Faculty Publications - School of Education   School of Education

1988

Faculty Development in Higher Education - A Literature Review

Patrick Allen
George Fox University, patrickallenauthor@gmail.com

III.3

Faculty Development in Higher Education
A Review of the Literature

A. Patrick Allen

Faculty development is a familiar term to even a fledgling academician. There is a faculty development program, committee, center, reading room, budget, or instructional developer on almost every campus. There is general agreement that faculty development plays an important role in the vitality of colleges and universities. Yet, there is little agreement about what the term "faculty development" actually means. Webb contends that the term "faculty development" has no universal definition (1977, p. 86).

Since there is no agreement as to the meaning of the term faculty development, it is not surprising to learn that the faculty development movement has been criticized for lacking a unifying theoretical base. During the height of the faculty development boom period (1973–1978), Martin chastised the movement for not having "adequate theory, comprehensive approaches, or a deep intention" (1975, p. 3). Ten years later, this indictment is still being leveled. In a recent evaluation of a major faculty development effort sponsored by the Bush foundation, Eble concluded (1985, p. 182):

> Our conceptualizations of faculty development are not yet well developed. The studies of faculty development cited earlier have categorized faculty development activities, but as yet we know little about how these categories relate to one another, let alone their usefulness in generating hypotheses about what kind of program a particular college should develop . . .

Faculty development has been defined in many ways. Rose defines faculty development as "almost anything a faculty member does outside the classroom" (1976, p. 22). Others expand the definition to include almost everything a faculty member does in or out of the classroom. For example, faculty development has been defined as a set of activities designed to help faculty members function more comfortably and effectively in all their roles (Munson 1975, p. 5; Wergin 1976, p. 291).

Mayhew emphasizes four rather general roles for faculty development: assisting faculty members in making their courses more attractive, creating proposals to attract external funding, developing the ability to solve significant institutional problems, and improving talents in extending professional consulting services (1979, p. 234). Obviously, Mayhew believes that the primary purpose of faculty development is to improve the faculty's ability to generate revenue. His book, intended for small college administrators, was appropriately entitled *Surviving the Eighties.*

Gaff emphasizes the idea of growth and the process of assisting professors in their instructional roles. He defines faculty development as "enhancing the talents, expanding the interests, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their roles as instructors" (1975, p. 14). Francis was one of the first to recognize that an effective faculty development program is really a form of planned change. He views faculty development as an institutional "process of change that attempts to modify the attitudes, skills and behaviors of faculty toward increased effectiveness and efficiency in meeting student, institutional, and personal objectives" (1975, p. 720).

Faculty development has also been conceptualized as a political process (Lacy 1983, p. 95), as a process of environmental modification (Ost 1976, p. 3), and visualized as a "deep-rooted, thick-trunked tree that lately has sprouted new branches" (Linquest 1981, p. 732). The "thick-trunked tree" is instructional development (rooted in the 1960s), and the new branches are organizational development and personal development. These branches began to grow in the 1970s.

Several authors argue that faculty development is a small part of a much larger process. For example,

Boyer and Crockett place faculty development inside the domain of organizational development, which they define as "a planned change strategy emphasizing more effective utilization of human resources of the organization" (1973, p. 340). For Faris, faculty development is a group process for instructional design (1970, p. 131). Whitmore, on the other hand, contends that "faculty development and curriculum redesign are interdependent aspects of the change process" (1981, p. 13).

While there is no agreement as to the precise definition of faculty development, Seldin finds three underlying assumptions of the American faculty development movement. First, teaching is the primary professional activity of most faculty. Second, instructional comportment is a combination of learned skills, attitudes, and goals. Third, faculty members can be taught how to improve their instruction (1976, p. 1). One implication of these assumptions is that the primary focus of faculty development is instructional improvement. This is particularly true of faculty development activities in the small college. However, as Gaff and Justice observe, faculty development has meant different things at different times: once it meant only the intellectual study of a field, but now it calls for a much expanded definition (1978, p. 89).

In summary, faculty development has meant different things at different times and there is no universal definition of the term. One primary emphasis is certainly instructional improvement, but a broader definition is necessary in order to encompass the immense number of activities being promoted today. With these considerations in mind, we may define faculty development as a set of institutionally sponsored activities based on the Human Resource Model, designed to enhance the total growth of faculty members — as persons, as professionals, and as members of their academic communities.

Need for Programs

The boom period for faculty development was from 1973 to 1978. In 1973, a survey of faculty development activities revealed "more plans than programs and models" (Gerth 1973, p. 84). By 1977, the situation had changed dramatically. Centra's study found that over sixty percent of the institutions polled indicated that they had "an organized program or set of practices for faculty development and improvement of teaching" (1977, p. 47), and over two-thirds of the universities had some kind of developmental unit (1978, p. 161). Gaff cautioned, however, that

colleges still needed to institutionalize their efforts (1977, p. 514), or faculty development would become just another educational fad (1978, p. 96). Many more recent observers believe that Gaff's warnings were prophetic (Hendrickson 1982, p. 338; Toombs 1983, p. 86).

There are several theories as to why the faculty development movement did not become firmly established. Toombs argues that the programs focused more on individual needs than on the needs of the institution, thus making them expendable during times of fiscal constraint (1983, p. 86). Another suggestion is that the programs were operating under the misguided assumption that the program of the future is the program of the past: traditional sabbatical leaves, new faculty members, bigger travel budgets, and better facilities, while good things, may no longer be adequate to insure institutional quality (Miller 1972, p. 11; Preus 1979, p. 5). Others contend that the problem is a lack of financial support of faculty development activities. Ellerbe reports that less than one percent of the budget was spent on faculty development activities in his sample of community colleges (1980, 1910), and Eble contends that "faculty development has never had a prominent place in the routine budgets of American collegiate institutions" (1985, p. 8). Probably all of these factors have had an impact on faculty development's failure to take hold as a comprehensive movement.

