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education.* The 1980s will probably be characterized as the second great depression for all of higher education, but the small college has been in perennial trouble. Looking back on the relatively stable era of the 1950s, McGrath writes (1961, p. vi):

> Severe financial problems related to the curriculum already exist in the independent liberal arts colleges. Indeed, their status in the structure of higher education and in the whole of American Society now rests in the balance. The outcome will be determined very largely by the willingness of faculty members to view the entire life of the college objectively, including their own special interests . . . If the crisis deepens without appropriate faculty action, the tradition of faculty control of the curriculum will necessarily be abrogated by those who have the legal and moral responsibility to preserve and advance the welfare of these colleges (1961, vi).

and ten years later, Astin cautions (1972, pp. 10–11):

> If the state college and the junior college can be regarded as the second-class citizens of higher education, then the invisible college is the third-class citizen, the unassimilated, the "outsider." It faces most of the same problems as the other two but always on a more severe scale . . . Of all institutions of higher education, invisible colleges are the most likely to become extinct.

What are some of these severe problems that face the small college, and militate against faculty development efforts? Centra's comprehensive survey of faculty development activities in the United States reveals that fewer than 40 percent of smaller colleges had any type of developmental unit on campus ten years ago (1978, p. 161). This was probably due to a lack of funds rather than a lack of commitment. Sutton adds that faculty development efforts in smaller institutions tend to be focused on the curriculum, have less organization than in larger institutions, and do not meet developmental needs (1978, pp. 1–5). Another problem is that many small–college faculty members feel overwhelmed by the sheer variety of things expected of them (Lowman 1984, p. 214), and institutional expectations conflict with the predominant pattern of professional success in higher education (Miller and Wilson 1963, p. 3). When we add to all of this the fact that faculty in smaller colleges often suffer from various forms of isolation owing to such things as very small departments and rural locations (Smith 1979, pp. 3–7), it is no wonder that Akin calls faculty development in liberal arts colleges the "unfinished agenda for the 80's" (1984).

All this is not to say that being small does not have its advantages. Being small does permit the institution to change more rapidly than a large institution, and often this change process can involve an entire academic department or division with very little difficulty (Bergquist and Phillips 1975, p. 204). Smaller colleges may also benefit by having developmental activities not only run for faculty but also by the faculty (Centra 1976, p. 6), thus enhancing faculty "ownership" of the program. Parsons adds that smaller institutions can more effectively involve part–time faculty in instructional development activities (1980, p. 54). There is also evidence that small-college faculty development programs are more cost-effective (Eble 1985, p. 216), involve a higher percentage of the total faculty as participants (Jordan 1978, p. 17), and have a greater impact on the life of the institution (Gaff 1975, p. 168).

In summary, the small college is fighting for its survival and has been fighting for at least the past fifty years. An effective faculty development program will, undoubtedly, enhance the vitality of these institutions and their efforts to renew from within. However, many factors such as professional isolation, heavy teaching loads, and limited financial resources work against the best intentions. On the other hand, as we noted, there is growing evidence that faculty development programs at smaller institutions are not only cost-effective, but also have a greater impact on the institution. Therefore, while smaller colleges often face more severe versions of the same problems pressing all of higher education today, their size may in the last analysis be their biggest asset rather than the deadly liability that it is often made out to be.

# Background to Growth-Contracting Programs

Before reviewing the literature concerning growth-contracting faculty development programs, it will be helpful to provide a brief critique of two concepts which provided a springboard for the growth-contracting movement—adult development and management by objectives.

## *Adult Development*

One of the central themes of adult development is that, like children, adults grow and move through identifiable life stages. In his seminal work on adult development, *Childhood and Society,* Erikson discusses the following adult stages and the corresponding developmental task for each stage.

| Developmental Stage | Primary Resolution |
|---|---|
| Adolescence | Identity vs. Role Confusion |
| Young Adulthood | Intimacy vs. Isolation |
| Adulthood | Generativity vs. Stagnation |
| Old Age | Ego Integrity vs. Despair |

Erikson states that the principal task of adult life is the quest of a sense of generativity—to leave one's mark by producing something that will endure (1963, pp. 227-32). Other stage models have been developed that build on Erikson's work, and include the concept of transition points as well as the idea of adult stages. For example, Loevinger offers a model with five adult stages and two transition levels (1976, p. 19). Levinson's model, on the other hand, features a person's "life structure" that evolves in an orderly sequence through five stages and four transition points including the now familiar "mid-life transition" (1978, p. 41). As with Erikson's model, these theories suggest that specific key issues must be resolved before one can move through a transition period and on to the next developmental stage.