New students, new programs, low mobility, stable enrollment patterns, harsh economic realities, external demands for quality and accountability, and the "graying of the faculty" all have demanded a new kind of faculty development program (Bergquist 1975, p. 3; Preus 1979, p. 18). Faculty mobility relieved the pressure for (and probably hid the potential of) faculty development during the 1960s and early 1970s (Group 1974, p. 16; Stordahl 1981, p. 1). Now, faculties are not only becoming less mobile, but are growing older as well. The average faculty age in 1979 was 43 years (Higher 1979, p. 5), and this average age is expected to increase to 48 years by 1990 (Gross 1977, p. 752). In fact, "if a child born today attends college at the age of eighteen, his chances of being taught by a person presently on the college faculty are 85 out of 100" (Preus 1979, p. 18). There is some evidence that faculty members develop a stronger interest in teaching — or at best a better interest in research — in the second half of their careers (Blackburn 1979, p. 568; Maehr 1984, p. 82). In addition, many authorities caution that faculty must be prepared to work with new students in new settings, and with new technologies in alternative modes of teaching and learning (Martin 1975,

p. 3; Stordahl 1981, p. 1; Levine 1981, p. 131). These conditions argue for a new type of faculty development program, inasmuch as most institutions will need to develop new responses and approaches with current personnel. Miller refers to seeking renewal from within as "intensive growth" (1974, p. 2). For intensive growth to be successful in a steady-state environment, Gallagher has maintained that faculty development opportunities must be extended to adjunct professors as well (1977, p. 3).

Hershfield points to another need for faculty development. He contends that the technology to improve educational instruction is now available, and if the faculty will not take advantage of it, someone else will (1980, p. 52). It is not clear whether that "someone" is the administration, proprietary schools, or business and industry, but the point is well taken.

A traditional, but often overlooked, problem supporting the need for faculty development programs is the general lack of preparation one receives for the teaching profession. Jacques Barzun's comments at the Conference on College Teaching thirty years ago still ring true (Dobbins 1956, p. 50):

> Just think: here is a profession in which the training does not prepare for the main task, and in the absence of that preparation does not provide apprenticeships; in which, after this double lack, there is no clear judgment of the work done, and in which the superiors of the newcomers do not care whether he succeeds or not in the task that he performs.

The President's Commission on Higher Education concluded in 1948 that college teaching is the only major learned profession that does not have a program to develop the skills essential for its practitioners (Presidents Commission 1948, p. 16). Today, these statements are still valid.

Faculty development programs are needed, according to Lowmand, because of the wide variety iof duties expected of academics (1984, p. 214). Brown simply states that faculty development is needed because self-growth is a professional responsibility (1975, p. 206).

Models for Faculty Development

The crisis in higher education during the mid-1960s began the search for new models of faculty development (Bergquist 1977, p. 3). In 1983, Sullivan, who first identified the mid-1970s as the "boom period"

for the faculty movement (1982, p. 7), warned that new models using a holistic approach and standard terminology must be adopted. "If left unattended, the faculty development movement could hang in the academic closet like the leisure suit of the 1970's" (1982, p. 13). Eble, after surveying the contemporary faculty development scene, categorizes faculty development models as being either single–focus or cafeteria (comprehensive) in their approach (1985, p. 13).

There are two basic single–focus approaches. The problem–oriented approach, used by the University of Chicago Medical School, involves a systematic search for problems and issues, and the development of strategies to deal with the areas in question (Pochyly 1977, p. 93). Many institutions fall into this category by default. That is, universities often operate by crisis–management and deal only with the most pressing issues. Unfortunately, faculty development is usually one of the things that can be kept on the back burner.

The other type of single–focus approach is the collaborative model. Many different types of collaboration are possible, but the essence of this model is that an individual faculty member chooses to pursue growth or improvement in collaboration with an instructional developer, colleague, or professional peer. Obviously, there is collaboration to some degree in all faculty development models, but in this model the collaborative relationship is at the center of the strategy and essential for its success. Wergin describes a collaborative consulting model between a faculty member and an instructional resource professional that begins with "low mutual trust and knowledge and an 'expert' consulting role, and develops into greater mutual trust and a more collaborative consulting role" (1976, p. 300). He contends that this relational shift must take place before the consulting model will be effective in creating lasting change.

The consultative model at Howard University College of Dentistry uses a three–step approach: needs assessment, inservice training, and educational research. The needs assessment includes self, student, and colleague appraisal. Then, in collaboration with an instructional specialist, an individualized program of in–service activities is designed. Faculty members are also encouraged to pursue educational research (Hutton 1977, p. 19). The centerpiece of Lhota's consultative model is a teaching center which functions as a learning resource center or "learning web" (1976, p. 35). This model resembles the instructional development program at the University of Michigan. Michigan is the university credited with the first major application of an in-

structional development process in higher education, in 1963 (Gaff 1975, p. 58).

Other collaborative models include an interinstitutional model where faculty innovation – leaders teach in experimental courses and use colleagues in a similar position at a nearby college or university for support (Noonan 1973, p. 94), a psychiatric model in which "the patient must acknowledge a need for treatment if the treatment is to be effective" (Eble 1983, p. 134), a peer observation model at the University of North Carolina which encourages faculty to examine critically each other's teaching styles and effectiveness (Bell 1977, p. 17), a team model where interdisciplinary teams receive release time to pursue common goals such as course development (Armstrong 1980, p. 53), and a triad model where teachers form triads to work together for one or more terms and share "teaching goals, methods, and proposed modifications" (Sweeney 1979, p. 54). One of the assumptions of the triad model is that professors should be as comfortable sharing their knowledge about teaching as they should be about sharing their research. It should become a common professional courtesy.

In the mid-1970s, the search was on for a comprehensive model of faculty development. The single – focus models were effective, but limited in scope. In 1975, no less than five comprehensive models were introduced. These models, or their descendants, represent the major thrust of current faculty development efforts.

In his influential book, *Toward Faculty Renewal,* Gaff presented a three-part faculty development model. The major aspects of this model and their distinguishing characteristics are outlined below (1975, p. 8):

	Faculty Development	Instructional Development	Organizational Development
Focus:	Faculty members	Courses or curriculum	Organization
Purpose:	Growth, skills, knowledge, and techniques	Course design, systematic instruction	Creative effective environment
Intellectual Base:	Social Psychology	Education & Ed. Tech	Organization Theory
Activities:	Seminars, workshops, evaluations	Redesign courses, writing course objectives	Action research, leadership workshops, and task forces

Also in 1975, there was published *A Handbook for Faculty Development,* by Bergquist and Phillips.

This "how-to-do-it" manual had a great impact on the faculty development movement, particularly in the smaller colleges. The Bergquist and Phillips comprehensive model also had three major parts and was quite similar to the model proposed by Gaff. In fact, except for the substitution of the term *Personal Development* for *Faculty Development,* the two models are identical in form (Bergquist 1975, p. 5). In their second volume (1977), Bergquist and Phillips did add a fourth dimension to their model — Community Development — and argued that all three aspects of their original model must be present in a mature faculty development program (1977, p. 6). In 1978, Hipps advocated this model for nursing faculty, and warned if nursing did not get going with faculty development, nursing would be forced into it as the other areas had been (1978, p. 695). The current pressures on nursing schools suggest that Hipps was right.

Also in 1975, higher education was introduced to the concept of organizational development through planned change. This was not a new concept, but institutions of higher education are always slow at trying methods taught in their business schools. Francis offered a three stage model: consciousness raising, focal – awareness, and subsidiary awareness (1975, p. 720), and Soulier a five stage model of general awareness, supporting faculty initiatives, faculty development, department development, and maintenance (1976, pp. 4 – 7). It is important to note that in the organizational development model, faculty development is only one step in a much larger process (Richardson 1975, p. 307).

According to Birnbaum, the academic calendar can be used to promote a comprehensive program (1975, p. 227). The idea would be to reduce the teaching semester to fourteen weeks, thus leaving three weeks for corporate developmental activities. Odiorne has advanced the idea of the human resources portfolio (1984, p. 61). He suggests we view the faculty (work force) as assets in a portfolio. Some are stars, some are workhorses, some are problem employees, and others are deadwood. Each group has its own needs and should be treated differently. This model, a takeoff on the Boston Consulting Group's Product – Market Portfolio, assumes that the direction of faculty development is an administrative duty. Many faculty members resist this assumption.

Obviously, the search for the one great comprehensive theory came up empty. Instead, there are many models which may be effective, if they are used in the right place at the right time. Experts believe generally that if a single comprehensive model is to be found, it must recognize the develop-

mental nature of faculty members. As is true of any adult, faculty members are not static in personality and attributes. They grow and pass through identifiable life stages — as a person and as a professional. A comprehensive faculty development program must recognize and allow for this process (Toombs 1975, p. 702; Ralph 1978, p. 61; Freedman 1973, p. 106; Bedsole 1978, p. 78). Adult development will be discussed further in the growth – contracting portion of the literature review.

Faculty Development Activities

Sabbatical leaves are the oldest form of faculty support. They had their origin at Harvard in 1810, and were granted to allow professors to gain competence in a subject area (Eble 1985, p. 5). Rudolph ties the growth in sabbaticals and paid leaves in the 1890s and following years to the growing emphasis on research and scholarly publication (1968, p. 407). This is not to say, however, that sabbaticals dominated the scene in higher education. In fact, as Eble observes, little attention was paid to sabbaticals until after World War II (1985, p. 5). Now, sabbaticals and leaves of absence are quite common, and are used for such diverse activities as attending advanced courses in a field of study, preparing for conferences and seminars, retooling in another field such as computers, and pursuing special research projects (Hoem 1975, p. 32).

Faculty development activities of one kind or another can now be found around the world and in every type of institution. The first International Conference of Faculty Development convened in 1974 (Munson 1975, p. 5). Since then, activities have been reported in nursing schools, medical schools, law schools, professional schools, community colleges, liberal arts collges, major universities, urban institutions, and small and rural colleges. It is difficult to see all these activities as being usefully related to each other. Centra divides faculty development activities into four categories: traditional practices, programs conducted by experienced faculty members, instructional assistance by specialists, and assessment of teaching quality (1976, p. 47). Ellerbe's typology of faculty development practices includes workshops, seminars, and programs; analysis and assessment practices; media, technology, and course development; institution – wide programs; and miscellaneous activities (1980, p. 1910). A much simpler typology would be to classify activities by the domain of the intended im-

provement: instruction, professional competence, or personal growth. That is, faculty development activities are designed to assist the faculty member in becoming a better teacher, a more competent professional, or a fully functioning person.

The most widely used approaches to faculty development prior to the "boom period" (pre-1973) were to reduce student/faculty ratio, to purchase new instructional technology, and to recruit new Ph.D's from prominent universities (Bergquist 1975, p. 179). In their survey, Padgett and Thompson found the most common activities to be seminars and workshops, professional leaves, and travel (1979, p. 7). Brown and Hanger listed over 140 activities for consideration by faculty and administrators, and argued that faculty development programs must be a combination of tradition and innovation (1975, p. 202). The implication is that the incorporation of the most common activities may not produce an effective program.

What activities hold the greatest promise? The answer to this question has changed over time. For example, Goodman cites the following list of effective approaches: monthly faculty bulletins, a general professional library, faculty clubs and short and infrequent faculty meetings (1950, pp. 68–9). Miller's list of most worthwhile activities includes sabbatical leaves, private offices, financial assistance to attend professional meetings, adjustment of load for research and writing, financial assistance for further graduate study, and less than a normal load for first year teachers (1963, p. 21). Gaff and Justice, on the other hand, advocate skills training, student evaluation of teaching, technical assistance, and consultation and counseling (1978, pp. 88–9). The common wisdom holds that there are many effective activities, but they must be considered in light of the specific needs of the target group and the institution.

Faculty development activities have featured a variety of techniques to improve the instructional effectiveness of faculty members. Behavioral outcomes have been measured by ratings of videotapes, and are reported to have some impact on cognitive, behavioral, and affective outcomes (Sheets 1984, p. 747). Peer observation caused faculty to carry out critical examination of their teaching styles and effectiveness at the University of North Carolina (Bell 1977, p. 15). Understudies have been assigned to mentor – teachers in the Dallas County Community College System in order to observe instructional methods first hand (Caswell 1983, p. 2), and Carroll presents evidence that good teachers can become even better by receiving instruction in the following five step lecture method: focus, place-

ment, definition, exemplification, and application (1981, p. 84).