Dalton applies the stage model to professional careers, and describes four unique stages of career development—apprentice, colleague, mentor, and sponsor (1976, p. 23). Ralph suggests that faculty must grow through these stages in their professional careers, and that effective faculty development programs must "reflect the fact of the growth of increasingly complex ways of thinking and acting" (1973, p. 61). Hodgkinson adds that faculty are "like other mature human beings and continue to grow psychologically" throughout their lives (1974, p. 264), and faculty development efforts must recognize the developmental nature of faculty if such programs are to be effective in meeting real needs (Bergquist and Phillips 1975, p. 181; Gross 1977, p. 752; Claxton and Murrell 1984, p. 40).

Faculty development can thus be understood as part of a specialized socialization process for teaching professionals in higher education (Brim and Wheeler 1966, p. 27). In addition to the idea that faculty development is actually a part of the process of socialization, adult-developmentalists have made several other contributions to our understanding of faculty development. First, adults are not static, but move through identifiable life stages. Second, professionals move through distinct career stages as well. Third, faculty members are professionals *and* people. Faculty development programs must recognize and allow for these growth and socialization factors if they are to be effective in promoting meaningful and lasting change.

## *Management by Objectives*

> "Cheshire-Puss," Alice began . . . "would you tell me please, which way I ought to go from here?" "That depends on where you want to get to," said the cat. (Carroll 1971, pp. 56-7)

As the Cheshire cat reminded Alice, a road map is of little use until you know where you are and where you want to be. Management by objectives (MBO) is essentially an organizational process designed to foster agreement between the employee and a supervisor as to specific performance objectives and means of assessment. Raia defines management by objectives as (1974, p. 11)

> A philosophy of management (proactive) (participative) and a process consisting of a series of interdependent and interrelated steps: (1) the formulation of clear, concise statements of objectives; (2) the development of realistic action plans for their attainment; (3) the systematic monitoring and measuring of performance and achievement; and (4) the taking of the corrective actions necessary to achieve the planned results.

In practice, MBO works in the following way. The subordinate and superior mutually establish and agree on objectives to be accomplished. Action plans are then developed and converted into individual work plans. Periodic progress reviews and formal appraisals follow, which allow management to provide rewards based on performance (accomplishment of objectives). Before objectives and work plans can be developed, however, it is essential for the organization to establish and communicate long-range goals, strategic plans, and overall organizational objectives in order to insure that individual plans are tied to organizational needs and priorities.

Management by objectives was the most popular method used in management development programs during the 1950s (Glueck 1974, p. 385). Since then, MBO has been used in a wide variety of organizations in both the public and private sectors with an interesting array of outcomes. S. J. Carroll and H. L. Tosi review the application of MBO in sixty English firms and report that MBO helps to identify problems and improve the overall developmental climate (1973, p. 12). Management by objectives has also been reported to help clarify mission and goals, increase productivity, promote the understanding of organizational goals (Carroll and Tosi 1973, pp. 11–13), and increase job satisfaction on the part of participants (Ivancevich 1972, p. 135).

Management by objective programs have been instituted in a variety of educational settings. At the secondary level, MBO has been employed primarily wtih school boards (Moberly and Stiles 1978) and with school administrators (Heiman 1978). I. I. Dow reviews several MBO studies in secondary schools and concludes that "a modified MBO program can work in education," and will "provide the identity, commitment, and motivation necessary for creating growth in a professional organization" (1981, pp. 379–85). In higher education, MBO programs have been implemented in many colleges and universities including the University of Tennessee, William Rainey Harper College, Brigham Young University, and the University of Utah (Temple 1973, p. 99). Heaton concludes that MBO can work in higher education and may provide an answer to the call for accountability by a wide variety of constituent groups (1975, p. 2; Fleming 1978, p. 28).

MBO has been used with administrators and faculty alike. Pearlman relates how Roosevelt University developed an "Administration by Objectives" program (1975, p. 5). At the University of Massachusetts, a similar program is called the "Management Review and Analysis Program" (Fretwell 1976, p. 4).

Winstead explains how MBO was implemented at Furman University as an aid for the institutional planning process (1977, p. 2). In spite of the fact that a workbook has been developed to assist in the step-by-step establishment of a faculty MBO program at a college or university (Deegan and Fritz 1975, p. 246), comprehensive MBO programs targeted at the faculty have not produced entirely positive results. Marsh reports that MBO can support a "multifaceted faculty evaluation model" based on mutually agreed upon criteria for evaluation between a faculty member and the department chair (1979, pp. 44–8). Wooten cautions, however, that an appraisal system employing management by objectives will be ineffective unless faculty members are allowed to participate in the administration of their areas (1980, pp. 208–10).

Cravens and Ross present a management by objectives model for faculty (based on the work of Odiorne), and cite these advantages (1976, p. 13):

> increased faculty productivity; involvement of faculty in the establishment of long and short-term goals (department and college); eliminate rivalry between faculty members; and provide deans with more specific knowledge of faculty accomplishments and constraints preventing objective accomplishment.

Their MBO model is based on three assumptions: a planning period of twelve months, department heads viewed as administrators, not coordinators; and departments and colleges *with* goals—established through faculty participation (1976, p. 14). The third assumption, established goals through faculty participation, may greatly reduce the number of colleges where this model is relevant.

Two additional studies report mixed results. Terpstra utilized "pre" and "post" questionnaires measuring perceptions of performance and satisfaction, and found that during an MBO application, faculty reported an increase in performance but a decline in satisfaction (1982, p. 353). Shetty and Carlisle, after conducting an exploratory study of faculty reactions to an application of management by objectives in a university setting concluded (1974, p. 78):

> Goal setting in a university setting would increase awareness of organizational goals, improve planning, and improve evaluation: however, faculty consistently complained of (1) excessive paperwork, (2) insufficient involvement, (3) lack of departmental goals, (4) difficulty in setting goals, and (5) inadequate reviews and feedback.

Why is it that MBO programs are more successful with college and university administrators than with faculty? The key seems to be that faculty members do not always feel that they have a vital role in institutional governance. Nash points out that MBO will not work "by itself" — it must be "linked to strategy and image, based on a true spirit of participation" (1983, p. 15). Richardson criticizes MBO programs that fail to include the "means of developing a supportive governance structure, but simply focus on clearly defined organizational goals and priorities" (1975, p. 309). Reid seems to summarize the criticisms of MBO for faculty (1974, p. 286):

> If we have not assured that the organizational context can support the required behavior through goal setting, sharing of objectives, developmental opportunities, self-control and recognition for achievement of predetermined goals, then we may instead be launching individuals into a period of frustration and disenchantment.

Before leaving this section on management by objectives, we will briefly trace its evolution, and examine its contribution to the development of a process that addresses at least some of the faculty concerns cited above as shortcomings of an MBO process in higher education.

Although Drucker is often credited with the invention of the term "management by objectives," he gives the credit to Alfred Sloan of General Motors. "I didn't invent the term 'management by objectives'; actually Alfred Sloan used it in the 1950's. But I put it in a central position, whereas to him it was just a side effect" (Tarrant 1976, p. 77). Drucker placed MBO in a central position by insisting that "the manager should be directed and controlled by the objectives of performance rather than by his boss" (1954, p. 137). "It is the manager's specific job to make what is desirable first possible and then actual" (p. 12) . . . and "the only principle that can do this is management by objectives and self-control" (1954, p. 136).

During the 1960s, the concept of management by objectives broadened as a result of the influence of McGregor, Schleh, and Odiorne. McGregor subtitles his Theory-Y approach Management by Objectives, and promotes "management by integration" by arguing that "external control and threat of punishment are not the only means of bringing about effort toward organizational goals or objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed" (1960, pp. 47-8). Schleh introduced management by results — a slight modification of the MBO original process. He believes that a manager must focus on final results in order to integrate the work of the individual with the overall objectives of the institution (1961, p. 6). Odiorne expanded Drucker's original idea of MBO and set it in systems terms (1965). While a Dean at the University of Utah, Odiorne promoted the application of MBO in institutions of higher education.

In 1974, Raia highlighted a developmental aspect of MBO applications by citing growth planning as the last step in the MBO process (1974, p. 16). That same year, Buhl and Greenfield pointed out that growth contracting, a recently emerging form of faculty development found primarily in smaller institutions, actually represented a blending of two important concepts — adult development and management by objectives (1975, p. 115). It was not until after these two concepts gained wide understanding and support in higher education during the early 1970s that the growth-contracting movement began to flourish.

# The Growth-Contracting Process

Faculty development programs using growth contracting as their core activity go by a variety of names. Although they are typically called growth-contracting programs, they have also been referred to as growth planning programs (Sikes and Barrett 1976, p. 28), faculty support programs (Gerth 1973, p. 90), personalized faculty development activities (Preus 1979), qualitative growth development programs (Kingsley 1978), and individual activity-performance agreements (Kramer 1976, p. 2).

Whatever the program title, growth contracting is essentially a process whereby a faculty member can contract with the institution for the support necessary to pursue personal and professional growth. Volpe defines a growth contract as a "formal written, systematic outline for role definition, professional growth, and performance appraisal" (1980, p. 16). Seldin's definition is similar—"a plan written by a professor which spells out his self-development, containing his specific goals for the year, each goal accompanied by intended means of accomplishment and assessment, and a required budget" (1981, p. 90). In what follows here, growth contracting will be defined as a three-part faculty development process in which faculty members assess their own professional growth needs, develop a written growth plan, and then contract with the institution for the support necessary to accomplish the proposed plan.