Some faculty development activities recognize and focus on the developmental needs of faculty members. Freedman suggests an in-depth structured interview as a means of stimulating self-awareness that could form the basis of an effective program (1973, p. 106). Others believe that career assessment and career development activities play a key role in faculty development programming (Bedsole 1978, p. 78; Baldwin 1981, p. 83). Murphy reports that a short-term faculty exchange can be a means of promoting self-development (1980, p. 33). The recognition of the developmental nature of the teaching profession, that faculty members do seem to track through identifiable career stages, has already had a tremendous impact on the content of faculty development activities, and will probably occupy center stage in the faculty development movement's continuing efforts to develop a comprehensive philosophy.

No faculty development activity has received as much attention, affection, or criticism as has the faculty development grant. The "lack of time and money" is a traditional excuse for nonparticipation in faculty development activities, and "Dean's Grants" were supposed to address at least the second half of this problem. In his comprehensive survey of faculty development practices in 1976, Centra found that grants "to faculty members for improvement to courses or teaching were a common and highly rated practice" (1976, p. 6). Small grants also have the potential to encourage innovation as well as boost morale (Rose 1975, p. 5; Mayo 1979, p. iii; Mayhew 1979, p. 240). Rice noted that if administered properly, "challenge grants" can encourage the team approach (1979, p. 8), but Eble has cautioned that these grants will be much more successful if they are designed for the needs of specific groups of faculty—younger, mid-career, and older teachers (1972, p. 129). One additional warning: faculty grants are often used to supplement or supplant developmental budgets rather than to support faculty development. The best way to deplete the fund in a hurry is to grant money for the purchase of equipment, travel, and overload salaries (Ericksen 1984, p. 145).

In summary, faculty development activities have been around since 1810, and can now be found in all types of institutions all over the world. There is no standard typology of faculty development activities, but they can be classified by the nature of the intended impact—personal growth, professional development, or instructional improvement. There are hundreds of different activities, and each institu-tion must develop an individualized package if the program is to be effective. One key to an effective program seems to be the recognition and allowance for the developmental needs of individual faculty members. The most popular activity is the small grant or challenge grant. There is some evidence that it can boost morale and encourage innovation, but it must be carefully administered or it will be used as an auxiliary departmental budget.

Organizational Principles

There are several underlying assumptions and operational principles which the literature in the field generally supports as essential to an effective faculty development effort. One fundamental assumption is that good teaching can be taught (Bell 1977, p. 15). If one cannot learn to be a better teacher, then the faculty development budget is merely an administrative expense. The Group for Human Development in Higher Education, credited with giving a big push to the term "Faculty Development," has contended that faculty members should give at least 10 percent of their professional time to faculty development activities (1974, p. 82). While this is a worthy objective, it is interesting to note that no one has called for a corresponding allocation of 10 percent of the instructional budget to support this goal. Also, Eble, for one, is not convinced that such a budget would actually lead to improved results in instruction since "when faculty members are given a choice about what might best further their professional development, they gravitate toward conventional support—time off and travel funds—of their own research" (1985, p. 9). In any case, it is possible to become a better teacher if one has the necessary motivation and support—to that extent, teaching can be taught.

One essential operational principle is that a program must pursue clearly defined goals within the context of institutional needs and priorities. Rose has cautioned that "the single most dangerous deficiency in professional development is this preoccupation with process. Professional developers have lost sight of the goal that gave rise to the professional development movement in the first place . . . and of the goals of their own programs" (1976, p. 22). The real goal of faculty development, according to Reilly, is program development (1983, p. 26). Individual needs and initiatives must be accommodated within the stated needs and priorities of the institution—and this has been recognized early and late in faculty development history (Kelly 1950, p. 121; Stordahl 1981, p. 1; Reilly 1983, p. 25).

During periods of financial stress, the first programs "to get the axe" are (and should be) those that do not support the institutional agenda.

Effective leadership is essential for a faculty development program, and can come from many different sources. Gaff enumerates five alternatives: administrative leadership, a faculty group or committee, an individual with a specialized appointment, a short–term project leader, or the instructional improvement center. Regardless of the alternative, there is considerable debate as to the proper role for the administration to play. One argument is that active administrative support is essential for program success (Jordan 1978, p. 18; Whitmore 1981, p. 13; Phillips 1976, p. 3). Others, however, contend that active participation by the administration will be counterproductive (Sikes 1976, p. 46; Hoyt 1977, p. 36; Warrick 1979, p. 7). Generally, the literature supports a middle-ground approach. The administration of a college or university must initially provide enthusiastic support for the program in a tangible way—then it should keep an interest in the program as it develops, but hands off.

What are the keys to a successful program? Again there is a diversity of opinion. Eble identified financial support, a sound system of development, and the lodging of responsibility with a high administrative officer as essential (1972, p. 129). Faculty development programs are most successfully operationalized, according to Brown and Hanger, if they are decentralized, faculty sponsored, centrally facilitated, visible, explicit, and traditional *and* innovative (1975, p. 202). Nelson's requirements for a successful program include flexibility, individual as well as corporate activity, and vigorous administrative leadership and support (1979, pp. 144–8). Finally, Gaff contended that the following are essential elements of a professional development program: consideration of adult psychological development, adoption of a framework, a sense of the level of institutional awareness about faculty development, and encouragement of faculty to develop professionally (1978, p. 70). Gaff's comments suggest an interesting question. If growth and development are beneficial for the individual and essential for the institution, why is there no penalty if one does not develop?

A tangible and available reward structure may be the key to program success (O'Banion 1978, p. 24; Redditt 1978, p. 39). Other important keys include the department chairperson (Plough 1979, p. 1), the separation of faculty development from faculty evaluation (North 1968, p. 15; Neff 1976, p. 427; Bell 1977, p. 17), and the recognition that faculty development is a political process, thus necessitating the need for coalition networks (Lacy 1983, p. 95).