Growth contracting is neither new to higher education nor exclusive to the faculty. Geller advocates the use of growth contracts as a staff development activity for student personnel professionals (1982, p. 20). There were "learning contracts" designed for out-of-class learning and growth for students even before contracting received attention as a faculty development tool (Dulley 1975, p. 53; Linquist 1976, p. 3; Feeney and Riley 1975, p. 10). Bare reports on a successful growth contracting program involving fifty-two administrators in the SUNY system (1983, p. 7). Inasmuch as administrators have more control over discretionary budgets than do individual faculty members, growth contracting may be more swiftly and successfully implemented at the administrative level than at the faculty level.

Growth contracting programs have been developed at many colleges and universities, although primarily at the smaller institutions. Twenty-one institutions were cited by Volpe as having implemented a growth contracting program, and they illustrate the diversity of its appeal: Austin College, Alvin Community College, Azusa Pacific College, College of the Mainland, Elmira College, El Paso Community College, Freed-Hardeman College, Gordon College, Hampshire College, John Brown University, Mankato State College, Ottawa University (Kansas), Spring Arbor College, St. Olaf College, University of Alabama (New College), University of Massachusetts (College of Education), University of Pennsylvania (School of Optometry), University of Texas Medical School, University of Vermont, Wharton County Junior College, and William Jewell College (Volpe 1980, pp. 19–30).

Where did the practice of growth contracting first begin? The answer to this question is not entirely clear. Although Gordon College is often credited as the first institution to develop a growth contracting program, Milley reports that the University of Vermont developed a growth contracting program called the Annual Review Process for Teaching and Learning Specialists in the Spring of 1975—six months before Gordon College began its program (1977, p. 12). What does seem clear is that growth contracting began at about the same time in a wide variety of institutions all across the country in the mid-1970s, and that with the assistance of a large Kellogg Foundation grant, Gordon College quickly became an advocate and a model for other institutions to follow.

While not widely accepted, growth contracting has been touted as a viable substitute for tenure (O'Toole 1978, p. 27). Park suggests that a five year contract with periodic review would provide "greater flexibility both for the individual and the institution, while offering the certainty of five years of a stated and agreed upon contractual relationship" (1972, p. 36). The faculty at Dominican College in San Rafael, California, thought enough of the idea that they voluntarily gave up the tenure system to adopt a system of periodic review (Lavaroni and Savant 1977, p. 499). Dominican College, it should be noted, did not become a trend setter with this move. While the extended contract does have some appeal (especially to non-tenured faculty), supporters of the tenure system argue that it is not able to protect academic freedom in the way tenure does.

The purpose of growth contracts is to "enhance professional competences rather than specific work outcomes" (Bare 1977, p. 3). This is a subtle but important difference between growth contracting and MBO. Volpe outlines three major goals of growth contracting: to define clearly an individual's strengths and weaknesses, to outline an on-going professional development program, and to increase the reliability, validity, and objectivity of an evaluation process (1980, pp. 16–17). Gaff also argues for individual contracting as a means of increasing the objectivity of the evaluation process (1971, p. 480):

> Individual contracts not only allow faculty to work on tasks in which they excel, but also provide an explicit basis for an individualized evaluation. They can assure faculty that they will be evaluated on what they have explicitly agreed to do, a procedure which can correct the situation in some universities where some faculty are hired to teach but evaluated in terms of their research.

A vital aspect of growth contracting is self-evaluation (Bergquist and Phillips 1975, p. 45). Seldin adds that "growth contracts rest on the double assumption that instructors know their shortcomings and are also intent on overcoming them" (1984, p. 147). But are self-evaluations really accurate? Webb and Nolan report that student ratings and instructor self-ratings are highly correlated, but the supervisor's ratings are uncorrelated with any of the measures they obtained (1955, p. 46). In an Allied Health school, growth contracting participants completed the Birkman psychological instrument as a starting point for self-evaluation, but the study concludes that "self-assessments have not proved satisfactory as a means of making comparisons among individuals" (Schaffer 1980, p. 239). It would seem that self-evaluations are quite accurate and adequate for a faculty development program designed to promote faculty growth, but they are inadequate as the sole source of evidence when the intent of the program is evaluation for the purpose of promotion and tenure.

Heie, editor of the first Gordon College Handbook on growth contracts, offers eight broad principles for successful growth contracting (Hale 1979, pp. 3–8):

1. Growth contracting should be individualized to reflect the faculty member's own perceived needs for growth in light of individual strengths and weaknesses.
2. Faculty members are whole persons who need to grow in all areas of professional responsibility as well as in personal areas not directly related to their professions.
3. Within the context of common responsibilities shared by all faculty, there should be opportunities for individualizing the role of a given faculty member on the basis of particular strengths and weaknesses.
4. The success of individual efforts to achieve growth will be best realized when growth contracts are self-designed and self-imposed.
5. Successful growth contracting requires that faculty be specific in their statements of goals and in their descriptions of means of accomplishment and assessment.
6. Growth contracting should be viewed as a means for a faculty member to generate positive evidence in support of promotion and tenure consideration; but the emphasis must be on individual development, with institutional evaluation a secondary by-product.
7. Growth contracting should encourage innovation and experimentation by maximizing the potential for reward for successful attainment of goals while minimizing the penalty for failure.
8. Growth contracting should seek after the ideal of creating a sense of community wherein persons are helping other persons to grow (Heie 1979, 3–8).

Volpe notes that two other keys to success are that institutions should, "once the decision is made to adopt growth contracting, create a unique program in light of the institution's goals/objectives, needs, and character" (1980, p. 70), and they should "create a climate conducive to success: open, honest, supportive, committed, and flexible" (1980, p. 73).

Once the proper principles have been established, the following nine step procedure for implementation is offered by Heie (1979, pp. 49–51).

1. Each professor prepares an individual profile containing a self-assessment, statement of current roles, and long range plans.
2. Faculty members visit with the Dean for a "profile conference."
3. Preparation of first draft of annual individual development plan containing goals, means of accomplishment, means of assessment, and budget proposal.
4. Submission of profile and annual plan to the faculty development committee—third week in October—returned with initial comments—first Monday in November.
5. Preparation of final draft of annual plan.
6. Submission of annual plan—last Monday in November for faculty development committee action—third Monday in December.
7. Carry out annual plan.
8. Assess (according to plan)
9. Submit final report to faculty development committee prior to beginning of Fall term. Process repeats each year.

In summary, growth-contracting programs were greatly influenced by two important concepts—adult development and management by objectives. Growth contracting is a formal process in which faculty members assess their own professional growth needs, develop a written growth plan, and then contract with the institution for the support necessary to accomplish the proposed growth plan. Growth contracts have been applied in a variety of settings with faculty, staff, and administration, but are primarily used in smaller colleges and universities. Growth contracting has successfully utilized self-evaluation, but this approach may prove to be ineffective if the process is also used as an evaluation tool for faculty promotion and tenure decisions. General principles for growth contracting have been established, and a step-by-step procedure can be followed to operate the program on an annual basis.

# Evaluation of Results

While there is a good deal of support for the concept of growth contracting in higher education today, we know more about ways to establish and operate a growth-contracting program than whether growth-contracting programs are effective. In this section, three related questions will be discussed. First, what is the best way to evaluate growth-contracting programs? Second, what results have been reported concerning the performance of growth-contracting programs? Third, should performance evaluations (rank and tenure decisions) be integrated as part of the growth-contracting evaluation process?

As with faculty development programs in general, the most effective method for evaluating the performance of a growth contracting program is the case study method utilizing data for a variety of sources (Wergin 1977, p. 70; Preus 1977, p. 46; Milley 1977, p. 53; Volpe 1980, p. 34). The best supporting evidence for this approach comes from Milley. In her dissertation, her research problem was to examine various methods of evaluation and determine the most effective method for evaluating the performance of a growth-contracting program in a small college setting. Her study concluded that a case study utilizing interviews, questionnaires, and thorough analysis of program documentation was the superior method (Milley 1977, p. 33).

In a related study (and one of a very few dissertations to focus on growth contracting), Volpe supported Milley's findings with regard to the case study method (1980, p. 34). However, his study examined only the extent to which a growth-contracting program met its first-year objectives. Centra cautions that it is as important to appraise the content of the growth contracts as it is to measure the program's progress toward meeting its objectives. If this is not done, faculty members' plans "may become simple listings of conferences that they would like to attend, trips that they want to take, and the like" (Centra 1979, p. 68). The obvious implication of Centra's concern is that a program can meet its objectives and really not be a success—particularly if the objectives are inappropriate.

If it is not enough simply to find out whether the program met its objectives, then how is program performance measured? A promising approach is to use "documentable indicators of program performance." Although Milley briefly discussed the topic (1977, pp. 191-2), Eble provides the first comprehensive list of documentable performance indicators (1985, p. 158). Allen utilized a list of documentable indicators to compare a growth-contracting program's performance over five years on a year-to-year basis at varying levels of funding (1986).

What impact can growth contracting programs have on their institutions? Baldwin suggests that these programs can enhance the range of options open to mid-career faculty, and outcomes often "far exceed the modest commitment of institutional funds required to support it" (1984, p. 49). Hodgkinson noted that "the widespread adoption of something like the faculty growth contract might help convince the public that college and university teachers really do want to improve their professional competence" (1973, p. 119). Unfortunately, there is no evidence at this time to support Hodgkinson's assertion that public confidence is strengthened by faculty growth contracting.

Heie at Gordon College cites six beneficial outcomes of faculty growth contracting (1979, p. 31):

> improved communication between faculty and administration; the establishment of a reasonable and satisfying reward system; the implementation of a wide variety of self-improvement projects; assisted faculty in identifying their strengths and weaknesses; encouraged faculty to do things they would not have done otherwise; and information developed during the growth contracting period aided in personnel decisions.