In summary, what are the general organizational principles that can be used to establish a successful faculty development program? Obviously, inasmuch as there are a great many opinions on this subject, it would be impossible to develop a list with which all would be satisfied. However, the four general principles offered by Hynes would be supported by a strong consensus (1984, pp. 32–4). First, faculty development is a continuous process. Gaff describes faculty development programs as "evolutionary, not revolutionary" (1978, p. 50). Second, the initiative for faculty development should come primarily from faculty. Faculty development is a process of change, and faculty "ownership" and openness are essential. There is also some evidence that a strong nucleus or "critical mass" is necessary for program success (Mathis 1974, p. 26; Gaff 1978, p. 50). A critical mass is certainly easier to achieve if the program is not perceived as a threat.

Third, one must make sure seed money does not become a "money trap." The money trap occurs when means and ends are confused, and faculty members begin to pursue activities for the money rather than for the opportunities for growth and development that the money was designed to provide. And fourth and finally, it is necessary to distinguish teaching improvement from teaching effectiveness. If faculty members believe that faculty development activities are really a covert form of faculty evaluation, participation and support for these activities will be minimal, or negative.

Participation

After studying the American faculty development scene in 1976, Seldin observed that there was not really much participation in faculty development activities. There were lots of programs, journals, committees foundation grants, and conferences, but faculty members were not turning out in large numbers (1976, p. 7). True, many glowing testimonials were coming in, reporting very positive results, but these programs almost always involved a minority of faculty members—many times the very faculty members who least needed to improve. Owens has counselled that "not all faculty will, or need to, participate in each faculty development activity: but if you provide variety, most faculty members will participate in something" (1977, p. 12). Apparently, Owens forgot to build variety into his own program, because in the same article, he

reports that only 15 percent of the faculty used the Teaching Center on campus (p. 10). In a national study on the effectiveness of faculty development functions, Jordan reported that over 50 percent of the instructional centers served 30 percent or less of the faculty (1978, p. 18). These findings tend to substantiate Seldin's initial observation.

Who is this minority who participates in faculty development activities, the group that planned change strategists have referred to as the "early adapters" (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 181). They seem to be the ones who need developing the least—the competent. A study of participation in community colleges concludes that those who are already competent (as rated by students) participated most often. Therefore, faculty development helps those who need help the least (Garlock 1979, p. 10).

Ellerbe's study of technical institutes and community colleges in North Carolina supports Garlock. His findings indicate that the faculty members who were perceived as good were most active (1980 p. 1910). Gaff noted that the voluntary nature of faculty development activities would insure an atypical mix—on the average, more talented and more interested in teaching (1975, pp. 167–8). Interestingly enough, when outstanding teachers are compared with a random sample of their peers, no statistically different characteristics are found (Gaff 1971, p. 480). One explanation for the participation of competent teachers in faculty development activities is that these activities pose no threat to them. A weaker teacher could view faculty development as a form of evaluation and maybe not be interested in sharing his or her deficiencies with the instructional staff. Perhaps teachers are better than average or competent because they participate in such things as faculty development, or perhaps it works the other way around.

There are several factors that have an impact on participation. One is age. Very young faculty members are not great participators. Some are working on advanced degrees, and most are operating on the survival mode: that is, they are just trying to get through the week. Long term developmental efforts are simply not relevant. Many faculty members with over fifteen years experience feel that they are already developed, or they are involved in faculty development as a mentor, or they believe that the program really does not meet their developmental needs. That leaves the group in the middle. The most active participators seem to be those who have five to fifteen years teaching experience (Toombs 1975, p. 715).

Other factors that might influence participation are employment status, sex-role factors, attitudes, institutional size, time, and money. Gallagher reported that, provided they live close to campus, adjunct faculty are more willing to participate in faculty development activities than are regular faculty members (1977, p. 5). Sex-role characteristics and expectations also have an influence on faculty development among nursing educators (Huggins 1980, p. 29). It may be that sex-role expectations influence the perceived value of faculty development activities, thus modifying participation. If there are negative attitudes concerning faculty development, it is likely that participation will suffer. Stordahl argues that faculty may not like the idea of being "developed." He suggests that the term faculty growth or support would have a more positive reception (1981, p. 1).

Some faculty development programs pose a significant threat to faculty members (Hoyt 1977, p. 36). When faculty evaluation is coupled with development activities, many faculty members simply choose not to participate. Obviously, programs must be evaluated, but the value of using the faculty development program as the means of evaluating individual faculty members is questionable.

Institutional size can also be a factor. From his national survey of faculty development activities, Jordan concluded that the "percent of faculty served by the faculty development center (or program) is inversely related to the size of the institution" (1978, p. 17). Smaller institutions, although operating with fewer resources, may have the edge in developing effective programs.

In summary, we know that a long list of factors may influence the level of participation in faculty development activities, but we do not know why certain individuals participate and others do not, or what the participation rate should actually be for an effective program. Two things, however, are quite clear. Faculty development programs reach only a minority of faculty members, fewer than 30 percent on most campuses. The other is that the average participant is already an above–average teacher. Programs tend to help those who need it the least.

Benefits and Impact

At the American Association of Higher Education National Conference in 1978, Gaff reviewed the then–current faculty development scene and concluded that while higher education is still learning about this phenomenon, the "evidence is beginning to accumulate that allows us to judge its worth. This evidence supports the conclusion that faculty

development has yielded significant benefits to faculty members, administrators, institutions, and students" (1978, p. 10). What exactly are these "significant benefits"? In the same year as the conference, Gaff and Morstain reported that over 80 percent of the participants in a sixteen–institution faculty development study indicated the following benefits: contact with interesting people from other parts of the campus, increased motivation for teaching improvement, support of innovative ideas, greater awareness of one's own teaching assumptions, and personal renewal (1978, p. 77). The study concluded that faculty development activities promoted organizational development by helping faculty to become "less insulated" (1976, p. 79). For the small college, faculty development activities provide leaders with the opportunity to act as institutional change agents, allowed faculty members to document their value to the institution, and might even help to guide tangential interests back toward institutional needs (1978, p. 39). Since most small colleges have very limited funds with which to support faculty development activities, it is becoming increasingly necessary to give first priority to those faculty development efforts that address stated institutional needs and concerns.