In Volpe's investigation of a growth contracting program, however, the results were not so positive. He found that (1980, p. 63):

> faculty and administrators had different views of faculty development and evaluation, promotion and tenure, and the reward system; the method used to introduce growth contracting was responsible in part for its failure; growth contracting had a negative effect on a number of faculty and administrators; the objectives of the program were not accomplished; and input from the faculty in the design and development of the program was not requested.

Although Volpe did not draw any clear conclusions, the implication of his findings is that the failure of the program was a result of inept management rather than some flaw in the nature of the growth-contracting process.

There has been considerable support for the idea that growth contracts should be tied to the institutional reward system (Gross 1977, p. 76). Smith argued (1976, p. 61):

> What is needed in higher education today, if we are to have truly effective teaching, are policies and programs that combine the concepts of faculty development and evaluation into one program at the department and/or college level. Growth contracts provide the best available approach for achieving this end. A climate of trust can be developed when the growth contracting process serves both the faculty development and faculty evaluation functions of a department, college, or university.

Hodgkinson advocated growth contracts because they are "one of the few procedures where assessment techniques (built-in) were supportive of educational objectives" (1973, p. 119). Seldin notes that institutions "could use growth contracting to get away from generalities about good teaching and research, and focus in on (or tie to) instructor's daily activities as well as departmental or institutional needs (1984, p. 123). But though these writers present a strong argument for including evaluation and development in the same program, there is yet to be a single positive report concerning a growth-contracting program where it was the only institutional means of faculty evaluation for the purpose of promotion and tenure (Volpe 1980, p. 63; Carlberg 1981, p. 26). This probably reflects the fact that growth contracting works best on a voluntary basis, and faculty members provide more accurate self-evaluations in a climate of trust (Carlberg 1981, p. 26). Personnel evaluations militate against these important conditions. All this is not to say that growth contracting could not be included as part of a faculty evaluation program, but the success of the program would be enhanced if it were only one of several evaluation tools for promotion and tenure rather than the single tool used.

In summary, the best method of evaluation for a growth contracting program is the case study method using data from multiple sources. Growth contracting can have many positive outcomes for the institution, but inept management can easily cause the program to fail. Growth-contracting programs may provide important input for the faculty evaluation process concerning promotion and tenure decisions, but if it is the primary source for evaluative information, the program will probably be less than successful.

In this article, the concept of growth contracting has been presented as a viable faculty development option—particularly in the small college. Growth contracting grew in popularity in the early 1970s and was an outgrowth of two other movements—adult development and management by objectives (MBO). The history, operating principles, and evaluation of results of growth contracting are offered in the hope that other colleges might attempt to implement a program. The need for an effective faculty development program is great—precisely when the faculty development movement seems to be running out of gas.

# References

Akin, W. E., ed. *Faculty Development in Liberal Arts Colleges: An Unfinished Agenda for the 80's.* Collegeville, Pa.: Ursinus College, 1984.

Allen, A. P. "The Relationships of Growth Contracting to Levels of Financial Support: A Case Study." Unpublished dissertation. University of Oklahoma, 1986.

Astin, A. W., and C. B. T. Lee. *The Invisible Colleges.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Astin, A. W., et al. "Faculty Development in the Time of Retrenchment." *Change* 6 (1974): pp. 43-56.

Baldwin, R. G. "The Changing Development Needs of an Aging Professoriate." *New Directions in Teaching and Learning, No. 19.* Ed. C. M. N. Mehrotra. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Bare, A. C. "Individual Development Planning in Academic Settings." *College and University Personnel Association Journal* 28.4 (1977): pp. 1-7.

———. "Results of an Administrator Career Development Program." Paper. International Conference on Improving University Teaching. Dublin, Ireland, 1983.

Bergquist, W. H., and S. R. Phillips. *A Handbook for Faculty Development.* Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges 1975.

———. *A Handbook for Faculty Development—Volume II.* Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges 1977.

———. "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program." *Journal of Higher Education* 46 Mar/Apr. 1975: pp. 171-203.

Brim, O. G. Jr., and S. Wheeler. *Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays.* New York: Wiley, 1966.

Buhl, L. C., and A. Greenfield. "Contracting for Professional Development in Academe." *Educational Record* 56.2 (1975): pp. 111-21.

Carroll, S. J., and H. L. Tosi. *Management by Objectives: Applications and Research.* New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Centra, J. A. *Determining Faculty Effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

———. *Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

———. "Plusses and Minuses for Faculty Development." *Change* 9 (1977): pp. 47–9.

———. "Self-Ratings of College Teaching: A Comparison with Student Ratings." *The Utility of Student Ratings for Instructional Improvement.* Ed. J. A. Centra. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

———. "Survey of Faculty Development Practices." *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education* 2.4 (1976): pp. 2–6.

———. "Types of Faculty Development Programs." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 Mar./Apr. 1978: pp 151–62.