Some benefits of faculty development relate directly to the instructional process. Rose suggests that a small grant fund can support innovation and stimulate faculty to try new teaching techniques (1975, p. 5). Kozma adds that classroom innovation is a function of the level of administrative and financial support at most institutions (1978, p. 442). In separate studies, Hoyt and Howard reported that students rate the teaching effectiveness of faculty who participate in faculty development significantly higher than that of those who do not participate (1977, pp. 32–5). It is not clear, however, whether participation in faculty development improves one's teaching effectiveness, or if it is simply that effective teachers participate in faculty development activities, or both.

Other benefits may include improved academic climates, better role models, and support for personal and professional development. Marker credits the small grant program at Hope College with improving the scholarly climate on campus (Nelson and Siegel 1980, p. 9). Since students learn best by example, Bailey reason, faculty development could be beneficial because growing faculty members could provide needed role models for students (1974, p. 24). Goldman provided "empirical support that faculty development workshops promote self-actualization of its participants" (1978, 257). This may become an increasingly important benefit

as institutions begin to deal with the developmental needs of an aging faculty (Gross 1977, p. 752).

Faculty development programs can have their down side as well. For example, faculty programs reach only a portion of those persons they are intended to reach, and the most active participators are those who need it the least, as we noted (Gaff 1975, pp. 167–8). This raises the issue of the cost–effectiveness of many programs. Some would argue that the funds could best be committed to other areas of the educational budget. Hoyt cautioned that faculty development programs may pose a real threat to many faculty members (1977, 36), the main reason being the close association of faculty development with faculty evaluation on some campuses. Growth needs to be encouraged and performance evaluation is necessary, but the assumption that these two efforts must be contained in the same program is questionable. Hodgkinson adds that some faculty find the whole idea of being developed professionally demeaning (1973, p. 119).

In summary, there are many benefits that can accrue from faculty development programs. These include benefits to students, faculty, and the institution. It is important to remember, however, that faculty development efforts can have negative effects as well, and these negatives are very real.

Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs

Three questions can be raised with regard to evaluation of faculty development programs: why should they be evaluated, what methodology should be used, and by what criteria can the effectiveness of a program be judged? Wergin listed four shortcomings of faculty development programs: they seemed to be at the periphery of institutions, they served a number of different publics, they competed for the faculty's time, and they were plagued with a lack of data (1977, p. 70). This lack of data is troubling because programs must be evaluated in order to justify their existence and improve their effectiveness (Centra 1977, p. 47; Goldman 1978, p. 254).

In their second faculty development how-to manual, Bergquist and Phillips urge program evaluation for the following reasons: to demonstrate accountability to funding sources, to provide an evaluative summation for policy makers, to assist professional staff members in formative evaluation, to contribute information for the institutional decision–making process, and serve as a model for other campus programs (1977, p. 287). Kelly cautioned that it is im-

portant to distinguish between two similar but fundamentally different evaluation questions: (1) did the program meet its objectives? and (2) was the program any good? (Diamond 1975, p. 77). A program would not necessarily be effective simply because it meets all of its objectives, particularly if the program objectives were inappropriate or inconsequential. Durzo noted that it is also important for the administration to keep in mind that the purpose of program evaluation is to be able to reward on the basis of productivity, not to punish the people (1976, p. 4).

Obviously, then, there are many good reasons for the evaluation of faculty development programs. Perhaps the best reason is that, without evaluation, programs will have no way to document their contribution to the vitality of the institution. In these days of continual financial stress and constraint, educational programs that cannot do this will have a justifiably short future.

If faculty development programs must be evaluated, what is the best method? There is extensive agreement in the literature that the case study method utilizing data from a variety of sources is the most effective (Palola and Lehmann 1976, p. 79; Wergin 1977, p. 70; Preus 1979, p. 34). Wergin has promoted the case study because it examines the program "as a whole, including its rationale and evolution, activities, accomplishments, and difficulties" (Wergin 1977, p. 70).

What are the most common sources of evidence for case study? Nelsen lists site visits by teams of experts, questionnaires, and interviews with participants (1980, p. 136). To this list, several items can be added, including observation of the general campus milieu, and review of program documentation (Bergquist and Phillips 1977, p. 299). Cronbach pointed out that questionnaires and interviews are valuable in their ability to measure attitudes (1968, pp. 37–52). Hinricks noted that "probably the only way to really evaluate how well the job is done is to ask the people most clearly able to judge —the employees themselves" (1975, p. 481). Although Hinricks was referring to management–development activities in business and industry, there is considerable support in higher education for including student inputs as a source of evidence in the evaluation of faculty development programs (Centra 1972, p. 21; Gaff 1978, p. 59).

In any evaluation, it is essential to establish acceptable criteria for measuring performance (Bergquist and Phillips 1977, p. 290), but there are no universal measures of program performance. "Those interested in organizational effectiveness must recognize that its construct space accommo-dates a wide variety of criteria, all of which cannot be assessed in any one single study" (Cameron and Whetten 1983, p. 274). Hoyt and Howard contend that the ultimate measure of an improvement in effectiveness is the performance of students (1978, p. 26), but exactly how to get at this measure of improvement of effectiveness with any degree of validity is problematic.

A workable means of measuring program effectiveness (or success) is to identify documentable measures of program performance (Milley 1977, p. 191). While evaluating the Bush Foundation's faculty development program, Eble and McKeachie developed a comprehensive list of performance indicators (1985, p. 158):

> Among the Bush program activities, developing & revising courses, acquiring new & different teaching skills, gaining information about how students learn, improving advising procedures, observing and being observed by other teachers, acquiring knowledge of a new field, and improving scholarly competence are documentable in kind, number, and quality. That they constitute changes likely to be beneficial to instruction appears to be a sound premise.

The list of documentable indicators of program performance that Eble developed for the evaluation of the Bush program is as follows: institutional effects—changes in norms about teaching, curricular changes, communication within and among departments, organizational changes, and improved morale; and impact on faculty—motivational effects, cognitive learning, and the development of new skills in teaching (1985, 187).