Claxton, C., and P. Murrell. "Developmental Theory as a Guide for Maintaining the Vitality of College Faculty." *Teaching and Aging. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 19.* Ed. M. N. Mehrotra. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Cravens, D. W., and J. B. Ross. "Management By Objectives in a University Environment." *American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business Bulletin* 12 (1976): pp. 12–20.

Dalton, G. W., and P. H. Thompson. "Are R&D Organizations Obsolete?" *Harvard Business Review* 54 Nov./Dec. 1976: pp. 105–116.

Deegan, A. X., and R. Fritz. *MBO Goes to College.* Boulder, Col.: Bureau of Independent Study, 1975.

Dow, I. I. "Participatory Supervision in Education: A Must For the Eighties." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 27.4 (1981): pp. 375–86.

Drucker, P. F. *Managing in Turbulent Times.* New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

———. *The Practice of Management.* New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Dulley, J. "Out-of-Class Contract Learning at Justin Morrill College." *New Directions for Higher Education* 3.2 (1975): pp. 53–64.

Eble, K. E., and W. J. McKeachie. *Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Erikson, E. H. *Childhood and Society.* 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1963.

Feeney, J., and G. Riley. "Learning Contracts at New College, Sarasota." *New Directions for Higher Education.* Ed. N. Berte. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Fleming, T. "Accountability: Some Considerations of a Continuing Education Dilemma." *The Journal of Educational Thought* 12.1 (1978): pp. 28–36.

Fretwell, G., et al. *A Management Review and Analysis of the University of Massachusetts.* Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1976.

Gaff, J. G. "Current Issues in Faculty Development." *Liberal Education* 63.4 (1977): pp. 511–19.

———. "Faculty Development: What Values For Whom?" American Association of Higher Education National Conference. Chicago, 1978.

———. "Involving Students in Faculty Development." *New Directions for Higher Education* 6.4 (1978): pp. 59–71.

———. "Overcoming Faculty Resistence." *New Directions for Higher Education* 6.4 (1978): pp. 43–57.

———. *Toward Faculty Renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Gaff, J. G., and R. C. Wilson. "The Teaching Environment." *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 57.4 (1971): pp. 475–93.

Geller, W. W. "Professional Growth Contracting." *Journal of the NAWDAC* 45.2 (1982): pp. 20–1.

Gerth, D. R. "Institutional Approaches to Faculty Development." *Facilitating Faculty Development. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 1.* Ed. M. Freedman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Glueck, W. F. *Personnel: A Diagnostic Approach.* Dallas: Business Publications, Inc., 1974.

Gross, A. "Twilight in Academe: The Problem of the Aging Professoriate." *Phi Delta Kappan* 58.8 (1977): pp. 752–4.

———. "Faculty Growth Contracts." *Educational Horizons* 55.2 (1977): pp. 74–9.

Heaton, C. P., ed. *Management by Objectives in Higher Education.* Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1975.

Heie, H., et al. *Professional Development Through Growth Contracting Handbook.* Wenham, Mass.: Gordon College, 1979.

Heiman, J. J. "How and Why a School District Implemented MBO." *National Association of Secondary School Principals* 62 (1978): pp. 36–45.

Hodgkinson, H. L. "Adult Development Implications for Faculty and Administrators." *Educational Record* 55 (1974): pp. 263–74.

———. "Faculty Reward and Assessment Systems." *The Tenure Debate.* Ed. B. L. Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

———. *How Much Change for a Dollar: A Look at Title III.* Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1974.

Hutchins, R. M. "Hard Times and the Higher Learning." *Yale Review* 22 (1933): p. 714.

Ivancevich, J. M. "Longitudinal Assessment of Management By Objectives." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17.1 (1972): pp. 126–38.

Jordan, T. S. *An Examination of the Self Report Status and Effectiveness of Faculty Development Functions at Higher Education Institutions Within the United States.* Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland State University, 1978.

Kingsley, J. G. "Choosing Qualitative Growth: Faculty Development at William Jewell College." *The Southern Baptist Educator* 3 (1978): pp. 12–15.

Kramer, J. L. "Some Suggestions for the Management of Human Resources: Procedures at Camelot State College." *Memo to the Faculty.* Manhattan, Ks.: Kansas State University, 1976.

Lavaroni, C. W., and J. J. Savant. "Replacing Tenure with Periodic Review." *Phi Delta Kappan* 58.6 (1977): p. 499.

Levinson, D. J., et al. *The Seasons of a Man's Life.* New York: Knopf, 1978.

Lindquist, J. "Contract Learning Innovation Process in Higher Education." Paper. National Conference on Higher Education, Mar. 1975.

———. "Professional Development." *The Modern American College.* Ed. A. Chickering. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Loevinger, J. *Ego Development: Conceptions and Theories.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Lowman, J. *Mastering the Techniques of Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Marsh, R. L. "Management by Objectives: A Multifaceted Faculty Evaluation Model." *Educational Technology* 19.11 (1979): pp. 44–48.