Eble's work, in this writer's opinion, represents the most effective means of assessing program performance to date. Allen (1986, p. 47) utilized a list of program performance indicators (adapted from Eble) to assess the effectiveness of a faculty development program over a five-year period at different levels of financial support. This case study approach provides a wealth of data unique to each institution that can be used by program professionals, faculty committees, administrative budget panels, and external evaluation agencies in the review and analysis of faculty development programs.

References

Armstrong, F. H. "Faculty Development Through Interdisciplinarity." *Journal of General Education* 32.1 (1980): pp. 52–63.

Bailey, S. K. "Helping Professors (and Therefore Students) to Grow." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 28 May 1974: p. 24.

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.

Baldwin, R. G., et al. *Expanding Faculty Options: Career Development Projects at Colleges and Universities.* Washington: American Association of Higher Education, 1981.

Bedsole, D. T., and D. C. Reddick. "An Experiment in Innovation: The Faculty Career Development Program at Austin College. *Liberal Education* 64.1 (1978): pp. 75–83.

Bell, M. E., et al. "Peer Observation as a Method of Faculty Development." *College and University Personnel Association Journal* 28.4 (1977): pp. 14–17.

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.

Birnbaum, R. "Using the Calendar for Faculty Development." *Educational Record* 54.4 (1975): pp. 226–30.

Blackburn, R. T., and R. J. Havighurst. "Career Patterns of United States Male Academic Social Scientists." *Higher Education* 8 (1979): pp. 553–72.

Boyer, R. K., and C. Crockett. "Organizational Development in Higher Education: Introduction." *Journal of Higher Education* 44 Sept.–Oct. 1973: pp. 339–44.

Brown, D. G., and W. S. Hanger. "Pragmatics of Faculty Development." *Educational Record* 56.3 (1975): pp. 201–06.

Cameron, K. S., and D. A. Whetten. *Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models.* New York: Academic Press, 1983.

Carroll, M. A., and J. C. Tyson. "Good Teaching Can Become Better." *Improving College and University Teaching* 29.2 (1981): pp. 82–5.

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

Caswell, J. M. "Low Cost/High Value Staff Development Program." Annual Conference of the World Futures Society's Education Section. Dallas: February, 1983.

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.

Cronbach, L. J. "Evaluation for Course Improvement." *Readings in Measurement and Evaluation.* Ed. Norman Gronlund. New York: Macmillan, 1968. Dalton, G. W., et al. "The Four Stages of Professional Careers—A New Look at Performance by Professionals." *Organizational Dynamics* Summer 1977: pp. 19–42.

Dobbins, C. G., ed. *Expanding Resources For College Teaching.* Washington: American Council on Education Studies, 1956.

Durzo, J. J. "A Summary of Implications for Implementing Instructional Development Programs." *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education* 2.2 (1976): pp. 4–8.

Eble, K. E. *The Aims of College Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

———. *Professors as Teachers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

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

Ellerbe, J. H. "Faculty Development Practices in North Carolina Technical Institutes and Community Colleges." *Dissertation Abstracts* 41 (1980): p. 1910A.

Ericksen, S. C. *The Essence of Good Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Faris, K. "Faculty Development—The Key to Instructional Development." *Viewpoints* 46.2 (1970): pp. 129–46.

Francis, J. B. "How Do We Get There From Here?" *Journal of Higher Education* 46.6 (1975): pp. 719–731.

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

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 D. O. Justice. "Faculty Development Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." *Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching* 6.4 (1978): pp. 85–98.

Gaff, J. G., and B. R. Morstain. "Evaluating the Outcomes." *Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching* 6.4 (1978): pp. 73–84.

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

Gaff, S. S., C. Festa, and J. G. Gaff. *Professional Development: A Guide to Resources.* New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Gallagher, J. F. "Extending Faculty Development: A Case for Adjunct Faculty." *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education* 3.2 (1977): p. 1.

Garlock, V. P. "Faculty Development at the Community College: Who Participates?" Paper. Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Association. San Francisco, 8–12 Apr. 1979.

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.

Goldman, J. A. "Effect of a Faculty Development Workshop upon Self-actualization." *Education* 98 (1978): pp. 254–8.

Goodman, J. E., ed. *Evaluation and Improvement of Instruction.* Stillwater, OK.: Oklahoma A & M College, 1950.

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.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. *Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment.* New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1974.

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

Hendrickson, R. M. "Faculty Issues in the Eighties." *Phi Delta Kappan* 63.5 (1982): pp. 338–41.

Hershfield, A. F. "Education's Technological Revolution: An Event in Search of Leaders." *Change* 12.8 (1980): pp. 48–52.

"Higher Education Faculty: Characteristics and Opinions." *NEA Research Memo.* Washington: NEA, 1979.

Hinrichs, F. R. "A Feedback Program To Make Management Development Happen." *Personnel Journal* 54.9 (1975): pp. 478–81.

Hipps, O. S. "Faculty Development: Not Just a Bandwagon." *Nursing Outlook* 26.11 (1978): pp. 692–6.

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.

Hoem, E. "The Professional Development Program You Can Afford." *Community and Junior College Journal* 45.8 (1975): pp. 32–4.

Hoyt, D. P., and G. S. Howard. *The Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs.* Manhattan, Kansas: Office of Educational Research, Kansas State University, 1977.

———. *The Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs.* Research Report Number 39. Manhattan, KS.: Kansas State University, 1977.

Huggins, K. *Nursing Education Research in the South.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1980.

Hutton, J. G. "A Professional School Faculty Development Program." *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education* 3.2 (1977): pp. 18–19.

Hynes, W. J. "Strategies for Faculty Development." *Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers.* Ed. D. G. Brown. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

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.

Kelly, F. J., ed. *Improving College Instruction.* Washington: American Council On Education Studies, 1951.

Kozma, R. B. "Faculty Development and the Adoption and Diffusion of Classroom Innovation." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (1978): pp. 438–49.

Lacey, P. A., ed. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Revitalizing Teaching Through Faculty Development, no. 15.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Levine, A. *When Dreams and Heroes Died.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Lhota, R. L. *Multidimensional Model: Adjunct Staff Development.* Council of North Central Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.