Miller, W. S., and K. M. Wilson. *Faculty Development Procedures in Small Colleges.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Educational Board, 1963.

Milley, J. E. "A Case Study Approach to the Evaluation of a Faculty Development Program Which Uses Individual Development Plans." Unpublished Dissertation. Syracuse University, 1977.

Moberly, D. L., and L. J. Stiles. "Getting a School Board to Address Its Primary Tasks." *Phi Delta Kappan* 60.3 (1978): pp. 46–53.

McGrath, E. J. *Memo to a College Faculty Member.* New York: Columbia University, 1961.

McGregor, D. *The Human Side of Enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Nash, M. *Managing Organizational Performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Odiorne, G. S. *Management By Objectives: A System of Managerial Leadership.* New York: Pitman, 1965.

Odiorne, G. S. *Management Decisions by Objectives.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

———. *Strategic Management of Human Resources.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

O'Toole, J. "Tenure—A Conscientious Objection." *Change* 10.6 (1978): pp. 24–31.

Park, D. "Down With Tenure." *Change* 4.2 (1972): 32–7.

Parsons, M. H., et al. "Using Part-Time Faculty Effectively." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 8.2 (1980): pp. 28–56.

Perlman, D. H. *Management By Objectives in a University—A Progress Report.* New Orleans, Louisiana, 1975. ERIC ED 123 965.

Preus, P. K., and D. F. Williams. *Personalized Faculty Development: Rationale, Applications, and Evaluation.* Bear Creek, Alabama: CESCO Press, 1979.

Raia, A. P. *Management By Objectives.* Glenwood, Ill.: Scott, Foreman, 1974.

Ralph, N. B. "Stages of Faculty Development." *Facilitating Faculty Development. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 1.* Ed. M. Freedman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Reid, T. J. "The Context of Management Development." *Personnel Journal* 53.4 (1974): pp. 280–87.

Richardson, R. C. "Staff Development: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Higher Education* 46.1 (1975): pp. 303–12.

Schaffer, D. R. "A Faculty Growth Contracting Model for Allied Health Schools." *Journal of Allied Health* 9.4 (1980): pp. 239–41.

Schleh, E. C. *Management By Results.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Seldin, P. *Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

———. *Faculty Development: The American Experience.* London: London University, 1976.

———. "Faculty Growth Contracting." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning.* Ed. K. Eble. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

———. "The Second International Conference on Improving University Teaching." *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education* 2.2 (1976): pp. 13–15.

Shetty, Y. K., and H. M. Carlisle. "Application of Management By Objectives in a University Setting: An Exploratory Study of Faculty Reactions." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 10.2 (1974): pp. 65–81.

Sikes, W., and L. Barrett. *Case Studies on Faculty Development.* Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1976.

Smith, A. B. *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education.* ERIC/Higher Education Research Report Number 8. Washington: American Association of Higher Education, 1976.

Smith, H. "Improving Educational Quality While Financial Strength Is Eroding." *New Directions for Higher Education, No. 38.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Smith, J. M. "Smaller College Sociologists Participation in Professional Organizations: Obstacles & Opportunities." Paper. Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society. New Orleans, Mar. 1979.

Sutton, C., and G. W. Armfield. "Staff Development for Small/Rural Community Colleges: Effective Renewal with Less Resources." Paper. National Conference on Small/Rural Colleges. Blackburg, Va., Aug. 1978.

Tarrant, J. J. *Drucker: The Man Who Invented Corporate Society.* Boston: Cahners Books, 1976.

Temple, C. M. "Management By Objectives at the University of Tennessee." *Intellect* 102.2352 (1973): pp 98–100.

Terpstra, D. E., et al. "The Effects of MBO on Levels of Performance and Satisfaction Among University Faculty." *Group and Organization Studies* 7.3 (1982): pp. 353–66.

Volpe, R. J. "Growth Contracting at a Small, Liberal Arts College: A Case Study of Faculty and Administrative Reactions." Unpublished dissertation. University of Pittsburgh, 1980.

Webb, W. B., and C. Y. Nolan. "Student, Supervisor, and Self-Ratings of Instructional Proficiency." *The Journal of Educational Psychology* 46 (1955): pp. 42–6.

Wergin, J. J. "Evaluating Faculty Development Programs." *New Directions For Higher Education* 17.2 (1977): pp. 57–76.

———. "The Practice of Faculty Development." *Journal of Higher Education* 47.3 (1976): pp. 289–309.

Winstead, P. C. "Management By Objectives." Paper. Conference on Running Higher Education. Warrenton, VA 1–4 Feb. 1977.

Wooten, B. "Faculty Appraisal—an MBO Approach." *Journal of Business Education* 55.5 (1980): pp 208–10.