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

———. "Professional Development." *The Modern Amer-*

ican College. Ed. A. Chickering. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

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

Maehr, M. L. *The Professor of the Future: Expectations, Dilemmas, Solutions.* Ed. T. B. Massey. Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Improving University Teaching. College Park: University of Maryland University College, 1984.

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

Martin, W. B. "Faculty Development and Evaluation or a Response to Student Interests and Needs." Paper. Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges. Washington, 1975.

Mathis, B. C. "Persuading the Institution to Experiment —Strategies for Seduction." Symposium. Improving Business Education Through Innovative Technology. Austin, Texas, March 1974.

Mayhew, L. B. *Surviving the Eighties.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Mayo, G. D. *Improving Small College Instruction Through Small Grants.* J. W. Brister Library Monograph Series 10. Memphis: Memphis State University, 1979.

Miller, R. I. *Developing Programs For Faculty Evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

———. *Evaluating Faculty Performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

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.

Munson, P. J., et al. *So You Want To Try Faculty Development?* Richmond: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1975.

Murphy, A. F. "The Short-Term Exchange: A Means of Faculty Development." *ADFL Bulletin* 12.1 Sept. 1980, 33–35.

McCarter, W. R., and E. L. Barnes. *Organizing and Managing Small/Rural Colleges: More Bang for the Buck.* Blackburg, Virginia: Conference on Small/Rural Colleges, Aug. 1978.

Neff, C. B. "Faculty Development Tug O'War or Up a Tree with a Tuning Fork." *Liberal Education* 62.3 (1976): pp. 427–32.

Nelsen, W. C. "Faculty Development: Prospects and Potential for the 1980's." *Liberal Education* 65 (1979): pp. 141–49.

Nelsen, W. C., and M. E. Siegel, eds. *Effective Approaches to Faculty Development.* Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1980.

Noonan, J. F. "Faculty Development Through Experimentation and Interinstitutional Cooperation." *Facilitating Faculty Development. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 1.* Ed. M. Freedman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

North, J., and S. Scholl. "Revising a Faculty Evaluation System: A Workbook for Decision-Makers." Higher Education Office, 1968.

O'Banion, T. *Organizing Staff Development Programs That Work.* Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

Odiorne, G. S., *Strategic Management of Human Resources.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Ost, D. H. "Perspective on Faculty Development." *Future* 14 (1976): pp. 2–4.

Owens, R. E. *Elevating the Importance of Teaching.* Manhattan: Kansas State University, 1977.

Padgett, S., and L. C. Thompson. "A Survey of Professional Development in Arizona Community Colleges." *Center for the Study of Higher Education.* Tucson: Arizona University, 1979.

Palola, E. G., and T. Lehmann. "Improving Student Outcomes and Institutional Decision Making With PERC." *Improving Educational Outcomes.* Ed. O. T. Lenning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Phillips, S. R. "Faculty Development: Just Another Committee?" *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education* 2.2 (1976): pp. 2–4.

Plough, T. R. "Academic Development for Department Chairpersons." Paper. Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. San Diego, 13–17 May 1979.

Pochyly, D. F. "Problem-oriented Faculty Development in a Medical School." *Educational Horizons* 55.2 (1977): pp. 92–6.

President's Commission on Higher Education (Conant Commission). *Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report.* New York: Harper & Row, 1948.

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

Ralph, N. B. "Faculty Development: A Stage Conception." *Improving College and University Teaching* 26 (1978): pp. 61–8.

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

Redditt, P. L., and W. T. William. "Teaching Improvement in a Small College." *New Directions for Higher Education.* Ed. J. Gaff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Reilly, D. H. "Faculty Development No: Program Development Yes." *Planning for Higher Education* 11.3 (1983): pp. 25–28.

Rice, R. E., and M. L. Davis. *Program Coordination of*

Academic Planning and Professional Development. Stockton: University of the Pacific, 1979.

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

Rogers, E. M., and F. F. Shoemaker. *Communication of Innovation.* 2nd Edition. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Rose, C. "Evaluation: the Misunderstood, Maligned, Misconstrued, Misused, and Missing Component of Professional Development." *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education* 2.2 (1976): pp. 22–4.

Rose, C., and G. F. Nyre. "From Retrenchment to Renewal: Faculty Development and Innovation in California State Universities and Colleges." Address. International Conference on Improving University Instruction. Heidelberg, May 1975.

Rudolph, F. *The American College and University: A History.* New York: Knopf, 1968.

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.

Sheets, K. J., and R. C. Henry. "Assessing the Impact of Faculty Development Programs in Medical Education." *Journal of Medical Education* 59.9 (1984): pp. 746–48.

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

Soulier, S. J. *A Description of a Conceptual Model of Institutional Renewal.* Educational Research & Improvement. Anaheim, Cal., 1976.

Stordahl, B. *Faculty Development: A Survey of the Literature of the '70's.* American Association of Higher Education — Educational Research & Improve-

ment/Higher Education Research Currents, March 1981.

Sullivan, L. T. "Faculty Development: A Movement on the Brink." *College Board Review* 127 (1983): pp. 20–1, 29–30.

———. "Faculty Development: A Movement on the Brink — (Of What)?" *EXCEL Report.* Little Rock: Arkansas University, 1982.

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.

Sweeney, J. M., and A. F. Grasha. "Improving Teaching Through Faculty Development Triads." *Educational Technology* 19.2 (1979): pp. 54–7.

Toombs, W. "A Three-dimensional View of Faculty Development." *Journal of Higher Education* 46.6 (1975): pp. 701–17.

———. "Faculty Development: The Institutional Side." *New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 40,* Dec. 1983: pp. 85–94.

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.

Warrick, C. M. "The Academic Seven Year Itch and a Possible Home Remedy." Paper. Annual Meeting of the Western College Reading Association. Honolulu, 7–10, Apr. 1979.

Webb, J., and A. Smith. "Improving Instruction in Higher Education." *Educational Horizons* 55.2 (1977): pp. 86–91.

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.

Whitmore, J. R. "Lessons Learned from Dean's Grants for the Restructuring of Teacher Educaion." *Journal of Teacher Education* 32.5 (1981): pp. 7–13.